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ABSTRACT

"In That New World Which Is the Old": New World/Old World Inversion In Aldous Huxley’s Brave New World

by

Oliver Quimby Melton

Dr. Beth Rosenberg, Examination Committee Chair
Associate Professor of English
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

"'In That New World Which Is The Old': New World/Old World Inversion In Aldous Huxley's Brave New World" examines the inversion of the concepts Old World, specifically associated with England, and New World, specifically associated with America, in the novel Brave New World. After examining and denotatively defining the terms Old World and New World, this thesis argues that the New World/Old World inversion in Huxley's dystopian novel exists because of Anglo-American cultural and political events of the 1920s and early 1930s, namely, the United States' rise as a military, political, and cultural superpower following World War I and Great Britain's concurrent early imperial dissolution and declining political power. Specifically, I argue that the New
World/Old World inversion of Brave New World stands as Huxley’s attempt, whether inadvertent or deliberate, to check the progress of modernity and the shift of political, economic, and military power from Europe to America, that is, from the Old World to the New.

The final two chapters of this thesis argue that the Old World/New World inversion of Brave New World is accomplished through two methods. First, chapter four argues that Huxley transplants Shakespeare to America where the American John Savage, rather than the Fordian English, preserves and venerates him. In this way, Huxley recreates Shakespeare as an American icon-fetish; and the transplantation helps recast England as the New World and America as the Old.

The fifth and final chapter of this thesis argues that the fictional religions of A.F. England and America and their respective existences as a sex cult and a syncretistic blend of Native American religions and the Catholic Penitente tradition further establish the New World/Old World inversion. Specifically, I argue that Huxley recreates England as the New World because of the Fordian religion’s progressive and technologically enhanced nature. In contrast, the religion of the American
Reservation Savages is traditional and primitive and is thus associated with the Old World.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Modernist novel is distinctly protean because of its experimental narrative techniques, its shifting points of view, and its use of multiple genres. Often, critical interpretations of books such as *Ulysses* (1922) and *To the Lighthouse* (1927) are similarly variable because they must deal with the uncertainties and inconsistencies of such texts. From this perspective, *Brave New World* (1932) stands as a sterling example of the Modernist novel.

Tilmann Vetter asserts that *Brave New World* can "be considered as Science Fiction, but was conceived by its author and received by most readers as a prophetic fable."¹ Further establishing its essence as a Modernist novel, critics even find it difficult to define the prevailing genre of *Brave New World*. Edward Lobb describes this problem in his article "The Subversion of Drama in Brave New World":

Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) is usually and rightly called a novel, but it is a novel of a problematic type. Satirical in technique, it is torn between the exaggeration peculiar to satire and the realism which is characteristic of the novel. Moreover,
as a work in the tradition of utopian and dystopian literature, Huxley's fable walks a line between the overt discussion of ideas, which is normal in the utopian tradition, and the novel's tendency towards more dramatized conflict.\(^2\)

In what is possibly an attempt to cope with this instability, Huxley scholars consistently focus their studies of *Brave New World* on narrow, isolated issues within the text. In so doing, though, they avoid interpreting the novel as the interdisciplinary statement Huxley clearly intended his book to be. I believe this is precisely why these critics have trouble fitting the novel into one genre and defining its theme. *Brave New World* was not written in one genre nor was it written to address one social ill. Rather, the book is interdisciplinary in theme, purpose, and genre. Therefore, I believe an interdisciplinary set of critical perspectives must be used to analyze it.

Huxley outlined his intentions for *Brave New World* in a 24 August 1931 letter to his father Leonard in which he lists the various themes and areas of commentary present in *Brave New World*. These include: "the appallingness . . . of Utopia"; "biological inventions [such] as the production of children in bottles"; "all the Freudian 'complexes'"; "the prolongation of youth"; "the devising of some harmless but effective substitute for alcohol, cocaine, opium, etc.";
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"Pavlovian conditioning"; and "universal peace, security and stability." A very few scholars such as June Deery and Peter Firchow complement Huxley's understanding of Brave New World by presenting interdisciplinary studies of Brave New World, for example, considerations of the relationship of religion and science in Brave New World. Generally, though, Huxley scholarship revolves around narrowly specific interpretations of Huxley's dystopian novel. This practice not only contradicts Huxley's own understanding of Brave New World; it also opposes the more general fact that Huxley saw himself, as many Huxley scholars such as Guinervera Nance still do, as a writer/intellectual whose work and interests act as pontifex, bridging the divide between disciplines as multifarious as art, science, and philosophy.

Though their interpretations are often segregated, Huxley scholars complement this understanding of Huxley and Huxley's own understanding of Brave New World by establishing six major areas of critical interpretation for the book. These areas can be categorized into three groups: satire, modernity, and religion.

Foremost among scholarly interpretations of Brave New World are interpretations of the novel as satire. Huxley himself considered Brave New World to be largely satirical,
referring to *Brave New World* in a letter to his father as
"a comic, or at least satirical, novel about the future." Huxley also writes that he created *Brave New World* as a
"revolt against the horror of the Wellsian Utopia," and
James Mulvihill has interpreted this comment to mean Huxley
intended *Brave New World* to be at least in part a parody or
satire of Wells' work. Many scholars support Huxley and
Mulvihill, including Peter Firchow who notes that "*Brave
New World* ... established [Huxley] as the greatest
English-language satirist of his time." The second category
often exists in conjunction with interpretations of *Brave
New World* as a satire but interprets the novel more
generally as a non-satirical part of the utopian/dystopian
tradition.

The next group of critical interpretations consists of
understandings of *Brave New World* as an examination of
modernity. Along with June Deery, James Sexton, and Wayne
Wheeler, Peter Firchow has also helped establish the
interpretation of Huxley's novel as a dystopian vision of
the radical extremes of science, technology, and progress.
This third area often complements and is complemented by
the fourth area of critical attention which, like
interpretations of *Brave New World* as a satire, Huxley
himself did much to establish, namely, *Brave New World* as a
comment on the twentieth century. Likewise, the fifth area of critical commentary is also relevant to Brave New World's connection to the twentieth century and consists of interpretations of Brave New World as a study of an industrialized and increasingly technological world that values the progress of science, social advancement, and technology over art, humanism, and humanity. This area often involves Huxley's extensive use of Shakespearean literature and his presentation of other types of art, film, and literature in Brave New World.

Though not completely distinct from the fifth area of critical commentary, certain scholars do consistently interpret the religious and mystical aspects of Brave New World so that it warrants individual mention as a sixth and final category of critical interpretation. Specifically, those who examine religion in Brave New World study how such belief systems operate in a society like that of the Fordian world and/or the twentieth century and beyond.

Just as Peter Firchow seeks in The End of Utopia "to elucidate Brave New World literally, historically, socially, politically, [and] scientifically," this thesis attempts to bring together several aspects of Brave New World in order "to [point] the way for new and different sorts of criticism." Therefore, like Firchow's important
albeit atypical book, this thesis rejects the segregation of the six major critical arguments surrounding *Brave New World* but preserves their mutual importance to the book. My interpretation of *Brave New World* focuses on the inversion of the New World/Old World dynamic; and to accomplish this interpretation, I draw from the following areas of critical interpretation: interpretations of the novel as a comment on the early twentieth century; the literary/artistic area of commentary; and the religious features of *Brave New World*. Specifically, I focus on the ways these areas affect the novel’s central cultural interaction between the American Reservation Savages and the Fordian English. There are only hints of concern with this transatlantic interaction in Huxley scholarship, for example Peter Firchow’s article "*Brave New World* Satirizes the American Present, Not the British Future" and Suzanne Kehde’s dissertation "The Myth of America as Paradise in Twentieth Century British Fiction: Colonial Discourse from Huxley to Mukherjee." Even when described by James Mulvihill’s general term "internationalism," the idea of the text’s Anglo-American cultural correspondence is little more than mentioned in *Brave New World* studies.

A possible explanation why *Brave New World*’s Anglo-American interaction remains chiefly underdeveloped in
Huxley scholarship is the condition of world politics in the novel. The existence of the World State makes customary political lines—such as those that establish a United States and a United Kingdom—obsolete since the world exists under the control of one government broken into ten major units and organized according to large regional political categories such as "Western Europe." In making this observation, I do not mean to imply that there are no customary political terms used in *Brave New World*. Political entities such as Iceland, Ireland, Texas, and New Mexico and cities such as New York, New Orleans, Santa Fe, and London are all mentioned and/or used as milieux in the book. However, in *Brave New World* Huxley never uses the political terms *United States of America*, *United Kingdom*, *Great Britain*, or any of their variants such as UK, US, USA, Britain, etc. Rather, he exclusively uses the terms America and England.

I believe this is a deliberate attempt to reference cultures rather than political states. Collections such as Hastings Donnan and Thomas Wilson's *Border Identities: Nation and State at International Frontiers* and David Hooson's *Geography and National Identity* outline the essential differences and the cultural implications of the differences between cultural terms and boundaries and
political terms and boundaries. These texts present a variety of international positions analyzing the relationship of political boundaries, geographical boundaries, and the effects of these on national cultural identity. Based on such differences, I believe that Huxley’s use of the terms America and England highlights the cultural rather than political aspect of Brave New World’s Anglo-American interaction. This argument is of paramount importance to my thesis because as I outline in the next chapter ("Toward a Definition of Old and New World"), the relationship of and interaction between the Old World and New in Brave New World is fundamentally cultural rather than political.

The political term United Kingdom can be confusing and often ill-defined and ill-understood as can the geographical-political terms Britain and Great Britain. United Kingdom is a term used since 1707 when the Act of Union joined England, Scotland, and Wales and augmented in 1801 when the Act of Ireland incorporated that country into the UK. At the turn of the twenty-first century, the term stands as the official title of the political entity composed of England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. The terms Britain and Great Britain, though, have both political and geographical meanings. First, each
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geographically references the island containing England, Scotland, and Wales; but like United Kingdom, the terms also have very powerful political overtones.

For example, in 1604 James I of England/VI of Scotland was proclaimed King of Great Britain because his coronation unified the Scottish and English monarchies. Furthermore, the term Britain has its roots in the Roman conquest and political control of the island from circa 55 BC to the early 400s AD. The distinctly political British Empire also bears evidence of the political overtones of the term Britain as does the political body referred to as the British Commonwealth of Nations. There exist, therefore, many shades of meaning based on various points of historical fact and linguistic nuance surrounding the terms Britain, Great Britain, and United Kingdom.

In contrast, the term England may possess certain archaic and obscure Medieval/Old English political roots as "[t]he territory of the Angles, as distinguished from that of the Saxons." However, this principally tribal/anthropological distinction was largely negated by the 1707 Act of Union which subsumed political England into the United Kingdom. Since 1707, then, the term England has come to refer to a specific cultural region in "[t]he southern part of the
island of Great Britain" within the larger political entity of the United Kingdom.

