

**People's Democratic Republic of Algeria**  
**Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research**  
**Amar Thelidji University, Laghouat**  
**Faculty of Letters and Languages**  
**Department of English**



**Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932)**  
**Through the Lens of Sheldon Wolin's American**  
**“Inverted Totalitarianism” (2008)**

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Master in English Literature and Civilization

by

Djamila Yahia

**Board of Examiners:**

- Mr. Salah BAKHOUCHE, University of Laghouat, Chairman
- Dr. Brahim ARIBI, University of Laghouat, Supervisor
- Mrs. Aicha HOCINE, University of Laghouat, Examiner

2019/2020

## **Dedication**

This work is dedicated to my beloved supportive parents, Mr. Ahmed Yahia and Mrs. Khadija Taher, to whom I owe a debt of gratitude that I can never hope to repay. It is also dedicated to my dear brothers, Ibrahim and Cherif, who have always been a source of encouragement and inspiration.

## **Acknowledgments**

Special thanks to my supervisor Dr. Brahim Aribi for his guidance throughout every step of this dissertation making. I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to all my hard working and respected teachers.

## Abstract

A major preoccupation of postmodern scholars is the idea of waning democracy in the light of an increasing governmental repression. The present dissertation investigates the prophetic relevance of Aldous Huxley's dystopian novel *Brave New World* (1932) to the political scene of the United States. It analogically traces aspects of Sheldon Wolin's political theory "Inverted Totalitarianism" in the novel. Therefore, it hypothesizes that *Brave New World*'s government adopts a set of non-democratic repressive ideologies similar to those suggested in Wolin's political theory. Hence, the current research undertakes a descriptive analytical approach to study the analogy between the novel's control strategies and those depicted in Wolin's *Democracy Incorporated: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism* (2008). It employs the Neo-Marxist and Foucauldian philosophical lenses to specifically explore aspects of power monopolization and discourse manipulation. The study ultimately concludes that the subjugation strategies employed by the New World government match to a large extent those used by the system of an Inverted Totalitarianism. Thus, the novel bares a strong prophetic ideological relevance to the American political scene.

## Table of Contents

Dedication .....	I
Acknowledgments.....	II
Abstract .....	III
Table of Contents .....	IV
<b>General Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter One: A Theoretical Background</b>	
Introduction .....	7
A. From Utopia to Dystopia.....	7
A. 1. Utopia .....	8
A. 2. Dystopia .....	8
B. Totalitarian Dystopia .....	10
B. 1. Origins of Totalitarianism .....	10
B. 2. The Theme of Totalitarianism in Dystopian Literature.....	12
B. 2. a. George Orwell's <i>1984</i> .....	12
B. 2. b. Margaret Atwood's <i>The Handmaid's Tale</i> .....	13
B. 2. c. Aldous Huxley's <i>Brave New World</i> .....	15
C. American Inverted Totalitarianism .....	16
C. 1. The Post-modern Perspective of American Democracy .....	17
C. 2. Inverted Totalitarianism .....	18
D. The Philosophical Framework of Analysis .....	20
D. 1. Neo-Marxism .....	20
D. 1. a. Political Class Domination .....	21
D. 1. b. Ideological Class Domination .....	22
D. 2. Foucauldian Discours Manipulation .....	24
Conclusion.....	26

## **Chapter Two: American Inverted Totalitarianism**

Introduction .....	28
A. Democracy Incorporation .....	28
A. 1. Totalitarian Socialism .....	29
A. 2. Democratic Capitalism .....	29
A. 3. Criticism of Modern Capitalism .....	30
A. 4. Capitalist Superpower in the US .....	32
A. 4. a. Economic Over Social Benefit .....	33
A. 4. b The False Promise of Stability .....	34
B. Eliticism.....	35
B. 1. The Roots of American Eliticism .....	36
B. 2. Eliticism as an Authoritative Trait .....	38
C. The Superpower Myth .....	39
C. 1. Myth Revival.....	39
C. 1. a. The Role of Technology in Promoting the Myth .....	40
C. 1. b. The Demonic vs. the Heroic Discourse following the 9/11 .....	41
C. 1. c. Shaping Reality through Mythical Discourse .....	43
C. 2. The Implications of Mythical Discourse.....	44
C. 2. a. Fear Installation .....	44
C. 2. b. Nationalistic Manipulation .....	46
Conclusion.....	48

## **Chapter Three: Inverted Totalitarianism in *Brave New World***

Introduction .....	51
A. Capitalistic Power Monopolization in the World State .....	51
A. 1. A Fordist State.....	52
A. 2. The Emergence of State and Capitalist Powers .....	52
A. 3. Prioritization of Capitalist Interest.....	53

A. 3. a. The False Promise of Stability .....	53
A. 3. b. Consumerism.....	54
A. 3. c. Social Class Division.....	54
A. 4. Voluntary Enslavement .....	56
B. Eliticism in the World State .....	57
B. 1. Intellectual Inequality in the World State .....	57
B. 2. Power Monopolization by the Elite.....	58
B. 3. Elite Manufacturing.....	59
B. 3. a. Genetic Engineering: Bokanovskification.....	59
B. 3. b. Sleep Teaching: Hypnopaedia.....	60
B. 3. c. Behavioral Conditioning.....	61
B. 4. Control of Information.....	61
C. The Superpower Myth in the World State .....	63
C. 1. The Myth of the Nine Years War... ..	63
C. 2. The Demonic vs. the Heroic Discourse In the World State .....	64
C. 3. Technology as A Totalitarian Tool .....	66
C. 4. The Creation of an Alter- Reality Through Mythical discourse.....	67
C. 4. a. The Use of Soma .....	68
C. 4. b. The Use of Censorship .....	69
C. 5. The Implications of Mythical Discourse in the World State .....	70
C. 5. a. Fear Installation .....	70
C. 5. b. Nationalistic Conformity .....	72
Conclusion.....	73
<b>General Conclusions .....</b>	<b>75</b>
Works Cited.....	78
Appendix A.....	84
Appendix B .....	85

ملخص البحث.....	87
Résumé.....	88

## General Introduction

The drastic shift from the utopian thinking that accompanied the nineteenth century Enlightenment and the optimistic rationality of modernism has always been a significant feature of the twentieth century. This is due to the troubling historical context of the century which was characterized by the rising figures of oppositional politics exemplified in the rise of totalitarian regimes, the Second World War, the negative effects of technological progress, economic crises and the Cold War. Within this historical context, aspects of disillusionment, uncertainty and pessimism represented in the works of thinkers such as Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995), Felix Guattari (1930-1992), Jean Francois Lyotard (1924-1998), Jean Baudrillard (1929-2007), and Jacques Derrida (1930-2004) have soon evolved into a standalone philosophy based on providing insightful accounts of the postmodern condition. Adopting an anti-foundationalist stand, they stressed the impossibility of an objective interpretation of the postmodern condition by providing a set of liberating theories instead. Not only did these theories question and disregard most of the long established ideological discourses, but have also paved the way to the spread of a spirit of post-modernity. Soon, this spirit swept a number of literary works which came to be known as the dystopian genre, and a set of political theories such as that of Sheldon Wolin (1922-2015), an outstanding American figure who longed at reinitializing democratic theory in the United States.

In relation to the dystopian genre with its themes of disillusionment, loss and despair, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) offers a faithful representation to this type of literature. Dressed in the form of a scientific utopia, Huxley's tale highlights the frightening dimension of curbed human freedom. The novel picturizes a society dominated by aspects of futuristic reproductive technology, biological engineering and sleep-learning. These developments are exploited by the evil ruling class to curb the democratic freedom of its citizens. Likewise, the works of postmodern political theorists ,such as Sheldon Wolin, articulate a postmodern view of the long founded American democracy referring to it as a new form of totalitarianism. In his *Democracy Incorporated: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism* (2008), Wolin argues that the American political scene is characterized by totalitarian tendencies which are distinguished from those of classical Nazi, Fascist and communist regimes, only in the fact that they take an inverted form. That is to say, the system in such regimes is underlied by a set of abstract totalizing powers which focus mainly on encouraging political disengagement. As such, private media becomes the

primary mediator that echoes the official version of events. Wolin calls this type of regime “Inverted Totalitarianism”, a system which is featured by two main features: power monopolization and discourse manipulation.

The main concern of this study will, therefore, be providing an analytical description of the repressive aspects of the system of Inverted Totalitarianism as depicted in both Huxley’s fictional work *Brave New World* and Wolin’s political works. This way, the research aims at identifying the affinities between the two writer’s postmodern visions of democracy.

Being a classical literary dystopia, *Brave New World* has been the subject of several critical research papers in which the scholars, who embarked on analyzing the repressive ideas reflected in the novel, approached the novel from a variety of critical perspectives: historical, scientific, feminist and psychoanalytical. Adopting New Historicism as an approach to deal with the novel, Sebastian Kylin, in his thesis “*Brave New World: Blind Perception of the Early 20 th Century*” (2017), attempted to analyze the novel from a historical perspective. Through juxtaposing the text to historical documents of the time, Kylin reached the conclusion that the novel is a satirical portrayal of the progressive horosities of its era.

From a feminist perspective, in her paper “*The Women of Brave New World: Aldous Huxley and the Gendered Agenda of Eugenics*” (2018), Jessica Eylem sheds light on the repression of female characters in the novel. She arrived at the conclusion that the repression technique of fear applied on the three female characters had ultimately resulted in the “destruction” of female body and characteristics.

Similarly, Nic Panagopoulos examined the repressive aspects of the scientific technology in Huxley’s futuristic world from a scientific perspective. In his “*Brave New World and the Scientific Dictatorship: Utopia or Dystopia essay*” (2016), he unveiled the dystopian repression lying under the scientific utopia. He concluded by suggesting that the novel stands as one of the “speculative narratives” of the early twentieth century which specifically aim at promoting “the idea of the World State”. In this sense, according to him, this literary masterpiece acts as a reflection for the social Darwinist agenda of the scientific elite.

From a psychoanalytical perspective, Michael O'Brien analyzed the notions of ideology and power in Huxley's post-Fordian liberal society in his paper entitled "A Post-Lacanian and Postmodern Interaction with the Utopian Project of Modernity: Ideology and Power in Brave New World" (2015). He demonstrated how the unconscious sexual and consumerist desires of the characters were exploited by the controllers. He, thus, arrived at the conclusion that Ideology and power function in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, as products of the unconscious desire, produced and sustained in "socio-symbolic" formations.

Nonetheless, what seems to escape the formerly mentioned studies is the ideological relevance of the novel to the postmodern political scene. Like this, they provide little reflection on the ideologically prophetic ideas of the novel. Therefore, this study aims at bridging this gap by approaching the novel from the perspective of Sheldon Wolin's postmodern political theory. By juxtaposing the fictional text to the political text, the study aims at identifying the common aspects of the repressive governments.

The study centrally seeks to answer the question, "How did Huxley prophesize the emergence of American Inverted Totalitarianism?" In order to answer that question a set of sub-questions is to be addressed. Firstly, what are the non-democratic aspects of the American system in Wolin's perspective? Secondly, what ideologies underlay these aspects? Thirdly, how were these aspects depicted in Huxley's novel before almost eighty years ago? And to what extent does the New World regime resemble that of Sheldon Wolin's United States?

The research hypothesizes that the Huxley's dystopian novel describes a system of government which features align with Sheldon Wolin's Inverted Totalitarianism. It, thus, draws on the claim that the American system of government, specifically during President George W. Bush's first term of presidency, adopted repressive techniques similar to those adopted by the New World government. The utopian American democracy was, thus, replaced by a dystopian form of an Inverted Totalitarianism. From here rises the necessity of questioning the futuristic path of politics. As the new forms of governmental repression takes subtler forms, citizenry starts to take the willful position of subjects. This strikes the heart of the authenticity of American democracy. It places the claims of equality and individual freedom in a questionable position.

In order to answer the aforementioned questions, the research adopts a descriptive analytical approach. It is descriptive in the sense that it descriptively explains the aspects of Inverted Totalitarianism as provided by Sheldon Wolin's book *Democracy Incorporated*

(2008). It is, also, analytical in the sense that it analytically traces the ideological aspects of such a system in the dystopian novel *Brave New World* (1932). The general analysis is based on the Neo-Marxist and Foucauldian philosophies with making reference to other philosophical theories.

On a specific scale, the study explores two main repressive aspects of Inverted Totalitarianism. While the Neo-Marxist theory is adopted to identify the ways in which power is monopolized by corporate capitalists and intellectual elite, the identification of the ways in which discourse is manipulatively used to control the citizen, is processed through the Foucauldian theory of discourse.

This dissertation is divided into three chapters. The first chapter is concerned with the broader contextualization of the topic. The aim is to provide a comprehensive theoretical view of the topic. The chapter points the intersection between the dystopian theme of totalitarianism and the postmodern political theory's perspective of Inverted Totalitarianism. Understanding such concepts and relating some of which relevant philosophical lenses likely result in erasing bewilderment among especially unfamiliar readers with Wolin's political theory. The chapter goes on to trace the shift from dystopianism to utopianism; as well as, the theme of totalitarianism in dystopias. In so doing, the chapter aims at leaving the reader with a firm idea of the origins of the literary genre and the varying ways in which it dealt with the theme of totalitarianism. The chapter, then, draws on the postmodern political theory to arrive at presenting Wolin's Inverted Totalitarianism. This provides the reader with an understanding of the contest of and the main ideas tackled in the theory. The chapter finally provides the philosophical framework of analysis. It explores the idea of power monopolization as presented by the Neo-Marxist theory and, then, presents Michel Foucault's ideas about manipulating discourse to subjugate masses. In doing so, the chapter sets backdrop for the analysis in the following chapters.

Both of the second and third chapters follow the same mirroring line of descriptive analysis. They provide the reader with an idea about the manifestations of Inverted Totalitarianism's in the political theory and the novel. The second chapter is divided into two sections which explore the techniques of power monopolization and discourse manipulation as presented by Wolin. The chapter aims at answering the questions: "what are the subjugating techniques employed by the US government? And how do these techniques oppose the claims of democracy?" This aims at exploring the underlying aspect of the alleged American democracy as claimed by Wolin. The third chapter traces the manifestations of the

same techniques in the Huxley's *Brave New World*. It analyzes the novel's setting, characters and events to show the similarities with Wolin's view of Inverted Totalitarianism. The chapter, thus, seeks to answer whether the World State fits the category of an Inverted Totalitarianism.

My most optimistic view in relation to this research is that it draws attention to the underlying forms of repression practiced by governments. As such, I aspire to evoke a degree of awareness by questioning the defining aspects of modern democracy.

**Chapter One**  
**A Theoretical Background**

## **Introduction**

The first signs of post-modern theory emerged in the 1930s. The later is set to be a critical time in the history of European thought. People across Europe were haunted by the atrocities of the First World War<sup>1</sup>. Consequently, such horror brought their intellectuals to the realization that both the ideological and the progressive influence of the Continent were dwindling. It became evident that the promise of modernism, and Western Civilization more generally, had proven untruthful. As a result, the body of literature produced came to reflect the prevailing sense of societal disillusionment. While novelists chose to invert the preceding Utopias, philosophers and theorists embarked on deconstructing the preceding societal doctrines. As such, Huxley's *Brave New World* and Wolin's *Inverted Totalitarianism* stand as witnessing works of the era.

This chapter provides a historical, ideological and philosophical contextualization of the post-modern dystopian novel and political theory. It specifically traces the totalitarian impulse in those productions. The chapter is divided into four sections. The first section draws on the literary shift from Utopianism to Dystopianism. The second section explores the notion of totalitarianism. It, first, defines and sets the features of classical totalitarian systems. It, then, provides a brief analysis of the different depictions of totalitarianism in Orwell's *1984* (1949), Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* (1984) and Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932). The third section presents the idea of Inverted Totalitarianism. It, first, points the changing attitudes toward American democracy. Then, it defines Wolin's theory of Inverted Totalitarianism. The last section provides a philosophical context of analysis. It depicts the idea of power monopolization in Neo-Marxism. It, then, presents Foucault's idea of discourse manipulation.

### **A. From Utopia to Dystopia**

It is said that Dystopia finds its roots in Utopia. While, the idea of Utopia stems from the myth of Eden back to Plato's *Republic*, in which Plato described an ideal, perfect world (Babae 64), Dystopia emerged in the twentieth century as a response to the earlier idealistic Utopian writings.

---

<sup>1</sup> First world war is ranked as the deadliest conflict in human history. By the end of the war a total of approximately 40 million people lost their life. Most of them were young soldiers and civilians killed in cruel ways (Solomon).

## **A. 1.Utopia**

Originally, “Utopia” is a Greek word that refers to “no place”. It is used to represent a non-existent, perfect, life (Gulik 3). According to the British Anthropologist Professor David Harvey “Utopia is an artificially created island, which functions as an isolated, coherently organized, and largely closed space economy” (160). His definition unveils the non-realistic nature of Utopia. It, in fact, points the perfectionist ideal that lies in the heart of Utopianism. Such Utopianism, however, is arguably non-existing, or never existed before, for Utopia gives an incredible image of an ideal life. It implies the existence of a perfect government that provides equality, rights and happiness for individuals. These are beyond reality and far from what societies are built on nowadays.

Historically, the first published work of literature pertaining to the idea of Utopian optimism is Thomas More’s *Utopia* (1516). The work “combined a most penetrating criticism of his own society, its irrationality and its injustice, with the picture of a society which...had solved most of the human problems which sounded insoluble to his own contemporaries” (Fromm and Orwell 258). Evidently, optimism continued to be one of the most prevailing “fundamental features” of the “Western Thought” during the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. The period was characterized by “faith in human progress and in man’s capacity to create a world of justice and peace” (Fromm and Orwell 257). Literary Utopias of the time are best exemplified in the works of Edward Bellamy’s *Looking Backward* (1888), H. G. Wells’ *A Modern Utopia* (1905), among others. However, According to Claeys, these literary works tied loosely the common living condition. They, hence, reflected nothing more than a “distorted image of humanity.”(15).This pushed people such as the French philosopher Bertrand DeJouvenel to think that “There is a tyranny in the womb of every Utopia.” (qtd.in Kapur). Such a conception suggests that within every Utopia is a Dystopia striving to emerge.

## **A. 2. Dystopia**

According to the Online Oxford Dictionary, Dystopia is “an imaginary place of condition in which everything is as bad as possible”. The term Dystopia was first used by the British philosopher John Stuart Mill in 1868 in one of his political speeches, to describe the British government’s policy on Irish landholding. He used the word in contrast with the term Utopia. Mill stated that “what is commonly called Utopian is something too good to be practical, but what they [the government] appear to favor is too bad to be practical.”(Robson).

In this quote Mill points out the unjust nature of the governmental practices of the English government towards the Irish citizens. He, thus, comments on the tyranny lying behind the seemingly innocent government.

As such, it is argued that the rise of dystopian literature is largely associated with the 20<sup>th</sup> century pessimism. The new brand of Dystopian literature or “Anti-Utopian” literature emerged as a reaction to exaggerated Utopian ideas. Critics of Utopianism claim that the word “Utopia” equates with the word “perfect,” and a perfect society would be one that is “finished, complete, or unchangeable” (Sargent 15). This bleak vision is a reflection of the historical context of the genre’s emergence. The shifting political scene in the world propelled writers to create diversified works of dystopian fiction. Moylan’s words sum up the social and historical context of producing these literary classics. She confirms that the dystopian narratives are the product of “A hundred years of exploitation, repression, state violence, war, genocide, disease, famine, ecocide, depression, debt...”(xi). Such conditions undoubtedly provided a fertile ground for the reversal of Utopian imagination. Ultimately, the sum of these events and the produced works of fiction had laid the ground to an expanded scope in which Dystopian genre can be defined.

Dystopia has been defined by many theorists as an imagined futuristic society in which the living conditions are extremely negative. It is, thus, characterized by extreme emphasis on oppression and despondence (Zuckerman). On the same token, American critics M.H. Abrams and Harpham describe Dystopia as a “very unpleasant imaginary world in which ominous tendencies of our present social, political, and technological order are projected in some disastrous future culmination” (218). Additionally, Donawerth mentions Gordon Browning’s argument about the Dystopian usage of satiric literary techniques. He writes that most oftenly isolated Dytopian settings function as mirrors reflecting the authors’ “dissatisfaction” of their societies (Baccolini and Moylan 29). Dystopia thus, is a world that is dominated by aspects of suppression and superiority. In a dystopian universe, the dominant bodies set their power through oppressing, exploiting, and abusing people. Moreover, in this sense, Dystopia can also be regarded as a horror fiction since it takes readers beyond reality. The aim usually, yet, is to warn against the growing forms of oppression in nowadays societies rather than merely providing an escapist world for readers.

Despite their fictional dress, literary dystopias aim at voicing the authors’ warnings, expectations and worries. They, hence, aspire to evoke a positive change. In contrast to

Utopian literature, Dystopian fiction derives this value from its strong relevance to realistic contexts. Thus, it is often regarded as a reflection scope for the post-modern writers. On this token, Bouaffoura states that: “Dystopia in the novel is not based on a faraway isolated and impossible land as that of Utopia, it is rather set in a real land with an accurate historical background” (Bouaffoura 12). Such a realistic aspect serves the purposeful nature of the genre. David.W.Sick highlights this as he writes that Dystopia is “a hopeful genre, which deliberately scares us for our own good: it does not exist in a vacuum, but shows the reader frightening visions of what might arise from events he or she can clearly see in the contemporary world.” (qtd.in Nyström 5).

## **B. Totalitarian Dystopia**

As formerly explained, the shift from utopian positivism to Dystopian pessimism is associated with the historical context of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This context was the out born of two main aspects. First, the progressive aspects of the Industrial revolution, rapid progress of technology, and popularization of capitalistic trends gave rise to a new type of fear. It, thus, popularized the idea of machine taking power over men (“Utopia and Dystopia Information”). Second, events such as; the October Revolution of 1917 in Russia, Nazi Germany, and the Second World War, had all placed the idea of totalitarian government in the heart of literary works. All these events created the disillusionment and the fear of the future that might not be as imagined (Gerhard 1).

