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Introduction

Man so highly prizes the ability to read and write that he divides his primitive past from his civilized present by speaking of "prehistory" and "recorded history." Apart from thought and speech, which even the most backward peoples possess, the ability to read and write is man's most valuable accomplishment. It is indicative of man's imaginative nature, says John W. Campbell, Jr., that he uses this ability to record more than just facts:

When man finally achieved a means of recording truths so that no failing of memory or change of viewpoint would becloud the issue, the means was used primarily for recording that which might have been, could possibly be, or might someday be. There is frequently a curious, but decidedly important, difference between what a man says he believes, and what his actions show he believes. Mankind, over the last four thousand years or so, has said it wanted to record facts imperishably; mankind, over the last four thousand years, has devoted practically all of its efforts in the recording line to setting down imperishable records of dreams, wishes, hopes, and fears.

"Dreams, wishes, hopes, and fears" are often about the future and the kind of life it holds for men. Rather than dealing with abstractions alone, prophets express their beliefs about the future of mankind through the creation of imaginary societies which personify those beliefs. Since various prophets have different interests,
their imaginary societies will have different emphases. Whether theirs in the religious emphasis of Isaiah's "mountain of the Lord,"\textsuperscript{2} the scientific emphasis of H. G. Wells's \textit{The Time Machine}, or any other emphasis, these writers reveal deeply personal and philosophical interest in the future. Yet, whatever else their concerns may be, they are united in approaching the future through the medium of fictional imaginary societies.

Some writers are so aware of their dependence on literature as a vehicle for expression that they develop an interest in the future of literature itself, making literature an integral part of their created societies. Changes in literature result from changes in men, so the twentieth-century upheaval in physical and psychological sciences, projected into the future, creates a corresponding upheaval in the future of literature. A changing literature reflects changing readers and writers.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the future of literature as predicted in selected twentieth-century imaginary societies. It will be demonstrated that a pattern exists. Since literature is inseparable from its readers and writers, it will first be necessary to study the imaginary societies themselves, as wholes, and then from the point of view of individual citizens. In each of these chosen imaginary societies, founded on the unchallenged preservation of the status quo, individual citizens must subordinate their own desires to the maintenance of society as a whole and are consequently subjugated by those in charge of preserving stability. Suppression could cause conflict, so citizens must focus their energies in directions deemed harmless to the society as a whole, directions encouraged by those in
control as substitutes for normal individualistic actions. After first studying the imaginary societies, one can proceed to a study of the future of literature itself. Because of the necessity for maintaining stability, the state must suppress any works written in the past which might contain ideas potentially dangerous to that social stability. Yet there is a need for some form of literature in society, so those in control produce official works for public consumption. A few men rebel against the suppression of literature, representative of suppression of individual thought, and their fight against the leaders in control forms the basis of many works about imaginary societies.

Brave New World by Aldous Huxley (1932), 1984 by George Orwell (1949), and Farenheit 451 by Ray Bradbury (1953) are three of these works which predict the future of literature through the use of imaginary societies. Of course, they are not the only works that do so. However, they are relatively current, taking into consideration factors about modern life that Bellamy, Wells, and others were too early to see. These three authors are respected as polished, professional writers. All three works are novel-length, allowing the authors sufficient time for full development of their themes. Most important, the authors, in these three works, deal directly with the future of literature; they reflect the "dreams, wishes, hopes, and fears" that they have about the future of their own art.

It is difficult but essential to define the nature of these novels. Generally, a utopia may be called the personification of a dream. In some respects, the novels are related to traditional utopian thought as Thomas Molnar views it in Utopia: The Perennial
Heresy: "From time to time the belief spreads among men that it is possible to construct an ideal society. Then the call is sounded for all to gather and build it—the city of God on earth." Kolnar extends his definition saying that such a society is based on a definable, idealized foundation, one which is the reason for being of the whole society. A utopia is a dream of a society, not of individuals, for "utopian systems never speak of the individual; they always speak of mankind. It is only on that level that they can broach their gigantic enterprise." Kingsley Amis, speaking of traditional utopian societies, adds that adherence to that foundation must consequently take precedence over any individual actions of citizens which might endanger the foundation of society as a whole, so some form of political pressure is often considered necessary to keep the inhabitants in line.

As portraits of societies based on a foundation, considered the highest good, which is maintained at the expense of individuality, these three novels are related to more traditional utopias. In other respects, however, the novels are related to science fiction. Brave New World in particular fits Isaac Asimov's definition: "Science fiction is that branch of literature which is concerned with the impact of scientific advance upon human beings," and Fahrenheit 451 and 1984 can also be included to a lesser degree. The three societies which these novels depict also fit into a pattern of typical science fiction future societies as recognized by Robert Bloch. Bloch establishes nine basic characteristics common to science fiction future societies, and these three novels generally fit all but the seventh: 1) There is a totalitarian state. 2) There is an underground. 3) There are forcible psycho-
therapeutic techniques used against individuals. 4) There are scientists who use their knowledge in working for those in control. 5) There is economic incentive. 6) There is a variation of present-day "Anglo-Saxon" culture which will continue to rule the world. 7) If other planets are reached, there will be colonization. 8) There will be little basic change in the future. 9) There will be no individualism. 7 Bradbury, Huxley, and Orwell present imaginary societies, based on definable foundations, composed of citizens who are required to conform that the society as a whole may survive unchanged. They do not present dreams of society as it should be, but rather nightmares of what it may become. These novels are what Kingsley Amis calls "admonitory utopias."
The Future Societies

For ease in later reference, a brief sketch of the important characteristics of each society follows. *Fahrenheit 451* presents an American society which differs little from America today (cars are faster and television screens are wall-sized) except that firemen are called to start fires; their job is only to burn books. *1984* portrays London in that year, known as Airstrip One, as part of a nation called Oceania, one of three constantly warring superstates on earth. The Party, a political organization comprised of fifteen percent of the citizens, includes a large working Outer Party and a select policy-making Inner Party. Because emotional identification with such an abstract organization is difficult for most people, the Party has created Big Brother as an omnipresent symbol and spokesman for the "benevolence" of the Party. In reality, Inner Party members achieve their goals through exercising totalitarian control so strict that even a fleeting facial expression can be considered a revelation of unconscious rebellion against the Party: it is "facecrime," punishable by imprisonment or death. Children learn to spy on their elders and to report any deviation to the Thought Police. Proles, citizens who are not Party members, are dismissed by the Party as being a mindless herd, not even human, and therefore beneath contempt.

For more extreme than either of these two societies is the World State of *Brave New World*, where Ford is worshipped as the only god. Life begins in hatcheries where babies develop in glass bottles, artificially conditioned to meet the demands of their predestined lives. After decanting (birth), those of the lower classes receive further conditioning by means of electric shock
and other techniques against books, flowers, and any other items deemed not necessary for their future roles. In this rigid caste system, each group has its own level of intelligence, stature, and color of clothing, and each citizen is made so happy to be in his own state that he has no desire to change it for another caste even if he could. Part of that happiness comes from the euphoric drug called soma which removes a man from his problems without giving him a hangover. Bodies are rejuvenated so that no one grows old, and all of life is one constant parade of games, soma, and sex.

Societies, such as these three books depict, which are consciously created and maintained by their inhabitants are not the result of chance. Each society has one central belief, one foundation, on which it was deliberately built, a foundation which became the moral standard by which all value judgments within the society were made. As Huxley, Bradbury, and Orwell imply, these societies may be understood through observing the consequences of their foundations.