Therefore, since the early 1700s, the terms England and English have been cultural rather than political designations. Essentially, England helps distinguish English culture from the cultures of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, and it references a culture and history of "the virtues claimed as peculiarly 'English.'" These virtues include such traits as those American philosopher Ralph Waldo Emerson outlined in his 1856 collection English Traits, namely land, race, manners, character, religion, and literature. By using the term England exclusively, then, Huxley can reference a specific culture without the confusion surrounding the political attributes of the other members of the United Kingdom or, in the case of Brave New World, the political entity Western Europe. As part of the Fordian political entity Western Europe, though, England can be interpreted as a type of synecdoche for the region, as the representative of what is customarily thought of as the Old World in contrast with America: the New World.

As New Americanists such as Djelal Kadir and Philip Fisher point out, this term America is quite different from the primarily political term United States. America is a cultural and geographical reference to two entire
continents of cultures: North and South America, that is, the entire New World. Such extensive American/New World culture is perhaps best represented in *Brave New World* by the presence on the Savage Reservation of aboriginal and white people as well as multiple language groups and cultural histories:

Leaning forward, the Director tapped the table with his forefinger. "You ask me how many people live in the Reservation. And I reply"—triumphantly—"I reply that we do not know. We can only guess ...

"... about sixty thousand Indians and half-breeds... still preserve their repulsive habits and customs... monstrous superstitions... Christianity and totemism and ancestor worship... extinct languages, such as Zuñi and Spanish and Athapascan... ."

The result of this multi-culturalism in conjunction with Huxley's exclusive use of the term *America* is a more complete cultural presentation of the New World than the politically charged term *United States* would allow.

Such an observation seems all the more legitimate considering Huxley's frequent use of *United States* in *Brave New World Revisited* (1958) to exemplify political states and parties in general and to reference the political government of the US specifically. For example, Huxley suggests that the oppressive political state of the future will achieve subconscious persuasion by a sensual, technological onslaught of propaganda images and sounds:

"[i]n the United States brief flashes of Abraham Lincoln...
and the words 'government by the people' will be projected upon the rostrum."²⁶ Likewise in Brave New World Revisited, Huxley uses the term British, which he completely eschews in Brave New World, to reference the political government of the United Kingdom;²⁷ and in "Greater and Lesser London," Huxley writes that after watching a Parliamentary political debate in 1931, he realized "that the public finances of Great Britain were in a bad way."²⁸ An example of the converse is Huxley's article "The Outlook for American Culture" where the author examines the early twentieth century dominion of the United States' culture, referring to it as "American Culture."²⁹

Therefore, Huxley's use of the cultural terms America and England in Brave New World rather than their political counterparts allows him to present an Anglo-American, New World interaction and inversion that has little to do with politics. Instead, the presentation is more an apolitical, cultural relationship that reflects the centuries-old correspondence between the Old and New Worlds.³⁰ Indeed, in Brave New World the political United States and United Kingdom are subsumed into huge regional politicals such as Western Europe and, presumably, North America anyway. Thus, their singular political definitions are blurred by inclusion into larger political regions. The political
entities of the United States and the United Kingdom are essentially wiped away by the rise of the Fordian World State, and this leaves behind English and American culture. Because of this, Huxley can present the Old and New Worlds unencumbered by political definition and the common confusion associated with the terms United Kingdom, Britain, and Great Britain; and he is able to present the two regions within their essential cultural relationship.

While negotiating nuanced cultural and political terminology may be somewhat difficult, classifying the traits of the English and American cultures in Brave New World is quite simple. In the text, the New Mexican Savage Reservation of America is the bastion of traditionalism and primitivism. In opposition, AF England disregards these traits as a danger to social harmony and functions among high technology and advanced cultural trends. I believe that this classification and difference is the crucial aspect of what has been labeled "Brave New World's central conflict" between progressivism and traditionalism.

More specifically, the classification of each culture in Brave New World as progressive and traditional reveals the Old World/New World inversion. In Huxley's dystopia, the two regions are characterized in a way opposed to the normal temporal order. England is the progressive/advanced
New World while America is the traditional Old World. Thus, the Anglo-American cultural interaction in *Brave New World* suggests an inverted cultural order. This inversion has been continually overlooked, but it is one of the most conspicuously evident aspects of Huxley’s dystopian novel. After all, the title *Brave New World* refers to technologically driven, New World Fordian England, not to primitive, Old World America.

However because these terms *Old World* and *New World* are so widely used throughout so many different disciplines, chapter two of this thesis seeks to define the terms *New World* and *Old World* and establish a consistent way in which they are understood and used throughout this thesis. After establishing these two key terms, I attempt in the third chapter to place *Brave New World* in a historical context and offer a possible reason for the New World/Old World inversion. This chapter, “Ghosts and the Next World,” draws from the area of Huxley scholarship that views *Brave New World* as a comment on the twentieth century. Specifically, this chapter argues that the New World/Old World inversion in *Brave New World* exists as a result of the United States’ rise as a military, political, and cultural superpower following World War I: a rise that paralleled Great Britain’s own early imperial dissolution and declining
political power. Specifically, I argue that the inversion was Huxley's attempt, whether inadvertent or deliberate, to check the progress of modernity and the shift of political, economic, and military power from Europe to America.

In the final two chapters of this thesis, I examine two specific ways in which the Old World and New World are inverted in *Brave New World*. Therefore, the second chapter may be interpreted as a reason for the Old World/New World inversion while the final two chapters are attempts to establish methods by which the inversion is achieved. First, chapter four argues that Huxley transplants Shakespeare to America where the American John Savage, rather then the English, preserves and venerates him. In this way, Huxley recreates Shakespeare as an American icon-fetish; and the transplantation helps recast England as the New World and America as the Old. In this way, the significant and often discussed presence of Shakespeare and Shakespearean literature in *Brave New World* aids in the inversion of the concepts New World and Old. Finally, chapter five suggests that the fictional religions of AF England and America and their respective existences as a sex cult and a syncretistic blend of Native American religions and the Catholic Penitente tradition further establish the New World/Old World inversion. Namely, I
argue that Huxley recreates England as the New World because of the Fordian religion's progressive and technologically enhanced nature. In contrast, the religion of the American Reservation Savages is traditional and primitive and is thus associated with the Old World.

There are few if any issues that are more important to understanding Huxley the man, the artist, and *Brave New World* as Shakespeare and religion. As I will discuss periodically and provide evidence of throughout this thesis, these two issues dominated Huxley's life and saturate his literature and therefore are appropriate to the point of being requisite for any analysis of Huxley and/or his works. As just one example, Huxley's final piece of writing, "Shakespeare and Religion," brings together both Shakespeare and religion and equates their revered statuses. Of this occurrence, Jerome Meckier notes that because of the role Shakespeare played in his life and works, it is "not surprising that Aldous Huxley's last words in print were about William Shakespeare." Because of Huxley's intense concern with religion and spirituality, though, a similar statement might be made about the fact that this final essay deals with religion.

Beyond Shakespeare and religion, Huxley was also acutely aware of the changes modernity would bring to Europe and
America. He saw himself as a prophetic figure in the inter-war period, forecasting the nature of the nascent twentieth century. His observations in *Brave New World* and elsewhere—in his essays and *Brave New World Revisited* especially—have been proven startlingly correct. And at the beginning of a new century and a new millennium, we are continually forced to deal with the enduring problems and successes of the twentieth century. *Brave New World* and Aldous Huxley can offer us insight into our modern world and will therefore continue to stand as important and perceptive sources of illumination about Western civilization, European-American modernity, and the relationship between the Old and New World. It is my hope that "'In That New World Which Is The Old': New World/Old World Inversion In Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*" will substantiate these assertions.
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Scholars who deal with it as a non-satiric part of the utopian/dystopian tradition include Peter Firchow, "Brave at Last: Huxley's Western and Eastern Utopias." This article compares and contrasts Huxley's utopian novel Island (New York: HarperCollins, 1962) and Brave New World, and this comparison often operates outside the belief that Brave New World is a satire or, more specifically, a utopian satire. However, as the quotation from the article cited in n.9 and the rest of the article suggest, Firchow does include many considerations of Brave New World's utopian essence as satirical. Likewise, Firchow's book, The End of Utopia: A Study of Aldous Huxley's Brave New World, builds its interpretation of Brave New World's utopian aspects upon the acceptance that the book is primarily "Huxley's satire" (9). Tilmann Vetter's introduction to Aldous Huxley between East and West analyzes several general utopian aspects of Brave New World but also refers to it as a "prophetic fable" (3). He cites Island as Huxley's true "Utopian vision" and notes that it acts as "an antidote to Brave New World" (7). Guinervera Nance makes comparable statements about Island in her book Aldous Huxley (82) while repeatedly implying the satirical nature of Brave New World's utopian aspects, e.g., the use of the Tempest line for the title (78); the interaction of the "natural man" John Savage and the AF English society (76); and the contrast between "primitivism . . . [and] scientific determinism" (81). Aldous Huxley's address, "Utopias, Positive and Negative" (Blashfield Address: American Academy of Arts and Letters-National Institute of Arts and Letters, New York. 24 May 1962. Reprinted in Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Letters and the National Institute of Arts and Letters, 2nd Series. New York, 1963 and in Aldous Huxley Annual I [2001]) discusses Brave New World's origins as a satire of H.G. Wells' Men Like Gods (New York: MacMillan, 1923) but also catalogs many different types of utopias in literature and places Brave New World in this tradition. Likewise, Dominic Baker-Smith's "Aldous Huxley and the Utopian parable" (Aldous Huxley between East and West) places Brave New World in the utopian tradition and discusses the novel as part of this tradition. However, there is no concern with the satirical utopian aspects of Brave New World in this article. For similar analyses of Brave New World and the dystopian/utopian tradition that do not consider these aspects satirical, see Alexandra Bertash Aldridge, "Scientising Society: The Dystopian Novel and the Scientific World View" (Ph.D. diss., 1978. Abstract in Dissertation Abstracts International 39 [1978]: 3560A-61A); William W. Matter, "Aldous Huxley and the Utopian Tradition" (Ph.D. diss., 1972. Abstract in Dissertation Abstracts International 33 [1972]: 279A-80A); Jerome Meckier, "Aldous Huxley: Dystopian Essayist of the 1930s" (Review of Aldous Huxley's Hearst Essays, edited by James Sexton and The Hidden Huxley: Contempt and Compassion for the Masses, 1920-36, edited by David Bradshaw. Utopian Studies: Journal of the Society for Utopian Studies 7 [1996]); and Arvin R. Wells, "Huxley, Plato, and the Just Society" (The Centennial Review 24 [1980]). See also chapter three of this thesis, "Ghosts and the Next World."