### **B. 1. Origins of Totalitarianism**

Totalitarianism is the most radical denial of freedom. It describes a society with no rights and no control over one’s own thoughts or actions. According to the Online Oxford Dictionaries, totalitarianism is “a system of government that is centralized and dictatorial and requires complete subservience to the state”. Given its relative recentness, Totalitarianism stands among the most contested terms in the political lexicon. The term was first coined in May 1923 by Giovanni Amendola (Baehr 2346). Particularly, it is often associated with the Fascist/Nazi “particularism”; which advocates the superiority of the nation or racial superiority, and the Bolshevist “universalism”; which advocates the aspiration toward an egalitarian society. Despite their differences, these regimes share an extreme suppression of liberty. They, thus, rule through excluding all forms of “legal restraint, civic pluralism, and party competition...”(Baehr 2344).

Historically, Totalitarianism first started taking shape in Italy during the late 1920s. The fascist promotion of a new “political religion” signed the emergence of a new transformative power. Subsequently, after the Nazi seizure of power in 1933, the word then quickly broadened to include National Socialism. Soon after, the word became equated with German, Italian, and Soviet systems. Consequently, the popularity of Totalitarianism increased considerably once the Nazi-Soviet pact was signed in 1939<sup>2</sup>. Following the defeat of Fascism in 1943 and Nazism in 1945, a new global conflict soon emerged that reactivated the role of “totalitarianism” (Baehr 2345). Tension over Soviet ambitions in Europe was particularly elevated when Churchill used the term twice in his “Iron Curtain” speech on March 5, 1946, at Fulton, Missouri. Subsequently, a year later, the Truman Doctrine introduced the term totalitarianism to American foreign policy and security jargon. The language of totalitarianism, thus, remained equally prevailing during the Cold War period. In the United States, being a center of wide political debate, the idea of totalitarianism continued to have relevance in the political milieu. Nowadays, following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Islamism and the “war against terror” continue to keep the idea of totalitarianism prominent within political academic discourse (Baehr 2345).

Nevertheless, despite its considerable recede in contemporary political modern scene, it can still be argued that the significance of Totalitarianism lies in its common tyrannical characteristics. In *Totalitarianism* (1954), Carl Friedrich identifies seven particular elements of Totalitarian regimes (Baehr 2345). First, they all adopt a “revolutionary, exclusive, and apocalyptic ideology”. Such an ideology, which is “Antiliberal, anticonservative, and antipluralist”, strives on the creation of myths, cults, and rituals designed to memorialize the destiny of the subjects. Second, totalitarianism advocates the notion of power monopolization. The charismatic leader, who tops the ruling political party, is regarded as omniscience and infallible. His subjects are expected to show unconditional personal devotion. Third, the regime holds a monopolistic gripp over mass media and “professional” organizations. Fourth, Totalitarianism adopts an economic system of bureaucratic collectivism<sup>3</sup>. Fifth, the system maintains hold over power by eliminating all forms of opposition. This includes; “active oppositionists”, “objective enemies” and “enemies of the people. Also, the Totalitarian regime

---

<sup>2</sup> In 1939, a non-aggression treaty was signed between Germany and the Union of socialist Republics. The pact boosted the power of the two parts as it allowed them divide Poland between them. It also included an ally commitment that banned them from aiding or siding with enemies of each other (Zabecki 536).

<sup>3</sup> Democratic collectivism refers to a form of socialism in which the society is divided into two classes. Theelite party bureaucracy controls both the state and the economy. They own means of production and are responsible for the distribution of the profit (Baehr 2345).

assures continual mobilization of the whole population through “war, ceaseless campaigns, struggles.” Finally, totalitarianism implies rule through violence. Thus, the regime’s “secret police” use terror to isolate, intimidate, and regiment all whom the regime regards menacing (Baehr 2345-2346). As such, Totalitarian regimes prove highly tyrannical. Their characteristics reflect an inherent opposition to all aspects of a democratic society

## **B. 2. The Theme of Totalitarianism in Dystopian Literature**

All of the formerly mentioned political and historical experiences are inseparable from the literary discourse of totalitarianism. Journalists, novelists, poets, playwrights, and filmmakers played a central role in publicly addressing aspects of totalitarian domination. They, hence, contributed to simplifying the vague academic term of totalitarianism. It was due to their efforts that the term became central to the vernacular of commonly educated people. As such, a number of literary masterpieces perpetuate the theme of totalitarianism. Despite the varying angles of approaching the theme, they all contribute to maintaining the idea vivid and unforgettable to readers.

### **B. 2. a. George Orwell’s *1984***

George Orwell’s *1984* (1949) is one of the most important novels of the modern British literature. Bradbury confirms that *1984* stands as a classical work in the genre of dystopian fiction. He writes that the novel represents a “classic tale of dystopia” in which the dangers and disorders of its present were masterfully projected onto the future (279). The state of the British society at the eve of the Second World War inspired Orwell to create a Dystopia set forty years into the future. Although set in a futuristic era, the novel was meant to deal with the consequences of political and technological changes of the twentieth century. While the novel was indeed published when “China went Communist, and Russia exploded a nuclear bomb”, its prospects came from the time of the Cold War (Bradbury 279). Accordingly, it can be claimed that the sum of Orwell’s experiences during the Second World War had significantly contributed to the masterful shaping of his totalitarian “superstate”. By writing the novel, thus, Orwell tried to comment on the consequential development of the status quo in his period. He confirms this in “*The Collected Essays, Journalism, and Letters of George Orwell*” (1968) stating that: “I do not believe that the kind of society I describe necessarily will arrive, but I believe that something resembling it could arrive. I believe also that totalitarian ideas have taken root in the minds of intellectuals

everywhere, and I have tried to draw these ideas out to their logical consequences.”(502). Hence, as a political novel, *1984* was written to ring the alarm of the totalitarian government in the west.

In *1984*, Orwell portrays the classical totalitarian society in which one party government holds absolute power. In this world the ruling party assures monitoring and controlling all facets of human life. As the plot progresses, the rebellious protagonist, Winston Smith, strives to challenge the Party’s powerful authority. Yet, his efforts go to vain as he gradually comes to the realization that the party’s ability to control and enslave its subjects is unchallengeable. The party employs classical totalitarian control techniques similar to those used by the Nazi and fascist governments. The totalitarian system of the novel employs technology to monitor and psychologically control the subjects. . The giant telescreen in every citizen’s room broadcasts a constant stream of propagandist content. The later is designed to engrave the heroic picture of the party in the minds of the citizens. The telescreens also monitor behaviors of the citizens. Therefore, they maintain the fearful aura surrounding the ruling party. Control, thus, is established through fostering fear from the government. Citizens are continuously reminded that “the big brother is watching”. Additionally, violence is a central aspect of this controlling system. The party practices physical control over the population. They are compelled to undergo mass morning exercises called the Physical Jerks, and then to work long hours at government agencies. Also, individuals who have oppositional tendencies are subjected to violent physical punishment. They are “reeducated” through brutal torture. Furthermore, the Party practices full informational monopoly. It controls every source of information through editing and censoring the content of all newspapers and histories for its own ends. The Party does not allow individuals to keep records of their past, such as photographs, diaries or even memories (Orwell). The rigid and violent aspects of *1984* government draw indeed similarity to classical Totalitarian systems of the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century. They, however, prove having weak relevance to the post-modern political scene of the USA which superficially appears to be free when compared to Orwell’s one.

## **B. 2. b. Margaret Atwood’s *The Handmaid’s Tale***

*The Handmaide’s Tale* (1985), written by Margaret Atwood, is another famous Dystopian work. In fact, Baccolini has considered the work as one of the earliest novels in the genre which has been named the “critical dystopia, following which there has been a

proliferation of fiction in this category” (520-521). Written in the wake of the Cold War, many of its themes resemble Orwell’s *1984*. Atwood’s Gilead is a totalitarian society where life conditions have been drastically changed to fit the political agendas of the authorities. Gilead, hence, is shown to the reader by Atwood as an “Ustopia”<sup>4</sup>. Through its protagonist’s account of life in Gilead, *the Handmaid’s Tale* presents to the reader how an ultimate authoritarian, anti-liberal and essentialist society is able to become a reality. Atwood, thus, reflects on the political direction of the United States. As the politics of the pre-Gilead United States mirror mainstream western politics, the reader is meant to consider future political changes as realistic possibility. In an interview with Douglas Busvine Atwood asserts her fear from the revival of “the dark days of the 1930s”. Atwood thinks that the reemergence of a classical form of totalitarianism is a highly plausible scenario. She draws parallels with the fascist and communist regimes stating that while: “People in Europe saw the United States as a beacon of democracy, freedom, openness”, it nowadays “feels the closest to the 1930s”. Such a statement justifies the aspects of classical totalitarianism in *The Handmaid’s Tale*. Yet, it simultaneously makes the novel less relevant to the early 2000s American political scene.

Nonetheless, the author’s extremist fears are echoed in her novel. Atwood’s Gilead meets the classical definition of a totalitarian society. The single centre of power is taken by the Commanders, who use the Christian Bible as their constitutional script to convey an oppressive ideology. All forms of freedom are stripped away from the citizens through violent force and compulsion tactics. Similar to Fascist and Nazi totalitarian societies, Gilead’s leaders use methods of direct action and gradual persuasion to gain control over the United States. They shoot the president and kill Congress members causing the United States to come under military control. These killings are then blamed on Islamic terrorism, which makes it possible for Gilead’s leaders to be established as the single source of power. The free pre-Gilead world is depicted as a false system by means of propaganda. Absolute obedience is set to be a necessary feature of the system. Those who are in control of Gilead are dogmatic radicals, blinded by the newly found power, or simply in search of a position of power to take advantage of their positions for personal gain. The inhabitants that are not lured into the ideology voluntarily and who refuse to submit are forced into complying by the regime through threats, torture and strict “re-programming” at training facilities. The system

---

<sup>4</sup> Ustopia is a term coined by Atwood to represent a society that is meant to function as a utopia by those who have imagined and founded it, but then ultimately turns into a dystopia as it is realized (“Other Worlds” 66-67)

goes even beyond to control the intellectual freedom. Rebellious thinking under such a totalitarian regime becomes illegal. When complete obedience is not maintained, the nonparticipants are discarded and killed (Attwood). This makes Gilead both a mental and physical trap for its inhabitants. The analysis above establishes that *The Handmaid's Tale* features a classical totalitarian regime. Similar to *1984*, its rigid forms of control make it less relevant to the post-modern political scene of the US.

### **B. 2. c. Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World***

In his novel, Huxley warned of “a new kind of non-violent totalitarianism” where “men and women will grow up to love their servitude and will never dream of revolution” (Huxley, *Brave New World Revisited* 164). As such, Huxley's totalitarian government breaks away from the classical forms of Totalitarianism presented in Orwell and Attwood's novels. The novel's dystopian qualities appear not in the violent oppression of people, but instead in the suppression of the common moral and rightful norms of the modern era. The totalitarian government of *BNW* controls the consensus with the promise of maintaining social stability and not the tyrannical oppression of its citizens. However, this ultimately appears to be a mere façade for a new form of totalitarian tyranny. The government is in complete control of a commonly prescribed ideology which gives little space for direct opposition. This reflects the inverted utopian tendency of Huxley's world. Thus, people's ability to practice free choice is connivingly abolished. Bülent Diken (1964) draws on the uniqueness the Huxley's totalitarianism. He comments on the novel's politics by writing that “In the brave new world, there is no line of flight that can escape the continuum of the disjunctive synthesis, no truly antagonistic praxis that can confront and change the system” (166). Corresponding to the definition of dystopia being something “as bad as possible”, it can be concluded that the form of government presented in the novel accurately represents the worst possible version of a political system.

In spite of being written in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, Aldous Huxley's novel stands as one of the most relevant dystopian works compared to the formerly mentioned works. Although many readers tend to limitedly interpret the novel in relation to the context of the 1930s' fears regarding the advancements of science and technology, the novel's ideological prospects surpass the simple frame of predictive science fiction. In this regard, Christopher Hitchens comments that while Orwell, in 1984, “was writing about the forbidding, part-alien

experience of Nazism and Stalinism... Huxley was locating disgust and menace in the very things – the new toys of materialism from cars to contraceptives – that were becoming everyday pursuits” (xi). This asserts that while indeed the novel reflects the political and social fears of its time, it, also, thoroughly confronts more menacing issues of the modern age. The later are largely real and familiar to post- modern readers. Firchow points out that “[t]echnology, or more commonly, the opposition to technology, is undoubtedly an important recurrent theme in much dystopian literature,” and this explains the novel’s clear “overlap with science fiction” (6). Hence, like most science fiction works, the novel draws heavily on the negative aspects of the technological and scientific progress. However, in his 1946 “Preface,” Huxley himself explains that the concerns of his work go beyond such a limited perception. He states that: “The theme of *Brave New World* is not the advancement of science as such; it is the advancement of science as it affects human individuals” (8). Hence, the main thematic objective of the novel is not the particular aspect of scientific advancement, but it is rather addressing the effect of repression and dehumanization on society in every aspect. Nicholas Murray, in his biography of Aldous Huxley, explains that *Brave New World* “was much more than a “nightmare vision” of babies in bottles. It was ...about science and human freedom, culture and democracy, and the manipulation of the citizen by mass media and modern consumer capitalism” (256). This concern makes *Brave New World* as haunting today as in 1932.

Like most post-modern critics, through his science fiction, Huxley reflects on a number of American present-day societal issues, both individually and structurally. The American literary critic Smith asserts that “Huxley’s dystopia is uncomfortably familiar in its unfamiliarity” (349). Such familiar “unfamiliarities” imply that Huxley’s dystopian society is coming to realization. Claeys, furthermore, claims that although critics have painted Huxley as “anti-American” in light of *Brave New World*, Huxley is in fact “a critic of modernity”. Thus, America is only a leading instance of its definitive characteristics (116). Huxley, thus, identifies characteristics in the American lifestyle which corresponded with what he regards as problematic of post-modernity.

### **C. American Inverted Totalitarianism**

With the coming of post modernity, many of the pillar concepts of the west came to be questioned. Lyotard defines post-modernity as a “condition” expressing suspicion of all the grand narratives or what he calls the “Metanarratives”; including religion, science,

universal history, philosophical “truths”, and so on. According to him, the later need to be questioned for their claims to universality (72-3). As such, the “Metanarrative” of American democracy became a central concern of the post-modern political theory.

### **C. 1. The Post-modern Perspective of American Democracy**

The origins of democratic rule can be traced back to the Greeks of the sixth century. Democracy, thus, according to them means the “rule of people”. Under such a form of rule all men participate in decision making. This idea of democracy was later developed by the Romans who adopted a representative form of democracy. Such a system entails power division between the senate’s and the common’s assembly. Nevertheless the source of power remains people (Barr et al. 7). This trend was further developed throughout the years. By the 17<sup>th</sup> century, English and French philosophers such as John Locke (1632-1704) and Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-78) advocated their ideas about people’s “natural rights.” The later included “the right to life, liberty, and the ownership of property” (Barr et al. 8). This school of thought paved the way for modern day American democracy. By the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the United States became the model nation for democratic principles. In 1776, the Declaration of Independence sat the cornerstone of American democracy. It advocated “the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness” (Barr et al. 9). The American founding fathers adopted a representative democracy with a system of checks and balances to eliminate corruption and power abuse. However, such a system is “no way perfect form of democracy” (Barr et al. 9).

Exposing the still deeply undemocratic tendencies that exist in contemporary society has been one of the central concerns of the post-modern theory. Post-modern theorists embarked on theorizing the great political issues of the day. Indeed, their tendency to become democrats is evident. This is apparent in the position of radical theorists of democracy “[who] have taken to caricaturing it as the guiding ideology of modern “critical theory.””(qtd. in McManus 12). Post-modern theorists aim to invoke democracy by addressing the “conservative” autocratic narratives of tradition. Such narratives, for them, do nothing but “privilege the totalizing views of experts over the considered opinions of people.” (McManus 12). Additionally, since they perceive representational parliaments as theatres in which democracy is falsely staged, they stress the idea of developing authentic “democratic institutions”. Post-modernists, hence, reject the representative form of democracy claiming that its promise of democracy is inherently paradoxical. In their book *Commonwealth*, post-modern political theorists Michael Hardt (1960) and Antonio Negri (1933) claim that:

Freedom and equality also imply an affirmation of democracy in opposition to the political representation that forms the basis of hegemony...The logic of representation and hegemony in both these instances dictates that a people exists only with respect to its leadership and vice versa, and thus this arrangement determines an aristocratic, not a democratic, form of government, even if the people elect that aristocracy.(qtd. in McManus 12)

As such, by breaking down the belief in meta-narratives of representational democracy, post-modern theorists aspire to broaden the discussion arena at the philosophical level.

## **C. 2. Inverted Totalitarianism**

Out of the above discussions, Sheldon S. Wolin's conception of "inverted totalitarianism" quickly surfaces as one of the most intriguing formulations. The term was originally coined on a radio show in northern California, and subsequently formulated in *Newsweek* and *The Nation*. Wolin's formulation seeks to address two main threats of American democracy. The former, first, captures the uniqueness of the Bush regime, its renditions for torture, ideological zeal, culture of fear and overt imperial ambitions. He, also, places democracy within a long trajectory of collusion between corporate and political power in the United States. *Democracy Incorporated* is, thus, Wolin's effort to further expand on his mapping of this novel form of total power and in forging a counter-paradigm. In his book *Democracy Incorporated: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism* (2008), Wolin offers a theoretical articulation of the emergence of inverted totalitarianism and the form of managed democracy that nourishes it. He, also, expresses his vision of democracy and how capitalist corporate power laid to its corruption. These concerns are sharply captured in his notion of Superpower which he defines as "the union of state and corporation in an age of waning democracy and political illiteracy"(131).

Wolin expresses his dissatisfaction with the political scene claiming that: "One cannot point to any national institution[s] that can accurately be described as democratic" (105). His criticism, thus, addresses "the highly managed, money-saturated elections, the lobby-infested Congress, the imperial presidency, the class-biased judicial and penal system, or, least of all, the media"(105). for him, this gives rise to a "new political system" which he labels "Inverted Totalitarianism". This system differs from the classical forms of Totalitarianism in the sense that it is "driven by abstract totalizing powers, not by personal rule, one that succeeds by encouraging political disengagement rather than mass mobilization

That relies more on private media than on public agencies to disseminate propaganda reinforcing the official version of events”(44). Hence, while Inverted Totalitarianism maintains the façade of electoral politics, constitutional system, civil liberties, freedom of the press and the independence of the judiciary, it still has effectively seized all power mechanisms rendering the citizen truly impotent.

In his book Wolin examines the novel system on two main dimensions. Following a Marxist perspective, he first draws on the aspect of power monopolization in an Inverted Totalitarianism. He, thus, sheds light on the emergence of capitalist corporate power with that of the state. As such, Wolin identifies the way in which “private economic power is coequal with legitimate political power” (Johnson). He, thus, establishes the idea that Inverted Totalitarianism is a system where corporations have corrupted and subverted democracy. Therefore, economics start to best politics in the grand scheme of policy making. As grand corporations proceed to exploit all sorts of natural and human resources, excess consumerism and “sensationalism” become major manipulative factors. They ultimately delude the majority into compromising some their main civil liberties and participatory rights in government matters (Johnson). On the same token, following the Gramscian line of analysis, Wolin draws also on the intellectual elite’s role in this system. He puts forward that the “intellectual class” have been “seamlessly integrated into the system” (68). The second dimension focuses on the manipulative discourse of the system. On the steps of the Foucauldian thought, Wolin argues that political discourse is tactically used to leave the public “fragmented, antagonistic and emotionally charged while leaving corporate power and empire unchallenged.”(Hedges). He, thus, suggests that media, especially, “serves to distract attention and contribute to a cant politics of the inconsequential” (112). Ultimately, he reaches the conclusion that the United States has effectively mastered the art of “managing” democracy without appearing to be suppressed (49).

It should also be noted that, like most post-modern democratic socialist thinkers, Wolin’s theory does not offer any direct solutions. It, rather, only emphasizes the need to resist. He offers little hope of triumph, or for real transformative change in the face of the overwhelming power of “Inverted Totalitarianism”. He, yet, believes that it is “right” to resist, even if it means “death and destruction” (Hedges). Wolin affirms that the flourishing of a real democracy depends on “people changing themselves, sloughing off their political passivity and, instead, acquiring some of the characteristics of demos” (289). Hence, as a post-modern political theory, Inverted Totalitarianism offers a bleak diagnosis of the retreating state of

American democracy. By determining capitalist power monopolization and discourse manipulation as hindering agents, it puts forward the need to question the inherent ideological constants.

## **D. The Philosophical Framework of Analysis**

In this dissertation, the analysis of the system of Inverted Totalitarianism in both Wolin's political theory and Huxley's literary masterpiece is conducted in the light of two major post- modern philosophical lenses. While the analysis of power monopolization is based on the Neo-Marxist thought, the analysis of discourse manipulation is based on the Foucauldian perspective.

### **Neo-Marxism**

Democracy in essence is rooted in the idea of power decentralization. Hence, consensus among the political philosophers is that, within the sphere of a democratic state, public benefit service should be a basic need for the success of democracy. This kind of elaborate system of democratic institutions minimizes the scope of power misuse. However, the emergence of capitalist corporate and state power stands in strike opposition with the former ideal. In fact, it only deepens the social hierarchy. This proves that democracy remains a myth in the absence of economic equality. While classical totalitarian systems thrive on socialist economies, the system of Inverted Totalitarianism thrives on capitalist power monopolization by the upper social classes. The later, use their influence to pilot political decision making. Ultimately, their authority enables them to rule over the majority of the lower classes citizens. Hence, the analysis of power monopolization within this system of government will be conducted in the light of the Neo-Marxist theories of class division

Originally, Marxism, as Afolyan explains, is a conception presented by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in their book, *The Communist Manifesto* (1848). Since 1840s, when Marx published his views about man and his socioeconomic position, scholars of diverse fields, including politics and literature, adopted his ideology (1). Marxist ideology has since been influential in framing the fundamentals of various fields of human endeavor including both of the literarily and the political theory. Although the utopian aspect of Marxist ideology came to be rejected following the Second World War, many post-modernists still build their

perspectives of the post-modern condition on the Marxist conception<sup>5</sup>. As such, the Neo-Marxist Fredrik Jameson defines postmodernism as the “cultural logic of late capitalism”, seeing it as a cultural outcome of the socio-historical and political circumstances (Afolyan 7). David Harvey also echoes Jameson’s view of postmodernism as a condition generated by the growth and expansion of capitalism across the world. Following Jameson and Harvey, Zygmunt Bauman came to attribute the postmodern condition to the socio-economic changes of what he calls the “liquid modern” era (Afolyan 8). As such, Marxism and post-modernism are intertwining concepts. Thus, while Neo-Marxism questions the western capitalism, Postmodernism questions the social structures that characterize western capitalist societies.