The foundation of the World State in Aldous Huxley's Brave New World is expressed in the official motto "Community, Identity, Stability."9 No less an authority than Mustapha Mond, one of the ten World Controllers, insists that stability is the greatest of the three: "Stability, . . . stability. The primal and ultimate need. Stability. Hence all this."10 However, rigid stability requires that the social structure cannot be changed, and consequently individual citizens cannot be permitted to tamper with the stability of that structure in any way. Although the actual foundation of society is stability, it is expedient for those in control to lead the people to believe that personal happiness in
really the foundation, a sleight of hand accomplished by the relatively simple technique of making people's lives so pleasant that they enjoy their predetermined destiny and consequently have no desire to try to change it. Nursery workers weave the desire for stability, called personal happiness, into the fabric of each child's life through proverbs repeated while the child sleeps, just as all other moral lessons are taught. Huxley illustrates how strong proverb-based belief in the supremacy of one's own happiness can be when LeninaCrowne, a major character, flies over a crematorium without being saddened by the lost lives which the building represents. Huxley writes, "Yes, everybody's happy now," echoed Lenina. They had heard the words repeated a hundred and fifty times every night for twelve years." This belief is also ingrained through historical and religious training, for the World State teaches that "Our Ford himself did a great deal to shift the emphasis from truth and beauty to comfort and happiness." Citizens learn that stability through personal happiness is the source of all good.

Ray Bradbury's world of Fahrenheit 451 advocates a similar foundation: belief in stability through elimination of intellectual conflict coupled with a belief that destroying the record of intellectual conflict, e.g., contradictory books by different philosophers, will prevent the recurrence of similar conflict. Again, the need for social stability is disguised by those in control through telling citizens that elimination of conflicting thoughts preserves the "real" foundation of society—happiness. Fire serves as Bradbury's symbol for this belief that destroying the physical record of intellectual conflict destroys the conflict
itself, or, as he illustrates through the plot, that burning a book destroys the problems with which the book attempts to deal. "Fire's real beauty is that it destroys responsibility and consequences. A problem gets too burdensome, then into the furnace with it," says fire captain Beatty, the exponent of the official point of view. \(^{14}\) Bradbury's preoccupation with books, manifest in his creation of a society which believes that books themselves cause unhappiness, has more prominence than in the work of the other two authors. Beatty explains this important social premise to the protagonist, fireman Montag, in these terms: "The important thing for you to remember, Montag, is we're the Happiness Boys, the Dixie Duo, you and I and the others. We stand against the small tide of those who want to make everyone unhappy with conflicting theory and thought. We have our fingers in the dike. Hold steady. Don't let the torrent of melancholy and drear philosophy drown our world. We depend on you."\(^{15}\)

Oceania of 1984 is the most obscure world. In a society with class divisions, constant war, shortage of consumer goods, and the fear of living where one's every move is observed by television and where children are trained to spy on their elders, the apparent foundation would be survival, but survival is not the true foundation. Ruthless power in the foundation, power completely controlled by the Inner Party. O'Brien, a member of the Inner Party, makes no pretense of fostering any personal happiness for the citizenry when he bluntly states, "The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake."\(^{16}\) To have power, the Party must have control over men's minds, especially over their memory of history, so that the populace cannot compare a brighter past with the dismal present and revolt.
against Party control. "Who controls the past, controls the future: who controls the present controls the past" is an official Party slogan. Through a rigorous campaign of fear and indoctrination, the populace has been trained to believe whatever the Party says currently, even when it completely contradicts what had been said a day or even a minute earlier. They have been trained to "doublethink," to simultaneously believe two contradictory concepts or facts, which allows them to have absolute certainty about the truth of all Party propaganda such as the slogans, "WAR IS PEACE FREEDOM IS SLAVERY IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH." In reality, the pressure of the constant war atmosphere is sufficient to keep the populace stable and united against outside forces—WAR IS PEACE. Citizens are taught that men in other ages had been forced to crawl before feudal lords and business tycoons, and that they should be grateful for now having Big Brother's protection—FREEDOM IS SLAVERY. Men of Oceania who never learn to think for themselves can more firmly believe what the Party tells them to believe—IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH. Citizens are unified and possessed by such slogans which seem to make excellent sense. Yet power gained through domination and fear is Oceania's foundation; slogans only serve to make that foundation seem desirable.

Whether its foundation is stability through personal happiness, stability through elimination of intellectual conflict, or stability through the power of domination and fear, the social structure of these admonitory utopias allows no tolerance for the evolution which is considered a normal part of non-utopian society, because an overpowering fear exists on the part of those in control that any innovation might eventually have consequences that would destroy
the entire foundation. They fear that stability would then yield to chaos. From one point of view, stability appears to be a foundation worthy of preservation at all costs; from the more humanistic point of view of the authors, it is not. Retention of stability requires that men be cut off from what Ray Bradbury calls the one right most essential to the fulfillment of human potential, the right of a man to carry out actions based on what he has learned from quality information combined with the leisure for thought.19 When a man is denied this right, no matter how pleasurable and stable his life, his world becomes a dead end rather than a paradise on earth. Thomas Mollnar agrees saying, "The truly frightening aspect of utopia is that there is nothing beyond it, for in utopia mankind comes to a halt, its every desire satisfied, its every instinct domesticated, its every ambition collectivized; there is neither attempt nor aspiration to think any longer, to explore new possibilities, to articulate grievances as a new starting point toward something uncharted."20 Either the person must conform, sacrificing creative individual thought, or be at odds with those in control of society.

Through their three novels, Bradbury, Orwell, and Huxley imply that stability at the expense of thought is wrong, that men are meant to have their thoughts left truly free. Huxley plainly states his belief: "Physically and mentally, each one of us is unique. Any culture which, in the interests of efficiency or in the name of some political or religious dogma, seeks to standardize the human individual, commits an outrage against man's biological nature."21 All three authors say the same thing fictionally through their creation of nonconformist protagonists. Brave New
World contains two. Bernard Marx is shorter and more slender than an Alpha caste member should be, an unfortunate fact of life which makes him acutely self-conscious, thereby acutely mentally alert. A target of his friends' jokes, he has become an outsider with a desire for solitude, a fear of rejection by women, and a reluctance to take as much tranquilizing soma as other "normal" people. Unintentionally, he becomes a philosopher, a misfit. John is even more of an outsider than Bernard; he is "the Savage." Born to a Beta woman stranded on a reservation by an accident, he grew up neither Indian nor civilized, torn between two conflicting modes of life and thought. By chance he acquires one of the few remaining copies of the works of Shakespeare, and his knowledge of Shakespeare's poetry gives him an insight into human nature and a historical perspective far greater than most of his contemporaries in either world. Because of his past, he is so misunderstood by everyone that he eventually is driven to suicide. Winston Smith of 1984 cannot lose himself in love of the Party and Big Brother. He writes a diary, risking arrest by the Thought Police; pursues a love affair, knowing that it is forbidden and that he will be caught; and worries about the consequences of his job, which is rewriting news so that no record of the Party's mistakes will survive. Guy Montag of Fahrenheit 451 is a fireman who would rather read books than burn them. All these characters are involved in individual creative thought. They try to fill a need which in other times had been met through open discussion, either in the form of conversation or through the printed word. Conflict between the rulers of the stable society and the thinking individual is the source of friction within those three societies where individual
creative thought is forbidden.

When serious individual creative thought is forbidden because it menaces the stability of society, the state must provide other outlets for the mental drives which serious thought would otherwise fulfill. Having rejected thought, the state instead provides various forms of "pseudo-thought" that channel mental energies in directions harmless to the foundation. Those in power in Oceania, the World State, and the world of Fahrenheit 451 permit two basic forms of "pseudo-thought": substitution of material which cannot possibly lead to social instability as an acceptable focus for harmless exercise of thought processes, and elimination of the need for the thought process itself through elimination of the problems which require thought for solution. Of course, the authors are really emphasizing their own belief that thought should be left truly free, for only in outward appearances are the characters in these novels allowed to freely think for themselves.

Thought substitutes are approached similarly in each of the three societies. When a man needs to make a judgment or a decision, he unconsciously draws on a series of set answers which the state has carefully provided for him. He seems to be thinking, but the thoughts in his mind are not his own. Techniques of implanting these automatic answers vary, but results remain the same. Even the questions are often provided by the state to harmlessly draw off mental energy.