1 See June Deery, "Technology and Gender in Aldous Huxley's Alternative(?) Worlds"; Peter Firchow, "Science and Conscience in Huxley's Brave New World"; James Sexton, "Brave New World and the Rationalization of Industry" (English Studies in Canada 12 [1986].


**See June Deery, "Analogies Between Mysticism and Science in the Works of Aldous Huxley." Also pertinent are several of the resources listed in n.1 of chapter five of this thesis, "Inversion Through Religion," since they discuss the religious and mystical aspects of Brave New World within considerations of Huxley's life and works.

**The End of Utopia, 9.

See James Mulvihill, "A Source for Huxley's 'Savage Reservations': "... topics germane to Brave New World, such as eugenics, free love, sexual hygiene, and internationalism" (84). Also somewhat relevant, as cited and discussed in n.16, are Lucien Le Bouille, "Inter- and Intracultural Antinomies in Aldous Huxley" and Jerome Meckier, "Aldous Huxley's American Experience." Again, though, these works are really more biographical studies of Huxley than analyses of Brave New World and deal more with Huxley's travels and cultural exposures than with Brave New World's internationalism and central cultural interaction. Finally, Charles Holmes in "The Sinister Outer World: Aldous Huxley and International Politics" (In Now More than Ever: Proceedings of the Aldous Huxley Centenary Symposium, Münster 1994) briefly discusses what he characterizes as Brave New World's "international flavor" (190).

See Brave New World where Huxley refers to Mustapha Mond as "The Resident Controller for Western Europe" and "One of the Ten World Controllers" (24).


The Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd ed., s.v., "England(1)."

ibid., s.v., "England(2)."

ibid., s.v., "English(3)."

Emerson's complete list of English characteristics and cultural traits also includes ability, truth, wealth, and aristocracy. See English Traits in The Essential Writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson (Ed. Brooks Atkinson. With an introduction by Mary Oliver. New York: Modern Library, 2000).

As mentioned, scholars involved in the "New American Studies" or "Transatlantic Studies" movement include Djelal Kadir, Julio Ortega,
Philip Fisher and others. This movement has as one of its goals the extension of the term America as a reference not only the United States but the whole of North and South America and its Transatlantic relationship with Europe. In his introduction to "America and Its Studies" (America: The Idea, the Literature, spec. issue of PMLA 118, no.1 [January 2003]), Kadir writes,

While America has come to be identified with a single country - The United States - America is a bicontinental hemisphere between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans that extends on a north-south axis from the Artic to Antarctica. The identification of this territorial expanse with the name of a single country inside it is a historical curiosity, with all the national(ist) symptoms that obtain in that peculiar history. The study of America in a discipline referred to as American studies has been likewise marked by this singular national denotation through a curious set of historical and ideological reductions that are at once evidence of and conductive to a perennial nationalism. (11)

Essentially, then, New American Studies is a revisionist movement that attempts to: broaden the scope of American studies; interpret both North and South America's relationship to Europe; and reclaim the term America as inclusive of all of North and South America not just the United States. The issue of the PMLA from which the Kadir quotation is taken also gives an overview of the interests of the movement and presents several examples of New American, Transatlantic scholarship written by scholars such as Kadir, Ortega, and Marietta Messmer. For an additional resource, see also the Transatlantic project website at Brown University: <http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Hispanic_Studies/Juliortega/Transatlantic.htm>.

25Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 78-79.

26ibid., 69. See also 61 and 95.

27ibid., 42.


The best source for defining the three terms England, Great Britain, and the United Kingdom remains the OED, 2nd edition. They are also given ample consideration, though, throughout the work that provided much of the historical fact mentioned in the main text: Simon Schama’s three volume, A History of Britain (New York: Miramax, 2000-02).

“A Source for Huxley’s ‘Savage Reservations,’” 84.


For examples dealing with the role Shakespeare played in Huxley’s life and work, see Jerome Meckier, “Shakespeare and Aldous Huxley”; chapter four of this thesis, “Inversion Through Shakespeare”; and the works listed in n.13 and n.33. For evidence of Huxley’s concern with religion and spirituality, see chapter five of this thesis, “Inversion Through Religion,” especially n.1 and n.6.


“Shakespeare and Aldous Huxley,” 129.
CHAPTER 2

TOWARD A DEFINITION OF OLD AND NEW WORLD

Many areas of academic study use the terms Old World and New World. To illustrate, a keyword search for the two terms in various university library catalogues yielded over 2,500 works at each institution. These works were spread across disciplines as diverse as biology, history, education, and economics. These conditions may appear to prohibit the development of consistent definitions for Old and New World. However, because this thesis analyzes the New World/Old World dynamic of the novel Brave New World, the definitions I propose in this chapter reflect the terms Old World and New as used in cultural and literary scholarship.

The denotative definitions of Old World and New World classify the terms as attributives with respective designations as “the Eastern Hemisphere” and the “the western hemisphere” [sic]. The terms’ denotative definitions also provide their specific cultural associations. New World has America as its constant cultural referent; and while Old World refers to “Europe,
Asia, and Africa" just as some scholars extend the phrase to include all three, the most fundamental interaction of New World and Old World is, as Stephen Greenblatt writes, "between Europeans and American peoples." As I suggest in the introduction and argue throughout this thesis, the Old World/New World inversion found in Brave New World is exclusively defined by this European-American relationship. Therefore, I do not include other New World/Old World dynamics such as the Asian-American, Pacific-American, or African-American. The definitions of the terms New World and Old World established for use in this thesis must exist in accordance with such a conservative, European-American understanding of the New World/Old World dynamic because it is the foundation of the New World/Old World inversion in Brave New World.

Such methodology is made all the more conservative in light of contemporary scholars such as the Diffusionists who question central features of the European-American relationship, namely the "discovery" of America by Columbus. Other progressive scholars not attached to the Diffusionists such as Djelal Kadir and James Robert Enterline similarly discount Columbus as merely one of the many discoverers of America who exists in an ancient and continuing atmosphere of interaction between America and
Europe. However, the New World/Old World inversion of Brave New World is, in many ways, built on Columbus’ arrival in the New World.

Columbus’ landing at Guanahuani, or San Salvador, in the Bahamas on 12 October 1492 may indeed be continually discounted as the first European discovery of America. But since the Scandinavians who preceded him established few colonies, important trade routes, or extensive cultural networks between their home countries and Vinland, Columbus’ landing remains the moment when sustained, European-American contact, colonization, and interaction began. Thus, it is the event in which the culturally-based, Anglo-American, New World/Old World dynamic inverted in Brave New World has its roots.

Such an interpretation maintains that the traditional, Columbian discovery of America is important to Brave New World, but it does not ignore the validity of current and continuing scholarship. Rather, it suggests that Columbus’ discovery is one after a fashion when two hemispheres largely alienated from one another came together and initiated a mutually affective relationship that continues to the present. As Robert Lopez writes, Columbus’ landing "weld[ed] a second hemisphere onto the first." The controversial Italian navigator, therefore, set the stage
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for the cultural re-creation of each hemisphere and
initiated the historically momentous relationship between
the New and Old Worlds. Rather than discounting Columbus
completely as just one in a series of European discoverers,
it seems best to revise Columbus' position as the
discoverer who, instead of being the first European
discoverer of America, initiated sustained and significant
cultural interaction between the Old and New Worlds.

Several years after Columbus' landing, however, the
magnitude of the discovery, the idea of a "new" world, and
the specific concept New World lay largely undeveloped in
the mind of Europe. J.H. Elliott presents an analysis of
the early development of the term New World and "the
process by which the 'New World' found its place within the
mental horizons of Europe." In "Renaissance Europe and
America: A Blunted Impact?," Elliot specifically
categorizes this process as "slow [and] erratic but
nevertheless [a] persistent process by which the Old World
adjusted itself to the forces released by its conquest of
the New." The OED, offering a specific date, suggests that
the first use of the term New World in English was 1555 in
Richard Eden's translation of Pietro Martire d' Anghiera's
Décadas del Nuevo Mundo (1530). This date suggests that it
took nearly a generation after Columbus' landing for the
idea of the New World to work its way into English. Such sources, however, bear evidence that Columbus' particular discovery laid the foundation for the eventual cultural interaction between the Old World and the New. They also help suggest that it took some time before Europeans fully understood the magnitude of the event and before they termed the newly discovered continents "the New World."

Once established in Europe, though, the term New World and its converse Old World took on certain cultural assumptions central to Brave New World's Old World/New World inversion. The denotative definitions of Old World and New World define these cultural assumptions. Even more pertinent to this chapter, though, these definitions present objective evidence of the cultural assumptions underlying the Old World/New World dynamic of Brave New World and help establish key issues essential to analyzing their inversion in Huxley's novel.

The denotative definition of Old World defines the term as an area of cultural tradition and the place where this tradition is preserved. It is associated with "the ancient order of things" and "early or bygone times . . . opposed to the New World or America" which is the place of advancement and cultural development. There are myriad examples of this relationship including the linguistic
modifications made by American English, French, and Spanish;\textsuperscript{16} the differences between the educational systems of America and Europe;\textsuperscript{17} and the fact that the United States' basic political structure and ideology are modified versions of the ancient, European models of Athens and Republican Rome as well as the philosophies of Enlightenment France.\textsuperscript{18} Specifically concerned with \textit{Brave New World}, this important interaction between Old World traditionalism and New World progressivism is the foundation of the novel's Old World/New World inversion.

In \textit{Brave New World}, the American Savage Reservation exists in the North American Southwest and thus in a region denotatively defined as the New World. In fact, the American West could even be defined as the New World of the New World. As Frederick Jackson Turner's influential thesis argues, the American West/Frontier is a place completely new and independent of European/Old World influence:

Little by little [the frontiersman] transforms the [American] wilderness, but the outcome is not the old Europe . . . The fact is, that here is a new product that is American. . . . Thus the advance of the frontier has meant a steady movement away from the influence of Europe, a steady growth of independence on American lines. And to study this advance, the men who grew up under these conditions, and the political, economic, and social results of it, is to study the really American part of our history.\textsuperscript{19}
Henry David Thoreau suggests a similar idea, that movement into the American west is a movement away from Europe and into something distinctly American. In his essay "Walking," Thoreau writes,

"Eastward I go only by force; but westward I go free. . . . I must walk toward Oregon and not toward Europe. And that way the nation is moving, and I must say that mankind progress from east to west. . . .
We go eastward to realize history and study the works of art and literature, retracing the steps of the race; we go westward as into the future, with a spirit of enterprise and adventure. The Atlantic is a Lethean stream, in our passage over which we have had opportunity to forget the Old World and its institutions."