### **D. 1. a. Political Class Domination**

Generally, in both economics and politics power is often associated with class relations. Marxist approaches to power monopolization, thus, focus on its relation to class domination in capitalist societies. Afolyan explains that both of classical Marxists and Neo-Marxists share an anti-bourgeoisie tendency. They denounce the persisting dichotomy between the haves and the have-nots. According to them this demarcation promotes a type of “continual conflict” between classes. Consequently, the conflict evolves into a struggle. The later is the outcome of the proletariat’s <sup>6</sup> attempt “to break away from the suffocating influences of capitalist manipulation of economic resources”. Yet, ultimately, the masses become only more socially and economically depressed (1-3). In this sense, it becomes evident that Marxism reflects an anti-totalitarian stand. Such a stand stems mostly from Marxist analysis of the relation between economic and political power structure.

Although Marxism stresses mainly the economic bases of class domination, it also acknowledges that state politics is a key aspect in capitalist societies. This acknowledgment stems from two main ideas. First, political revolution is necessary for overthrowing existing patterns of class domination. Second, political institutions contribute largely in “the routine

---

<sup>5</sup> The end of the Second World War marked an acute decline in the legitimacy of communist orthodoxy. Subsequently, a defense in favor of a “culture-based” Marxist version was quickly mounting. A number of post modernists saw an “irrefutable” aspect of Marxist thinking that makes it strongly relevant to the postmodern condition as such Derrida who stated that: “Politico-economic hegemony, together with its new technological, intellectual, and discursive domination, is conditioning and putting in danger all possibilities for democracy.” (qtd.in Neizen 127). Similarly, in 1965 Germany, the Neo-Marxists gathered under the league the Frankfurt School marking the rise of Western Marxism and Cultural Marxism. Neo-Marxist ideas were echoed in the works of Frederic Jameson's 1984 book *The Political Unconscious* and Terry Eagleton's 1983 book *Literary Theory*. they all agreed on interpreting texts as products of discourse of class struggle and advocating socialist morality (Neizen 134-142).

<sup>6</sup> According to Marxism, the proletariat is a working class of wage-earners whose only procession is their labor power.

reproduction of class domination” (Jessop 3). Evidently, the state becomes central to Marxist analysis. In this respect, Marxists view that the state plays a major role in mitigating the social revolutionary prospects. They claim that this is manifested in its efforts to maintain “the overall structural integration and social cohesion of a society divided into classes” (Jessop 3). The role of this structural division, thus, is to function as a cover for capitalist “contradictions and antagonisms”. The later do nothing but boost the power the upper classes on the expense of the lower ones.

The instrumental role of the state in securing the conditions for economic class domination is set to be the corner stone for Marxist account of political class domination. In capitalist society, the state is to a large extent subordinate to the economy. Ralph Miliband comments on this by stating that “the ruling class of capitalist society is that class which owns and controls the means of production. It is, thus, able by virtue of economic power to use the state as an instrument for the domination of society” (qtd.in Jessop 4). From here stems the tacit tyranny of the emergence of state and corporate power. Although in such a case the state itself has no inherently capitalist form and performs no necessarily obvious capitalist functions, all the functions it perform for capital originate from the fact that “pro-capitalist forces happen to control the state” (qtd.in Jessop 4). Hence, state members become representatives of the capitalists who abuse their authority in favor of the powerful capitalist. It becomes evident that state in capitalist societies is inevitably class-bias. As a result democracy is threatened by the emerging form of power monopolization.

#### **D. 1. b. Ideological Class Domination**

According to Heywood, Marxist thinking emphasizes the prevailing power of ideology, values and beliefs in determining and protecting the established class relations in a society (100). Marx recognized that power monopolization is not restricted in economic exploitation but it is further reinforced by a dominance of ruling class ideas and values. Marx and Engels first referred to ideological class domination in *The German Ideology* (1845) when they noted that “the ruling ideas of any age are the ideas of the ruling class” (qtd.in Jessop 5). Marxist approaches to power are, thus, reflected in the later’s ownership of means of production including intellectual ones. The early 20<sup>th</sup> century, according to Jessop, witnessed an increasing Marxist interest in the forms of ideological class domination that paralleled with rise of democratic government and mass politics (5). Hence, addressing the

effects and mechanisms of ideological class domination became a central concern of the Neo-Marxist school.

The Italian communist Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937) is among the firsts who drew on the role of elite groups in advocating consensual power monopolization. Imprisoned for much of his life by Mussolini, he presented this idea in his *Prison Notebooks* (1947). Gramsci defines the state as: “the entire complex of practical and theoretical activities with which the ruling class not only justifies and maintains its dominance but manages to win the active consent of those over whom it rules” (qtd.in Jessop 6). In other words, Gramsci sees the capitalist state as a body composed of two overlapping structures. First, a “political society” that rules through force. Second, a “civil society” that rules through consent. He considers the later as the public sphere where “trade unions and political parties” gain concessions from the bourgeois state. Consequently, this sphere becomes the arena in which the ideas and beliefs of the lower class majority are molded. As a result, bourgeois “hegemony” is echoed in cultural life through various intellectual institutions such as the media, universities and religious bodies which role is to “manufacture consent and legitimacy” (Heywood 100-101).

Gramsci points out the non-forceful aspect of mass control through his definition of “hegemony”. According to Gramsci, hegemony (“predominance by consent”) is a condition in which a dominating upper takes the lead of the political, intellectual, and moral societal aspects within a hegemonic system. Such a condition is often fostered by fixing a common world-view or “organic ideology.”(Ramos). In other words, he points out that the successful way of mobilizing and reproducing the “active consent” of dominated groups by the ruling class is through the exercise of political, intellectual, and moral leadership (Jessop 8). Overall, his main argument is that the tyrannical aspect of the capitalist state does not lay in being a “coercive apparatus”, but it, rather, lays in being an institutional ensemble that combines aspects of consent over coercion. He, hence, advances the idea that different educational institutions and apparatuses should not be perceived as purely technical instruments of government. They are, for him, social bases that back state power.

In his writing on the dominating role of intellectual elite groups, Gramsci focuses on examining the relations between education and class, vocationalism as well as drawing on the ideology of education. In the section titled “On Education” in his *Prison Notebooks* (1971), Gramsci explains two aspects of elitist intellectual domination. He, first, notes the systematized manufacturing of elite groups. He suggests that specialization had become a

prevailing characteristic of “modern civilization”. Hence, a new division between “classical and vocational (professional) schools” had emerged (Gramsci). Such a division is meant to serve the upper classes’ hold on power. He demonstrates that while “the vocational school [is] for the instrumental classes, the classical school [is] for the dominant classes and the intellectuals”. Thus, the majority of those who attend “common schooling” are steered toward manual and technical vocations. In contrast, only a “tiny élite” of people are given the chance to pursue “formative” schooling. As such, this deterministic nature of education assures that “the pupil’s destiny and future activity are determined in advance” (Gramsci).

As such, Gramsci draws on the ways in which education is systematically used in depriving the majority access to power positions. The second aspect is defining Eliticism as a condition for the occupation of authority positions. Gramsci suggests that the modern systems of governments are characterized by the creation of a “whole bureaucratic body”. This body is composed of the specialized departments of experts who prepare the technical material for the deliberative bodies and also functionaries who are described as “less disinterested volunteers”. They are selected variously from industry, the banks and finance houses. The result, according to Gramsci, is the rise of “the career bureaucracy [which] eventually came to control the democratic regimes and parliaments”. Overall, by identifying these systematic ideologies behind educational and vocational formation, Gramsci highlights the underlying form of power monopolization. He, in turn, emphasizes the need for breaking the imposed intellectual ceiling to restore the majority’s right of participating in the government.

## **D. 2. Foucauldian Discourse Manipulation**

Among the integral aspects of a healthy democracy is the notion of active citizenry. Aside from choosing the leader, the later is also expected to play a critical participatory role in varying aspects of the democratic process. This participation may be positive i.e. by supporting the decisions of the government in power. Conversely, it may take a negative form by protesting and opposing the government in power. Thus, in order to secure a meaningful participation, the government is supposed to assure enlightening its citizen by means of a truthful political discourse. The citizens should have access to knowledge of all the affairs of the administration. Otherwise they will lose the status of active citizens and will be reduced to the position of “subjects”. Thus, truthful communication is a corner stone in a healthy democracy.

However, in his *Regimes of post-truth, Postpolitics and attention economies* (2015), Harsin claims that the scope of post modernity is identified by the emergence of what has been labeled post-truth regimes. The later are the out born of the rising “authoritarian populist movements and figures, the decline of trust in mainstream media and expert knowledge, and the growth of alternative media” (qtd.in Prosorvo 18). Among the inherent characteristics of the post-truth political culture is a “relativist standpoint”. The later refers to adopting a skeptical stand toward the truth claims of the political establishment and mainstream media. As such, most claimed truths become mere opinions, pretexts and expressions that serve ulterior private interests of a certain powerful group. This devaluation of truth strikes at the heart of the democratic public sphere as it paves the way for the rise of delusion and obscurity. The origins of this position can be traced to a variety of events, from “the innovations in information technology ... to the crisis of the neoliberal hegemony” (Prosorvo 18). Yet, undoubtedly the ideas of the French philosopher Michel Foucault had evidently established the cornerstone of post-truth politics in the post-modern context. His ideas offer a valuable insight into governmental discourse manipulation (Pitsoe 25).

Discourse is a highly contested term. Thus, this concept’s multidimensional nature results in the suggestion of varying definitions. Nonetheless, its origins stem from Latin “*discursus*”, meaning “running to and from”, and generally refers to “written or spoken communication” (Prosorvo 26). In other words, discourse is an umbrella term that refers to various conversations or information. Foucault suggests that discourse plays a major role in “creating” people’s world views about truth, morality, and meaning. Hence, its power stems from our casual acceptance of the “reality with which we are presented” (Pitsoe 26). In turn, such causality is systematically taken advantage of by those who hold power over the means of communication. Therefore, Foucault asserts that in every society the production of discourse is managed, controlled, selected, systematized and redistributed according to a set of procedural rules. He says that the later’s role is “to avert its powers and its dangers, to cope with chance events, to evade its ponderous, awesome materiality” (qtd.in Pitsoe 26). Foucault’s conception of discourse, thus, provides an insight into the way in which discourse shapes reality in favor of those in power.

Indeed, discourse represents the meeting point of power and knowledge. Foucault suggests that while discourse is bound to particular sayings and thoughts, it is also bound to “who can speak, when, and with what authority” (Pitsoe 27). Thus, discourses determine meaning and social relationships through constituting subjectivity and power relations.

Effectively, they are “practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak. In addition, discourses are not about objects; they do not identify objects, they constitute them and in the practice of doing so conceal their own invention” (Foucault 49). Furthermore, since power is a tool for the social construction of reality, discourse is set to be an instrument of power and ideological control. As such, discourse can be used as a tool of oppression. It serves to marginalize, silence and oppress the non-authoritative majority who has limited access to certain knowledge.

## **Conclusion**

The changing conditions of the post-modern era have evidently been reflected in the intellectual productions of the time. The subject of the rising oppression and the waning democratic freedom became a central concern of those writers. On the literary level, the shift from utopian optimism to dystopian pessimism marked a deconstructivist tendency toward the inherited values of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Through their novels, authors reflected a preoccupation with the rising totalitarian systems of the 1930s. Yet, while many works tackled the theme of totalitarianism, Huxley’s version stands out through its depiction of a more unique and subtle form of governmental oppression. His vision, thus, comes to meet that of posterior political theorists such as Sheldon Wolin. The later’s formulation also captured the subtle forms of oppression practiced in the early 2000s American political scene. Wolin’s *Inverted Totalitarianism* draws on the aspects of power monopolization and discourse manipulation under the covers of democratic guise. Despite being 80 years apart, the two works reflect an intertwining postmodernist vision. They both approach the idea of oppression from the lenses of Neo-Marxist criticism of power monopolization by capitalist and intellectual elite groups. They, also tackle the idea of subjugation through discourse manipulation in the light of the Foucaudian perspective.

## **Chapter Two**

# **American Inverted Totalitarianism**

## **Introduction**

In his book *Democracy Incorporated: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism* (2008), Wolin outlines the main features of the modern American political system. The later, according to him, is transforming to a hybrid form of ruling that combines both democratic and tyrannical features. However, this form of Inverted Totalitarianism, as he calls it, aims to assure public subjugation by means of political manipulation. This chapter provides a conceptual analysis of two main tyrannical aspects of American Inverted Totalitarianism during the presidency of George W. Bush. It first explores the notion of “democracy incorporation”. The later identifies the aspects of power monopolization by both capitalist corporate as well as elitist groups. The second aspect is “the Superpower myth”. This notion brings to light the ways in which discourse was manipulatively used to subjugate the American citizenry during Iraq invasion (2003). Each section includes an exploration of one aspect through analysis, providing conceptual basis and a projection on the political scene of the early 2000s.

### **A. Democracy Incorporation**

In contrast to a true democracy, the controlling systems of Inverted Totalitarianism and classical Totalitarianism share the feature of power monopolization. Yet, according to Wolin, a key difference between the two forms of totalitarian domestic power projection lies behind their underlying power structures. He argues that classical totalitarian systems function through power monopolization by a central state body, or figure. This is well demonstrated in the Italian dictator Benito Mussolini’s formulation “Everything in the State, nothing outside the State, nothing against the State.” However, Inverted Totalitarianism, functions through a combination of powers. The later particularly appears in the intertwining relationship between the “traditional government and the system of private governance represented by the modern business corporation”. This, consequently, gives rise to a “system that represents the political coming-of-age of corporate power” (Wolin xiii). As such, the intersection of state and capitalism appears to be a direct threat to American democracy.

The fusion of capitalist corporate power with that of the central government results in what Wolin calls “Democracy incorporation”. This idea is built upon his criticism of the long founded claim of American capitalist democracy. By drawing an analogy between American capitalisms and socialist totalitarianism, Wolin arrives at the conclusion that the capitalist

system bares the seeds of public mass suppression. Hence, it can be said that the democratic claims of capitalism are not more than a mere façade for the post-modern form of American totalitarianism.

### **A. 1. Totalitarian Socialism**

Among the most common misconceptions is the association of socialist economic systems with the idea of totalitarian rule. This partly stems from the historical association of classical totalitarian regimes; such as German Nazi, Russian communism and Italian Fascism with socialist economic systems. Under these systems, the economic upper hand was that of the state. They, hence, “attracted limited support from the representatives of “big business” (Wolin 63). Additionally, in contrast to Inverted Totalitarian systems, during their years in power capitalism was “subordinate to them”. It can, indeed, be argued that the totalitarian aspect of socialism lies in state control over all aspects of the social life in its endeavor of serving a single goal. For instance, during the early years of the socialist revolution, “physical control and repression through brute force played the crucial role in this attempt to achieve total social control” (Sajó and Ganczer 844-848). Moreover, the totalitarian nature of socialism appears in the way in which it facilitates the ideological control of the citizens. The “annihilation” of freedom of press and speech is achieved through government ownership of all the news papers, publishing houses and meeting halls. Consequently, government censorship over information is easily achieved (Reisman).

### **A. 2. Democratic Capitalism**

On the other part, capitalist philosophy is, often, associated with democratic ideals. Rousseau claims that the capitalistic policies of most countries are democratic in nature (143). Also Schmpeter asserts that: “History clearly confirms... [That]... modern democracy rose along with capitalism, and in casual connection with it”(22). This suggests that the democratic aspect of capitalist systems lies in the idea of ensuring the well-being and freedom of individuals<sup>7</sup>. This is further confirmed by Friedman’s saying about capitalist societies: “A society that puts equality before freedom will get neither. A society that puts freedom before equality will get a high degree of both.” Moreover, the democratic claim of capitalism finds its justification in two prominent elements of the capitalistic system; stability and

---

<sup>7</sup> The association between capitalism and democracy had particularly popularized following the Second World War. Hence, “The technocratic, bureaucratic nature of communist states was not just an aberration or an abuse of an otherwise unassailable model of history.” (Niezen 125).

decentralized power. It is argued that, while the former is achieved via providing work opportunities and high quality goods, the later is manifested in the free market dynamic.

Among the early proponents of capitalism was the “father of modern economics”; Adam Smith. He argued against mercantilism and was a major supporter of laissez-faire economic policies. He believed that such a strategy would eliminate state intervention; thus, restrict its power. His idea of an “invisible hand” is a land marker in the history of economics. In his famous book, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776), Smith formulated the theoretical basis for what became known as free- market capitalism. The term “invisible hand” is defined in his book as the natural consequence in any process in which every individual attempts to invest his capital so that it multiply in value. Although, in such a case the individual does not deliberately intend to promote the public interest; he is still “led in this as if by an invisible hand to promote an end that was no part of his intention” (102). Thus, by pursuing his own interest, the investing individual unintentionally promotes the general good of society. In other words, every person’s selfish motive for economic gain can inadvertently helps to create the best outcome for all. The capitalists profit from engaging in variant economic activities of manufacturing, selling and buying. In such a case their financial earning is tied to the effective meeting of their customer’s needs. Thus, while they are engaging in enterprise for the purpose of earning money, they are also serving society by providing useful products. Smith argued that this kind of capitalist system creates wealth for those investors, as well as for the entire nation. Hence, for him, in capitalism the market is driven only by rules of “supply and demand” rather than governmental restrictions on production and consumption.

### **A. 3. Criticism of Modern Capitalism**

In this regard, the theory of “Inverted Totalitarianism” proposes the concept of “Democracy Incorporation” as a direct antithesis to the “utopian” capitalist promise of democracy. In fact, Wolin argues that the free markets and the Invisible Hand of capitalism are, indeed, an inverted form of the socialist ideals adopted by earlier classical totalitarian systems. Yet, modern American capitalism still parallels with socialism in terms of its efficiency in achieving mass subjugation by a “central” power. This centrality of power opposes the ideals of American democracy.

Since the writing of Karl Marx's *Das Kapital*, two hundred years ago, capitalism has been increasingly under attack. Many modern scholars have been building on the Marxist model that links together the profit mechanism, the production technology, working conditions, social class conflicts and the cultural consequences of the commodity economy. Most of the modern critical works focus on two main aspects of capitalism. First, they emphasize the exploitation of working classes. Tom Brass argues in his essay "The Populist Drift of Global Labor History" that the unjust exploitation of the working class persists in modern world economic system. Also, Lysander Spooner emphasizes the former idea by writing that: "almost all fortunes are made out of the capital and labor of other men than those who realize them. Indeed, large fortunes could rarely be made at all by one individual, except by his sponging capital and labor from others" (173). Moreover, other scholars focus on the inefficiency of capitalist industry. As a profit driven system based on selling as many products as possible, capitalism had gave rise to low quality, readymade materials (Hawken et.al 23-26). Critics, also, relate the "ready-made" and "mass-production" trends to a growing pollution issues. According to the American EPA "Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) Pie Chart"(2008) : "... 4.5 pounds of trash are generated per person each day (compared to 2.7 pounds in 1960)". With these increasing problems in capitalism, the postmodern criticism came to address the inherent injustices of the system. Thus, political theorists such as Sheldon Wolin attempt to help deconstructing the grand capitalist narrative.

In formulating his theory about "Inverted Totalitarianism", Wolin identifies the rising capitalist threat of corporate power to American government democracy. According to Wendy Brown, a political science professor at UC Berkeley and a former student of Wolin:

Resisting the monopolies on left theory by Marxism and on democratic theory by liberalism, Wolin developed a distinctive analysis of the political present and of radical democratic possibilities. He was especially prescient in theorizing the heavy statism forging what we now call neoliberalism, and in revealing the novel fusions of economic with political power that he took to be poisoning democracy at its root. (Hedges)

As such, the concept of "Democracy Incorporation" provides an insightful critical look into the threat of Capitalist Corporation on the American democracy.

## **A. 4. Capitalist Superpower in the US**

According to Wolin the main threat of modern American democracy is the integration of capitalist corporate power with state power. Such integration results in a new form of anti-democratic power monopoly. It, also, gives rise to a manipulative type of control by the “Hidden Hand” of the corporate. This new type of control, however, differs from the direct and violent power projection of classical Totalitarianism. The new system fosters mass subjection by means of creating dependency, stability illusion and a demobilizing consumerism. Wolin constructs his argument about the danger of capitalism on American democracy by tracing the roots of such power in the US, identifying its presence during Bush’s presidency, analyzing the contradictory nature of corporate power and state democracy, and finally drawing on some of subjugation dynamics of corporate power.

The joining of government and state power had begun fully crystallizing following the Second World War. Wolin argues that the disabling of the New Deal program marked the end of the first large scale effort toward realizing a “social democracy in this country”(16). The program, which was sanctioned by President Franklin D. Roosevelt between 1933 and 1939, included series of public work projects, financial reforms, and regulations. Its reformations were repressed by the forced mobilization, conscription of male population and economic governmental control. He says that while the Second World War killed social and political democracy, it increased the “cohabitation” between the corporation and the state (16). Such a relationship was further strengthened during the Cold War. The state began relying on the economic corporate power. Hence, they together became “the main sponsors and coordinators of powers represented by science and technology” (16). This resulted in an unprecedented combination of totalizing tendencies.