Lenina Crowne is Fuxley's prime example of the ideal stable citizen of the World State. Through the foresight of the World Controllers, her "moral education, which ought never, in any circumstances, to be rational,"\(^2\) is just like the moral education of
her fellow citizens, a collection of proverbs mechanically
whispered to her in her sleep hundreds of time each night during
all the years of her childhood and adolescence. Myopedia
provides all:

"Not so much like drops of water, though water, it
is true, can wear holes in the hardest granite; rather,
drops of liquid sealing-wax, drops that adhere, incrust,
incorporate themselves with what they fall on, till
finally the rock is all one scarlet blob.

"Till at last the child's mind is these suggestions,
and the sum of the suggestions in the child's mind. And
not the child's mind only. The adult's mind too—all
his life long. The mind that judges and desires and
decides—made up of these suggestions. But all these
suggestions are our suggestions!" The Director almost
shouted in his triumph. "Suggestions from the State." 23

Lenina's sexual code is "Everybody belongs to every one else," 24
and her philosophy of life "Everybody's happy nowadays." 25 With
such certain knowledge implanted in her mind by the World State,
she has absolutely no opportunity or need to learn to think for
herself. Proverbs substitute for thought.

Another approach to thought substitution calls for the
artificial creation by the state of a focal point which requires
full attention of the citizen, one which by its very nature becomes
the center of all serious concern. The trick is to make sure that
none of this concern will ever cause a social disturbance. There-
fore, in Oceania, attention must all be directed toward love of
the Party and Big Brother as well as hatred of the enemies of the
Party, real or imaginary, such as Emmanuel Goldstein, "the Enemy
of the people." 26 For those who cannot lose themselves in love
for an abstract like the Party, there are always purely physical
personal concerns requiring constant attention. The pressure of
living under constant wartime conditions makes the little luxuries
of life, razor blades and shoe laces, hard to find, and even some
necessities are obtainable only with great personal effort. Under the pressure of the need for survival there is no leisure for abstract thought, and with telescreens and the Thought Police seeking out deviators from the norm, there would never be a way to apply such thought anyhow. The path of least resistance is, as usual, complete emotional and mental conformity to the status quo, the Party.

Ray Bradbury offers facts as thought substitutes, an approach more logical than it may first seem. Captain Beatty speaks again:

Give the people contests they win by remembering the words to more popular songs or the names of state capitals or how much corn Iowa grew last year. Cram them full of noncombustible data, check them so damned full of "facts" they feel stuffed, but absolutely "brilliant" with information. Then they'll feel they're thinking, they'll get a sense of motion without moving. And they'll be happy, because facts of that sort don't change. Don't give them any slippery stuff like philosophy or sociology to tie things up with. That way lies melancholy.

In all three cases, society offers its citizens "intellectual bubble gum" on which they can exercise their jaws for hours. The "sense of motion" tells them that their hunger should be appeased by the process when, really, there is no food value to be had.

If the substitute is not satisfactory, other provisions must meet the need to draw off intellectual energy, to prevent it from manifesting itself in any dangerous individualized form. Such provisions take the shape of either action or oblivion, and with all intellectual paths blocked, both action and oblivion must take sensual forms.

In the first escape mechanism, thought yields to action. "The normal triad of thought, emotion, and action is reduced ... by the deliberate excision of the most typically human and civilized
member of the three, and in the fictional world that results, the characters continually require the onus of action to dull their awareness of emotions that fester inward—emotions ... which only thought might lance and drain." Brave New World offers inhabitants of the World State the widest range of activities. Obstacle Golf, Electro-magnetic Golf, Escalator Squash, Musical Bridge, Riemann-surface Tennis, Centrifugal Rumble-puppy, and dozens of other elaborate games are readily available. Dancing, music, television, scent organs, and feelies (movies with electronically induced tactile impressions, so accurate that they reproduce every hair on a bearskin rug, added to the conventional trio of sight, sound, and odor) fill more leisurely hours. Everyone participates since advances in medical science make it possible for the human body to remain in a youthful state until death. Guy Montag's society also offers activities which distract one from problems. There are television scripts with one part missing so that viewers can participate by reading those lines, highways where drivers race aimlessly into the night, and fun works where children smash cars with a big steel ball. Winston Smith is allowed no actual pastimes, but occasionally he immerses himself so deeply in his work or in required "volunteer" work for the Party that he can temporarily forget his problems.

Oblivion provides just as much escape value as activity. When someone in the World State tires of participation in elaborate amusements, he can always turn to sex, the more promiscuous the more conventional, and soma. Soma, the drug of oblivion, has "all the advantages of Christianity and alcohol; none of their defects. ... Take a holiday from reality whenever you like, and come back
without so much as a headache or a mythology. . . . One cubic centi-
metre cures ten glibby sentiments . . . And do remember that a gramme is
better than a damn.

"Soma is never "the easy way out"; logically it is the only civilized way to approach life—with as little strain
as possible. In [Fahrenheit 451], Guy Montag's wife Mildred takes
full advantage of her Seashell radios which drown her in an eternal
ocean of pleasant sound and attempts the most permanent oblivion
of all—suicide. Winston Smith and his fellows in Oceania lack
the opportunity for pleasant oblivion. Victory Gin occasionally
helps, but it is relatively expensive and possesses all the unplea-
sant side effects which soma eliminates. Love and sex offer
little remedy because they always create larger problems than they
solve. The affair between Winston and Julia could never have
ended happily, they both knew from the beginning, because of the
unwritten sexual code of conduct enforced by the Party: "Mere
debauchery did not matter very much, so long as it was furtive and
joyless, and only involved the women of a submerged and despised
class . . . All marriages between Party members had to be approved
by a committee appointed for the purpose, and—though the principle
was never clearly stated—permission was always refused if the
couple concerned gave the impression of being physically attracted
to one another." The only other escape routes are suicide or
thought, an empty brain and a heart filled to overflowing with
the love of Big Brother. No thought substitution, however elaborate,
can ever replace freedom of thought.
The traditional place of literature in society has usually been a highly respected one, but in the midst of societies such as these, the position literature holds disintegrates until literature becomes despised and condemned. Such a drastic change in the position of literature did not occur by chance; there were definable causes for the change, causes directly related to the foundations of these societies.

Ray Bradbury addressed himself to the question most directly. He said the initial cause was apathy, which had become a dominant force "forty years ago when the last liberal arts college shut for lack of students and patronage." One of the major characters in the novel was Faber, a professor of English who lost his job when that last liberal arts college closed; through the person of Faber, Bradbury illustrated how a change took place. The rapidly growing apathetic majority who had never learned to care about abstract intellectual interests or to respect those who did care swallowed up those small but historically significant groups of men like Faber who cared about abstract intellectual pursuits.

People chose to ignore the philosophical questions with which intellectuals had attempted to deal in favor of creating a society based on personal happiness, happiness defined as freedom from intellectual conflict. Absolute freedom, however, required that intellectual conflict could not just be ignored but must be totally eliminated; thus apathy was replaced by active hostility. All serious books, past or present, were registered on a list of forbidden works, and book burnings were instituted to destroy such books wherever they might be found. Book-burning firemen
adopted an official slogan: "Monday burn Millay, Wednesday Whitman, Friday Faulkner, burn 'em to ashes, then burn the ashes." Under the guise of reassuring a wavering Montag that books were indeed meant to be burned, fire captain Beatty explained the official account of the change from neutrality to active hostility to Montag. It all began, he said, with an increase in population and a corresponding necessity for increase in circulation of various media if they were to survive:

"And because they had mass, they became simpler," said Beatty. "Once, books appealed to a few people, here there, everywhere. They could afford to be different. The world was roomy, but then the world got full of eyes and elbows and mouths. Double, triple, quadruple population. Films and radios, magazines, books leveled down to a sort of paste pudding norm, do you follow me? . . . School is shortened, discipline relaxed, philosophies, histories, languages dropped, English and spelling gradually neglected, finally almost completely ignored. Life is immediate, the job counts, pleasure lies all about after work. Why learn anything save pressing buttons, pulling switches, fitting nuts and bolts? . . . Colored people don't like Little Black Sambo. Burn it. White people don't feel good about Uncle Tom's Cabin. Burn it. Someone's written a book on tobacco and cancer of the lungs? The cigarette people are weeping? Burn the book. Serenity, Montag. Peace, Montag. . . . There you have it, Montag. It didn't come from the Government down. There was no dictum, no declaration, no censorship, to start with, no! Technology, mass exploitation, and minority pressure carried the trick, thank God. Today, thanks to them, you can stay happy all the time, you are allowed to read comics, the good old confessions, or trade-journals."  