The American West, then, can be categorized as the New World of the New World. In Brave New World, however, the American West is not the New World of progress and innovation. Rather, it is the bastion of older, traditional culture while England, part of the cultural and denotative Old World, is a place of eugenics, progress, and modernization. Philip Fisher argues that such traits are what continually maintain America's status as the New World; and in Brave New World, they are what define England as the New World and America, because of their absence, as the Old.

In Brave New World, therefore, the terms New World and Old World and their common cultural associations are inverted, one for the other. Typical New World associations
of progressivism exist in the denotative Old World and typical Old World associations of traditionalism exist in the denotative New World. By setting the American Reservation in the American West, Huxley allows the greatest possible degree of inversion and contrast since the New World of the New World, the only section truly American according to Turner, is recast as the Old World.  

Perhaps the most powerful example of this shift, or at least Fordian England's disregard for history, in *Brave New World* comes early in the novel. Mustapha Mond approaches the group of students touring the Central London Hatchery and says, "You all remember . . . , I suppose, that beautiful and inspired saying of Our Ford's: History is bunk." Then, after repeating Ford's quotation, Mond wave[s] his hand; and it was as though, with an invisible feather whisk, he had brushed away a little dust, and the dust was Harappa, was Ur of the Chaldees; some spiderwebs, and they were Thebes and Babylon and Cnossos and Mycenae. Whisk, Whisk-and where was Odysseus, where was Job, where were Jupiter and Gotama 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, Passion; whisk, Requiem; whisk, Symphony; whisk . . . [Huxley's ellipsis].

The following chapters seek to illustrate the specific ways the cultural associations of the New World and the Old are transplanted in *Brave New World* and for what purpose
they may be so inverted. However at its core, Brave New World's Old World/New World inversion is based on an exchange of denotative cultural associations from the New World to the Old and vice versa. This shift creates a fictional exchange that recreates England as the Old World which is the New and America, in Tennyson's words, as the "new world which is the old."
Notes


The *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v., "old(12.b)" and "New World." The inconsistency in capitalization between the two definitions reflects the words as printed in the OED.

ibid., s.v., "old," "old-world," and "world(11)."

Certain scholars extend the term Old World to include Asia and Africa rather than preserve it as an exclusive reference to Europe. For example, see William McNeill's use of the term Old World to include Asia in the fourth edition of his *A World History* (New York: Oxford UP, 1999); Gerhard Kraus, *Humanity at the Brink* (London: Janus, 1998), specifically "America and the Old World" and the whole of section three which re-examines Diffusionism and North American population theory in light of current anthropological evidence, Modernity, and historical interpretation; and the collection of biological essays on catarrhine simians titled *Old World Monkeys* (Ed. Paul Whitehead and Clifford Jolly. New York: Cambridge UP, 2000) in which the editors and writers refer to Africa and Asia - the habitats of such monkeys - as "the Old World."

*New World Encounters* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1993), viii. In this section, Greenblatt discusses the "mutual destiny" of the New World/Old World relationship "between Europeans and [the] American peoples": a relationship that has "remarkable specificity and historical contingency" (vii).

Current scholarship considers a wide range of discoverers of America including the traditional Bearing Strait nomads; Pacific groups such as Polynesian boatmen; Scandinavians; and perhaps even other Atlantic groups such as Africans. Such research makes it more difficult than ever to proclaim Columbus as the discoverer, per se, of America. Examples of and discussions concerning such scholarship include: Eugene
Fingerhut, Explorers of Pre-Columbian America? The Diffusionist-Inventionist Controversy (Claremont, CA: Regina Books, 1994) and Who First Discovered America? (Claremont, CA: Regina Books, 1984); Gerhard Kraus, Humanity at the Brink; and Marc K. Stengel, "The Diffusionists Have Landed" (The Atlantic Monthly, January 2000). Also, it would be negligent not to note the work Stephen Greenblatt refers to in his introduction to New World Encounters as a "monumental study" (vii): Samuel Eliot Morrison's The European Discovery of America (2 vols. New York: Oxford UP, 1971-74). As also noted by Greenblatt in the same introduction, Morrison's work exemplifies a conservative, Eurocentric viewpoint, the assumptions of which are often challenged in current scholarship. However, apart from such debate, Morrison's work is important since it includes all the major European voyages and discoveries of America, including the Scandinavian and even early medieval Irish. It serves as another example, therefore, of the wide range of European explorers and discoverers of America.

8See Djelal Kadir, Columbus and the Ends of the Earth: Europe's Prophetic Rhetoric as Conquering Ideology (Berkeley: U of California P, 1992) and James Robert Enterline, Erikson, Eskimos, and Columbus: Medieval European Knowledge of America (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2002). For more examples of scholarship and discussions regarding Columbus as merely one of the many discoverers of America, see the works listed in n.7 and n.9.

9The L'Anse aux Meadows archeological site in Newfoundland, Canada bears the most extensive evidence of Scandinavian presence in pre-Columbian America, or, as they referred to it, Vinland. For scholarship analyzing this site, see Anne Stine Ingstad, The Norse Discovery of America (Translated by Elizabeth Seeberg. Oslo: Norwegian UP, 1985; distributed by Oxford UP). Also pertinent to this archeological site as well as the Norse Sagas that deal with Vinland and the broader Scandinavian discovery of North America: Geraldine Barnes, "The Vinland Voyages in Saga Narrative" (In Viking America: the First Millennium. Rochester, NY: D.S. Brewer, 2001); James Robert Enterline, Erikson, Eskimos, and Columbus: Medieval European Knowledge of America; various essays and sections of William Fitzhugh and Elisabeth Ward, Vikings: The North Atlantic Saga (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000); Elinor Ingvild Haugen, Voyages to Vinland (New York: Knopf, 1942); Magnus Magnusson and Hermann Palsson, The Vinland Sagas (Baltimore: Penguin, 1965); and Grenlingdinga Pátrr, The Vinland Sagas: The Norse Discovery of America (New York: NYU Press, 1966).


11Though the work ostensibly focuses on the impact of the New World on the culture, politics, religion, and language of the Old World, First Images of America: The Impact of the New World on the Old is an important resource that presents a diverse range of essays and resources establishing the early relationship and thus the foundation for the continuing relationship between Europe and America. For a view more manifestly concerned with the impact of the Old World on the New,


14First Images of America: The Impact of the New World on the Old, 22.

15See the OED, 2nd edition, s.v., "world(11)." The OED cites that this first occurrence is on the title page of Richard Eden's work Decades of the Newe Worlde or West India (London, 1555; Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1966). As stated, this book is a translation of Pietro Martire d' Anghiera's Décadas del Nuevo Mundo (Alcalá de Henares (Madrid), 1530; Madrid: Ediciones Polifemo, 1989).

16The Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd ed., s.v., "old-world."


22Additional to the central text of "the Turner Thesis" cited in n.19, other Turner writings help elucidate and defend his idea that the American west was a uniquely American experience and an affective territory rather than an influenced and controlled hinterland. See the other works in Rereading Frederick Jackson Turner, especially, "Contributions of the West to American Democracy" and "The West and American Ideals."
23Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited* (New York: HarperCollins, 1965), 24. The actual quotation attributed to Henry Ford reads: "History is more or less bunk. It's tradition. We don't want tradition. We want to live in the present, and the only history that is worth a tinker's damn is the history we make today" (Interview, in *The Chicago Tribune*, 25 May 1916).

24Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited*, 24

We . . . penetrated into the secret places of the [Hollywood movie] studio. In one room they were concocting miracles and natural cataclysms—typhoons in bathtubs and miniature earthquakes, the Deluge, the Dividing of the Red Sea, the Great War in terms of toy tanks and Chinese fire crackers, ghosts and the Next World[, . . . ] . . . and the architecture of the remote future. . . . [A] series of machines was engaged in developing and printing the films. Their output was enormous. I forget how many thousands of feet of art and cultures they could turn out each day. Quite a number of miles, in any case.

—Aldous Huxley, Jesting Pilate (1926)

In both a 1931 letter and the 1946 foreword to Brave New World, Aldous Huxley makes similar claims that "Brave New World is a novel about the future."¹ Such statements, though, are atypical, and they characterize neither Huxley's widespread interpretations of his novel nor the interpretations of scholars. For example, the latter group consistently rejects the notion that Brave New World comments on a hypothetical, forthcoming world, and this tendency complements—and perhaps has its origins in—a statement Huxley published in 1929, just three years before Brave New World: "My own feeling whenever I see a book about the future is one of boredom and exasperation."² Examples of scholars who reject the idea that Brave New

39
World is a novel about the future include Alexander Henderson who writes that *Brave New World* is not targeted at "a future civilization" but rather at "present-day Europe and America." ³ "Brave New World," he continues, "is a book of the present, not of the future." ⁴ Likewise, Stephen Greenblatt suggests that *Brave New World* "is primarily concerned not with what will happen in the future but with what is happening to mankind now." ⁵ And finally, the distinguished Huxley scholar Peter Firchow argues that Huxley almost certainly never intended [*Brave New World*] to be a satire of the future. . . . The present is what matters most in *Brave New World[,] . . . and Huxley only uses the lens of future time . . . to discover better the latent diseases of the here and now.⁶

Firchow also argues in favor of Huxley's belief that the "only meaningful future is actually . . . the future which already exists in the present" and wonders "what, after all, is the good of satirizing the future?" ⁷

As used by these scholars, though, the terms *now* and *present* refer to the middle and late parts of the twentieth century, not to the early twenty-first century and beyond. However, as the editor's preface to the first volume of the *Aldous Huxley Annual* reads, "Huxley's works have important things to say to the twenty-first century" ⁸; and *Brave New World* is no exception. Yet even though *Brave New World* may indeed have had relevance in the later parts of the
twentieth century and even though it may continue to have relevance in the twenty-first century because of its concerns with genetic and social eugenics, globalization, and sexual freedom—as Charles Holmes writes, the text seems "each day to comment more accurately on us now"—Huxley's dystopia primarily comments on the early twentieth century.

In chapter one of this thesis, I cite scholarship that argues this idea such as James Sexton's "Brave New World and the Rationalization of Industry" and Erika Gottlieb's "The Dictator behind the Mask." Even the scholars already quoted in this chapter such as Greenblatt and Henderson suggest that Brave New World comments on the twentieth century rather than on the future. However, additional examples abound.