The totalizing tendencies which started taking shape after the Second World War had made their way into the new third millennium. Bush’s arrival to the office marked the beginning of a “big businesses” presidency. To start with Bush’s most expensive electoral campaigning in history was sponsored by some of the biggest corporate heads. Their support for him was a preplanned escape from the government law suit held against them during the days of Clinton. Philip Morris offered “\$2.8m to the new president's war chest, his inauguration and his party”. Also, “Big Tobacco” as a whole gave “\$7m to Bush and the Republicans, 83% of the industry's total election spending” (Borger). Hence according to Wolin Bush was the “favored child of privilege, of corporate connection, a construct of public relations...” (44).

The fruits of such support were to be picked during the whole terms of his presidency. As the scope of “regulatory authority” has increasingly receded, corporate acquired governmental functions and services (Wolin 91). It became evident that economy became a part of the foundation of the political society. The National Security Statement made by President Bush in 2002 acknowledged this:

Ultimately, the foundation of American strength is at home. It is in the skills of our people, the dynamism of our economy, and the resilience of our institutions. A diverse, modern society has inherent, ambitious, entrepreneurial energy. Our strength comes from what we do with that energy. That is where our national security begins. (24)

From here was the birth of, what Wolin labels, a new corporate “Superpower”. The emergence of the new economic Superpower is a major step in the road of democracy devolution. The dominating and competitive nature of the capitalistic corporate power omens the rise of totalitarian tendencies in the American political scene. The theory of “Inverted Totalitarianism” offers a set of justifications to why such power fusion opposes the ideals of democracy.

#### **A. 4. a. Economic Over Social Benefit**

The sanctification of economy evidently disturbs the balance between “freedom, democracy and free enterprise”. These elements are among the pillars of American democracy. Yet, with such sanctification the former two elements became “subservient” to the later (Wolin 91). Consequently, the growing corporate power results in a growing loss of individual freedom. The growth of the government's economic intervention in favor of capitalist corporate, in this case, results in a loss of individual freedom. People are pushed to and prevented from doing what they voluntary choose by this form of “abstract power (Reisman). The prioritization of corporate interest over that of citizens is vividly apparent in Bush’s policies regarding wealth regulations, taxation policy, health care and educational opportunities (Wolin 147). A good example is the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act of 2003. At the time, public opinion polls had shown that the public is calling for improvement in healthcare system. The government responded by issuing “the most sweeping reform of publicly funded health care in the United States since Medicare's inception in 1965” (Hurley and Morgan). The reform eventually proved to benefit health care

corporations rather than the public. The new prescription-drug benefit undoubtedly provided much-needed assistance for “the very poor and the very sick among US seniors who had little or no drug insurance”. Yet, that relief was modest because most elders faced the high costs, and many (including some on low incomes) suffered financial hindrance under the new program (Hurley and Morgan). This confirms that while corporate democracy shows a superficial care of the mass benefit, it is ultimately self-interest driven.

#### **A. 4. b. The False Promise of Stability**

Among the main promises of capitalism is achieving economic stability. However, Wolin argues that it is, in fact, a source of social instability. He suggests that while it “produces goods, services and jobs”, it also serves social dislocation” (143). Such a dislocation is often the result of the broadened social differences. This idea is also confirmed in Karl Marx’s *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (1852). He considers that societal organization is inherently unstable. He, hence, believes that capitalist democracy is “only the political form of revolution of bourgeois society and not its conservative form of life” (qtd. in Przeworski 215 ). Once introduced, Marx’s utopian thought of a proper political democracy was centered on workers nationalizing the means of production to restore their political power. Accordingly, Wolin and Postmodern Neo-Marxists, argue that the building tension of the disenfranchised lower classes is an increasing factor of social instability.

In the case of an “Inverted Totalitarianism”, in which democracy is incorporated, the capitalist corporations are having a hidden upper hand over state matters. Wolin attacks Smith’s concept of a “democratic” hidden hand. He claims that Smith’s utopia, which advocated power dispersion “among countless actors” and free markets, is the main fosterer of concentrated forms of power monopoly. Thus, Capitalism gave rise to “trusts, monopolies and holding companies” making the working class is choice less (xiv). As a result they willingly started compromising their political rights and freedom attempting to maintain the illusion of stability. Citizens, thus, are voluntarily accepting being demobilized (Wolin 90). This manipulative “vicious circle” aims at fixating the mass’s focus on maintaining their economic stability rather than practicing their right of political power checking. In such a case the economic fear factor is used to subjugate the financially dependent mass.

Under classical totalitarian systems, political demobilization is achieved by the destruction of political institutions such as parliaments and elections. However in an Inverted

Totalitarianism, the dynamic of achieving political demobilization operates under the covers of democratic state institutions. In such a case, the citizenry lose their active role despite the presence of most elements of a democratic system. Wolin writes that:

The power of the government was derived from a citizenry who...transmitted a distinctively political character to governmental authority that served to justify its exercise of power...Now, however... [The] government appears as autonomous, distanced from the citizens because the power of the citizenry is given a sharply different focus. (90)

This focus is set to be the illusion of economic stability. By giving the promise of ensuring the nation' prosperity, the government creates a sense of strong dependency (Wolin 91). Therefore, the masses willingly compromise their political freedom to maintain a certain feeling of economic stability. Hence people in such a case become socially conditioned to bow to a higher power that is the capitalist corporation.

Over all, the rise of a Capitalist Superpower is the result of state and corporate power union in age of a fading democracy. Wolin asserts that Capitalist Superpower within a system of an Inverted Totalitarianism succeeds to transform democracy from “formative principle” to one that only has a “rhetorical function” (131). Thus, individual welfare is compromised for that of economic corporate, and the promotion of stability becomes the mean of fostering voluntary submission under of which individuals are politically demobilized.

## **B. Eliticism**

As a part of his exploration of power monopolization in Inverted Totalitarianism, Wolin spots light on the role of elites in such a system. He argues that the alleged modern American democracy is not more than a hybrid form of aristocracy of the “intellectuals”. Hence American Inverted Totalitarianism derives its power from promoting intellectual inequality. According to him democracy is: “the conditions that make it possible for ordinary people to better their lives by becoming political beings and by making power responsive to their hopes and needs” (260). This implies that democracy is an anti-elitist concept. Unlike classical totalitarianism, under Inverted Totalitarianism, the power is not monopolized by one person. However, the power is also not placed in the hands of citizens. Jacques Rancière introduced the same idea in his book *On the Shores of Politics* (1992). He writes that Post-

Democracy is, a “non-conflicted rule of experts... or... the precise coincidence of ochlocracy with its supposed opposite, epistemocracy, government by the most intelligent... “(35). this implies that postmodern democracy clearly deviates from the just form of democracy.

Historically, the Greek word "*Aristos*" means “best.” According to Greek philosophers; Plato and Aristotle, aristocracy refers to the rule of the few best. They are regarded as “morally” and “intellectually” superior. As such, they are given the authority to govern in the best interest of the entire population. Hence, in an aristocracy, power is not placed in the hand of one person but to the group of citizens who are considered to be the elite (“Democracy and Elite”). Thomas R. Martin writes that; “in Ancient Greece, aristocrats were greatly respected members of society with vast political influence and were considered to uphold the virtue of nobility” (3). Nevertheless, the US identifies as a democracy which spirit is opposed to elitist power monopoly. This is well formulated in the Declaration of Independence which states that: “all men are created equal”. Yet, paradoxically the political American system embodies many aspects of aristocratic republicanism. Despite differing from tyrannical and monarchical forms of government, the republican tendencies oppose by definition the Athenian “pure democracy” i.e. “the pure rule of the people”. Wolin claims that this implied opposition gives rise to what he labels “Managed Democracy”. For him, the later marks the triumph of elitist republicanism over the alleged democracy (150). It, thus, marks power monopoly by intellectual elitist groups.

### **B. 1. The Roots of American Eliticism**

In his book, *Managed Democracy*, Wolin raises the claim that the American constitution is a masterful translation of republicanism (155). In contrast to the common belief in the “democratic tripod”, the articles of the constitutions are not tailored to establish the rule by the people as in a true democracy. The American Constitution rather mirrors the trust in a representative form of democracy. The later suggests the rule by the minority chosen by the majority. That is to say that while it is true that such a government derives its authority from the people, it does not embody a true direct democracy. The people’s representatives; including the President and the legislators, are chosen for a defined number of years. Yet, during those respective periods they have “the right, and even the duty, to exercise the authority allotted them by the Constitution, without looking over their shoulders to make sure whether the people agree with them or not” (“Democracy and Elite”). As such, Wolin asserts

that: “modern political system had to make concessions to democratic sentiments without conceding governance to the people.” (155). While people indeed have a political presence, this presence is constrained with the systematic structuring of the system through the process of electing. The later ensures that majorities are not to take decisions.

The process of choosing representatives through election is in itself a consensual delegation of the elites. Clearly, the Founding Fathers’ formulation is, nowadays, questioned. Although the general ideal of modern America seems to be that Democracy is “the rule of the people, for the people, and by the people”, in reality, people only have the right to exercise democracy in “periodic elections”(“Democracy and Elite”). According to Wolin, these elections serve only to empower the “few” while propelling the “many” to submit and consent to obedience (148). Hence, citizens indeed have the authority of electing, but they do not have power to either control or set the terms of the actual elections<sup>8</sup>.

It is in the Superpower’s interest that the constitution appears unchanging (Wolin 99). Whereas, German Nazi, or Italian Fascism gained power by destroying constitution and parliamentary authority, American government makes use of American citizens’ fundamentalist view of their constitution and democratic nation. Under such a cover of a presupposed democracy the elites of Inverted Totalitarianism practice their hegemonic power abuse. In 2006, President Bush featured a clear ignorance of people’s will. In a state union address in January, 2007, he decided to increase troop numbers in Iraq by 20,000. Such a decision was made despite popular opposition of his war policies. His indifferent attitude toward his loss of midterm elections of 2006 reflects hegemonic tendencies. This is a violation of the democratic ideal as the elected representative, in this case, had acted without considering the public mood and the popular opinion. In a true democracy, “It is the popular will and the public sentiment which must be obeyed by the elected officials” (“Democracy and Elite”). Undoubtedly, this is an aspect of Inverted Totalitarianism. Despite the presence of the main elements of a free society such as free elections, free media, functioning congress, democracy is overrun by the authority of an aggrandizing executive.

---

<sup>8</sup> The citizens do not interfere nor decide the regulations of campaign finances and debate formats.

## **B. 2. Eliticism as an Authoritative Trait**

In addition to elites' violation of democratic ideals, Wolin argues that this group assures power monopolization through knowledge manipulation. This is achieved by both limiting public access to knowledge, and emphasizing knowledge as governing trait. First, under Inverted Totalitarianism, the controllers gain their position by virtue of their "personal qualities." (Wolin 159). This stems from a republican belief in human inequality. People choose a president, or have him chosen by the "Electoral College", because he has some qualities which, allegedly, qualify him for the job more than others ("Democracy and Elite"). Consequently, limiting the majority's access to education is a key strategy for power monopolization in both classical and inverted totalitarianism. "Populist" education opposes the requirements of American elite hegemony (Wolin 161).

Subsequently, public education is increasingly privatized, especially at the levels of primary and secondary schools. Private corporations are encouraged to operate schools. Since, the majority of students come from average income families, this aims at restraining their access to higher education institutions (Wolin 161). As a result, the majority of students attend "community colleges". The latter are mostly institutions that make work force by offering technical education. Conversely, private institutions monopolize the preparation of the ruling elite. In addition, the earned "badge of superiority" is further refined in post graduate stage. These intellectuals are integrated into the system by signing institutional contracts, and occupying governmental posts (Wolin 162). Second, government elites, often, opt to distance public opinion by denying them access to information. This, according to Wolin, is usually achieved under the pretext of state secrecy. It is well established, throughout American history, "foreign policy [has been] out-of-bounds politically, not only to safeguard secrets but to insulate decision-makers from the whims of a democratic citizenry and the distractions of populist politics" (Wolin, 133). The secrecy claim releases the elites from the constraints of democratic sovereignty. President Bush used the doctrine of "reason of state"<sup>9</sup> in both domestic and international levels. An evident example of this is the secret meeting between the vice president, Dick Cheney, and executives from the energy industry. The meeting was held to discuss the government's energy policy. However, it excluded representatives of

---

<sup>9</sup> Reason of the State is a concept that refers to the idea that all government actions are directed toward the stability and the well-being of the state. The term bears a negative connotation as it can be used as a pretext to commit illegal or immoral actions under ordinary circumstances.

public and environmental interest. Furthermore, the identities as well as the proposals of the attendees were kept in secret (Wolin, 133).

## **C. The Superpower Myth**

It is difficult, nowadays, for ordinary people to believe that American democracy can be linked to a dictatorship, or the constitutional system to a totalitarian one, or even see similarities between Bush and Hitler. A large part of this is attributed to the success of the government in maintaining a façade of democracy. Mass subjugation in such a system is achieved through social conditioning by means of discourse manipulation. The later is manifested in the creation of what Wolin labels as a universal “Superpower Myth”. However, in such a case, the universal aspect of this superpower was, in turn, an agent for domestic power practice. Thus prior to moving to external power projection, i.e. launching a military attack on the enemy, the government started a systematic plan toward expanding its domestic authority. In order to reactivate the notion of primitive war against Iraq, the US government opted to mythologizing the 9/11 day to its favor. The later plays a major role in justifying the non-democratic practice of power. According to Wolin, the main tool of myth creation is media. Such a tool works to realize two main subjugations aims. First, it promotes fear, thus provides a rational justification for government power expansion. Second, it assures mass allegiance by fostering a false form of patriotism (4-15).

### **C. 1. Myth Revival**

The concept of a “New World” had often been associated with the myth of “The First New Nation”. It generally refers to a place of promise and a new birth. Conventionally, the United States fulfilled that when it was founded. Yet, Wolin argues that the myth has been revived during the modern age. This new form of myth is characterized by a “willful act of power” and a determination to “supersede... current [order]” (4). He suggests that the beginning of the third millennium marked the birth of this new world. The sense of optimism regarding the age’s revolutionary technological marvels was soon challenged. The 9/11 attack, which targeted the World Trade Center, marked a turning point in the American democratic scene. The change was echoed in the words of the National Security Strategy declaration: “In the new world we have entered the only path to satisfy is the path of action” (2). Such a system fits largely into the category of an Inverted Totalitarianism.

### **C. 1. a. The Role of Technology in Promoting the Myth**

Among the most noticeable commonalities between classical and Inverted Totalitarianism is their employment of the technological advancement, especially in the field of media, to echo their hegemonic discourse and set ideological control. Wolin justifies this by saying that: “the preconditions for Superpower are the availability of totalizing technology and an accompanying ideology that encourages the regime’s aspirations of domination” (62). Wolin suggests that the new government strategies are based on “the powers that technology and science” have made possible. By exploiting these powers the rulers are able to redefine the democratic concept of citizenry. Citizens become “respondents” rather than “actors” (132). Hence they act as easily manipulate able “subjects”.

Unlike ancient days when myth used be popularized through oral literary tradition, the modern myth spread is attributed to the modern age technological advancement. Wolin shows the paramount role of the scientific progress in nourishing the dominating myth. The scientific optimism that accompanied the 20<sup>th</sup> century had overrun the tyrannical pessimism of early 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Thinkers such as Max Weber celebrated the triumph of scientific rationalism and skepticism. For them, the era marked the end of supernatural deities which authority was challenged by that of scientific facts (139, 148, 155). However, Wolin, like most postmodernists, suggests that this conception is challenged by the persistence of nativity. He believes that Weber miss predicted the present day role of technological achievement. Today, media technology is the means by which myth acquire its power as leaders proceed their tyrannical plans.

Ideological conditioning through media is a common strategy used by both Classical and Inverted Totalitarian regimes. An example can be seen in the following analogy. The Nazi regime heavily depended on media to install its ideological norms. *The Triumph of Will* (1935) was a Nazi propaganda documentary film. The film’s main theme was the return of Germany as a great power under the leadership of Adolf Hitler. Although it did not contain spoken commentary, it relied on showing “events, parades, mass assemblies, images of Hitler and speeches”. It was requested by Hitler himself who wanted to celebrate “the annual rally of the National Socialist German Workers party (the Nazi party)”. The film was regarded as the largest ever staged announcement and demonstration, to the entire world, of German rebirth (Petersen). The film, according to Nichols, “demonstrates the power of the image to represent

the historical world at the same moment as it participates in the construction of the historical world itself.”(qtd.in Petersen). *Triumph of the Will*, premiered in March 1935, was considered a masterpiece. It was, indeed, regarded an overwhelming propaganda success and brought many to the Nazi cause (Peterson). Analogically, the rebirth of the American Superpower was covered by various media channels. Disguised in the form of news reports, the ideological conditioning made its way to the houses of American masses. On May 1, 2003, in another well orchestrated “documentary,” viewer “were given an American version of stern resolve and its embodiment in a leader.”(Wolin 1). Like the “*Triumph of Will*”, the film demoed the forceful military capacity of the American army and “its embodiment in a leader”. The tyrannical aspect was clearly reflected in the leader who “emerges, not as a plain and democratic officeholder, but as one whose symbolic authority is antidemocratic.” (Wolin 1).

Both examples are manifestations of modern myth creation and distribution. For Wolin cinema and television function as myth distributors. Hence, they are agents of mass communication. This shows that, undoubtedly, the concept of myth became an indispensable element for social conditioning in the mass media milieu. R.Barthes confirms this idea, in his *Selected Works: Semiotics and Poetics*. He likens the myth-making to a semiology object that tries to provide the historically conditioned intentions with a natural status:

If our society is objectively privileged sphere of mythical values, the hidden reason for this is that myth is certainly convenient means of ideological inversion typical for our society; at all levels of human communication with the help of the myth antiphysis transforms into pseudophysis. (qtd.in Tsybalenke 116).

This asserts the role of myth in ideological shaping in contemporary societies. Thus, most often, the myth functions as the tool of altering facts and shaping opinions.

### **C. 1. b. The Demonic vs. the Heroic Discourse Following the 9/11**

In a manner similar to the propaganda campaigns that accompanied many of the wars of the twentieth century, Bush’s governments strove to justify their war position during the months and days leading up to the conflict. The government sought to convince somewhat skeptical populations of the necessity of sending soldiers to a “pre-emptive” war (Rampton and Stauber). Aided by the technological advancement of the age, the government created a

mythical alters reality. The later, by turn, succeeded in paralyzing the national consciousness through a masterful context setting. It was built upon two main elements; first, demonizing the enemy, and second wearing the dress of heroism and superiority.

Enemy demonization was among the main characteristics of the discourse that sat the Iraq war context. Prior to moving to external power projection, i.e. launching a military attack on the enemy, the government started a systematic plan toward expanding its domestic authority. In order to reactivate the notion of primitive war against Iraq, the US government opted to mythologizing the 9/11 day to its favor. Concepts such as “axis of evil” and “weapons of mass destruction” were associated with the attackers. This helped in reviving the stereotypical struggles between “civilization” and “barbarism”. It also engraved the image of the envied self and the envious other rising by that the question “why the world hates us?” (Wolin 6). After introducing the enemy the public was systematically fed an evil definition of such an entity. The National Security Strategy declared that terrorism is: “a shadowy network of individuals that can bring great chaos and suffering” to the civilized US (1). Furthermore, the reports of the vivid representations of the twin towers destruction and the death scenes aimed at “fixing the image of American vulnerability while testing the potential for cultural control” (Wolin, 5). It also equally aimed at entrenching an unquestionable unified interpretation.

Heroism is another component of this created mythological discourse. For Wolin, the exploitative nature of the myth lies in its way of justifying its heroes no matter “how bloody or destructive” (11). This is a major part of a planned process of belief installation. He says that 9/11 day was transformed into the “political equivalent of a holly day of crucifixion... [the leader was transformed from] a powerful office holder of a questionable legitimacy into an instrument of redemption” (12). This fostered a sense of loyalty within the citizens. They were obliged to participate in a “crusade” that aimed, according to President Bush, to “rid the world of evil” (NSS 5). The heroic element tightly enveloped the war; from the claim of maintaining world peace and eliminating the Weapons of Mass Destruction to the reinstallation of democracy in Iraq and overthrowing the “dictatorship” of Saddam Hussain. This is best exemplified in the words of the National Security Strategy: “the United States will use this opportunity to extend the benefits of freedom across the globe... [by spreading] the hope of democracy, development ... to every corner of the world” (2). On the same token, divinity was another characteristic of the myth. President Bush declared that the US is “the

greatest force for good on earth” and in fighting terrorism the nation is responding to: “a calling from beyond the stars” (qtd.in Cohen, 1). This reflects a masterful disguise of devilish intention in the robe of benevolence.

### **C. 1. c. Shaping Reality through Mythical Discourse**

Both of the prejudice forms of heroism and demonism were parts of a larger scheme of an alter-reality creation. The later is crucial in establishing the legitimacy of the myth. Since postmodern generations hold “skepticism” as a life doctrine, Wolin argues that mythology was not an “easy sell” (13). Hence, it required a dose of reality to prove its relevance. While emphasizing the role of myth in the systematized promotion of falsities, he argues that both cinema and television function as tyrannical tools by means of filtering realities. Such filtering often worked to “eliminate” whatever may weaken the power of their creators. They, hence, promote audience passivity which, by turn, opposes the ideal of citizenry’s active participation entailed in democracy (Wolin 14).

The formerly mentioned idea ties closely with the French philosopher Jean Baudrillard’s concept of “Simulacrum”. Baudrillard’s criticism of hyperreality created by television and of information provided in “real time” aligns with Wolin’s political declaration that, in fact, the government’s power appears in its control over media. . In *Key Concepts in Literary Theory*(2006), the authors state that the term Simulacrum stems from Baudrillard’s thoughts on “reality effect,”. The later draws on the ways in which reality is synthetically established by means of “hyperreal media” such as photography, film and other media. Hence, “simulacrum refers to the image, representation or reproduction of a concrete other in which the very idea of the real is no longer the signified, but it is rather the simulacrum” (92). In other words, Simulacrum is a copy that replaces the real. Copies replace originals, thus, image becomes reality. This blurs the line between fiction and reality. As such, societal values become wholly constructed despite the “being” of things and/or the “occurring” of events. People now experience simulation instead of reality. Today, all mediums of media are the means of simulation and Simulacra.