In this way elimination of books constituted an advance in the pursuit of happiness, and book-burning firemen protected this happy freedom from intellectual conflict. Every fireman read in his handbook about the origin of his job: "Established, 1790, to burn English-influenced books in the Colonies. First Fireman: Benjamin Franklin." This tit of "history" may seem ludicrous here, but such fabricated misrepresentations of historical facts
tie in with the crucial importance attributed to the historical orientation of the justification of such a change in the attitude toward literature.

George Orwell and Aldous Huxley took a slightly different approach from Bradbury; they assumed that a similar change in the attitude toward literature would necessarily have taken place, but that the change would not have happened of its own accord. Since such a change did not happen naturally, it was necessary to create an artificial environment in which an intentionally induced change would not arouse antagonism; such a transition was deemed essential to the maintenance of the status quo, and, as always, the maintenance of the status quo was the prime concern. In each case the change was aided by war (in *Brave New World* the Nine Years' War which began in 1441 A.F. in *Aldous Huxley's World State*, the great Furses which took place thirty years earlier) which destroyed cultural continuity and produced a convenient opportunity to create an abyss between past and present. In Huxley's *World State*, a few years of vigorous suppression were sufficient until a time when pre-Fordian history and the transitional years were forgotten. After that, the unfamiliarity of history and its resulting incredibility, in themselves sufficient to bring about atrophy, were combined with hypnopaedic proverbs to eliminate any possibility of history's rebirth in a world where men believe: "Was and will make me ill... I take a gramme of soma and only am." Thus the *Brave New World* ignored its past:

"You all remember," said the Controller, in his strong deep voice, "you all remember, I suppose, that beautiful and inspired saying of Our Ford's: History is bunk. History," he repeated slowly, "is bunk." He waved his hand; and it was as though, with an invisible feather whisk, he had brushed away a little
dust, and the dust was Ur of the Chaldees; some spider-webs, and they were Thebes and Babylon and Croesus and Mycenae. Whisk. Whisk—and where was Odysseus, where was Job, where were Jupiter and Gautama and Jesus? Whisk—and those specks of antique dirt called Athens and Rome, Jerusalem and the Middle Kingdom—all were gone. Whisk—the place where Italy had been was empty. Whisk, the cathedrals; whisk, whisk, King Lear and the Thoughts of Pascal. Whisk. H2 Passion; whisk, Requiem; whisk, Symphony; whisk . . . .

The Inner Party of 1984 went even further in their campaign against the past. Like the Controllers of the World State, they created an abyss between the beginning of their own control and previous history, but they also did what they called keeping history and literature "up to date," rewriting it so that a favorable light would always be cast on whatever the Party might be doing at the moment, so that the Party would never be wrong. Just as others were rewriting Shakespeare, Winston Smith was rewriting news:

In this way every prediction made by the Party could be shown by documentary evidence to have been correct; nor was any item of news, or any expression of opinion, which conflicted with the needs of the moment, ever allowed to remain on record. All history was a palimpsest, scraped clear and reinscribed exactly as often as was necessary. In no case would it have been possible, once the deed was done, to prove that any falsification had taken place. . . .

It was merely the substitution of one piece of nonsense for another. . .

An even more powerful tool of change was the creation of Newspeak, which will be discussed in detail later. At this point, it is sufficient to note that Newspeak was a skeletal form of English devised "to narrow the range of thought" in the belief that people would become submissive when they had no words with which to express dissatisfaction. Since "orthodoxy is unconsciousness," as O'Brien explains, the supplanting of English by Newspeak, forecast for 2050 A.D., would make unorthodox thought impossible. The power of the Party would be absolute.
Those in control had an urgent need to create an abyss between past and present, but some of the older works and many of the newer ones were in keeping with the new foundation and did not have to be destroyed. As a matter of policy, a cut-off date was established; works written before that date were to be destroyed, but those published after that date, if in keeping with the new foundation, were to be permitted. In _Brave New World_, the cut-off date was 160 A.F.\(^5\) In 1984, it was 1960.\(^5\) _Fahrenheit 451_ gives no specific date. (An attempt to establish an approximate date from textual evidence places the cut-off date about thirty years before the events of the novel. The last liberal arts college closed because of apathy forty years earlier when the purge had not yet begun.\(^5\) Montag has been a fireman for ten years, since he was twenty years old.\(^5\) Because he cannot remember a time when firemen were called to put out fires rather than to start them,\(^5\) the break must have taken place within a few years of his birth, thirty years ago.) All that really matters is that the change took place so long ago that it has practically been forgotten. Instead of a date, "typed lists of a million forbidden books" issued by the government determine which are to be burned.\(^5\) In actual practice, however, books are burned on sight without any investigation to discover which are legal.

A few texts survived these three surges. An examination of these texts, the people who have preserved them, and why they have been preserved is a convenient place to begin the actual study of the future of literature as predicted in these three imaginary societies.

Books themselves are of major concern to Ray Bradbury, as the
title page indicates: "FARENHEIT 451—the temperature at which book-paper catches fire, and burns ..." Guy Montag is one fireman of the many companies stationed about the city, ready to answer alarms of books discovered or books suspected, ready to burn the whole house with kerosene squirted from a hose. Alarms often send Montag and his fellows to the homes of private citizens, the first group of book preservers, as the several calls they make in the short opening interval of the novel indicate. None of the calls are false alarms, and the only planted book is placed in fireman Black's house by Montag himself in a final desperate attempt to bring suspicion on firemen as a group, thus aiding those who risk their homes to preserve forbidden books.

A second group of book preservers is a loose organization of self-imposed exiles, intellectuals become hoboes to escape government persecution, who preserve texts in the hope that someday books can be restored to their rightful place in society. Microfilm and other physical means of copying books having proved awkward and dangerous, the men have discovered a photographic memory recall technique which allows them to remember anything they have ever read. Cranger, the leader of one band, explains the organization this way:

Thousands on the roads, the abandoned railtracks, tonight, burns on the outside, libraries inside. It wasn't planned, at first. Each man had a book he wanted to remember, and did. Then, over a period of twenty years or so, we met each other, traveling, and got the loose network together and set out a plan. The most important single thing we had to pound into ourselves is that we were not important, we mustn't be red ants; we were not to feel superior to anyone else in the world. We're nothing more than dust-jackets for books, of no significance otherwise.

The hoboes are content to wait and to teach their own children until the world decides it is ready for them again. A third group
is composed of men like Captain Beatty. He is familiar with snatches of famous works, though Bradbury never makes clear where he could have learned them. Preservation of texts from the past is most complete in *Fahrenheit 451*.

In contrast to *Fahrenheit 451*, *1984* offers no hope for the preservation of texts. Winston Smith makes it quite clear that a thorough purge and systematic rewriting have left nothing unaltered. Time will wipe out old literature in its original form from men's memories. All that will remain is what the Party can adapt to its own purposes. Syme, an expert reviser, explains: "By 2050—earlier, probably—all real knowledge of Oldspak (standard English) will have disappeared. The whole literature of the past will have been destroyed. Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Byron—they'll exist only in Newspeak versions, not merely changed into something different, but actually changed into something contradictory of what they used to be." All that will remain is what the Party can adapt to its own purposes.