Hans J. Rindisbacher and Robert S. Baker both argue that aspects of modernity and Modernism itself can be found in Brave New World in their respective articles "Sweet Scents and Stench: Traces of Post/Modernism in Aldous Huxley's Brave New World" and "The Nightmare of the Frankfurt School: The Marquis de Sade and the Problem of Modernity in Aldous Huxley's Dystopian Narrative." Also, Raymond Legg writes that Huxley's "description of society in Brave New World was reflective of contemporary British society"; and Stephen Greenblatt argues that Huxley examines and
satirizes "life in the British Empire from the end of the First World War to the start of the . . . ‘Cold War.’"^{13}

Robert S. Baker categorizes Huxley's work between 1929-1939 as less bound by "literary trappings and conventions" and more

polemical, more exigently insistent on exposing the basis for the profound historical disorientations of the post-[Great War] period as they began to reflect Huxley's more pressing concerns with politics, pacifism, and social reform.^{14}

Baker even describes Huxley's works of 1921-1939, including *Brave New World* which was published in 1932, as texts

driven by a fascination with Western modernity. . . . And with its manifestation in the contemporary social quandaries of post-war England and Europe[,] . . . [t]he idea of modernity was central to what Huxley called "the novel of social history," and his satirical attack on historicism throughout the 1920s.^{15}

Furthermore, Alexander Henderson offers some specific aspects of the high Modern period that he believes Huxley addresses in *Brave New World*, for example, Fascism and Communism's "restriction of freedom"; the insufficiency of Henry Ford's high-wage system; the mechanization of work and leisure; and the re-creation of man as a mere social function.^{16} According to Ian Ross, Huxley's interest in these early twentieth century issues and in applying them to his writing even carried like a shockwave through the
1930s, "after [Huxley's] literary success with *Brave New World.*"\(^{17}\)

Apart from the two lines cited at the beginning of this chapter, Huxley himself clearly believed that *Brave New World* comments on the early twentieth century. In this situation, then, I will take Huxley's advice to his readers: "The best I can do is to warn the reader against my distortion of the facts, and invite him to correct it by means of his own."\(^ {18}\) In his 1946 foreword to *Brave New World,* a 1956 essay "*Brave New World Revisited,*" and his 1959 book *Brave New World Revisited,* Huxley struggles with the painfully accurate portrayal of the early twentieth century that he achieved in *Brave New World.* As Huxley writes in the 1956 essay,

> The most distressing thing that can happen to a prophet is to be proved wrong; the next most distressing thing is to be proved right. In the twenty-two years that have elapsed since *Brave New World* was written, I have undergone both these experiences. Events have proved me distressingly wrong; and events have proved me distressingly right.\(^ {19}\)

In the 1946 foreword, he lists such things as nuclear fission, atomic warfare, nationalist radicalism, and *realpolitik* that he wishes he had written into the book so it could stand as an even more comprehensive assessment of the early twentieth century.\(^ {20}\) In fact, *Brave New World* so fundamentally comments on the 1920s and early 1930s that
the book's 1946 foreword and the book and essay Brave New World Revisited/"Brave New World Revisited" ultimately stand as Huxley's attempts ex post facto to cram more aspects of the early twentieth century into his dystopian novel.

What initially seem to be peripheral addenda, then, are actually extensions of Brave New World's essential connection to the early twentieth century. Therefore, the 1946 foreword and the book and essay Brave New World Revisited/"Brave New World Revisited" are better interpreted as the twentieth century appendages of Brave New World, reminding scholars and readers of Brave New World's essential connection to the twentieth century; how much of the early twentieth century Huxley was able to deal with in Brave New World; and how desperately he wanted Brave New World to stand as a meditation on the social, cultural, economic, and political issues of the period. Indicative of the essential correspondence between the four parts of Brave New World—the novel, the foreword, the essay "Brave New World Revisited," and the book Brave New World Revisited—and thus suggesting the connection of this novel-matrix to the early twentieth century, a significant number of the editions of Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited come printed together; and as David Bradshaw
points out, "Unfailingly, each time [Brave New World] is reprinted, the [1946] Foreword is reprinted as well."21

Both scholarship and Huxley's own assessments, then, establish Brave New World's essential connection to the early twentieth century, and I believe that one of the specific aspects of this time period that Huxley responds to in his novel is the Anglo-American political dynamic that existed between the end of the Great War and the start of the Great Depression. Partly specific to Brave New World, the date range of this period is as follows:

(1) from between 11:00 a.m. on 11 November 1918 when fighting ceased on the Western Front and 28 June 1919 when the United States and European powers signed the fatally flawed Treaty of Versailles

(2) to between "Black Tuesday" 29 October 1929 when the American stock market crashed—thus signaling the onset of "the global chaos"22 of worldwide economic depression and the end of the American cultural and economic boom of the 1920s—and the publication of Brave New World in January 1932.

This first half of the inter-war period includes the composition (May-August 1931) and publication (January 1932) of Brave New World, and I believe that this period and the New World/Old World inversion of Brave New World
are linked because of the United States' rise as a military, political, and cultural superpower during the 1920s and the British Empire's concurrent early imperial dissolution and declining worldwide economic, social, and military power.

As David Bradshaw writes, "Brave New World was written during a period of unprecedented instability in modern British politics and at a time when Huxley daily expected the country to sink into bloody disorder." Bradshaw provides a succinct and informative gloss of this period, as well as Huxley's place in it, in which the British government "lurched from one crisis to the next," namely, "the formation of Britain's first National Government"; "the abandonment of the gold standard"; and other economic problems of "the Slump" such as the City of London Stock Exchange fraud of 1929 which Bradshaw describes as "the darkest moments of modern British History." James Sexton echoes these statements in his introduction to a collection of Huxley's essays by outlining Huxley's political concerns of the early 1930s and by quoting Huxley's assertion that the early 1930s were a "supremely uncomfortable moment of history."

In the third and final volume of his A History of Britain, Simon Schama describes the inter-war period in a
way similar to Huxley, Bradshaw, and Sexton by discussing the late 1920s as the early years of the British Empire's ultimate dissolution. Likewise, political and financial historian Niall Ferguson attempts to portray the period by examining the British Empire Exhibition of April 1924 as he believes this exhibition is an apt summary of the early, 1920s decline of the ostensibly sunsetless British Empire. The Exhibition, Ferguson writes,

was intended as a popular celebration of Britain's global achievement, an affirmation that the Empire had more than just a glorious past but a future too, and in particular an economic future. . . . But the tone of the event was set by [Wembley Stadium in which it was held]. The fact that [the stadium] was made of concrete and looked hideous was in itself a bold statement of modernity . . . [and] despite a government subsidy of £2.2 million, the Exhibition made a loss of over £1.5 million, in marked contrast to the profitable pre-1914 exhibitions. Indeed, in this respect, there were those who saw unnerving parallels between the Empire exhibition and the Empire itself. 27

Summarizing the inauspiciousness of the Exhibition, Ferguson describes the popular reaction to the event as a "creeping crisis of confidence in Empire." 28

This general British Imperial malaise was prevalent precisely when Huxley was writing Brave New World: in the middle to late 1920s. David Bradshaw also makes this connection, asserting that while it is "but one, oblique expression," Brave New World is nevertheless a manifestation "of Huxley's passionate interest in planning
and the condition of England" after the Great War. 

Demonstrating this passion and an awareness of the political change afoot in Britain, Huxley writes in his article "Abroad in England" that "[England] must either plan or else go under." 

I believe, therefore, that the inversion of Old World and New in *Brave New World* was Huxley's attempt, whether inadvertent or deliberate, to check the progress of modernity and the shift of political, economic, and military power from Europe to America, that is, from the Old World to the New. This shift has been so profound over the course of the twentieth century that scholars such as the previously cited Niall Ferguson conclude that in the twentieth century and on into the early twenty-first century, "the Americans have taken [the old British Imperial] role" and made it their own. In so doing, the culture of dominance and military power that existed between each side of the Atlantic shifted from its traditional, historical dynamic.

In his essay "America and Europe: Yesterday's Influence on Today," Huxley himself observes this traditional dynamic of cultural and industrial supremacy, its shift in the twentieth century, and the differences in Anglo-European culture and American culture. Instead of flowing
from Old World Europe to the New World United States as it had done since first colonization in the sixteenth century, the cultural, political, and military power dynamic of the post-Great War world began to flow from east to west, from New World to Old. Simon Schama supports Huxley's observation and discusses the European response to the changing dynamic between the New World and the Old World which was rampant in England and the rest of Europe during the first part of the twentieth century:

The unstoppability of America's economy and its immigrant-fuelled demographic explosion worried the rulers of [the Italian, Russian, British, and German] empires, even as they staggered into the fratricidal slaughter that would insure exactly that future.®®

Huxley was completely engulfed in such concerns, and it even seems that he worried the United States would become more and more urbanized and progressive while American-style frontier primitivism would move into the UK. Describing an agrarian, communal camp in the New Forest, Huxley writes in his essay "Pioneers of Britain's 'New Deal'": "At the Grith Fyrd camp for unemployed men you will find, in the New Forest, what is almost a replica of an American backwoods settlement of a century ago."®® Here, the Englishmen work and live like American West pioneers of the 1800s: growing their own food; residing in log cabins; and living among and working with carpentry apparatus, hand
looms, knitting machines, a printing machine, and farm animals such as chickens, pigs, and goats. The observations Huxley makes and the concerns he expresses in this essay provides evidence as to why Huxley makes America so primitive and "savage" in Brave New World. Based on his essays and the conclusions of scholars, Huxley clearly understood the changing dynamic between the US and UK; and based on his essay "Pioneers of Britain's 'New Deal'", specifically, he even seems to have worried about the change in extreme terms: America would continue to modernize while England would fall deeper and deeper into primitivism. Huxley's conclusion seems to be that FDR's "New Deal" of the 1930s would essentially create prosperity and economic recovery for the New World while the American plan's dominance over Europe and Britain would cause the Old World to fall even deeper into poverty, unemployment, and even pioneer primitivism. In Brave New World however, Huxley inverts the Anglo-American dynamic of the early twentieth century and recreates America as the dominated land of weakened primitivism and England as the dominant land of progress and technology. Thereby, Huxley textually alters the course of the Anglo-American, New World/Old World dynamic of the inter-war period.
Huxley's fears about England slipping into American Frontier-style primitivism as the New World continued to increase in social and technological progress may seem fanciful, extreme, and even outlandish. However, his views are not without contemporary echoes. John Maynard Keynes also seems to have felt Britain and the rest of Europe were heading for primitive, even third-world conditions as America prospered. In *The Economic Consequences of the Peace* (1919), Keynes outlines both the shift of Anglo-American/Old World-New World power and the changing and adjusting dynamic of influence and dependence between "the systems of the Old World and the New."\(^{35}\)

Keynes argues that the late-Victorian population explosion in the Americas ran concurrent with increases in the region's agricultural and industrial output. However, because of the resulting New World demand for its own goods, Europe had to pay more for them. Because of "the completeness of [Europe's] dependence . . . on the food supplies of the New World" and the Great War, the Old World was sick and dying; its population was greatly in excess of the numbers for which a livelihood was available; its organization was destroyed, its transport system ruptured, and its food supplies terribly impaired.\(^{36}\)

Nothing, Keynes believes, is as dominant in the early twentieth century as "the produce of the New World" for
which all the powers of Europe will compete. Keynes even presents Woodrow Wilson coming to the 1919 Paris Peace conference as the dominant, New World savior of Europe. Keynes and Europe seem to have trusted Wilson's leadership over their own politicians; and expressing the dominance of the New World over the Old, Keynes describes Wilson's bold and measured words [which] carried to the peoples of Europe above and beyond the voices of their own politicians. The [Central Powers] trusted him to carry out the compact he had made with them; and the [Allies] acknowledged him not as a victor only but almost as a prophet. In addition to this moral influence the realities of power were in his hands. . . . Never had a philosopher held such weapons wherewith to bind the princes of the world. How the crowds of the European capitals pressed about the carriage of the President! With what curiosity, anxiety, and hope we sought a glimpse of the features and bearing of the man of destiny who, coming from the West, was to bring healing to the wounds of the ancient parent of his civilization and lay for us the foundations of the future.