Through the promotion of alter-reality, the government created an unreal experience of war. For ordinary American citizens, says Wolin, war was not more than “an action game, played in the living room, or a spectacle on a screen, but ... not actually experienced” (13). Hence, media recreation of images was systematically planned to fit the agendas of those in

power. Therefore the virtual reality of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center was experienced only via “the spectacles of the occasional and hapless terrorist or captive journalist put on public display.” (Wolin 13). However, the coffins of the dead soldiers were hidden from the public eye. As a result the government elite succeeded in justifying the war through reality molding. The “credulousness” and the “overestimated” skepticism had largely aided the successful spread of myth (Wolin 14). Hence, by backing the “superpower” myth with a fictional form of reality the government was able to paralyze the nation’s national consciousness.

## **C. 2. The Implications of Mythical Discourse**

After providing a tyrannical justification of the enmity through the Mythical discourse, the American myth then succeeded in setting the stage for fear installation and patriotic manipulation. These two elements are set to be among the control strategies used by the government of an Inverted Totalitarianism. The discreet nature of these ideological strategies allows the controllers to further subjugate the masses under the cover of preserving the long celebrated democracy.

### **C. 2. a. Fear Installation**

By manipulating discourse to fabricate the necessity of a war, then shaping the public opinion in favor of that war, the government was able to install a state of fear in the nation. Such a state served as rationale for government authority expansion. First, the fear of an external threat entitled the government to play the role of the protecting “sovereign” (Wolin 19). Consequently, the “subjects” willingly surrendered power to such a protector. Second, by observing the power exercised on the “enemy”, the subjects became hesitant “before voicing their criticism” (Wolin 75). Thus, absolute power depends on fear and passivity. These ideas stem from the Hobbesian philosophy of power and fear. Fear plays a major role in eliminating any attempt of revolt against the state authority. In turn, such a strategy comes to oppose the ideal of free choice implied in democratic states. In his "Hobbes and America", Srinivas Aravamudan suggests that Hobbes's theory of sovereignty is grounded in the notion of "a radical break between modern sovereignty and a premodern state of nature"(qtd.in Downes 48). Evidently, this marks the rise of authoritarian absolutism which opposes “democratic consent” (Downes 49).

In his *Leviathan* (1651), Hobbes (1588-1679) offers a further explanation of people's willful surrender of power. Seeking to explore the roots of society formation, he identifies the concept of "State of Nature". He argues that the latter is "an anarchic world" in which individuals are solely driven by an egoistic quest of self preserving (Fin). In this state, fear is the most prevalent sentiment. Despite minor differences in mental acuity and strength, humans are equal in this "natural condition of mankind", yet they are still highly competitive and distrustful (Fin). Since the "notions of Right and Wrong, Justice and Injustice have there no place", all sorts of action are justified in such a state (Hobbes 188). As a result, in this state of constant war, life becomes; "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" because individuals are in a "war of all against all" (Hobbes 186). Consequently, in such a state, Hobbes claimed that individuals have a "natural right" act in any way that guarantees preserving their lives. That is to say, they start considering moving from the state of nature to civil society (Apperley 170). Hence, an individual seeks protection by giving up his right of democratic self-government in favor of representation by a sovereign (Apperley 170). This is echoed in the covenant made by the individual which is according to Hobbes as follows: "I Authorise and give my right of Governing my selfe, to this Man or this Assembly of men, on this condition, that thou give up thy Right to him, and Authorise all his actions in like manner" (120). This, for Hobbes, marks the birth of a civil society. However, human liberty, in such a society, is simply that of bodily action without any moral or legal restrictions. A person is free, in other words, "when not physically confined or imprisoned" (Fin). Such a seizure of individual freedom comes to totally oppose the ideals of modern liberal democracy (Apperley 168).

Analogically, Wolin argues that under the system of Inverted Totalitarianism the state follows a Hobbesian doctrine of control through fear. The state's revival, and indoctrination of the Superpower Myth discourse served to recreate a Hobbesian state of nature (74). In other words, the identification of a foreign threat; that is terrorists, in addition to, calling on for a war against "terror" created, within the masses, the same sense of fear felt in a Hobbesian state of nature (42). Consequently, and unconsciously, the masses shift from a democratic state in which they are politically active to a new form of totality in which they are politically demobilized. Hence they agree to obey an absolute power. In addition, this state of nature allows the government to free itself from the restraints of treaty obligations and the potential constraints of international judicial bodies. This is realized under the pretext of prioritizing "homeland security". For example a senior office chief declared: "the

Europeans... who did not want us to go to Afghanistan ...can get with the plan [to invade Iraq] or get off” (qtd.in Sanger, 14). Her, says Wolin, the Hobbesian line between the state of nature and civil society begins blurring (90).

By the same token, such a state of fear allows the government further power expansion by blurring the line between foreign and domestic policy (Wolin 89). The totalizing impulse of the US as a superpower, claims Wolin, appears in the state’s attempt to justify domestic power exercise under the pretext of a foreign threat. This can simply be seen as a political maneuver to justify the power exercised on citizens. This was formulated in the NSS declaration which stated that: “the distinction between foreign and domestic affairs is diminishing” (23). The war context frees the state from ordinary constraints. Wolin, thus, says that the measures of governmental power changed from the ordinary constraints of the constitutions to new measures defined by “the character of terrorism as officially defined” (90). Totality, in this case, emerges from the convergence of an external threat and the indirect tantalizing forces working inside. This combination results in accepting “the restraints on personal freedom” imposed by the protecting body. Wolin suggests that such an acceptance stems from the illusion of a pressuring need to adopt “rapid change”. Consequently, this places the fate of the population in the hand of a controlling state with unlimited power.

### **C. 2. b. Nationalistic Manipulation**

In addition to control through fear installation, Inverted Totalitarianism uses nationalistic manipulation to assure the voluntary subjugation of the masses. According to Wolin, unlike classical totalitarian systems, the American totalizing system does not exhibit any evident public enforcement of ideological uniformity (57). However, it uses “Nationalism and patriotism ... to control the population and gain its support.”(35). According to Parenti:

Nationalistic devotion tends to mimic religious devotion, not only in its intolerance of dissent but in its very forms and belief structure. [Its] ritual symbols, monuments, and hymns; its parchments engrossed with the revealed word; its devotional pledges uttered like prayers; and its commemorative holidays and convocations. (66-67)

As such, manipulating the nationalistic sentiment of the population through a well orchestrated discourse, the sense of nationalism becomes a valuable control strategy in Inverted Totalitarianism.

Nationalism, thus, entails the idea that the nation is an indispensable part of one's identity. As such it is a sentiment that supersedes an individual's sense of self. Since it eliminates all forms of skepticism, controlling governments use it as a paralyzing factor of a nation's national consciousness. Consequently, citizens become manipulatable subjects who are willing to "die" and "kill" for the nation. They, thus, pledge full loyalty without hesitation or questioning to their leaders. In the case of American nationalism, the indoctrination of ideas about the nation's greatness starts from an early age. This insures entrenching the nationalist discourse of superiority, which is often referred to as "American Exceptionalism", in the mind of citizens. Typically, under regular circumstances American nationalism lies dormant, but when triggered, it plays the role of a highly influential manipulation instrument (Wolin 60). In the context of American intervention in Iraq in 2003, nationalism was among the elements that laid justification for military action. The nation's nationalistic sentiment was manipulated to moralize that decision. This type of manipulation was echoed in the political discourse of the period. Nationalistic manipulation was clearly reflected in the words of President George W. Bush, nine days after the 9/11 attacks, when he asserted that:

I will not forget this wound to our country or those who inflicted it. I will not yield; I will not rest; I will not relent in waging this struggle for freedom and security for the American people. The course of this conflict is not known, yet its outcome is certain. Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them.

His speech reflects a systematic orchestration of the nationalistic discourse. It, thus, echoes the government's attempt to empathize the war cause. By referring to the attack as a collective "wound", the president triggers the nationalistic sense of the nation. It, therefore, lays justification for taking the steps toward revenge. The later is manipulatively referred to as a "struggle for freedom". Furthermore, the speech establishes a sense of uncertainty which calls for placing a blind trust in the government. In this case, the later becomes the sovereign of a nationalistic cause.

It becomes evident that the main instrument of nationalistic manipulation is the propagandist discourse promoted by media. Despite its non-violent and superficially democratic form, the later fosters an “anti political” nationalistic sentiment among the masses by emphasizing fear and warning from an exterior threat. Consequently the population becomes receptive to being led (Wolin 53). Such a control strategy makes advantage of two of people’s innate tendencies. First people tend to be extremely vulnerable to “the unanimous views of others, and hence a single dissenter, or voice of sanity, is likely to have a huge impact on them” (Sunstein 18). In this case that voice is the president Bush’s. Second, people have a natural inclination to seek group conformity. Thus, members of the same group have a major influence on each other. In contrast, members of other distrusted or disliked groups are far more likely to be considered enemies (Sunstein 18). In this case, the enemies are the less civilized terrorists. Bonds of affection have a large impact on how members of nations react to what leaders say and do. As such, the need to conform becomes prevalent (Sunstein, 18). Therefore, similar to classical Totalitarianism, Inverted Totalitarianism works on nurturing the loyalty of its followers while simultaneously legitimizing the predominance of its elites (Wolin 56).

Overall, the revival of the Superpower myth discourse is, according to Wolin, a main element of the modern system of Inverted Totalitarianism. It is a means for paralyzing the national consciousness, thus, enabling mass subjugation. By spreading the myth through mass media, the government is able to activate two discreet control mechanisms. First, the Superpower myth successfully reinstalls a Hobbesian state of nature. Under such a state, the government becomes the protecting sovereign with expanded power. Second, the myth fosters a sense of radical nationalism. The later fixates the need of conformity. It, hence, eliminates all sorts of skepticism while promoting obedience. This type of desecrate control carefully takes place in a way that aligns with the claims of democracy. Citizens are eluded by a false sense of freedom, due to which, they overlook the ways in which they are being politically demobilized and ascribed the role of a spectator.

## **Conclusion**

To conclude, each of the three aspects of American Inverted Totalitarianism plays a major role in democratic devolution. Wolin successfully deconstructs the long established belief in American democracy. First the fusion of corporate and state power denotes the

danger of capitalism on American democracy. Under such a union the democratic ideal of public service transforms into a tyrannical exploitation. By fostering a sense of economic dependency, the capitalist controlling force; i.e. corporations, assure political demobilization. It, thus, pushes the public to a voluntary submission to its authority. Second, the creation of a Superpower myth enables the government to achieve control through fear installation and nationalistic manipulation. These strategies aim at expanding government power under the consent of the public. Hence, the system masterfully controls the citizenry under the covers of democracy. Lastly, intellectual elites play a critical role in this non- democratic system. In fact, they are both the designers and the operators of this exploitative system. By identifying knowledgeability as a governing attribute, the system controllers succeed in alienating the majority. This, furthermore, enables the elites of power abuse and monopolization.

## **Chapter Three**

# **Inverted Totalitarianism in *Brave New World***

## **Introduction**

In his essay “Utopias, Positive and Negative” (1963), Huxley refers to *BNW* as “Utopia in Reverse” (1). The negative implication of such a description stems from the novel’s inherent social criticism of the postmodern status quo. Hence, Huxley’s “negative utopia” goes beyond to an “inverted utopia” (2). This vision ties closely with Wolin’s postmodern American “Inverted Totalitarianism”. Both works masterfully depict the ideologies employed by a new version of a totalitarian system. Despite being produced in 1932, a time in which classical totalitarian forms came to power, the novel bares a strong relevance to the political scene of the 2000s. Such relevance becomes evident when noting the striking overlapping ideological aspects of the totalizing tendencies of the brave world’s government and that of the United States as described by Sheldon Wolin. Through *Brave New World*, Huxley does not only address the pitfalls of postmodern technological progress. He also criticizes the dangers of an ill-informed public mass under non-democratic authoritarianism. In the World State, “people are happy; they get what they want, and they never want what they can’t get” (Huxley 151). As an unfortunate result, they are prepared to surrender freedom of self, freedom of thought, social justice, equality and every other democratic right. This chapter traces two main threats of democratic freedom identified by Huxley in *BNW*. First, it explores Huxley’s warning against power monopolization in the capitalist and elitist system of the World State. Secondly, it sheds light on control through discourse manipulation which includes control through fear and nationalistic conformity pressure.

### **A. Capitalistic Power Monopolization in the World State**

Among the accurate prophetic suggestions of *BNW* is the danger of an untamed increase of capitalist power. Similar to the political theory of Inverted Totalitarianism, the novel stands as a direct critic of postmodern American capitalism. Its anti-utopian criticism of market economy led Marxist critics such as Adorno to read the society portrayed in the novel as essentially American (97-122). The novel’s rich capitalist discourse echoes Huxley’s Marxist worries regarding the declining individual freedom as an expense of the increasing capitalist state power.

## **A. 1. A Fordist State**

Huxley's warning against the threat of the emerging power of the state and capitalism is evident in his novel. He depicts a fictional version of a world governed by a state government of ten "world controllers". Yet, his world is outlined by a capitalist God; Ford. The later's "name had become synonymous with capitalist technical advances and industrial production between 1910 and 1920" (Baker 83). In *BNW* Capitalism has effectively replaced spirituality. Traditional religion has been completely abolished and replaced by "Fordism". As such, aspects of Fordist capitalism represent the organizational backbone of the new world society. The novel draws heavily on the repressive aspects of mass-production and endless consumption which are associated with Henry Ford assembly line.

The elevation of capitalism to a divine status reflects the unlimited extent of its power. Henry Ford is revered as the founder of the World State and the establisher of its customs. He is therefore worshipped as a form of religious deity by its citizens. Evidently, the novel's overall setting is based on the discourse of capitalist industrialism. For instance, the calendar is based on an industrial milestone. *Brave New World* is set in 2540 CE, which the novel identifies as the year AF 632. "AF" stands for "After Ford". This era began when Henry Ford introduced his Model "T". Accordingly, expressions such as "Oh, Ford!" instead of "Oh, God", and "his Fordship" instead of "his Lordship" become parts of the community speech. In addition, the Christian cross is sawn-off to a 'T' sign. This clearly signifies the startle of industrialism in the setting of *BNW*. It, consequently, echoes Huxley's predictive wisdom. While most of his contemporaries were centered upon the totality of the 1930s socialist systems, he was able to foresee the lurking danger of capitalism.

## **A. 2. The Emergence of State and Capitalist Powers**

Unlike classical forms of totalitarianism where power is reserved in a single entity, the power division in the World State is much similar to that of modern American Inverted Totalitarianism. Whereas the capitalist control is embodied in an omniscient concealed deity, the executive organizational power is divided among ten World controllers. Mustapha Mond, world controller of Western Europe is depicted as "the *raisonneur* and devil's advocate of the book" (Adorno 111). Despite having no direct connection with, the World State inhabitants still view him with an inflated sense of admiration. The excitement from a group of students upon seeing him reveals this: "His Fordship Mustapha Mond! The eyes of saluting

students almost popped out of their heads. Mustapha Mond! ... he was going to stay, to stay, yes, and actually talk to them... Straight from the mouth of Ford himself.” (25). The association of the World controller with the ominous figure of Ford is an implicit indication of their power emergence. Additionally, this also bears resemblance to people in positions of power in the real world, especially within states with authoritarian tendencies who ordinarily have charismatic leaders creating a cult of personality through mass media campaigns around them. Hence, it can be said that, just like Wolin’s modern USA, power in the World state is reserved in the emergence of capitalist corporate representatives and governmental figures.

### **A. 3. Prioritization of Capitalist Interest**

The result of the former capital and state power emergence is a demolishing democratic ethos. The latter is reversed as the individual caters to the state’s capitalist interest. Therefore, citizenry is reduced to utility. Consequently, passivity and dependency arise under the pretext of maintaining social stability. Barber confirms that: “the political system is one of the most important social mechanisms for the creation and maintenance of public expectations of a stable moral social order” (68). The World State is clearly aware of this. It exploits the citizens’ trust to demobilize its population. This is mainly achieved through creating a misconstrued social reality where stability is paramount. Huxley, thus, captures a control world in which passive nihilism aligns perfectly with the capitalist age of “cynicism” (Deleuze 225).

#### **A. 3. a. The False Promise of Stability**

As the novel opens, the “Utopian” state’s motto is introduced; “COMMUNITY, IDENTITY, STABILITY” (Huxley 5). However, it soon comes to light that the price of this stability is the loss of individual freedom. Serving the logic of industrialism, citizens are reduced to products of an assembly line. The society of *BNW* maintains an everlasting flow of workers due to the “Bokanovsky” creation process. The director of the Hatchery and the Conditioning Center explains that: “... a bokanovskified egg will bud, will proliferate, and will divide. From eight to ninety-six buds, and every bud will grow into a full-sized adult. Making ninety-six human beings grow where only one grew before. Progress.” (Huxley 7). This implies the dehumanization of the society members. It, also, marks the fading line between humanity and machinery in capitalist societies.

Nonetheless, the economization of human life in this case is masterfully concealed under the premise of ensuring stability as the director explains “Bokanovsky’s Process is one of the major instruments of social stability!”(Huxley 7). Moreover, Mustapha Mond comments how the “wheels” of society “must turn steadily” by men who are “as steady as the wheels upon their axles... obedient men, stable in contentment” (31). The association of the “men” with the “wheel” proves that men are perceived as mere instrumental parts in the World State. Their value is only relevant to the extent to which they fulfill their social function. Their individuality, hence, melts within the larger scheme of capitalism.

### **A. 3. b. Consumerism**

Stability in the World State is also ensured through advocating consumerism. This serves to further subdue the passive population by means of creating a deep sense of dependency. Since the *Brave New World* state adopts scientific logic as the cornerstone of its materialism, it uses behavioral conditioning to indoctrinate the consumerist ideal. The director explains that: “If the children were made to scream at the sight of a rose, that was on grounds of high economic policy” (17). Consumption, thus, becomes a natural aspect of life, and the citizens of the World State indulge in consumerist activities. An example appears in the way in which the children are conditioned to like flowers. Such a liking pushes them, according to the director, to go “out into the country at every available opportunity, and so compel them to consume transport” (17). Besides, the population is obliged to consume. As “Ending is better than mending,” “all members of society are compelled to consume so much a year to serve the interests of industry” (Huxley 35). Consumerism, therefore, as an enforced part of artificially fabricated personalities, conveniently serves the controlling purposes of the government. This is well summarized in the words of Diken who comments that in *Brave New World*, “happiness” is dwarfed to access consumerism, just as “politics” in the *Brave New World* is degraded to conformism (1). Through his novel, thus, Huxley offers an accurate commentary on the effect of postmodern consumerist culture on the society. He points out its numbing effect on active citizenry. The later become distant from political engagement as they are trapped in the vicious circle of consumption.

### **A. 3. c. Social class Division**

Huxley explores the aspects of capitalist power monopoly through pointing the class division that the capitalistic system fosters and maintains. It, subsequently, highlights the role

of such a division in facilitating state control through political mass demobilization. In the novel, the products of the capitalist system are five different classes, or castes, of human beings. They range with decreasing intelligence, skill, physical beauty and sophistication of work. The upper classes range from Alpha-Plus to Beta-Minus. These upper castes are conditioned to hate the lower castes; Gammas, Deltas and Epsilons. While sleeping children of upper castes repeatedly listen to inflammatory messages that would deepen the class difference. Their superiority is asserted through messages such as: "I'm really awfully glad I'm a Beta" (Huxley 21). Conversely, hate of inferior classes is also fostered: "Gammas are stupid...Oh no, I don't want to play with Delta children. And Epsilons are still worse. They're too stupid to be able" (Huxley 21). This representation of society is a key element in denoting the emerging emphasis of functionality and efficiency over the ethos of equality inherent in democracy. By maintaining the societal division, the government ensures keeping the wheels of economy turning in favor of the powerful minority.

*Brave New World* shows the government's prioritization of capitalist interest comes at the cost of individual democratic freedom. Huxley explains this idea in his *Brave New World Revisited* writing that:

Organization is indispensable; for liberty arises and has meaning only within a self-regulating community of freely co-operating individuals. But, though indispensable, organization can also be fatal. Too much organization transforms men and women into automata, suffocates the creative spirit and abolishes the very possibility of freedom. (21)

The novel's depiction of mass production and class division, that is inherent within the notion of capitalist Fordism, mirrors the dehumanization of individuals in the scheme of capitalist economy. As utility supersedes individuality, citizens become mere components within the larger machine of the social whole. Indeed, according to such logic corporate interest supersedes that of the citizen. This is further echoed in the words of the director when referring to the dispensability of citizens: "Murder kills only the individual—and, after all, what is an individual? ... We can make a new one with the greatest ease—as many as we like" (Huxley 100). Individuality, hence, "strikes at Society itself. Yes, at Society itself" (Huxley 100).

## A. 4. Voluntary Enslavement

By placing capitalism as the law of life, Huxley reflects on the devolution of American democracy. His stand stems from observing the American social scene of the 1920s. In an essay titled “The Outlook for American Culture, Some Reflections in a Machine Age” published in 1927, Huxley writes that: “One of the most ominous portents of the American Way of Life is that it embraces a large class of the people who do not want to be cultured”. They, according to him, “are not interested in the higher life”. Their lives are centered on material pleasures. Their happiness, subsequently, is ensured as long as they are “given food, drink, and the company of their fellows, sexual enjoyment, and plenty of noisy distractions” (qtd.in Varricchio 98). By making such a remark, Huxley echoes the ideas of Wolin regarding the latent danger of Democracy Incorporation. It shows that he was able to predict the role of capitalism in creating a voluntary enslavement and political disengagement. Such non-violent enslavement stands as the direct passivity insurer.