Preservation of texts is more complex in *Brave New World*. Since the cut-off date for the World State's literature was 150 A.F. and the events of the novel take place in the seventh century A.D., any degree of preservation would seem unlikely; however, the old works are preserved in three ways. A few works, with the rather surprising inclusion of the works of George Bernard Shaw, are allowed to continue without hindrance or alteration. Reservations, where primitive Indians and misfits from civilization are focused in and allowed to go their own ways, retain a few works, usually in the form of distorted oral tradition. The copy of *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* which was given to John, the Savage,
was one of several books bound in chests for hundreds of years on
the sacred Antelope Kiva of the New Mexico Reservation. Civilized
men also retain Shakespeare and the Bible as well as other works,
but knowledge of these works is restricted to a very small elite
which probably only includes the ten World Controllers. Mustapha
Mond has the Bible, The Imitation of Christ, The Varieties of
Religious Experience, and, in his own words, "a whole collection
of pornographic old books." 67

Preserving books is not enough, however, unless knowledge of
the meaning of their contents is also retained. In some of these
admonitory utopias, loss of meaning is so great that books are
almost unintelligible; other times their message is at least
partially retained.

Ray Bradbury explores the problems related to loss and
retention of meaning through the same technique he uses for almost
all literary and philosophical questions in Fahrenheit 451, a study
of Guy Montag's gradually deepening awareness and understanding
of these questions. Montag first approaches books as physical
objects which only exist to be burned by firemen: "Montag stood
looking in now at this queer house, made strange by the hour of
the night, by murmuring neighbor voices, by littered glass, and
there on the floor, their covers torn off and spilled out like
swan feathers, the incredible books that looked so silly and really
not worth bothering with, for there were nothing but black type
and yellowed paper and raveled binding." 68 He then realizes that
each book had an author. When he returns from one fire, he tries
to explain this insight to his wife, saying, "Last night I thought
about all the kerosene I've used in the last ten years. And I
thought about books. And for the first time I realized that a man was behind each one of the books. A man had to think them up. A man had to take a long time to put them down on paper. And I'd never even thought that thought before." Yet good intentions toward books are not enough; when Guy and Mildred attempt to read one of the books he has smuggled into the house, their lack of experience in reading causes them to miss the author's point entirely, and the meaning is lost through their lack of training:

He spoke the words haltingly and with a terrible self-consciousness. He read a dozen pages here or there and came at last to this:

"It is computed, that eleven thousand persons have at several times suffered death rather than submit to break their eggs at the smaller end." Mildred sat across the hall from him. "What does it mean? It doesn't mean anything!" The Captain was right!"\footnote{20}

Captain Beatty does seem to be right; even when Montag begins to think he understands the books he will sacrifice his home and wife to defend, Beatty warns Montag of how little he actually knows about applying what books contain. Beatty says, "What traitors books can be! you [sic] think they're backing you up, and they turn on you. Others can use them, too, and there you are, lost in the middle of the moor, in a great welter of nouns and verbs and adjectives."\footnote{21} Guy Montag's well-intentioned quest for understanding is doomed to failure as long as he remains within reach of the authorities and apart from men like Faber who have the literary training he lacks. Without help, Montag is not able to find the meaning of the forbidden books he has preserved.

As dark as Montag's fate may sound, Fahrenheit 451 depicts the smallest degree of loss of meaning and the largest degree of retention of the three novels. In Montag's world, the time gap
between the old order and the new is shortest, about thirty years; there has been no real change in the social structure which would make works written about the old society unintelligible; and the language has not changed and is not expected to change significantly, so that the old works will be at least readable for years to come. There are no insurmountable obstacles. The only obstacle is a lack of experience in interpreting literature, but men like Fabor and the intellectuals turned hoboes, all educated in the liberal arts tradition, are still alive to teach their own children and convert like Montag what books can mean. While recognizing that training is necessary for fuller understanding, not all men have to be formally educated to grasp at least a part of the meaning which books contain. The gap between past and present is small enough that most people retain a kind of instinctive recognition of the validity of what the old, forbidden books have to say, as seen in Mrs. Foiles' reaction when Guy rashly reads "Dover Beach" to a group of Mildred's friends. His reading causes a highly emotional reaction, but all she can do is to denounce Guy as an enemy of the foundation of their society, stability through the complacent happiness which lack of conflict brings. She shouts, "You see? I knew it, that's what I wanted to prove! I knew it would happen! I've always said, poetry and tears, poetry and suicide and crying and awful feelings, poetry and sickness; all that mush! Now I've had it proved to me. You're nasty, Mr. Montag, you're nasty!" She understands well enough. With training, men like Montag will be able to achieve a degree of understanding comparable to that of men on the far side of the historical gap. The goal of the hoboes it to preserve the old
future.

1984 offers no such hope for the future. The old men whose memories might have spanned the abyss between past and present have either died or suffered the disintegration which old age brings when combined with the constant pressure of propaganda. Their memories have become so fragmented as to be useless when they try to establish any comparison between past and present. These old men were the last ever trained to understand literature. Neither is there any hope that the insight these old men once had might be rediscovered by later generations since the old books, printed before 1960, have been so systematically sought out and replaced with copies rewritten according to the dictates of the Party that their original meaning has been lost. In spite of time and pressure, a few fragments of works from the past have survived in their original Oldspeak [standard English] form, offering a false hope that they might someday be revived. Hope is false because, even if a Party member could obtain a copy and evade detection by the Thought Police, Newspeak will soon have replaced Oldspeak, making the document unreadable. Without memory, text, or common language, the literature of the past will soon disappear entirely.

Winston Smith recognizes how carefully the Party has established complete control of its members' minds when he writes in his diary: "If there is one ... it lies in the proles." The proles, the lower classes who are not Party members, comprise eighty-five percent of Oceania's population. Proles are so despised by the Party that it allows them to go their own ways, maintaining a loose but sufficient control over them through the use of an occasional bomb and a few agents of the Thought Police.
Proles are not encouraged to adopt Party modes, which are seldom allowing any, and consequently the proles will retain their own customs and language. Oldspeak, long after Party members will have been forced to change to Newspeak. If the proles could obtain any fragments of old works, at least they would be able to understand the language. Like all Party statistics, the official claim that forty percent of adult proles are literate is probably exaggerated, but some proles can read works of the past; theoretically they might even rediscover an idea that could lead to the overthrow of the Party. Winston Smith knows why, in spite of theory, a revolution by enlightened proles will never take place. He believes they are not capable of enlightenment because, "even when they became discontented, as they sometimes did, their discontent led nowhere, because, being without general ideas, they could only focus on petty specific grievances. The larger evils invariably escaped their notice." By keeping Oceania in a constant state of wartime pressure, the Party makes personal well-being so difficult to achieve that everyday life acts as a thought substitute for proles, draining off energies that might otherwise be directed toward creative thought and toward the realization that the Party is responsible for all the proles' problems. Proles are too busy fighting over saucesans to worry about politics. Winston writes, "Until they become conscious they will never rebel, and until after they have rebelled they cannot become conscious." If all contact with the past has not already been lost, it soon will be, and there is no way it can be regained in Oceania.

In spite of the number of texts preserved for public consumption by those who rule Brave New World's World State, for their own
edification by World Controllers, and for quasi-religious purposes by savages on reservations, citizens of the World State have a smaller understanding of the meaning of literature than any of their counterparts in the other societies. As World Controller Mustapha Mond explains, "That's the price we have to pay for stability. You've got to choose between happiness and what people used to call high art. We've sacrificed the high art." There might have been hope that the old literature would have lived on secretly, as in Fahrenheit 451, under the protection of individuals who were willing to dedicate their lives to its preservation, except for that emphasis on personal happiness. Literature fell victim to what Kingsley Amis calls "a pleasure so overmastering that it can break down the sense of reality or at least the pattern of active life, and break them down in everyone, not merely in the predisposed neurotic." Hundreds of years of pleasure-seeking have taken their toll; the old literature is dead in the mainstream of the World State.