Keynes continues, further suggesting the level of the New World's dominance:

The American armies were at the height of their numbers, discipline, and equipment. Europe was in complete dependence on the food supplies of the United States; and financially she was even more absolutely at their mercy. Europe not only owed the United States more than she could pay; but only a large measure of further assistance could save her from starvation and bankruptcy.

Even though Keynes tempers his words later in the book by expressing disillusionment with the peace process and asserting a more sober assessment of Wilson and his policies, these hyperbolic passages bear evidence of the
presence of America in the inter-war world and the sway it held over European politics and economics.

Much like Keynes' ultimate conclusions in The Economic Consequences of the Peace, Huxley's response to and understanding of the dominance of the New World over the Old World is quite sober. And like Keynes' disenchantment because of the process and final results of the Paris conference, Huxley's concerns with the dominance of the United States in the inter-war period seem to be the product of specific issues, namely, his general distrust of progress, innovation, and modernity and his 1920s and early 1930s aversion to American culture, military, and politics and his fears about this culture's future domination.

Huxley was a famously "dyed-in-the-wool debunker of progress." He wrote in 1929 that earlier in his life, he would have felt "ashamed of not being up-to-date":

I lived in a chronic apprehension lest I might, so to speak, miss the last bus, and so find myself stranded and benighted in a desert of demodedness, while others, more nimble than myself, had already climbed on board, taken their tickets and set out towards those bright but, alas, ever receding goals of Modernity. . . . Now, however, I have grown shameless, I have lost my fears. I can watch unmoved the departure of the last socio-cultural bus. . . . I make no effort to board them, and when the noise of each departure has died down, "Thank Goodness!" is what I say to myself in the solitude. I find nowadays that I simply don't want to be up-to-date.
Peter Firchow has perceptively labeled this trait of Huxley's—and of other Moderns such as Ezra Pound and T.S. Eliot—"reluctant modernism." And Huxley's reluctance even seems so complete that Firchow ultimately wonders "Was Huxley a modernist?"

Being one who was so skeptical of progress, Huxley saw the worst of it in America. Because of this perception, he seems to have not only defined the United States as an ever-changing land shooting into the future at a supersonic though cultureless rate. Rather, Huxley seems to have also projected all his fears about progress and modernity onto the republic across the Atlantic. Establishing it both as the denotative New World and as a land of rapid cultural and political progress, Huxley writes in Jesting Pilate that the "American slogan" should be changed and "under America's flapping eagle" should be written: "Vitality, Prosperity, Modernity." Throughout the rest of this section, Huxley proceeds to outline, with cheeky condemnation, the problems America faces because of each of these three traits and the problems the country passes on to other countries by harboring and furthering them.

For example, Huxley writes that America is not bound by history and that "[c]hange is accepted in America as the first and fundamental fact . . . [and] as the foundation
and key of practical life." In America, Huxley writes, "things . . . are built to be scrapped as soon and they have outlived their first youth. Change is made much of, it is rejoiced in. That is modernity." Such may indeed be modernity, but Huxley feared this state of affairs and what he saw as the coming dominance of America and its values.

Huxley expressed these "fears of American cultural expansionism" in a letter to his brother Julian. In this letter, Huxley worries about

the inevitable acceleration of American world domination . . . We shall all be colonized; Europe will no longer be Europe; we shall all be buffeted on huge fabulous new oceans, longing all the while for the little old dark pond where a frail and wizened child launches its paper boat towards the sunset.

In one of his especially prophetic moments, Huxley seems to have had a premonition that American/New World dominance would be the future; and he has in large measure been proven right since discussions and concerns about contemporary globalization are often merely discussions and concerns about Americanization.

According to Jerome Meckier, "Huxley realized the future would be American—America writ even larger." Meckier also quotes Huxley's insistence—published in 1927, five years before Brave New World—that "Speculating on the American future, we are speculating on the future of civilized
man." In the essay from which this quotation comes, an essay Jerome Meckier describes as "an anticipatory gloss on Brave New World," Huxley further asserts:

The future of America is the future of the world. Material circumstances are driving all nations along the path in which America is going. Living in the contemporary environment, which is everywhere becoming more and more American, men feel a psychological compulsion to go the American way. Fate acts within and without; there is no resisting. For good or for evil, it seems the world must be Americanized.

The reluctant but resolved tone of this passage augments the subtle irony of Huxley's statement about "civilized man" while suggesting that Huxley observed and reluctantly accepted the rise of the United States' various forms of power.

However, I believe Huxley fought back with the literary, satiric weapon of Brave New World by casting the southwestern section of America—the only section of America he concentrates on in any detail in the novel—as a primitive, Old World land that is devoid of worldwide power and dominance of any kind and that is hobbled by its own oppressive traditionalism. Conversely, Huxley recreates Europe, and England in particular, in Brave New World as the New World of progress, dominance, and innovation. He recreates it first by stripping England of those very characteristics that he saw hindering its advancement in
the early twentieth century—traditionalism, antiquated cultural values, ancient political systems—and then by adding those traits of post-Great War America which made it so successful in the 1920s—progressivism, technology, realpolitik.

This conflict of Anglo-European traditionalism and American progressivism in the 1920s and early 1930s is well expressed and summed up by Congressman Lewis' admonitory and even prescient speech to the European delegates in *Remains of the Day* (1988). Considering the traditional role of noble, aristocratic "amateurs" in politics and blaming such involvement for the rampant, violent nationalism of the early twentieth century, Lewis accuses the Europeans of being "naive dreamers." He continues:

And if you didn’t insist on meddling in large affairs that affect the globe, you would actually be charming. Let’s take our good host here [Lord Darlington]. He is . . . a classic English gentleman. But his lordship is . . . an amateur and international affairs today [1923] are no longer for gentlemen amateurs. The sooner you here in Europe realize that the better. . . . The days when you could act out of your noble instincts are over. Except of course, you here in Europe don’t yet seem to know it. Gentlemen like our good host still believe it’s their business to meddle in matters they don’t understand. . . . You here in Europe need professionals to run your affairs. If you don’t realize that soon you’re headed for disaster.®®

Lord Darlington’s response to Lewis’s speech simply reaffirms the Congressman’s concerns and the traditionalism
of European politics in the post-Great War period. And as the novel progresses, Darlington simply enters deeper and deeper into the traditional, nationalist rhetoric that created the punitive flaws of the Treaty of Versailles and that ultimately brought about the Second World War.

Essentially, Congressman Lewis' speech forces a progressive, realpolitik American political theory on the Europeans; and based on his letters and essays, Huxley seems to have recognized and to have been suspicious, if not outright bitter, about such dominance of American culture and ideas in Europe. Indicative of this, David Bradshaw writes about the influence of H.L. Mencken on Huxley, suggesting that "Mencken's vilification of his fellow [Americans] gave unbridled voice to Huxley's own qualms about Americanization." Such "qualms" are perhaps better characterized as vituperations because of their acridity, prevalence, and zealousness. However one terms them though, Huxley's concerns--outlined generously and effectively by Bradshaw--characterize the United States as a circus, as a cultural wasteland, and as an uneducated region that Huxley describes as "pure Rabelais, a chronic kermesse." Bradshaw's selection of essays in Aldous Huxley Between the Wars shows Huxley angry at America and worried about the future of Britain and Europe in a world dominated
culturally and militarily by the United States. In a review of Bradshaw's collection, Jerome Meckier provides the link between these inter-war essays and Brave New World when he labels the former "dystopian" and suggests that they were written in preparation for Brave New World. Likewise, Robert Baker notes that these essays create "fascinating questions about Huxley's politics and, in particular, their role in Point Counter Point [1928] and Brave New World."

The animosity Huxley expressed toward the US during the 1920s and 30s might very well be explained as a result of the nationalism rampant in Europe during the inter-war period: nationalism of which Huxley was a part. Even though Huxley eventually became part of the inter-war peace movement, in the 1920s and early 1930s he was involved in the nationalism that was, as he saw it, "the most powerful political idea at the present time." After all, Huxley was in his own estimation "an Englishman with normal patriotic feelings." More broadly, the essay from which I have taken this second quotation—"What Gandhi Fails to See"—is strongly pro-Imperial, Anglo-centric, and anti-Gandhi/Indian independence. In it, Huxley writes that he could "never quite objectively appreciate activities which, though undertaken in the name of abstract Justice, would result, if successful, in something like the ruin of my..."
During the 1920s and early 1930s when composing *Brave New World*, therefore, Huxley clearly seems to have valued English culture and his country's Imperial interests over those of other areas including India and the United States even though these opinions seem to have changed later in his life. In his article "The Sinister Outer World: Aldous Huxley and International Politics," Charles M. Holmes provides a detailed examination of Huxley's political views throughout his life, including those of the 1920s and early 1930s which he describes as nationalist, elitist, provincial and which he believes were opposed to cultural and political standardization. During this time and under these political beliefs, Holmes notes that "we realize [Huxley] is working on *Brave New World.*"

Huxley's feelings about the US, though, ultimately seem incongruous with his biography because of his fully self-chosen, intimate connection with the United States. He traveled throughout the United States in 1925—a journey which resulted in the "America" chapter of *Jesting Pilate*—and made California his primary residence as a resident-alien from 1937 until his 1963 death in Los Angeles. Thus, he seems to have been quite fond of New World America. A great many of his works, though, bear evidence of Huxley's misgivings about the US, including *Brave New World.*
Peter Firchow outlines the ironic, anti-American jabs present in Ape and Essence (1949); and David Bradshaw and James Sexton—coeditors of the heretofore lost Huxley play Now More than Ever which was completed in October 1932, revised in 1933, but never produced during Huxley's lifetime—write in their introduction to Now More than Ever that it reflects certain early twentieth century British concerns about the rise of the United States as an industrial, economic, and cultural leviathan. They write, "Now More than Ever... like Brave New World..., the text which immediately preceded it, may be understood as part and parcel of Huxley's... response to the social, economic, and political upheavals of the late 1920s and the early 1930s." Other of Huxley's inter-war works also ruminate on the early twentieth century and bear evidence of misgivings about the United States in particular. For example, Milton Birnbaum describes After Many a Summer Dies the Swan (1939) as "a sarcastic satire on the materialism in the United States"; and Jerome Meckier notes that the novel presents America as an "aesthetic jumble, an unprecedented explosion into cultural chaos."