The danger of such an exploitative system lays in its concealed public distancing control strategies. Similar to modern American government’s practices of Inverted Totalitarianism that maintains the covers of democracy, the World State government preserves a prevailing sense of happiness among its citizens. Fukayama quotes the words of Leon Kass to point out “the foolish happiness” of the citizens of the World State. Unlike the man reduced by traditional slavery, the dehumanized people of the New World are not miserable. This results from an ignorance of their dehumanized state. Further worse, even such knowledge proves ineffective to them as they are sinking in deep illusionment. It is due to their ideological prejudices that every specialized caste in the novel “learns” to be happy. All members of society in the World State are ideologically conditioned to be happy with their jobs. They are, indeed, “happy slaves with a slavish happiness” (6).

This indifference toward their situation can be explained when considering the words of Henry Ford himself regarding the aim of his system. In his 1926 biography, he states that the aim behind creating his assembly line is to reduce “the necessity for thought on the part of the worker and the reduction of his movements to a minimum” (qtd.in Sexton 426). Correspondingly, The World Controllers in *BNW* condition the population into pre-assigned tasks. This limits any dissatisfactory probability. “The optimum population, said Mustapha Mond, is modelled on the iceberg-eight-ninths below the water line, one-ninth above” (Huxley 153). Hence, the factory workers and the lower castes are deliberately maintained

below the water line. In other words, they need to remain unaware of the grand scheme of things. This metaphor unveils the World controller's intention of distancing the vast majority of the population from any political worries. In fact, these strategies prove workable as "People are happy; they get what they want, and they never want what they can't get" (Huxley 151). The masses are successfully distracted from seeking any higher purpose.

Over all, the danger of capitalism is well depicted in Huxley's novel. He was successfully able to sensor the pacifying, subjugating and non-democratic nature of the capitalist system when intertwined with state power. By shedding light of the dominance of capitalism he was able to pinpoint its negative ramifications. He depicted the falsities of stability premise, consumerist affluence and thriving progress by unveiling the underlying sense of servitude, passivity and democracy deterioration.

## **B. Eliticism in the World State**

In both of Huxley's inverted Utopia and Wolin's Inverted Totalitarianism, Eliticism plays a central role in defining the controlling system. Intellectuality is depicted as a determining agent in the hierarchy of the Inverted Totalitarian systems. It is also a factor of denying the masses active political participation. The controllers of the World State adopt the strategy of power monopolization through ideological domination. Hence, Huxley's novel highlights the role of Eliticism in this new version of totalitarianism.

### **B. 1. Intellectual Inequality in the Word State**

The idea of inequality inherent in the notion of "Eliticism" appears as a dominant defining feature in the *BNW* society. The deliberate separation of the cast system is denoting of this. Infants in this world are predestined to fit into a caste system based on preconditioned physical and intellectual capabilities. Hence, there are five castes: Alphas, Betas, Gammas, Deltas and Epsilons. Alphas, like Bernard and Helmholtz, are highly intelligent people whereas Epsilons are only capable of performing basic tasks which require minimal intellectual effort. The pillar of the World State's ideology is maintaining stability. The controllers, thus, resort to justify most of their authoritarian techniques; including the cast system, through emphasizing its importance. In this regard Mustapha Mond explains that: "stability. No civilization without social stability. No social stability without individual stability. Stability. The primal and the ultimate need. Stability. Hence all this" (31). From such a statement one can see the new form of totality that Huxley was able to foresee. He, like

Wolin, identifies a system that rules through knowledge allotmentation rather than knowledge deprivation. This represents a clear cutting line between the classical form of totalitarianism and the inverted one as the former prioritizes the military over the intellectual excellence of a leader.

## **B. 2. Power Monopolization by the Elite**

Elitist monopolization of power in the World State is achieved through maintaining intellectual differences. In a conversation between John the savage and the controller Mond, the later reveals a key factor of preserving the totalitarian system in the World state.

“I was wondering,” said the Savage, “why you had them at all - seeing that you can get whatever you want out of those bottles. Why don’t you make everybody an Alpha Double Plus while you’re about it?” Mustapha Mond laughed. “Because we have no wish to have our throats cut,” he answered. “We believe in happiness and stability. A society of Alphas couldn’t fail to be unstable and miserable. Imagine a factory staffed by Alphas - that is to say by separate and unrelated individuals of good heredity and conditioned so as to be capable (within limits) of making a free choice and assuming responsibilities. Imagine it!” he repeated. (Huxley 195)

His words clearly indicate that power is placed in the hands of a minority of the population. Hence, to preserve their power the minority opt to promote passivity of the majority by limiting their critical intellectuality. Controllers, thus, are the most knowledgeable members of the society. Consequently, just like in Wolin’s US, knowledgeability is an attribute of those in power. Alpha, being the top caste citizens in *BNW*’s society can be seen as a reflection of the power elite within an Inverted Totalitarianism.

As a result, Eliticism becomes a ruling feature in Huxley’s new world. It appears that the world controllers are the only ones who know the most. Hence, it can be deduced that knowledgeability is a required feature of ruling figures. In *BNW*, it is perfectly clear that a smarter, better educated and free Alphas are only fit to occupy high positions of power. Mond explains to the savage that an Alpha “man would go mad if he had to do Epsilon Semi-Moron work-go mad, or start smashing things up” (152). He continues to refer to Alphas’ intellectual ability as an entitling character of holding power positions. In contrast, Epsilons are “foredoomed” to “scarify” by occupying low positions in the social hierarchy. In this

sense, the novel satirizes the republican perception of a superior elitist minority. According to this logic, education is a promoter of social inequality. By amplifying the chasms between the different social groups, this system gives rise to specialized groups who have little to no freedom of choice.

### **B. 3. Elite Manufacturing**

In *BNW*, Huxley highlights the idea of elite manufacturing which is considered a key feature in Inverted Totalitarianism. In the World State, biology and politics overlap. As such, biological engineering can be regarded as a political instrument. Biological birth and parenting are considered “obscene” occurrences (31). Infants are, thus, raised in “hatcheries” and “conditioning centers” to fit into predetermined positions in the intellectual class hierarchy. Hence, the World State achieves this through three methods; genetic engineering, sleep teaching and cognitive behavioral conditioning.

#### **B. 3. a. Genetic Engineering: Bokanovskification**

In *BNW*, “bokanovskification”<sup>10</sup> is one of the processes through which science shapes society. It is described in the text as “one of the major instruments of social stability” (5). In Huxley’s world, biological birth is prohibited. Babies instead are born in test-tubes on assembly lines. As such, intellectual hierarchy in the novel is maintained through the state’s predetermination of the varying levels the citizens’s intelligence, physical qualities and social position through the “Bokanovsky” process. The later entails starving a fertilized egg of oxygen to prevent sufficient organ development. The director explains that: “The surrogate goes around slower; therefore passes through the lung at longer intervals; therefore gives the embryo less oxygen [...] The lower the caste, said Mr Foster, the shorter the oxygen” (10-11). Therefore, this process of oxygen starvation decides the social classes by hindering the mental and physical development of embryos. Through this eugenic caste system, the state ensures reducing social complexity as it eliminates any future rebellious probability. Mond says that: “We also predestine and condition. We decant our babies as socialized human beings, as Alphas or Epsilons, as future sewage workers or future Director of Hatcheries” (Huxley 9 - 10). This illustrates that in the World State, people are born to serve a specific purpose which

---

<sup>10</sup> Bokanovsky's Process is described in the novel as a process of human cloning. It allows rapid splitting of fertilized eggs into identical groups. Although the maximum number of embryos possible is 96, with 72 being a "good average.", the process can still be repeated several times.

in turn decreases complexity by severely reducing the chances of the majority to take control over power.

### **B. 3. b. Sleep Teaching: Hypnopaedia**

The conditioning continues after the infants have been born – most prominently through the sleep-teaching technique “Hypnopaedia”<sup>11</sup> which teaches children about class distinctions and love for the community, science and Ford. Gramsci maintains that the state uses schools as “a positive educative function and courts as a repressive and negative educative function ... which form the apparatus of the political and cultural hegemony of the ruling classes” (qtd.in Mastroianni). In *Brave New World*, education is used as one of the means of children conditioning. It aims to make them dutiful citizens of the World State. In the novel Hypnopaedia; or sleep-teaching, stands as an allegorical equivalent of mass education. It consolidates the elite power monopolization by preparing the children of the world state to become its compliant citizens. The Director of Hatcheries explains that a set of instructions are repeated “till at last the child’s mind is these suggestions, and the sum of the suggestions is the child’s mind. The adult’s mind too .... And not the child’s mind only. But all these suggestions are our suggestions” (Huxley 21). By depicting education in such a bleak manner in which sleep-taught proverbs are repeated “[one] hundred and twenty times three times a week for thirty months”, Huxley invariably draws attention to the systematized nature of learning in the totalitarian World State.

The description of Hypnopaedia by Mustapha Mond as “the greatest moralizing and socializing force of all time” (28) in chapter two only serves to emphasize the idea of education control in favor of a certain social group. In fact, the particular use of “moralizing” implies the totality of this form of intellectual control. Its efficiency lies particularly in the way in which it molds the intrinsic moral aspect of one’s identity. Citizens become fully conditioned as this sense of control is cemented through repetition. Mond asserts that these sleep-teachings are repeated until they finally establish the child’s motivations, aspirations and beliefs. Subsequently, they remain firmly anchored in his consciousness “all his lifelong”. (Huxley 21).

---

<sup>11</sup> Hypnopaedia or sleep-teaching is a conditioning process used by the governing bodies in the New World. It allows the indoctrination of differing intellectual values that correspond to the child’s class. This information is engraved into the child’s mind via the repetition of slogans and messages through loud speakers while they sleep.

### **B. 3. c. Behavioral Conditioning**

The totalitarian practices of the World State and the sense of control which accompany them are further emphasized by another form of behavioral conditioning. The Infant Nurseries, or Neo-Pavlovian Conditioning Rooms use psychological methods to condition infants to suit the designs of the World State. In the nursery, books and flowers are arranged in a long row. Then, the infants who are destined to be Delta children are brought to the room. Naturally, on seeing the flowers and books, they crawl towards them. However, at the instruction of the Director, the Head Nurse suddenly presses down a lever which results in a violent explosion accompanied with maddeningly sound alarm bells. The children scream with terror. Then, the flowers are electrified much to the shock of the children. They are, thus, conditioned to hate flowers and books (Huxley 15-16). This Pavlovian process of conditioning mimics the way in which lower classes are usually oriented toward what Gramsci referred to as “Vocational schools” which eventually equip them to only occupy instrumental jobs.

### **B. 4. Control of Information**

Another method of maintaining the intellectual classicism in the novel is control of information access. The latter is common in totalitarian dystopias. For instance in both of *1984* (1949) and *The Handmaid's Tale* (1984), authors have represented the control of information as an oppressive technique that is achieved in a forceful manner. In contrast, Huxley employs the control of information in a much more subtle and less forceful manner. This aligns with the nature of Inverted Totalitarianism. The World Controllers ensure that, under no circumstances, the knowledge of the past, or the brilliance of individuals de-conditions the citizens. Such a strategy eliminates intellectual mobility. As a result, only the World Controllers have access to the books that highlight the values of the past. They become the custodians of all knowledge which is forbidden for others to know. Neo-Marxist criticisms acknowledge the need for creating awareness to bring about social change. Such awareness is averted by the World Controllers of Huxley's imaginary world by preventing the citizens from attaining true knowledge.

The latter idea is well exemplified in the sixteenth chapter of the novel. In the World Controller's room, John takes the book “MY LIFE AND WORK, BY OUR FORD” that was published in Detroit by the Society for the Propaganda of Fordian Knowledge (Huxley 149). Yet, he is not impressed. Through this incident, Huxley comments on the systematized

distribution of knowledge in modern society. Driven by curiosity, John asks whether the new “Worlders” are allowed to read Shakespeare. The reply is negative as all old knowledge is regarded inutile. Progressive utility is associated with stability in the World state. It is, thus, used again as a pretext to deny the masses access to information. Mond explains to John that: “We haven’t any use for old things here...we don’t want people to be attracted by old things. We want them to like new ones” (Huxley 150). This knowledge systematization leads ultimately to creating a sense intellectual deficiency. Hence, Mond replies that they cannot “understand” the old knowledge (Huxley 150).

Furthermore, in his essay “Writers and Readers” (1936), Huxley highlights information restriction via periodical press. He suggests that elite groups believe that by controlling the press they could steer public opinion to their favor. Hence, they consolidate their power position. He states that these groups “... buy up newspaper ... mainly in the confident hope of being able to persuade the electorate to do what they want it to do” (29). Similarly, in the novel, newspapers bear names which reflect the attitude of the government. The World state publishes different news Newspapers for different classes. They include; “The Hourly Radio, an upper-caste sheet, the pale green GammaGazette, and, on khaki paper and in words exclusively of one syllable, The Delta Mirror.” (Huxley 44). The systematization of both of the form and the content of the different papers reflects the attitude of the government toward the different classes. It also marks the state’s effort to intellectually mislead the lower classes. Harding remarks that Plekhanov, the father of Marxist criticism, asserts that: “the essential preliminary task in winning the working class ... was the winning over, and proper induction of the radical intelligentsia” (75). Hence, by relying on intellectual blackout, the “intelligentsia” conditions the masses to accept their social status without questioning.

In sum, *BNW* provides an excellent prophetic depiction of the role of Eliticism in promoting power monopolization. The later, stands in direct opposition to the democratic rule of the ordinary people. Huxley succeeds in highlighting the latent control strategies used by such groups. He, like Wolin, shows a system in which knowledgeability is an entitling character of leaders. He, also, points out the ways in which the system seeks power monopolization by maintaining intellectual differences and restricting information access. All of these aspects stand in perfect alignment with the features of the American government depicted in *Democracy Incorporated* (2008).

## **C. The Superpower Myth in the World State**

Huxley's World State stands as the most powerful state in the futuristic era he created. Its power is largely based on the fabrication of discourse regarding its world status. The government of the New World uses the "Nine Years" war myth to recreate a Hobbesian sovereignty. This myth is well promoted via the advanced technology of the year 2450 A.D. Such a technology allows the state to create a well tailored alter-reality. As a result, the new "Worlders" willingly hand power to their controllers. Hence fear from a foreign threat and the need to conform become the new strategies of subjugation. Evidently, this new totality does not derive its power from an oppressive control technique, but, rather, it eliminates all sorts of revolt by maintaining the illusion of freedom and happiness under a protecting sovereign.

### **C. 1. The Myth of the Nine Years War**

In *Democracy Incorporation* (2008), Wolin identifies "the war on terror" as a critical point in the history of the political system of the US. It is a turning point that led to the revival of a new Superpower myth. Similarly, Huxley presents the "Nine Years" war in his novel as a turning point that marks a shift in the system of the New World government. Mond states that before the war there was "something called democracy" (Huxley 34). However, after the dropping of the "Anthrax" bombs, this changed. The war was waged in the year "A.F. 141". According to Mond, it was "a point of crisis and economic collapse so acute that people had to make a choice between World Control and destruction" (Huxley 35). Yet, the staggering aspect of this new type of control lies in its similarity with that identified by Wolin. The world controller point the nonviolent nature of the new type of control as he states that: "Government's an affair of sitting, not hitting. You rule with the brains and the buttocks, never with the fists." (Huxley 35). Huxley had, thus, successfully foreseen the way in which discourse and reality can be molded and used to serve the political agenda. However, what closes the vision of Huxley to that of Wolin even further is the manipulative sense rather than the oppressive one. Hence, it can be argued that the novel portrays a new type of totalitarianism that differs from the classical one presented by George Orwell's *1984*. Huxley's inverted Utopian system parallels in this sense with that of an Inverted Totalitarianism.

A better illustration of the particularity of this aspect in *Brave New World* can be seen when juxtaposed with Orwell's *1984*. In *Brave New World Revisited* (1958), Huxley

himself indicates that whereas *1984* portrays a totalitarianism that practices control through fear and violent punishment, the New World government controls its citizens via manipulative discourse (5). In this, “science” is supported with a type of permissive and pleasure ethics. This type of control prophetically bares a strong relevance to the post September, 11 attacks America. In contrast, Orwell’s vision in *1984* draws more on classical forms of totalitarianism such as the Nazi and Communist ones. This minifies its relevance to the modern American scene. The use of a pacifying discourse is what guarantees the Brave New World against destructive passions. It subjugates its citizens through a systematic molding of their knowledge. It, thus, uses information manipulation rather than deprivation. On this token, Postman asserts that:

Orwell feared those who would deprive us of information. Huxley feared those who would give us so much that we would be reduced to passivity and egoism. Orwell feared that the truth would be concealed from us. Huxley feared the truth would be drowned in a sea of irrelevance. Orwell feared we would become a captive culture. Huxley feared we would become a trivial culture. (Vii–viii)

Postman’s comparative vision, thus, confirms that the stereotypical oppressive forms of control have been inverted in the context of post-modernity. In such a case, the success of information manipulation is largely attributed to the use of technology to create a well weaved alter-reality.

## **C. 2. The Demonic vs. the Heroic Discourse in the World State**

In an allegiance with the strategies of an Inverted Totalitarianism, the World State adopts a similar path to that of Bush’s government following the 9/11 attack. It seeks to entrench the demonic inferiority of the enemy while dogmatizing its heroic superiority. The significance of such a strategy is well explained in the American anthropologist Jeffery Cohen’s *Monster Theory*. In the section entitled “The Monster Dwells at the Gates of Difference”, Cohen asserts that: “cultures create monsters in order to discriminate against certain groups of people” (3-25). They, thus, highlight the “Otherness” to expand their own superiority. In *Brave New World*, the World State “monsterizes” its enemies in the “New Mexican reservation” so that it creates justification for its domestic power expansion. This, also, allows the state to maintain support for its current way of life. Cohen writes, “Representing an anterior culture as monstrous justifies its displacement or extermination by

rendering the act heroic” (10). Huxley’s juxtaposition of the savage reservation and the World State, in the novel, perfectly serve such an objective.

The superiority of the World state is asserted throughout the novel. From the very first chapter, the reader is introduced to a highly sophisticated civilization. The Director educates the students in the “Hutchery and Conditioning Centre” about the Bokanovsky processes as well as the Pavlovian conditioning mechanisms used in the artificial, highly scientific world (Huxley 5-14). This immediately creates an impression of superiority. The advanced nature of the World State is further described with a sense of superiority and grandeur as Mutapha Mond explains to the savage: “Our civilization has chosen machinery and medicine and happiness” (Huxley 159).

In contrast, the New Mexican reservation is an embodiment of inferiority when compared to the ideals of the civilized World State. The two different worlds are set apart by a “frontier that separated civilization from savagery” (Huxley 70). Thus, the “reservation” is an image of an orientalist chaotic space. It is regarded as an archaic state of nature which the ordinary new Worlders know little about. Consequently, the world controllers are the only sources of information about this remote world. They, hence, ensure indoctrinating a demonized picture of this world in the minds of the citizens. This is well exemplified in the following passage in which the World controller Mond tells a group of students about the life of their enemies in the reservation:

...home was as squalid psychically as physically. Psychically, it was a rabbit hole, a midden, hot with the frictions of tightly packed life, reeking with emotion... Manically, the mother brooded over her children (her children) ... brooded over them like a cat over its kittens; but a cat that could talk... (Huxley 28)

He goes on to assert his disgust by describing those “premoderns” as “mad and wicked and miserable” (Huxley 30). Such a negative backward discourse aims at fixating the idea evil associated with the New Mexicans.

Correspondingly, the indoctrination proves effective. When Lenina and Bernard are granted the rare opportunity of visiting the reservation, they reveal feelings of utmost disgust and contempt. Both of the setting and the inhabitants of the reservation are depicted by them as barbaric and grotesque. At the first arrival to the savage reservation, the natives’ faces are

described as "... inhuman with daubings of scarlet, black and ochre..." (Huxley 74). The subsequent image of a "coyote-man" beating a boy until his "blood was streaming" seems brutish and cruel to them (Huxley 77). Effectively, they unconsciously place themselves in a position of superiority to those "savages." As such, Lenina explicitly expresses her scorn by saying: "I don't like it, ... I don't like it." Her feeling is further worsened as she witnesses "The dirt,.. , the piles of rubbish, the dust, the dogs, the flies". She reacts by wrinkling up her face "into a grimace of disgust" while, simultaneously, holding "her handkerchief to her nose." (Huxley 74). Such an exaggerated reaction reflects the success of superiority indoctrination of the World State.

As such, it can be said that the context of the Superpower myth of the World State' was convincingly sat through a manipulative discourse which juxtaposes its superiority to the inferiority of the New Mexico reservation. Citizens, like Lenina, become not only a World State captive but also captives of their own mind. The World State succeeded in a complete colonization of its citizens' minds. They genuinely believe that the World State is a doer of good in such a situation. .As a result, the trusting relationship between government and subjects in the New World is amicably reinforced. Consequently, the citizens willingly place power in the hands of the controllers. The later, proceed to further entrench their ideological dogmas using technological progress.

### **C. 3. Technology as a Totalitarian Tool in the World State**

According to Firchow, *Brave New World* is recognized as "a kind of byword for a society in which the values of scientific technology are dominant" (301). As such, in *Brave New World Revisited* (1958), Huxley sheds light specifically on the role of such technology in controlling the masses rather than merely serving them. He suggests that mass communication, particularly, is a force that can be used both positively and negatively. On the one hand, press, radio and cinema are necessary to the survival of democracy. Yet, on the other hand, they also can be "among the most powerful weapons in the dictator's armory". He continues to assert the power of these means of "mass communication" and "technological progress" by claiming that they have always been used by "Big Man" to subjugate the "Little Man" (33). This, as Congdon says, clearly indicates that *Brave New World* (1932) provides an accurate critique to the way in which technological progress is exploited to serve "the social, political, and economic agendas" of powerful controllers (3). Similarly, Beuchamp elaborates on the systematized use of technology in Dystopias. He points out that technology in

Dystopias is often “not a neutral tool misused by totalitarian rulers”. It rather holds an intrinsic totalitarian nature in itself. He describes it as “a futuristic Frankenstein's monster” (55). This idea manifests itself vividly in *BNW*. Mustapha Mond claims that the World State maintains control over science and technology (168). This suggests that the World State Controllers are aware of the harmful potential technology.