Even if millions of copies of Chaucer, Faulkner, and Shakespeare were suddenly made available to the public, there would be little likelihood of any revival for literature. In seven hundred years, the World State has changed so drastically in its social structure that the old works no longer make sense. Those who might try to read them have lost the logical and especially the emotional links with the problems which preoccupied the great writers of the past. Loss of meaning is natural:

Because our world is not the same as Othello's world. You can't make flinvers without steel—and you can't make tragedies without social instability. The world's stable now. People are happy; they get what they want, and they never want what they can't get. They're well off; they're safe; they're never ill; they're not afraid of death; they're blissfully ignorant of passion and old age; they're
plagued with no mothers or fathers; they've got no wives, or children, or lovers to feel strongly about; they're so conditioned that they practically can't help behaving as they ought to behave. And if anything should go wrong, there's some.

In a world where children are decented from bottles rather than born, "parent" becomes a smutty word. Telemachus's search for Odysseus is incomprehensible. Where sexual promiscuity is encouraged, Romeo and Juliet is ludicrous. Huxley illustrates by relating the reaction of Helmholtz, considered a radically liberal poet by his friends, to Romeo and Juliet when he first hears it read by the Savage:

The mother and father (grotesque obscenity) forcing the daughter to have some one she didn't want! And the idiotic girl not saying that she was having some one else whom (for the moment, at any rate) she preferred! In its smutty absurdity the situation was irresistibly comical. He had managed, with a heroic effort, to hold down the mounting pressure of his hilarity; but "sweet mother" (in the Savage's tremulous tone of anguish) and the reference to Tybalt lying dead, but evidently uncremated and wasting his phosphorous on a dim monument, were too much for him. He laughed and laughed till the tears streamed down his face.

For almost everyone in the World State, the meaning is lost.

A few people and places, however, remain outside the structure of the World State. Reservations exist for Indians and other savages where natives are permitted to live out their lives as their ancestors had for centuries before Ford. People on the reservations preserve the old customs, the old tales, and the old meanings. Even though much of what they retain has become garbled in the course of time, memories of Jesus, Shakespeare, and dozens of other now legendary figures live on precisely because their words still have meaning in the unchanged society of the reservation. Values and conflicts are the same as a thousand years ago.
For this reason John, raised as a literate Indian, could develop a deeper understanding of Shakespeare than a highly educated but socially removed World Controller. No one else in Brave New World truly shares John's emotional understanding of Shakespeare, a point worth noting since Huxley's title and most of his examples of old literature are from Shakespeare.

Mustapha Mond, as World Controller, has been provided with Shakespeare and other works, taught enough about history to be able to understand them intellectually, and left to draw his own conclusions, but as a citizen of the seventh century World State, he cannot understand literature other than on a detached intellectual level because he has no way of relating what he reads to his own life. Yet Mond does have a feeling for what has been lost in the social transition, even though he has no way of returning to the old order. For men who share Mond's insight but lack his willingness to dedicate his life to the maintenance of stability in the community as a whole, islands are set aside where they may live, doing as they please, without interference from the authorities so long as they do not jeopardize stability by trying to return to the "civilized" parts of the world. From Mustapha Mond's point of view, islands are the home of "the most interesting set of men and women to be found anywhere in the world. All the people who, for one reason or another, have got too self-consciously individual to fit into community-life. All the people who aren't satisfied with orthodoxy, who've got independent ideas of their own." 85 Islands differ from reservations because their inhabitants are not savages but intellectual exiles; they have been decanted and raised in the Brave New World. It is unlikely that people on the islands would
ever revive the lost meaning of the old literature because they are, like Mustapha Mond, products of another age. No matter how much intellectual effort is expended in an attempt to gain understanding, the old and the new orders are mutually unintelligible to their inhabitants. It is only natural that the meaning of the old literature should have been lost.

Loss of contact with the literature of the past, as depicted in all three novels, is not a new event in the history of mankind. Whole nations have been destroyed, taking their literary heritage with them into oblivion, and their successors have had to supply new literature. Sometimes the void was filled by borrowing from other cultures; other times the newly dominant nations were able to replace what had been lost with a body of their own works, beginning with writings intended to answer fundamental questions (e.g., the origin of the world), to replace traditions which had been lost, and ending with entirely new works to meet new demands. If current production was good enough, the new nation suffered little from the loss of the old works.

Societies in Brave New World, Farenheit 451, and 1984 have more complex problems when they attempt to replace the lost literary tradition because neither of the historical alternatives, borrowing and creating, is open to them. When all the world is one World State, there is nowhere to borrow different material. Although three superstates exist in 1984, Eastasia and Eurasia are just as far from their traditions as Oceania is from its own tradition; none of the three has anywhere to borrow. Ray Bradbury is not as specific in defining political backgrounds in Farenheit 451, but Guy Montag's fellow citizens appear to be just as cut off from
international exchange as their counterparts in *Brave New World*. Creating new traditions is as impossible as borrowing from old ones since any new works containing imaginative ideas potentially threaten the foundation of stability as greatly as old works, necessitating that all but the most innocuous new works must also be banned by those in power.

Yet a form of literary tradition is necessary for the smooth functioning of society, and even when borrowing and creating are impossible, literature must somehow be provided. People like to feel well informed about world and local events which might affect their lives; they need songs to express emotions; they need to escape occasionally into an imaginary world and forget their problems for a while, and it is easier to have an imaginary world already provided than to have to invent one. From the point of view of those in power, literature is a thought substitute which pacifies citizens and keeps them from needing to think for themselves; thus the masses become easier to control. Since literature of the right type can be a convenient tool for those in power, they manufacture works which strengthen their own position while meeting the general need for literature in society. What is important about this official literature is that most of it is trash by any traditional standard of what good literature should be. Good literature is dangerous literature because it requires thought. If bad literature is plentiful and interesting, it will fulfill the literary need without ever becoming a threat to stability.

It must also be remembered that literary tradition contains more than just novels and poetry. All forms of communication are "literary" to a degree; thus official production in the three
societies must provide all forms, as exemplified by Winston Smith's description of the Ministry of Truth:

The Records Department [where Winston rewrote news], after all, was itself only a single branch of the Ministry of Truth, whose primary job was not to reconstruct the past but to supply the citizens of Oceania with newspapers, films, textbooks, telescreen programs, plays, novels—with every conceivable kind of information, instruction, or entertainment, from a statue to a slogan, from a lyric poem to a biological treatise, and from a child's spelling book to a Newspeak dictionary. And the Ministry had not only to supply the multifarious needs of the Party, but also to repeat the whole operation at a lower level for the benefit of the proleletariat. There was a whole chain of separate departments dealing with proletarian literature, music, drama, and entertainment generally. Here were produced rubbishy newspapers, containing almost nothing except short, crime, and astrology, sensational five-cent novelettes, films dealing with sex, and sentimental songs which were composed entirely by mechanical means on a special kind of kaleidoscope known as a versificator. There was even a whole subsection—Pornographic, it was known in Newspeak—engaged in producing the lowest kind of pornography.

Films and television become important in technologically advanced civilizations. The films most often mentioned in 1984 are newsreels designed to promote patriotism through showing war episodes. Winston remembers one evening at the movies and records it in his diary this way:

April 4th, 1984. Last night to the flicks. All war films . . . then you saw a lifeboat full of children with a helicopter hovering over it. There was a middle-aged woman might have been a jewess sitting up in the bow with a little boy about three years old in her arms . . . then the helicopter planked a 20 kilo bomb in among them terrific flash and the boat went all to matchwood. Then there was a wonderful shot of a child's arm going up up up right into the air, a helicopter with a camera in its nose must have followed it up and there was a lot of applause from the party seats.

The World State provides for more enjoyable films for its citizens, including "feelies" with odor and tactile effects added to sight and sound. One of the most popular, "THREE WEEKS IN A
is famous for its love scene on a beardskin rug produced so that the audience feels every hair on the bear. Oversimplified plots result from emphasis on sensory stimulation, but when anyone protests that the plots mean nothing, as does the Savage, his protest can be countered by Mustapha Mond's reply: "They mean themselves; they mean a lot of agreeable sensations to the audience." Films produced by those in power evoke emotions, hatred of the enemy and love of Big Brother in 1984 and any strong emotions in Brave New World, designed to distract the mind from serious thought and thereby to serve as social stabilizing forces.