Furthermore, Birnbaum argues that Huxley's inter-war "observations of life in the United States did not in any way make him more optimistic about the condition of the..."
world" and references the "America" chapter of Jesting Pilate to support this statement.\textsuperscript{71} Certainly, this section of Jesting Pilate, completed just before Brave New World, does suggest that Huxley sees the United States as rather like a technologically enhanced race of children without the cultural history, knowledge, or self-control to effectively wield its awesome cultural, technological, and military power.\textsuperscript{72} Peter Firchow comes to much the same conclusion in his discussion of the "America" section of Jesting Pilate in his book Aldous Huxley: Satirist and Novelist\textsuperscript{73}; and as Jerome Meckier argues, Huxley believed—much like José Ortega y Gasset—that "America is a case of arrested development despite technological advantages."\textsuperscript{74}

The epigram to this chapter sums up this issue well. Its dry, ironic edge is unmistakable, but Huxley's words make a historically accurate point: Pre-Depression, Post-Great War America was a veritable factory of cultural and material output. Eerily anticipating the boom and bust cycle of the middle and late 1990s and early 2000s, the United States in the 1920s experienced: a largely artificial stock market swell; the empowerment and rising regulatory dominance of the Federal Reserve; an economy-enhancing flood of mergers and acquisitions; and great leaps in technological progress including the radio, the automobile, and cinematic film.\textsuperscript{75}
As Gilman M. Ostrander argues, "the United States . . . emerged by the opening of the twentieth century as the industrial colossus of the world." And as research into 1920s America continues, "[h]istorians [are becoming] increasingly aware that beneath the glitter of the Jazz Age profound and far-reaching changes in American life were taking place." In the passage quoted in the epigram, though, Huxley diminishes America’s achievement by placing American cultural and economic progress of the 1920s on the small, artificial scale of a movie set: toys, props, and early special effects. By so diminishing, he not only reduces American achievement, he also reduces American power to a manageable, weakened standard.

This passage reflects Huxley’s methodology in Brave New World where America is a region easily controlled because of its primitivism and dominated by the technological and progressive Fordian Europe/England. Huxley’s base estimation of "savage reservation" America in Brave New World suggests this. It is, he writes, "'a place which, owing to unfavorable climactic or geological conditions, or poverty of natural resources, has not been worth the expense of civilizing.'" The America of Brave New World, then, is devoid of even the most minimal amount of political or cultural power. Thus, it is easily controlled.
and maintained by Fordian England. It is also stripped of political distinction and power and discussed only as America: the cultural, geographical, regional, and apolitical term discussed and defined in chapter one of this thesis.

In *Brave New World*, then, Huxley recreates the United States as the Europeans found America in the age of discovery. Huxley strips America of its early twentieth century equal and even dominant standing with Europe and recreates the United States in its originally weak, colonized, and uncivilized image: a relationship very like that between dominant Italy/Europe and the dominated enchanted island—which is America by many estimations—in *Brave New World's* namesake play. By weakening America to a state of apolitical, powerless primitivism in *Brave New World*, Huxley not only exemplifies what he sees as the primitive, unsophisticated nature of America. He allows Europe, and England in particular, to dominate the world and America once again. Therefore, the Anglo-American/European-American relationship of *Brave New World* represents an inversion from the reality of the 1920s. Rather than dominated by America, Europe and England are dominant in the novel. As Charles M. Holmes writes, "*Brave New World* is very London-oriented" while America is set in
the hinterlands of the Fordian world. Conversely, the novel’s America is a weakened region dominated and mired in cultural tradition which, as Congressman Lewis’ speech asserts, is precisely what weakened and ultimately destroyed Europe in the early part of the twentieth century.

The historical United States in the 1920s and early 1930s, though, was caught in the updrafts of Progressivism and *realpolitik* and was thus free to advance itself and develop as a world power. I believe, then, that there is great amount of interaction and indeed tension between America and Europe in *Brave New World* just as there was in the era in which Huxley wrote and published the novel. Scholars have even noted that Huxley reworked *Brave New World* in “May and June 1931 to make it fundamentally anti-American.” And besides bolstering the claim that there is a cultural inversion of New World America and Old World England in *Brave New World*, Jerome Meckier’s statement, based on Donald Watt’s work, “that the London of Brave New World is Fordian, that is, Americanized” suggests exactly what Huxley’s target is in *Brave New World*: early twentieth century American traits exaggerated and transplanted to better exemplify their dangerous eventual results.
Doubtlessly referring to "The American Dream: Brave New World and Ape and Essence"—the fifth chapter of Peter Firchow’s book Aldous Huxley: Satirist and Novelist—Jerome Meckier notes that "Peter Firchow pinpointed America as the inspiration for the brave new world," that is, Fordian England. Furthermore, Meckier notes that the England of Brave New World is "Fordian, that is, Americanized" because Huxley gives it traits of 1920s, prosperous America: "increased leisure . . . [,] food, drink, the company of . . . fellows, sexual enjoyment, and plenty of noisy distractions from without." Both Meckier and Firchow argue that the word Fordian essentially means "American" in Brave New World. And based on this conclusion, they assert that because England of Brave New World is Fordian, it is best labeled as "new world" England. Textually, these ideas are born out by the fact that Fordian England rejects everything old just as Huxley believed America did. After all, as quoted and discussed in chapter two of this thesis the prevailing opinion of Fordian England is, in Henry Ford’s words, that "History is bunk."

In addition to supporting my argument that England is the denotative New World of Brave New World, Peter Firchow and Jerome Meckier’s assertions create an interesting question:
why would Huxley recreate his homeland in the image of a
country and culture he mistrusted and was frequently
critical of throughout the 1920s and early 1930s?
Essentially, I believe Huxley textually recreated Fordian
England in twentieth century America’s image because even
though he was critical of the New World, Huxley believed
that England had to take on New World, US traits if it was
to at least survive or even thrive as the US was doing
across the Atlantic. Huxley seems to have been willing to
become something widely vilified in order to save England.
For example, when post-Great War England was distraught and
seemed to be spiraling into chaos, Huxley advocated
totalitarianism and Soviet-style dictatorship as a means to
salvation. This support for dictatorship was largely based
on his fear that England was spiraling with the rest of
Europe into chaos and his concurrent belief that only a
radically strong central government could bring about
salvation. Fears about Hitler and the power der Führer
received after the death of Hindenburg in 1934 eventually
cooled Huxley’s enthusiasm for totalitarianism. Thus by
fear Huxley’s enthusiasm for strong, executive government
was brought about and by fear it was dispelled.

Huxley’s 1920s and early 1930s era concerns about the
changing Anglo-American political, cultural, and military
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dynamic and his reluctance to accept modernity and the shift of power from Old World Europe/England to the New World United States also seem to have been largely based on confusion and fear. Living in the age of rabid and destructive nationalism, botched peace treaties that foreshadowed even more disastrous wars, and the breaking down of global power structures that had stood since the late Renaissance, Huxley’s generation of Moderns faced what was arguably the greatest era of cultural re-creation and instability since the Industrial Revolution. The actual, historical shift of power and cultural dominance from the Old World to the New was just one part of this revolutionary period, but it represents a major aspect of Huxley’s inter-war life and his inter-war novel Brave New World. As if attempting to restore the dynamic he was all too aware was shifting during his own lifetime, Huxley either purposefully or inadvertently used the methods outlined in the two subsequent chapters of this thesis to redraft the world according to his own conservative design: New World America as the secondary, dominated region and Old World Europe/England as the primary power over the US and the World.

One can imagine Huxley and his contemporaries reading the headlines, perceiving the discourse, absorbing the
zeitgeist, and wondering about what the world was going to be like after the dust of the Great War and radical transition and revolution settled. In the context of the Old World/New World dynamic and its place in Brave New World, the West was determinedly moving toward a new order and a new power dynamic. Therefore, unlike John Donne's great compass-conceit, the direction gauge of Modernism represents nothing like order, guidance, or perfect circulation. Rather, the Modern measure of world power was caught in transition and seems to have been unsure as to whether political and cultural power would be concentrated in the New World or the Old, in America or Europe. The Modern judgment of world power and its cultural and political future, then, is more like a compass set too close to either pole: spinning erratically, cardinals unsure, directions confused. Even the relationship of five-hundred year old, historical standards like Old World and New were in a state of flux, shifting like the hanged John Savage at the Surrey lighthouse:

Slowly, very slowly, like two unhurried compass needles, the feet turned towards the right; north, north-east, east, south-east, south-south-west; then paused, and, after a few seconds, turned as unhurriedly back towards the left. South-south-west, south, south-east, east. . . .
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If [our soules] be two, they are two so
As stiffe twin compasses are two,
Thy soule the fixt foot, makes no show
To move, but doth, if the'other doe.

And though it in the center sit,
Yet when the other far doth rome,
It leanes, and hearkens after it,
And growes erect, as that comes home.

Such wilt thou be to mee, who must
Like th'other food, obliquely run;
Thy firmness drawes my circle just,
And makes me end, where I begunne.

Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 199.
CHAPTER 4

INVERSION THROUGH SHAKESPEARE

The previous chapter attempts to establish a reason for the New World/Old World inversion of Brave New World. However, the fourth and fifth chapters of this thesis shift focus from arguing why the inversion occurs to arguing "how" it occurs by examining two methods Huxley uses—whether intentionally or inadvertently—to achieve the New World/Old World inversion of Brave New World. Shakespeare's substantial and multi-faceted presence in Brave New World is the first of the two methods I examine; and complementing the important role the Bard plays in Brave New World, Huxley suggests in the final essay of his life that Shakespeare's "name . . . is a household word, and a word that is on everybody's lips."¹ Thirty years later, Harold Bloom argues that Shakespeare's legacy transcends mere name recognition and places him as the central figure of the Western literary cannon.² Even as theoretical and canonical shifts in literary study become routine—shifts drastically antithetical to Bloom's views—Shakespeare's
reputation remains perpetually intact, his place at the head of the literary table virtually unchallenged.