Accordingly, it appears that both Wolin and Huxley share a pessimistic view on the authoritarian power of modern-day technology. They agree on its crucial role in echoing manipulative discourse. Yet, the uniqueness of this meeting point lies in Huxley’s ability to foresee the subtlety of such use of technology. In classical forms of totalitarianism; such as that of Orwell’s and Attwods’s, information is completely inaccessible. Yet, in Inverted Totalitarianism, information is systematically distributed to create an illusion of reality i.e. alter-reality. In *BNW*, Huxley draws heavily on the idea of creating an alter-reality through advanced technology. Hence, it can be noticed that in both of Wolin’s United States and Huxley’s World State, information distribution plays a focal role in the government’s plan to expand its authority. In his theory “World Risk Society”, Beck suggests that the real risk of modernity lies in the changes of reality reflexivity. The later, by turn gives rise to an alter-reality which Baudrillard pointed to. The unprecedented speed of new information affects the reflexive interpretation of modernity. It allows individuals to view themselves and their surroundings from a distance without taking part in the actual experiences. The World State is keen on controlling and adjusting new information through censorship and a monopoly of facts. This ultimately aims at manipulating the citizen to trust the government.

#### **C. 4. The Creation of an Alter- Reality Through Mythical Discourse**

The citizens’ reflexive interpretation of event is hindered in the New World. They, thus, view themselves and their surroundings in light of the new systematized information that is severely halted. This is apparent in the World State’s ideology depicted through the character of Lenina. She ignorantly says that “when the individual feels, the community reels” (63). Such a statement indicates that reality interpretation should only accord with nation’s “greater good”. As such, the essence of truth changes in the world state to serve the alleged stability of the nation. Mustapha Mond points out to John, Helmholtz and Bernard that “I’m interested in truth, I like science. But truth’s a menace, science is a public danger. As dangerous as it’s been beneficent”(Huxley155). Such a statement reflects Mond’s belief in the intertwining power of science and truth. “Universal happiness keeps the wheels steadily

turning; truth and beauty can't" (Huxley 156), Mond says, underscoring that their "truths" are consciously biased in order to pay the price for public happiness. Similar to American Inverted Totalitarianism, the world state filters the information in a way that aligns with its Superpower myth. Thus, maintaining happiness becomes a pretext to legitimize the created myth. In turn, passivity becomes the dominant feature of citizenry.

#### **C. 4. a. The Use of Soma**

American government, according to Wolin, opted to paralyze the nation's national consciousness through promoting its myth heavily on media channels. The result was a highly receptive trusting public. Likewise, the government of the New World used Soma to achieve this. In *Brave New World Revisited*, Huxley comments on the significance of "drugging" the national consciousness to make people willingly surrender power. He considers "Soma" as one of the most powerful tools in the armory of the World Controllers. Thus, he asserts that the daily soma dose eliminates all forms of "personal maladjustment, social unrest, and the spread of subversive ideas". According to him, Soma "called up visions of another, better world, it offered hope, strengthened faith..." (55). Hence, the role of soma resembles that of the propagandist discourse promoted in media. It gives rise to a form of an alter-reality. Such an idea is well manifested in Mustapha Mond's words to the children:

there's always soma to give you a holiday from the facts. And there's always soma to calm your anger, to reconcile you to your enemies, to make you patient and long-suffering. In the past you could only accomplish these things by making a great effort and after years of hard moral training. Now, you swallow two or three half-gramme tablets, and there you are. Anybody can be virtuous now. (Huxley 162)

Unfortunately, like American citizens, most of the new "Worlders" are unable to realize the manipulative installation of the superpower myth. The character of Lenina is a satirical depiction of how free views of reality are altered by contemporary political agendas. Her high dependency on Soma is a reflection of the success of governmental control of the citizenry's free thought. This is well manifested in her following statements; "A gramme is always better than a damn," "A gramme in time saves nine" and "Remember one cubic centimeter cures ten gloomy sentiments"(60). In contrast to her, yet, Bernard is one of the few citizens who realize the danger of restricting the freedom of thought by denying access to

truth. In a conversation with Lenina, during their holiday, he expresses his frustration from the situation:

No, the real problem is: How is it that I can't, or rather-because, after all, I know quite well why I can't-what would it be like if I could, if I were free-not enslaved by my conditioning." "But Bernard, you're saying the most awful things." "Don't you wish you were free, Lenina?" "I don't know what you mean. I am free. Free to have the most wonderful time. Everybody's happy nowadays." He laughed, "Yes, 'Everybody's happy nowadays.'" ...But wouldn't you like to be free to be happy in some other way, Lenina? In your own way, for example; not in everybody else's way. (Huxley 61)

The holiday in this case signifies a search for a true experience that differs from the New World's simulacrum. It is an experience that is "far more real than reality" (Huxley 112). Bernard's words reflect a rare awareness of the discursive enslavement of the citizens. His search for a different form of happiness indicates a longing to set free from the predefined form of reality drew by the government.

#### **C. 4. b. The Use of Censorship**

In addition to Soma, the realistic aspect of the Superpower myth discourse of the World State is also maintained by placing censorship over all sorts of publications. This largely resembles the censorship on written press content in the US, following the 9/11 attack, which Wolin refers to in his *Inverted Totalitarianism*. The governments, who are working on consolidating their power, apply censorship as a way to pacify the society. In one instance, Mustapha Mond reviews a paper titled "A New Theory of Biology". He ultimately decides that the paper should not be published as its "novel" ideas are "heretical ... dangerous and potentially subversive"(Huxley 118). This shows that in the World State information is not assessed according to its quality, but rather according to its conformity to the state orthodoxy. Despite the truth value that the paper held as Mond describes it as a "masterly piece of work", it was prohibited because of the reaction that it might provoke. He says, its ideas could

easily decondition the more unsettled minds ...[and] make them lose their faith in happiness as the Sovereign Good and take to believing, instead, that the goal was somewhere beyond, somewhere outside the present human sphere, that the

purpose of life was not the maintenance of well-being, but some intensification and refining of consciousness, some enlargement of knowledge. (Huxley 118)

This sort of information filtering mirrors the careful ways in which discourse is manipulated. It shows that it is through the systematized discourse that citizens are held a captive to powerful ideology.

### **C. 5. The Implications of Mythical Discourse in the World State**

After installing the superpower myth as form of unquestionable “reality”, the government succeeded in expanding its authority. It, hence, maintained hold over power under the apparent consent of the majority of citizens. Such a strategy defers largely from the conventional types of control used by classical totalitarian systems. Under the later, the citizenry feels a compulsive need to surrender power to its oppressive government. Yet, under Inverted Totalitarianism, the citizenry surrender power in a willful manner. In fact, the government under such a system becomes the protecting severing. As a result, a sense of belonging is fostered. By turn, any questioning of its decisions will appear as a non-conformist behavior which might ultimately result in alienation.

#### **C. 5. a. Fear Installation**

By using a manipulative discourse, the government of the World State ensures fixating the history of the “Nine Years” war in the minds of its citizens. It, thus, equates the inhabitants of the reservation with the features of a threatening enemy. The new “Wolders” start to fear this foreign threat. Such a fear plays a major role in eliminating any attempt of revolt against the state authority. While Wolin argues that the war on terror stands to represent the former break, Huxley, represents the Nine Years war as an equivalent for that. Hobbes description of the “State of Nature”<sup>12</sup> as an uncivilized state of existence corresponds with the Warden of the reservation’s depiction of the “uncivilized” pre-war world in the novel. He describes it as a direct reverse of the New World state:

... about sixty thousand Indians and half-breeds. absolute savages...no communication whatever with the civilized world. still preserve their repulsive habits and customs. Marriage,... no conditioning. Monstrous superstitions. Christianity and totemism and ancestor worship. extinct languages, such as

---

<sup>12</sup> See Hobbes 186-188.

Zuñi and Spanish and Athapascan. pumas, porcupines and other ferocious animals. infectious diseases. priests. venomous lizards. (Huxley 67)

This description aims to provoke a natural fear from returning to such a state. The Warden further continues to assert that once being in that state death becomes the only destiny (Huxley 67). Corresponding with the Hobbesian concept of sovereignty, people facing such a fear prefer to willfully surrender power to a protecting sovereign “state”. In this regard Mustapha Mond explains to John that: “... after the Nine Years’ war. People were ready to have even their appetites controlled then. Anything for a quiet life. We’ve gone on controlling ever since.”(Huxley 156). However, he also points to the price of such a protection. He says that such a surrender of power “hasn’t been very good for truth, of course. But it’s been very good for happiness.” Yet, “One can’t have something for nothing. Happiness has got to be paid for”(Huxley 156).

In this sense, Huxley breaks away from the conventional expectations about totalitarian governments in Dystopian literature. Typically, Dystopian fiction associates totalitarian governments with aspects of violence, fear, suspicion, disillusionment and resentment. Orwell’s *1984* is again an accurate illustration of this. The ruling Party, according to Booker & Thomas “seek only to perpetuate its own power” (68) and are consciously working toward a dystopian world. In contrast, The World State rules “not through the overt exercise of power [...] but through the more subtle manipulations that are typical of modern bourgeois society in the West” (67). This suability hides another aspect of Hobbesian sovereignty that is the unconscious fear of the state itself.

By embodying the role of the protector, the state successfully establishes a trusting relationship with its citizens that allow them to surrender unquestionable authority. However, Kohn states that a central component of trust meaning is the position of vulnerability the trustors place themselves in (14-15). Although Violence is a rare occurrence in the novel, the pre-World State government relied heavily on warfare and violence in response to the “Nine Year’s War” and the “Great Economic Collapse”. This raises the possibility that the powerful “trustee” state is able to resort to violence and brutality even against its “trustors” if needed. Hence, given the state’s historical context, its authority must be read with skepticism. By establishing such a position, the government succeeds in sweeping one of the main eliminators of absolutism in liberal democracies that is the risk of public rebellion if the citizen’s do not sufficiently feel that the government is catering to their interest.

### **C. 5. b. Nationalistic Conformity**

The patriotic manipulation of the governed group is another implication of discourse manipulation in the World State. It is set to be another subjugation strategy. It paralyzes the individual's consciousness under the pretext of conformity. In *Brave New World Revisited*, Huxley highlights the role of "groupism" in destroying the individuality of humans. Groups are capable of having moral values like individuals who constitute them. "But a crowd is incapable of intelligent action and rational thinking. People in a crowd cease to have a will of their own, they become victims of 'herd poisoning'" (40). The character of Bernard represents a vivid embodiment of this. Throughout the first chapters of the novels Bernard's discontent of the state enslavement appears to be strong. Yet, as the novel progresses it becomes evident that the need to conform defeats any rebellious inclination.

Conformity plays a central role in the World State. The director explains to Bernard that he should be cautious not to act against the principles of the World State. He asserts that Alphas need not be infantile in their emotional behavior like other classes. He says that it is the reason "for their making a special effort to conform. It is their duty to be infantile, even against their inclination" (Huxley 66). However, despite being a member of the higher cast, Bernard struggles to accept the world view dictated by the government. His critical sense of individuality is apparent in the first chapters of the novel as he refuses to be a "part of the social body" (Huxley 61). The rebellious aspect of his character is manifested in a number of his expressions and actions. By refusing to take Soma, wanting to be alone, reminiscing over the lost motherhood to craving freedom, Bernard appears as a non-conformist. Consequently, he struggles with social alienation. He admits to John that he feels "Terribly alone" (Huxley 91). His attitude places him, the director says, in the position of the "enemy of Society, a subverter, ...of all Order and Stability, a conspirator against Civilization itself" (Huxley 101). He, therefore, risks incurring punishment upon himself.

Ultimately, the threat of social alienation pushes the rebellious Bernard to seek conformity. In chapter eight, where he first meets John and Linda, Bernard realizes that they are an "enormous asset" to assert his conformity. Despite the fact that Bernard himself was once an outcast in the New World society, he decides to use John and Linda in order to escape his social alienation. Therefore, he becomes a part of the system of behavior that he had formerly tried to distance himself from. "Bernard now found himself, for the first time in his life, treated not merely normally, but as a person of outstanding importance" (Huxley 104).

Moreover, he falls back into the state approved behavior of sex and soma by losing his sense of individuality. Being a conformist, he loses the drive for seeking “more”. This marks the way in which Inverted Totalitarianism assures people passivity through pushing them to a voluntary submission of individuality. Under such a system the only heard voice becomes that of the state.

As a result of patriotic feeling of unity, the citizens lose their sense of truth evaluation. They act as a blind enslaved herd. This is apparent in the failing attempts of John to save them from “slavery”. John is referred to as a “savage” throughout the novel. He comes from an aboriginal background. Hence, his free upbringing allows him to see beyond the restrictions of the cognitive conditioning of the New World. In one instance John tries to disparately instruct the Deltas not to take “soma” telling them that it is “Poison to soul as well as body.” (Huxley145). His action stems from a strong want to free them. Yet, he soon realizes the futility of such an attempt. Driven by a strong faith in their government instructions, the group of Deltas become furious, and attempt to attack him. They prove being culturally hypnotized. They are fully convinced with the false ideals promoted by their leaders. He is, then, left with endless questions; “Don’t you want to be free and men? Don’t you even understand what manhood and freedom are...” (Huxley 146).

## **Conclusion**

In sum, the new authoritarian state’ power does not lie in its ability to dictate by force, but rather in its manipulative persuasion strategy. The later inevitably drives the population into “political indifference”. Consequently, as Huxley shows, this indifference results in the deterioration of democratic ideals such as; justice and freedom. These conditions, by turn, allow the elite to become the World Controllers, while the majority of the population becomes, indeed, “Civilization’s mindless automatons” (Giroux 30 -32). *Brave New World* proves strongly relevant to the post modern political scene. Huxley was able to foresee the emerging of an unconventional type of totalitarianism. By depicting a world in which the utmost power is embodied in a capitalist God whose executives are a group of elites, he deconstructs the conventional form totalitarianism. Additionally, his depiction of the use of a manipulative discourse to subjugate the masses reflects a similar mode of control to that of the early 2000s US. Thus it can be concluded that Huxley’s *Brave New World* is evidently a prophetic literary masterpiece. Huxley’s novel provides an ideological reading of a non-violent tyrannical system. Hence, this inverted Utopia echoes an inverted totalitarianism.

# **General Conclusion**

## General Conclusion

The criticism of fundamental defining notions was a prevailing feature of the postmodern generation. Touched by the historical context of the era both novelists and political theorists embarked on questioning, redefining and rejecting former conceptions. The most prominent of which was the idea of democracy. Despite being produced eighty years apart, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and Sheldon Wolin's *Inverted Totalitarianism* (2008) share an analogous perception of a devolving form of democracy. This research aimed at exploring the prophetic relevance of Aldous Huxley's inverted utopia to the American political scene as described in Wolin's book *Democracy Incorporated: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism* (2008). It specifically focused on the aspects of power monopolization and discourse manipulation. The work most notably emphasized the uniqueness of the subtle oppression forms as opposed to other classical dystopian works. Exploring this subtlety helped in formulating a clear vision of the regressive direction of democratic systems.

The starting point of the research was establishing a historical, ideological and philosophical context for the study. The emergence of the dystopian genre from the womb of utopia is largely attributed to the historical context of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Thus, many works of the age spotted light on the theme of totalitarianism. The later was a significant characteristic of the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century that was associated mainly with fascist, nazi and communism. This cruel system of government evidently inspired various literarians to capture its totality. Among the most prominent works focalized this theme are *1984* (1949), *The Handmaid's Tale* (1984) and *Brave New World* (1932). yet, each of these works had approached the idea of totalitarianism. *Brave New World* particularly stands out through its depiction of a more subtle and manipulative form of totalitarianism. This unique vision, thus, parallels to a large extent with the perception of the postmodern political theory; specifically with Sheldon Wolin's theory of Inverted Totalitarianism. The chapter finally provided a philosophical backdrop for the analysis. The Neo-Marxist lens was chosen to study the aspect of power monopolization, whereas the Foucauldian lens was chosen to analyze the aspect of discourse manipulation in such a system.

In its second chapter the research provided a conceptual exploration of the aspects of Inverted Totalitarianism as described in Wolin's *Democracy Incorporated: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism* (2008). It focused on two

main aspects of this system. First, it explored the notion of “democracy incorporation”. The later identifies the aspects of power monopolization by both capitalist corporate as well as elitist groups. Despite the common association of socialist economic systems with the different forms of totalitarianism, Wolin’s theory argued that capitalism has an inherent inclination toward non-democratic ideals. The increasing influence of the capitalist corporate resulted in the emergence of an economic Superpower. The later appears to be highly threatening to American democracy through its prioritization of economic over social benefit and maintenance of an illusive promise of stability. On the same token, the role of elitist groups in policy making was also identified as promoter of a power monopoly. This was evidently explored through highlighting the roots of Eliticism in American politics and its identification as an authoritative trait. Subsequently, the Superpower myth was then presented to highlight the aspect of discourse manipulation as a control strategy under the façade of democracy. The revival of the Superpower myth was associated with the war on terror which started after the September 11 attacks. The role of technology in promoting the myth was a crucial. It was the means of echoing biased discourse and creating perverting reality. Consequently, the myth had considerably succeeded in expanding governmental authority in a non-democratic way. The later was apparent in fear installation and nationalistic manipulation.

Analogically, the third chapter traced the ideological aspects of Inverted Totalitarianism in *Brave New World* through a literary analyzing of the text. Power in the world state appears to be monopolized by the capitalist deity; Henry Ford and the ten executive world controllers representing the state elites. The negative implications of such power emergence are manifested in the prioritization of economic benefit through the promise of stability, promotion of consumerism and maintenance of social class division. Consequently, the citizenry engages in a form of an unconscious voluntary enslavement that opposes the notion of a free democracy. Additionally, the idea of Eliticism is also pivotal in Huxley’s *World government*. Intellectual inequality is apparent in the World state. As such, power is essentially placed in the hands of the minority members of the elitist group. Subsequently, the later keep monopoly over power by limiting access to power position through elite manufacturing. Furthermore, the World state government also uses the strategy of discourse manipulation to keep the masses under its control by creating of the Nine Years war myth. The discourse that surrounds the myth is manipulatively tailored to draw a division line between a superior heroic self and a monstrous inferior other. Moreover, Technology also

plays a crucial role in this process of manipulative control. The nation's consciousness is layed dormant under the effect of Soma and censorship. As products of advanced technology, they are used to promote the twisted realities. Consequently, residents of the World state accept the Hobbesian sovereignty and bow to the pressures of conformity. the alignment of such control strategies

The analytical framework of the study had essentially laid to identifying the meeting points between the political theory of Inverted Totalitarianism and the dystopian novel *Brave New world*. Sheldon Wolin's formulation had identified the emergence of a set of non-democratic tendencies in the American system of government. Underlied by the ideologies of power monopolization and discourse manipulation, these repressive aspects match to a large extent those appearing in Huxley' novel. Hence, the prophetic dimension of the novel becomes evident with its strong ideological relevance to the American political scene perceived by Wolin. This strikes the heart of the authenticity of democracy. It places its claims of equality and individual freedom in a questionable position. It equally raises the need to further investigate the waning direction of universal democratic sovereignty.

## Works Cited

- ✓ "Dystopia, Def.1." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, March 2020. Web. <<https://www.oed.com/oed2/00071444;jsessionid=CE8626BAD189967AFAC47986695715F2>>
- ✓ "Democracy and Elite". *Inter Collegiate Studies Institute*. 8, October. 2014. Accessed on 2 Feb, 2020. Web. <<https://isi.org/modern-age/democracy-and-elite/>>
- ✓ "Utopia and Dystopia Information". *Utopia and Dystopia*. Accessed on: 24 Dec, 2019. Web <[www.Utopiaanddystopia.com](http://www.Utopiaanddystopia.com)>
- ✓ Abrams, M. H., and Geoffrey G. Harpham. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Boston: Wadsworth, 1999. Pdf.
- ✓ Adorno, Theodor W. *Prisms*. London: N. Spearman, 1967. Pdf.
- ✓ Afolyan, Sola. "A Marxist Interpretation of the Dystopian Society in the African Novel." *Kemanusiaan* vol. 18, no. 2, 2011, pp 1–18<<https://doi.org/10.1080/03017605.2011.583084>>.
- ✓ Apperley, Alan. "Hobbes on Democracy." *Politics*. vol.19, no.3, 2002, pp 165-171<<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9256.00101>>.
- ✓ Babae, Ruzbeh. "Critical Review on the Idea of Dystopia".*Review of European Studies*. vol. 7, 2015. 64-76<<https://doi.org/10.5539/res.v7n11p64>>.
- ✓ Baccolini, Raffaella, and Tom Moylan. *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Pdf.
- ✓ Baccolini, Raffaella. "The Persistence of Hope in Dystopian Science Fiction." *PMLA*, Vol. 119, no. 3, 2004, pp 518-521<<https://www.jstor.org/stable/25486067>>.
- ✓ Baehr, Peter. "Totalitarianism." *New dictionary of the history of ideas*, Vol. 6, 2005, pp. 2342-2348<[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265729481\\_Totalitarianism](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265729481_Totalitarianism)>.
- ✓ Baker, R. S. *Brave New World, Science and Dystopia*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1990. Pdf.
- ✓ Barber, B. *The Logic and Limits of Trust*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1983. Pdf.
- ✓ Barr, Eric ,and John Baird, and Taylor Rankin. "American Democracy." Roger L. Kemp. *Documents of American democracy : a collection of essential works*. North Carolina: Jefferson, 2010. Pdf.
- ✓ Beuchamp, Gorman. *Technology in the Dystopian Novel*. MFS Modern Fiction Studies, Volume 32, Number 1, Spring 1986. 53-6 <<https://doi.org/10.1353/mfs.0.1315>>.
- ✓ Biography.com Editors. "Aldous Huxley Biography." The Biography.com, A&E Television Networks, 02 Apr 2014. Accessed on: 28 June 2020. <<https://www.biography.com/writer/aldous-huxley>>
- ✓ Booker, K. and Thomas, A. *The Science Fiction Handbook*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2009. pdf.
- ✓ Borger, Julian. *All the president's businessmen*. The Guardian. 27, April. 2001. accessed on : 6 Jan, 2020. <<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2001/apr/27/usa.julianborger>>
- ✓ Bouaffoura, Maroua. *The Dystopic Body in Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale*. Unpublished Master thesis. Montréal, 2012<[https://papyrus.bib.umontreal.ca/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1866/8608/Bouaffoura\\_Maroua\\_2012\\_memoire.pdf?sequence=4&isAllowed=y](https://papyrus.bib.umontreal.ca/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1866/8608/Bouaffoura_Maroua_2012_memoire.pdf?sequence=4&isAllowed=y)>.