Television in Oceania and the World State reinforces movies as a means of pacifying the populace. Oceania's public places, offices, and homes have telescreens which can be turned down but never completely off (except by a few select Inner Party members) so that citizens are constantly bombarded with the Party propaganda which constitutes the major portion of programming. In addition, telescreens send and receive simultaneously; agents of the Thought Police can maintain constant surveillance on anyone, watching until he makes a mistake that can be construed as thoughtcrime, unconscious antagonism to the Party, punishable by death or brainwashing. From its hiding place behind a picture, a telescreen led to the arrest of Winston Smith and Julia. 1984's telescreens differ greatly from television in Brave New World, where pleasure is the only goal and television resembles feelies lacking only touch and odor. They are also different from the walls of Fahrenheit 451, wall-sized television screens surrounding the viewer and giving him
the illusion of being in the midst of soap opera "families." To complete the illusion, one program produces episodes with one part missing and prints scripts so viewers can actually participate by reading the missing lines. For commercials, an attachment automatically supplies the viewer's name whenever the announcer "talks" to him. Through requiring the emotional involvement usually found within real families, parlor "families" siphon off emotions and leave relatives strangers in real life. Guy Pontag realizes what happens to human relations when he asks Mildred, who has become more stranger than wife, "'Millie, does — He licked his lips. 'Does your "family" love you, love you very much, love you with all their heart and soul, Millie?' Television not only replaces books which might cause intellectual conflict; it breaks down the human bonds which make communication possible.

Love songs are seldom great literary treasures, but even they lack quality when they are written by those in control. Lenina Crowne sings the worst one:

Nig me till you drug me, honey;  
Kiss me till I'm in a coma;  
Nig me, honey, snuggly buggy;  
Love's as good as soma.

One song very popular among the proles in 1984 is slightly better, but it was composed without human intervention on a machine called a versificator:

It was only an 'epeless fancy,  
It ranz' like an irril dye,  
But a look an' a word an' the dreams they stirred  
They 'ave stolen my 'eart away!

Winston Smith has novels written by machines. Guy Montag has comics, confession magazines, and trade journals. Although the lower classes are conditioned against books, citizens of the
World State have newpapers and occasionally a technical journal like the one belonging to the Savage’s mother, The Chemical and Bacteriological Conditioning of the Embryo. Practical Instructions for Beta Embryo-Store Workers, the only book she owns. For anything beyond technical information, official literary products are all but worthless.

Precisely because of their worthlessness, official literary products designed to meet all of society’s needs never actually meet them all. A few perceptive citizens sense the insufficiency and search for sources of more significant communication than official works provide. Sometimes the search has little direction, as while Guy Montag asks Clarisse McClellan about herself and her unusual family when he is just beginning to be interested in conversation as an art of communication:

"What’s going on?” Montag had rarely seen that many house lights.

"Oh, just my mother and father and uncle sitting around, talking. It’s like being a pedestrian, only rarer. My uncle was arrested another time—did I tell you?—for being a pedestrian. Oh, we’re most peculiar.”

"But what do you talk about?”

She laughed at this.

Other times a searcher is more consciously aware of problems which he is trying to solve. Faced with the meaninglessness of books and papers rewritten and distorted time after time and with the transience of human memory, Winston Smith begins a diary which he hopes will remain true and unchanged for at least a few years. However, he is suddenly confronted with a frustrating communications gap:

For whom, it suddenly occurred to him to wonder, was he writing this diary? For the future, for the unborn. His mind hovered for a moment round the doubtful date on the page, and then fetched up with a hump against the Newspeak
word doublethink. For the first time the magnitude of what he had undertaken came home to him. How could you communicate with the future? It was of its nature impossible. Either the future would resemble the present in which case it would not listen to him, or it would be different from it, and his predicament would be meaningless.

Helmholtz of *Brave New World*, an expert in "emotional engineering" faces the problem of worthless official works most directly when he refers to the official slogans which he has been trained to write. He believes that his products are good but meaningless:

They go such a little way. They aren't important enough, somehow. I feel I could do something much more important. Yes, and more intense, more violent. But what? What is there more important to say? And how can one be violent about the sort of things one's expected to write about? Words can be like X-rays, if you use them properly—they'll go through anything. You read and you're pierced. That's one of the things I try to teach my students—how to write piercingly. But what on earth's the good of being pierced by an article about a Community Sing, or the latest improvement in scent organs? Besides, can you make words really piercing—you know, like the hardest X-rays—when you're writing about that sort of thing? Can you say something about nothing? That's what it finally boils down to.

Because it is impossible to say something about nothing, men like these are forced to find something they can talk about; official works being insufficient, they write their own.

Guy Montag never actually writes anything, but his concern for meaningful conversation might be considered an attempt at private production. Clarisse McCuller, a neighbor girl, plants in him an awareness that the conversation he has known is not all it could be:

"People don't talk about anything."
"Oh, they must!"
"No, not anything. They have a lot of cars or clothes or swimming pools mostly and say how swell! But they all say the same things and nobody says anything different from anyone else. And most of the time in the cafes they have the joke-boxes on and the same jokes most of the
time, or the musical wall lit and all the colored patterns running up and down, but it's only color and all abstract. And at the museums, have you ever been?

All abstract. That's all there is now. My uncle says it was different once. A long time back sometimes pictures said things or even showed people."106

Having realized the validity of what she tells him, he tries to remedy the lack of meaningful conversation by walking into the parlor where his wife and her friends are watching the walls, turning off the walls, and saying "Let's talk."107 In the unexpected silence, the women nervously begin to speak a stream of worthless drivel. Then even that stream dwindles, Montag tries reading "Dover Beach" to give them something to think about, but it only unsettles them more. Guy's sole meaningful communication is with Clarisse, Faber, and the hoboes, and he is almost murdered by the police because his desire to join them and improve his own capacity to converse meaningfully threatens social stability.

Winston Smith also creates his own work, a diary, but he is neither sure for whom he is writing it nor in he sure exactly why he ever began it. All he knows is that he feels trapped and that putting these feelings on paper seems to give him a little relief and to clarify what he has been trying to express in his own mind: "He did not know what had made him pour out this stream of rubbish. But the curious thing was that while he was doing so a totally different memory had clarified itself in his mind."108 After a few days, he begins to achieve a degree of artistry that makes his diary a truly "literary" private product: "To the future or to the past, to a time when thought is free, when men are different from one another and do not live alone—to a time when truth exists and what is done cannot be undone: From the age of uniformity, from
the age of solitude, from the age of Big Brother, from the age of doublethink—greetings! —109

Helmholtz also seeks meaningful communication and writes his own works to achieve it. Although he is a professional writer of slogans for the Emotional Engineering department, it has already been shown that his job alone does not satisfy his longing for communication. While preparing a lecture on the "Use of Rhymes in Moral Propaganda and Advertisement,"110 he writes the following rhymes as illustrations:

Yesterday's committee
Sticks, but a broken drum,
Midnight in the City,
Flutes in a vacuum,
Shut lips, sleeping faces,
Every stopped machine,
The dumb and littered places
There crowds have been:
All silences rejoice,
Weep (loudly or low),
Speak—but with the voice
Of whom, I do not know.
Absence, say of Susan's,
Absence of Egeria's
Arms as respective bosoms,
Lips and, ah, posteriors,
Slyly form a presence;
Whose? and, I ask, of what
So absurd an essence,
That something, which is not,
Nevertheless should populate
Empty night more solidly
Than that with which we correlate?111
Why should it seem so scaldingly?

These lines, in quality closer to Romeo and Juliet than to "Bug me, snuggly bunny," constitute a creative private effort through the presentation of a positive reaction to solitude and thought in direct opposition to the social foundation of stability through personal happiness—as found in group living.