- ✓ Bradbury, Malcolm. *The Modern British Novel*. London: Penguin, 2001. Pdf.
- ✓ Brass, Tom. *The Populist Drift of Global Labor History*. The Populist Drift of Global Labour History. Leiden, Nederland: Brill, 2017, pp 157- 177. pdf.
- ✓ Bush ,George W., “Address to the Joint Session of the 107th Congress”, 20, September. 2001. Pdf.
- ✓ Busvine, Douglas. “We are closer than ever to 1930s-style totalitarianism: Atwood”. *Reuters*. 14 Oct, 2017. Accessed on: 12 Jan, 2019. Web<<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-germany-bookfair-atwood/we-are-closer-than- ever-to-1930s-style-totalitarianism-atwood-idUSKBN1CJ0EL>>
- ✓ Claeys, Gregory. *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Pdf.
- ✓ Cohen, Jeffrey. J. *Monster Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996. Pdf.
- ✓ Cohen, Roger. *A Global War: Many Fronts, Little Unity*. New York Times 5, September .2004. Accessed on 27 Dec, 2019. <<https://www.nytimes.com/2004/09/05/weekinreview/a-global-war-many-fronts-little-unity.html>>
- ✓ Congdon, Brad. *Community, Identity, Stability”*: *The Scientific Society and the Future of Religion in Aldous Huxley’s Brave New World*. ESC: English Studies in Canada, vol. 37 no. 3, 2011, pp 83-10 <<https://doi.org/doi:10.1353/esc.2011.0041>>.
- ✓ Das, Pauline. *The Politics of Surviving in The Novel of Margaret Atwood*. Phd Thesis. Kongunadu Arts and Science College (2009). Pdf.
- ✓ Deleuze, Guattari. G. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia II*. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1987. Pdf.
- ✓ Deleuze, G. *Nietzsche and Philosophy*.,New York: Columbia University Press, 1983. Pdf.
- ✓ Diken, B. *Nihilism*. London: Routledge, 2009. Pdf.
- ✓ Diken, Bülent. “Huxley's Brave New World — and Ours”. *Journal for Cultural Research*. Vol 15, 2011, pp 153-172. <<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14797585.2011.574056>>.
- ✓ Downes, Paul. *Hobbes, Sovereignty, and Early American Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- ✓ Eylem, Jessica, "The Women of Brave New World: Aldous Huxley and the Gendered Agenda of Eugenics". Ray Browne Conference on Cultural and Critical Studies, Bowling Green State University, 2018< <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/rbc/2018conference/011/2>>.
- ✓ Fin, S. *Thomas Hobbes: Methodology*. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. N.d. <<https://www.iep.utm.edu/hobmeth/#SH3b> >
- ✓ Firchow, Peter .E. Aldous and Julian: Men of Letters, Men of Science. *Aldous Huxley Annual: A Journal of Twentieth-Century Thought and Beyond*, Vol.4, 2004. 205-230. Pdf.
- ✓ Firchow, Peter Edgerly. *Modern Utopia Fictions: from H.G. Wells to Iris Murdoch*. Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America U.P., 2007.
- ✓ Firchow, Peter. “Aldous and Julian: Men of Letters, Men of Science.” *Aldous Huxley Annual: A Journal of Twentieth-Century Thought and Beyond* 4 (2004): 205–30

- ✓  Fromm, Eric , and George Orwell. *1984 ... with an Afterword by Erich Fromm*. New York: New American Library, 1962. Pdf.
- ✓  Fukuyama, Francis. *Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002. Pdf.
- ✓  Gerhard, Julia. *Control and Resistance in The Dystopian Novel: A Comparative Analysis*. Master Thesis. California State University, 2012.Pdf.
- ✓  Gramsci, Antonio. "On Education". Q. Hoare and G. N. Smith. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers, 1971. Pdf.
- ✓ 81
- ✓  Gulik, Angela Michelle. *The Handmaid's Tale by Margaret Atwood : Examining Utopian, Dystopian, Feminist and Postmodernist Traditions*. Master Thesis. Iowa State University, 1991. Pdf.
- ✓  Harding, Neil. *Lenin's Political Thought: Theory and Practice in the Democratic and Socialist Revolutions*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2009. Pdf.
- ✓  Harvey, David. *Spaces of Hope*. Eidinburgh: University Press, 2000. Pdf.
- ✓  Hawken.Paul, Amory B. Lovins, and L. Hunter Lovins. *Natural Capitalism : Creating the Next Industrial Revolution*. Boston: US Green Building Council, 2000. Pdf.
- ✓  Hedges, Chris. "Sheldon Wolin and Inverted Totalitarianism." *truthdig*. 02 Nov, 2015. Accessed on: 12 Jan, 2020. Web. <<https://www.truthdig.com/articles/sheldon-wolin- and-inverted-totalitarianism/>>.
- ✓  Herley, Jeremiah and Steven Morgan. *US Medicare reform: why drug companies and private insurers are smiling*. NCBI. 17, February. 2004. Accessed on: 10 Dec, 2019. Web. <<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC332707/>>
- ✓ Heywood, Andrew. *Political Ideas and Concepts: An Introduction*. London: Macmillan, 1994. Pdf.
- ✓ Hitchens, Christopher. "Foreword." *Brave New World*. By Aldous Huxley. New York: Harper Perennial, 2005. vii-xxi. Pdf.
- ✓ Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1968. Pdf.
- ✓ Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World Revisited*. New York : HarperCollins, 2004. Print.
- ✓ Huxley, Aldous. *The Olive Tree and Other Essays*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1936. Pdf.
- ✓ Huxley, Aldous. *UTOPIAS, POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE*. N.P, 1963. Pdf. <https://opentextbc.ca/englishliterature/wp-content/uploads/sites/27/2014/06/utopias-pos- and-neg>. Pdf.
- ✓ Jessop, Bob. "Marxist Approaches to Power." Amenta E. and Nash K. and Scott.A.
- ✓ *Blackwell Companion to Political Sociology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2012. Pdf.
- ✓ Johnson, Chalmers. "Chalmers Johnson on Our 'Managed Democracy.'" *Truthdig*. 16 May, 2008. Accessed on: 12 Jan, 2020. Web<<https://www.truthdig.com/articles/chalmers-johnson-on-our-managed- democracy/>>.
- ✓ Kapur, Akash. *The Return of The Utopians*. The New Yorker. 3 Oct, 2016. Accessed on: 27 Dec, 2019. Web <<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/10/03/the-return-of- the-utopians>>
- ✓ Kohn, M. *Trust. Self-Interest and the Common Good*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Pdf.

- ✓ Kylin, Sebastian. "Brave New World : Blind Perception of the Early 20th Century." Karlstad University, Department of Language, Literature and Intercultural Studies. *Published Bachelor Thesis*. 2018<<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:kau:diva-66354>>.
- ✓ Lyotard, Jean-François, Geoffrey Bennington, and Brian Massumi. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. NP, 1984. Pdf.
- ✓ Martin, James J. *Men Against the State*. London: Ralph Myles Publisher, 1970. Pdf.
- ✓ Martin, Thomas.R. *Ancient Greece: From Prehistoric to Hellenistic Times*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996. Pdf.
- ✓ Mastroianni, Dominic. *Hegemony in Gramsci*. Post Colonial Studies, Oct .2017. Accessed on: 12 Mar, 2020. <<https://scholarblogs.emory.edu/postcolonialstudies/2014/06/20/hegemony-in-gramsci/><
- ✓ Max Weber, *Science as a Vocation*.New York: Oxford University Press, 1946. Pdf.
- ✓ McManus, Matthew. "Post-Modernism, Agency, and Democracy." *Philosophies*. Vol.3, 20 Oct. 2018. Pdf.
- ✓ Moylan, Tom. *Scraps of the Untainted Sky*. Boulder: Westview Press, 2000. Pdf.
- ✓ Murray, Nicholas. *Aldous Huxley: A Biography*. New York: St. Martin's, 2003. Pdf.
- ✓ Niezen, Ronald. "The New Neo-Marxism." *In A World Beyond Difference*, vol. 01, no. 01, 2004, p. 122-143. Pdf.
- ✓ Nyström, Fredrik. *Surveilled and Silenced:A Study about Acquiring and Maintaining Power in Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale*. Sweden: Halmstad UniversityPress, 2012. Pdf.
- ✓ O'Brien, Michael. "A Post-Lacanian and Postmodern Interaction with the Utopian Project of Modernity: Ideology and Power in Brave New World." Dystopian Fiction Conference, University of Newcastle,2015  
<[https://www.academia.edu/7206103/A\\_PostLacanian\\_and\\_Postmodern\\_Interaction\\_with\\_the\\_Utopian\\_Project\\_of\\_Modernity\\_Ideology\\_and\\_Power\\_in\\_Brave\\_New\\_World](https://www.academia.edu/7206103/A_PostLacanian_and_Postmodern_Interaction_with_the_Utopian_Project_of_Modernity_Ideology_and_Power_in_Brave_New_World)>.
- ✓ Orwell, George, Sonia Orwell, and Ian Angus. *The Collected Essays, Journalism, and Letters of George Orwell*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc, 1968. Pdf
- ✓ Orwell, George. *1984*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1949. Pdf.
- ✓ Panagopoulos, Nic. "Brave New World and the Scientific Dictatorship: Utopia or Dystopia?." *Comparatismi*. vol. 02, no. 01, 2016, pp 301-310< <http://dx.doi.org/10.14672/2016907>>.
- ✓ Parenti, Michael. *Superpatriotism*. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2004. Pdf.
- ✓ Petersen, Kara. *Triumph of the Will: Film Art or Nazi Propaganda?*. St. Edwards University. 24, September. 2016. Accessed on: 21 Feb, 2020. <<http://sites.stedwards.edu/comm4399fa2013-kpeters3/2013/09/24/triumph-of-the-willfilm- art-or-nazi-propaganda/>>
- ✓ Pitsoe, Victor ,and Moeketsi Letseka. "Foucault's Discourse and Power: Implications for Instructionist Classroom Management." *Open Journal of Philosophy* vol. 3, no. 1, Feb, 2013, pp. 23-28. Pdf.
- ✓ Postman, N. *Amusing Ourselves to Death*. London: Methuen, 1985. Pdf.

- ✓ Prosorvo, Sergei. “Why is there truth? Foucault in the age of post-truth politics.” *Constellations* vol. 26, no. 1, 10 Dec ,2018, pp. 18-30. Pdf.
- ✓ Przeworski, Adam, and Michael Wallerstein. “The Structure of Class Conflict in Democratic Capitalist Societies.” *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 76, no. 2, 1982, pp. 215–238. Pdf.
- ✓ Ramos, Valeriano. “The Concepts of Ideology, Hegemony, and Organic Intellectuals in Gramsci’s Marxism.” *Theoretical Review*. 27 March, 1982. Accessed on 20 Jan, 2020. Web<<https://www.marxists.org/history/erol/ncm-7/tr-gramsci.htm>>.
- ✓ Rampton, S., Stauber, J. . *Weapons of Mass Deception: The Uses of Propaganda in Bush's War on Iraq*. New York: Penguin Group, 2003. Pdf.
- ✓ Rancière., J *On the Shores of Politics*. New York: Verso, 2007. Pdf.
- ✓ Reisman, George. “*Why Nazism Was Socialism and Why Socialism Is Totalitarian* “.Mises Institute. 11, November. 2005. <https://mises.org/library/why-nazism-wassocialism-and-why-socialism-totalitarian>.
- ✓ Robson, John M. «John Stuart Mill, Collected Works of John Stuart Mill, in 33 vols. [1963].» 16 January 2005. Online Library of Liberty. Accessed on 17 March 2020 <<https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/mill-collected-works-of-john-stuart-mill-in-33-vols>>.
- ✓ Rousseau, Dancan. *Identifying Threats and Threatening Identities: The Social Construction of Realism and Liberalism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006. Print.
- ✓ Sajó.A and Mónika Ganczer. ” *Socialist Law*”.*International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Elsevier, 2015. P 844-848.
- ✓ Sanger, David. *US Goal Seems Clear and the Team Complete*. New York Times. 13, February. 2002.
- ✓ Sargent, Lyman Tower. “In Defense of Utopia.” *Diogenes*, vol. 53, no. 1, Feb. 2006, pp. 11–17. Pdf.
- ✓ Schumpeter, joseph. *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. New York: Harper,1946.
- ✓ Sexton, James. *Brave New World and the Rationalization of Industry*. ESC: English Studies in Canada, vol. 12 no. 4, 1986, p. 424-439. Project MUSE, doi:10.1353/esc.1986.0041.
- ✓ Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. New York :Modern Library, 1994. Pdf.
- ✓ Solomon, Burt. “The Tragic Futility of World War I.” *The Atlantic*. Jul 27, 2014. Accessed on Dec 12, 2019 <<https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2014/07/world-war-i-tragicfutility/ 375103/>>.
- ✓ Sunstein, Cass.R. *Conformity: the Power of Social Influences*. New York: New York University Press, 2019.
- ✓ Taylor, Mark. *Sheldon Wolin & Inverted Totalitarianism: Don't Call It Democracy Putting Understanding To What America Has Become*. The Commoner Call. 11, November. 2019. [america-has-become/](http://america-has-become/)
- ✓ The National Security Strategy of the United States of America. Washington: President of the U.S, 2002.

- ✓ Tsybalenke, Yevhen. *Myths in Media Communication*. Ukraine: Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv press, 2007. Pdf.
- ✓ Varricchio, Mario. "Power of Images in Brave New World and Nineteen Eighty-Four." *Utopian Studies*, vol. 10, no. 01, 1999, p. 98-114. Pdf.
- ✓ Wolfreys, Julian, Ruth Robbins and Kenneth Womack. *Key Concepts in Literary Theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006. Pdf.
- ✓ Wolin, S. *Democracy Incorporated: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008. Pdf.
- ✓ Zabecki, David T. *Germany at War: 400 Years of Military History*. California: ABCCLIO, LLC, 2014. Pdf.
- ✓ Zuckerman, Josh. "Totalitarianism and Dystopian Literature: A Review". *The Princetontory*. 23 Nov, 2014. Accessed on: 24 Dec, 2019. Web <<http://theprincetontory.com/totalitarianism-and-dystopian-literature-a-review/>>.

## Appendix A: A Brief Biography of Aldous Huxley



**Aldous Leonard Huxley (1894–1963)**

**Novelist, poet, play writer and essayist.**

Born in Godalming, England, on July 26, 1894, Huxley was the child of a family of a deep intellectual history. His grandfather was the well accomplished biologist T. H. Huxley who was an early proponent of Charles Darwin's theory of evolution. Also, his father, Leonard, was a teacher and a writer and his mother, Julia, was a descendant of the English poet Matthew Arnold. In later years of adulthood, Huxley's older brothers, Julian and Andrew, both became well known biologists. While Aldous also sought to be a biologist, he was unfortunately struck blind by the disease keratitis Punctata in 1911 that left him partially blind for the rest of his life. He, thus, turned his focus to literature (Biography.com Editors).

Despite the obstacles of his early life, Huxley earned a scholarship to Balliol College at Oxford University where he studied English literature. He also started to produce poetry. By his graduation in 1916, he was able to publish his first book. It was a collection of poems titled *The Burning Wheel*. His literary career took off when he started spending time with intellectuals and writers such as Virginia Woolf, Bertrand Russell, T. S. Eliot and D. H. Lawrence, with whom he developed a strong friendship. He produced a number of successful works starting with his novel *Crome Yellow* (1921). He continued to write several more novels before publishing his most famous work, *Brave New World* (1932). His dystopia is widely regarded as one of the greatest novels of the 20th century. Huxley moved to the United States in 1937. For the rest of his life, he continued to produce novels, nonfiction works, screenplays and essays. He died of cancer in Los Angeles, California, in 1963 (Biography.com Editors).

## **Appendix B: Novel Synopsis**

The novel opens in London, 2540 CE. This futuristic era is referred to as the year 632 “After Ford”. Its beginning is marked with Henry Ford’s introduction of his first Model T Which places him as the World State’s deity. As such, the entirely industrialized life in the world state is designed by Ford and managed by 10 individuals who are set to be the “World Controllers”. The first scene of the novel offers a look into the highly complicated creation and conditioning process in this scientific society. The director of the Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Centre explains the way in which children are artificially created and cloned outside the womb. He indicates that this process is carefully systematized to maintain the hierarchal cast system of the world which includes Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, and Epsilon.

Bernard Marx, an Alpha-Plus member, is one of the novel’s protagonists. Throughout the first chapters, he stands out with his unique rebellious attitude. Unlike most of population, Bernard appears to be discontent with the material comfort and physical pleasure of the World State. This attitude places him in the position of a social outcast. He develops a love interest in a single female named Lenina Crowne. Eventually, the two undertake a rare opportunity of visiting the “Savage Reservation” in New Mexico. When arriving, they witness a number of unfamiliar rituals that ultimately makes them feel highly uncomfortable and endangered. Yet, during the visit, they also stumble upon Linda and her son John. Soon enough, Bernard realizes that Linda is the long lost companion of his director. Aiming to gain social acceptance and power, he decides to bring the two back to London. Bernard, then, publically presents them to the D.H.C. John, the son the Director never knew he had, calls the director “Father”. This shocks the director who flees in terror after being exposed to have a connection with natural birth. Consequently, Bernard starts enjoying the great success of being a nationa hero.

John, the “Savage”, is kept in the World State to be studied. Soon, however, his mother Linda loses her life due to “Soma” addiction. As a result, John becomes infuriated and starts acting violently. His actions, ultimately, lead to his arrest along with Bernard, who is blamed for John’s behavior, and Helmholtz Watson, an "emotional engineer" who wishes to be a poet. Their fate is, then, decided by the World Controller Mustapha Mond. In a long conversation, Mond admits the flaws of the World State, he, however, justifies the loss of freedom and individuality as being the price for stability. Eventually, Mond decides to punish

Bernard and Helmholtz by exiling them to the Falkland Islands. He, yet, rules that John must stay in London. Left alone, John seeks isolation and purification from civilization in an abandoned lighthouse. This proves unfruitful as he soon attracts the attention of the curious crowds and news reporters. Subsequently, John feels overwhelmed with the undesired attention. He, ultimately, decides to end his life. The novel closes on an image of John's body, hanging lifeless from a wooden beam.

## ملخص البحث

تمثل فكرة تضائل الديمقراطية في ظل تزايد القمع الحكومي أحد أهم انشغالات مفكري فترة ما بعد الحداثة. تدرس هذه المذكرة الصلة التنبؤية بين رواية الديستوبيا لألدوس هكسلي "عالم جديد شجاع" و نظرية " الشمولية العكسية" للفيلسوف السياسي شلدون وولن. حيث ان الدراسة تقوم علي مقارنة تناظرية للنصين بهدف تحديد معالم الالتقاء الإيديولوجي. و من هنا المنطلق فإن الدراسة تفترض أن نظام السلطة في الرواية يتبنى عددا من الإيديولوجيات القمعية الغير ديمقراطية و التي تماثل تلك المقترحة في نظرية وولن السياسية. على هذا الأساس فان البحث الحالي يتبع مقاربة وصفية تحليلية لدراسة أوجه التشابه بين استراتيجيات التحكم المستخدمة في الرواية و تلك المصاغة في كتاب وولن " الديمقراطية المدارة و شبح الشمولية المعكوسة". يتم استكشاف معالم احتكار القوة و التلاعب الخطابى للنظام من خلال العدسات الفلسفية للماركسية و الفوكودية. و يفضي التحليل إلى انه يوجد تماثل كبير بين استراتيجيات الإخضاع المستعملة من طرف حكومة العالم الجديد في الرواية و نظام الشمولية العكسية و منه يمكن اعتبار أن الرواية تحمل صلة قوية بالسياق الحديث.

## Résumé

Le sujet du recul de la démocratie est parmi les préoccupations les plus importantes des savants postmodernes. La présente dissertation examine la pertinence prophétique du roman dystopique d'Aldous Huxley « le Meilleur des Mondes » (1932) à la scène politique des États-Unis. Il retrace analogiquement les aspects de la théorie politique de Sheldon Wolin « Totalitarisme Inversé » dans le roman. Donc, il émet l'hypothèse que le gouvernement du nouveau Monde adopte un ensemble d'idéologies répressives non démocratiques similaires à celles suggérées dans la théorie politique de Wolin. Par conséquent, la recherche actuelle entreprend une approche analytique descriptive pour étudier l'analogie entre les stratégies de contrôle du roman et celles décrites dans Wolin's « Démocratie Incorporée : démocratie gérée et le spectre du totalitarisme inversé » (2008). Il utilise les lentilles philosophiques néo-marxistes et foucauldienne pour explorer spécifiquement les aspects de la monopolisation du pouvoir et de la manipulation du discours. L'étude conclut finalement que les stratégies d'assujettissement utilisées par le gouvernement du Nouveau Monde correspondent dans une large mesure à celles utilisées par le système d'un totalitarisme inversé. Ainsi, le roman révèle une forte pertinence idéologique prophétique ou scène politique Américaine.