Since creative private efforts such as these are considered threats to social stability by those in control, Montag, Smith,
Helmholtz, and others like themselves are in constant danger of punishment by the authorities. Guy Montag, knowing that possession of books is illegal, is forced to answer the alarm turned in by his wife, to burn his own home, and to flee from the police to save his own life. Winston Smith, knowing that keeping a diary is considered evidence of thoughtcrime, writes until he is arrested. Helmholtz, knowing that his musings on solitude and suffering are considered abnormal, continues to explore them until he is sent to an island. Creative men like those know they will be persecuted by the authorities, but they continue to produce their own works to fill the gaps left by worthless official productions.

Although the quality of private productions is seldom outstanding, the drive that produces them is important. Bradbury, Orwell, and Huxley express a hope that suppression of the creative drive cannot be complete as long as the man is not first destroyed; the creative drive will live forever. Montag, Smith, and Helmholtz are a minority, but they form part of the same historical minority of creative men who have been changing the course of history since history began. Their efforts are heartening. Their successes are nonexistent. Their own recognition of their slight must end in frustration and defeat unless they can organize. They cannot always sit back and wait for the rest of the world to diminish, as do Bradbury's Hoboes, or they will die leaving the world unchanged.

When studying the literary aspects of these three imaginary societies, one must also study aspects of language itself. Concern for language is most noticeable in 1984, but all three novels deal with it to a degree.
Fahrenheit 451 does not deal directly with languages but indirectly implies that standard English is and will continue to be the prevalent language in the area which is now the United States. The other major implication relates to Guy Montag's concern for the dying art of conversation, which distresses him deeply. His goal of reviving the significance which conversation once had for people, a significance lost during years of isolation caused by walls and Seashell radios, relates to language.

Brave New World provides a more specific linguistic setting. Polish, French, and German are listed among the dead languages. However, some languages dead in the civilized parts of the World State live on in the reservations; Sufi, Spanish, and Athapascan survive in the New Mexico Reservation. Standard English remains the language of civilized men in the areas once called England and America, yet it does not remain unchanged because the society has changed so greatly. For example, since people are decanted from bottles and only animals are born, "mother" has become an obscene word and "father" a smutty one (his connection with the birth process is not so obviously direct). Although the words remain the same, the changed connotation reflects drastic distortion of the original meaning. With processes like cultural distortion and thought substitution at work, World Controllers have no need to raddle directly in the linguistic affairs of the citizens in order to keep them in line. To the World Controllers, language is only a tool to be used in encouraging citizens to behave and think as they should.

1984's Oceania, comprised of the Americas, the Atlantic Islands, the British Isles, Australasia, and the southern portion
of Africa, is unique. The common language is Oldspeak (standard English), but the official language being forced into general use by Party pressure is Newspeak. By the year 2050, all Party members will speak Newspeak exclusively although the proles will retain Oldspeak for a while, but Party members are taught to believe that proles and their ways are "not human." Conversion to Newspeak, when attained, will make unorthodox thought impossible since Newspeak eliminates the very words which express discontent.

Newspeak achieves its goals through two means: elimination and simplification of vocabulary. *Cyne*, a Newspeak lexicographer, explains the effectiveness of these approaches: "Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it. Every concept that can ever be needed will be expressed by exactly one word, with its meaning rigidly defined and all its subsidiary meanings rubbed out and forgotten." Sometimes the context of a Newspeak sentence is simple to translate into English: "times 3.12.83 reporting th dayorder doubleplusungood refs unpersons rewrite fullwise unsun只剩文件" means "The reporting of Big Brother's Order for the Day in the *Times* of December 3rd 1983 is extremely unsatisfactory and makes reference to nonexistent persons. Rewrite it in full and submit your draft to higher authority before filing." Other words like "doublethink" can be so complex as to require several paragraphs and examples in standard English for a basic understanding, while the emotional overtones are never fully captured in translation. Language is not just a tool of the Party; it becomes a weapon
used to destroy the right of an individual to think for himself.

The simple mechanics of Newspeak are explained by Orwell in an appendix to the novel. Operating on a premise that one needs words to think, and consequently one who has no words for an idea can never really grasp the idea, members of the Inner Party have developed Newspeak. Through the publication of a series of progressively restrictive Newspeak dictionaries, the number of permissible words is constantly being reduced. Words for politically heretical concepts are eliminated from the dictionary, i.e., they are forbidden. Cutting out a few strategic political words begins the process, but reduction of all vocabulary to an absolute minimum diminishes the possibility that men would ever be able to recapture the lost concepts. 116 Three word lists will survive: the A vocabulary, containing words necessary for everyday life; the B vocabulary, containing words constructed for political purposes; and the C vocabulary, containing technical words necessary only to a few specialists. Parts of speech are interchangeable and have regular endings ("speedful" means "rapid" and "speedwise" means "quickly"), antonyms are unnecessary as different forms ("uncold" is sufficient as the antonym of "cold"), and prefixes provide all necessary gradations ("good, ungood, plusungood, doubleplusungood"). 117 Even inflections are regularized and simplified ("wans" replaces "men" and "thinked" replaces "thought"). 118

If such systematic destruction of language seems impossible, it is only because the power which the Inner Party exercises over the minds of Party members cannot be fully understood by someone who has not grown up under the Party. By making simplicity and euphony the major considerations, the Party makes Newspeak so
monotonous that speech is practically unconscious, and therefore ideologically neutral. Speech becomes a thought substitute.
Conclusions

The future of society as predicted in these novels is not very encouraging. When preservation of any social foundation becomes more important than the preservation of individuality, citizens suffer. No amount of thought substitution can ever fully replace the need of a perceptive man to understand himself and his relationship to the world around him. Faced with suppression by those in control, such a man has only two alternatives: he can yield or he can rebel. Yielding means that he surrenders his creative individuality so that the state as a whole may survive unchanged. Rebellion means that he will be persecuted by those in control and eventually will fail because he is powerless to overthrow the social foundation. Because he has been isolated from his fellow citizens, he is incapable of rallying them.

The future of literature as predicted in these novels is not very encouraging either. Part of the general suppression extends to literature and language. Even as records of the past are destroyed because their content is considered dangerous, so unauthorized current literary works are suppressed to assure that nothing damaging to the foundation will ever reach the public. What works are not destroyed are distorted and adapted to suit the purposes of those in control. Instead of being a tool for reaching out to the universe, literature becomes a weapon for restricting man's ability to reach. Whatever happens in literature is only man's record of what has happened to himself.

Of course, it might be possible to dismiss all these predictions as mere pessimistic fatalism. However, too much of what the
novels predict is already taking place: juke boxes make discussion impossible in campus snack bars, and battery-operated televisions go anywhere; the younger generation experiments with L. S. D., and the older generation swallows tranquilizers; to be an author is to be a rarity, and to be a poet is to be an outcast; world leaders rise to power on the strength of their slogans. Yet there is a heartening side, too: more people are literate than ever before, a higher standard of living (at least in many countries) allows leisure for literary pursuits, television brings cultural opportunities to people who never had them before, and experimentation in the arts is an accepted practice.

These three authors warn that individual creative thought is the key to the future; if it is encouraged, there is hope, but if it is not, there is none. Literature is one way of providing a stimulus for that thought. Furer speaks from a world that has almost forgotten the importance of literature:

It's not books you need, it's some of the things that once were in books. The same thing could be in the "parlor families" today. The same infinite detail and awareness could be projected through the radios and televisions, but are not. No, no, it's not books at all you're looking for! Take it where you can find it, in old phonograph records, old motion pictures, and in old friends; look for it in nature and look for it in yourself. Books were only one type of receptacle where we stored a lot of things we were afraid we might forget. There is nothing magical in them, at all. The magic is only in what books say, how they stitched the patches of the universe together into one garment for us. Of course you couldn't know this, of course you still can't understand what I mean when I say all this.
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