Marjorie Garber echoes these sentiments in her article “Hamlet: Giving up the Ghost” where she questions contemporary scholars and readers who continually return to Shakespeare to test their methods and substantiate their interpretations:

Why do we still maintain the centrality of Shakespeare? Why in a time of cannon expansion and critique of canonical literature does Shakespeare not only remain unchallenged, but in fact emerge newly canonized, as the proliferation of new critical anthologies—alternative shakespeares, Political Shakespeare, Shakespeare and the Question of Theory attests? Why with the current renaissance in Renaissance studies, is Shakespeare still the touchstone for new historicists, feminists, deconstructors? Why, in other words, do those who criticize canonical authority so often turn to Shakespeare to ratify the authority of their critique?

In her later article “Shakespeare as Fetish,” Garber seems to offer possible answers to the central issue raised by these questions. She notes that Shakespeare exists “as the anchor of the [English literary] cannon,” “the fantasy of originary cultural wholeness, the last vestige of universalism[,]” and “the dream-space of nostalgia for the aging undergraduate.” Garber even goes as far as to suggest that Shakespeare, as a fetish figure, “amounts to a version of the same thing [as God]” because readers and scholars have a need to believe in “something, in someone, all-
knowing and immutable."⁵ To Garber, "'Shakespeare' ... [is ultimately] a concept—and a construct—rather than an author."⁶ He is the ghost of English literature who "haunts postmodern England and postmodern America ... [as] the superego of literature ... in an imposed, undecidable, but self-chosen attribution of paternity."⁷

Garber’s articles imply the international fetishization of Shakespeare. However, apart from his role as the unser Shakespeare of Germany, the postcolonial Shakespeare of Africa and the Caribbean, and the American Shakespeare of Summer festivals from Alabama to Utah,⁸ many consider Shakespeare to be a primarily English icon-fetish. Shakespeare’s role in the Old World/New World inversion of Brave New World rests on this place as an elevated English cultural figure and as an important representative of Old World culture. Specifically, in Brave New World Huxley transplants Shakespeare to America where the American John Savage, rather than the English, preserve and venerate him. In this way, Huxley recreates Shakespeare as an American icon-fetish; and the transplantation helps recast England as the New World and America as the Old because Shakespeare and his works help to reveal that “Old World” America functions according to certain social systems antithetical to and archaic in comparison to those of Fordian England.
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Thus, Shakespeare and Shakespearean literature help to suggest that America and England are inverted as the New and Old Worlds in Brave New World.

In the preface to The Genius of Shakespeare, Jonathan Bate suggests the extent to which England venerates Shakespeare and establishes the idea that England sees the Bard as their icon. Bate writes that in contemporary English life,

[Shakespeare] seems to be everywhere. He is quoted and adapted daily in newspaper headlines and advertising copy. He is the only compulsory author in the National Curriculum and in Advanced Level English Literature in schools. He has a national, massively subsidized theatre company named after him and committed to the regular revival of all his works. Driving down the M6 motorway, you pass signs indicating the new county you are entering: Cheshire, Staffordshire, Warwickshire. But the sign does not say "Warwickshire"—it says "Warwickshire: Shakespeare’s County". Handing over a cheque guarantee card, one presents as a mark of its authenticity a hologram of Shakespeare’s head.

Furthermore, Bate presents a culture bound to Shakespeare and one that privileges him above most, if not all, other cultural figures. Bate notes that the English government produces official interpretations of Shakespeare’s plays that serve as “guardian[s] of the value system of the established powers” and also discusses the government’s attempts to “wrest [Shakespeare] away from foreigners” so the English can reconstruct him as a uniquely English writer. Therefore while The Genius of Shakespeare, other of
Bate's works, and Garber's articles clearly exhibit the dynamic, international Shakespeare whose works and "genius"—as Bate refers to it—are continually interpreted and modified to reflect the zeitgeist of any given period or national culture. The Genius of Shakespeare bears strong evidence that for good or ill the English frequently interpret Shakespeare as a writer who is fundamentally theirs. As Bate writes, Shakespeare is ultimately "the prize waxwork in the museum of the [English] national heritage."13

This passionately nationalistic view of Shakespeare seems to have existed since the earliest days of Shakespeare's legacy. For example, Ben Jonson lauds Shakespeare in the well-known preface to the 1623 First Folio as an English playwright who stands with the great dramatists of ancient Europe. He writes,

And though thou hadst small Latin, and less Greek,  
From thence to honour thee I would not seek 
For names, but call forth thundering Aeschylus,  
Euripides, and Sophocles to us,  
Pacuvius, Accius, him of Cordova dead,  
To life again, to hear thy buskin tread 
And shake a stage; or when thy socks were on, 
Leave thee alone for the comparison 
Of all that insolent Greece or haughty Rome  
Sent forth, or since did from their ashes come.  
Triumph, my Britain, thou hast one to show  
To whom all scenes of Europe homage owe.14
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Jonathan Bate outlines, with a trace of irony, the next stages of Shakespeare's development as a nationalistic, English icon: "[h]e rose to pre-eminence in the period 1660-1830 on the back of the British Empire, the strength of the middle class and the reaction against the French Revolution." Bate's book *Shakespeare and the English Romantic Imagination* covers much of Shakespeare's development as an English icon during the early 1800s; and in *The Genius of Shakespeare*, Bate gives an overview of the Victorian and early twentieth century development of Shakespeare as an English icon or, as Bate terms him, the "National Poet." Bate argues that the contemporary understanding of Shakespeare as an English icon/fetish has its roots and perhaps greatest popularity in this early twentieth century period: precisely when Aldous Huxley was coming of age at Oxford and several years later, in 1932, when he published *Brave New World*. The connection between Huxley, *Brave New World*, and the early twentieth century English concept of Shakespeare is much more specific, though, than this statement suggests.

In his description of Shakespeare's place as an English icon during the Modern period, Bate criticizes late Victorian/early twentieth century scholars whom he
mordantly labels the "guardians and propagators of Shakespeare's reputation." As examples of these scholars, he lists "men like A.C. Bradley, Sir Walter Raleigh, John Dover Wilson, T.S. Eliot and G. Wilson Knight." Bate makes it clear that, in large part because of the politics of the World Wars and especially the early twentieth century aggression of Germany, these men were very influential in establishing Shakespeare as a particularly English figure linked with the nationalism of the day. To support this idea, Bate examines two specific works that were published just after the turn of the twentieth century: A.C. Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy* (1904) and Walter Raleigh's *William Shakespeare* (1907).

Raleigh transformed the study of Shakespeare into a nationalistic crusade: a transformation that fits perfectly into and that was probably the result of the early twentieth century nationalism outlined in the previous chapter of this thesis. Like the scholar's highly political 1918 British Academy lecture "Shakespeare and England," Raleigh's *William Shakespeare* did much to establish Shakespeare as a particularly nationalistic English icon in the early twentieth century. Raleigh's form of Shakespearean criticism has been characterized as "celebration of the National Bard as the guardian of all
that England was fighting for against the philistine Hun" 
and as a "[fulmination] against the perversion of 
Shakespeare on the part of German philologists."²²

While Raleigh clearly seems to have influenced English 
society in general, he had a particular influence on Aldous 
Huxley. Raleigh was one of Huxley's major professors at 
Oxford; and clearly, Raleigh influenced Huxley's views on 
English literature in general and his views of Shakespeare 
in particular. For example, in almost a dozen of his 
letters, Huxley mentions Raleigh, including the scholar's 
lectures and the coursework he assigns. These letters cover 
a period of five years and show Raleigh and Huxley in close 
contact from university coursework to, in the last years, 
Huxley hoping Raleigh can help him gain employment "at 
Oxford or elsewhere."²³ Huxley's intimate connection to 
Raleigh and his tutelage under an air of extreme, 
nationalistic veneration of Shakespeare as an English icon 
exhibit not only a possible reason for Huxley's life-long 
veneration of Shakespeare. They also suggest that he, like 
Raleigh and turn-of-the-twentieth-century England, 
understood the Bard to be a particularly English icon and 
that he wrote these feelings, in one form or another, into 
Brave New World. This conclusion recreates the migration of 
Shakespeare from England to America in Brave New World as a
violent seizure of a national fetish wherein the absence of Shakespeare—arguably England’s most important cultural icon—highlights Fordian England’s inversion from Old World to New. Thus, England’s status in the novel as the dominant New World comes at a price: the loss of its national icon and central cultural figure.

Reflecting on this issue in light of Brave New World’s historical context and in light of Huxley’s 1920s and 30s feelings about America as a cultural wasteland and as a society of ever-refreshing newness, Huxley seems to assert in Brave New World that any New World is inherently devoid of culture on such a scale that even its nationalistic icon-fetishes are discarded. Even though the New World of Brave New World is England, Huxley’s true goal seems to be a characterization of the New World in general. In the temporal/historical sense, this means the United States: the New World whose dominance Huxley dreaded in the 1920s and 30s because he felt it would bring with it the loss of culture, widespread ignorance, and the decline of enthusiasm for art. After all, as Mond’s “whisk, whisk” gesture suggests such things are merely whisked away like dust in the New World. Nationalistic fetishes are built on tradition and cultural legacy: two things antithetical to the concept of the New World—especially Philip Fisher’s
concept of the *New World*—and two things Huxley clearly felt were lacking in temporal New World America.

It makes sense, then, that in *Brave New World* the Old World American Reservation Savages—rather than the New World Fordian English—fetishize Shakespeare and maintain his legacy. Only the former possesses tradition and cultural heritage necessary to maintain icons and understand them in the first place. The Americans preserve Shakespeare’s plays in their sacred "Antelope Kiva . . . for hundreds of years" and then through the sensibility of John Savage. When John receives *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, he immediately approaches the text with primitive logocentrism and religious veneration. To him, Shakespeare’s *Complete Works* is a holy book. John describes the plays’ language as a "terrible[,] beautiful magic" and as "talking thunder." The words remind him of religious "drums at the summer dances," the medicine man "Mitsima’s magic," and the "men [of the Savage Reservation] singing the [sacred] Corn Song." The language of the plays even "[explain] and [give] orders" and nearly haunt John’s every thought. Using Garber’s words, then, I believe Shakespeare “amounts to a version of the same thing [as God]” for the American John Savage.
For example, the Bard controls John's comprehension of the world around him. As Ira Grushow observes, "Shakespeare's morality has invaded [John's] consciousness"; and as Charles Holmes writes, pre-Fordian "Shakespearean values," "Shakespearean morality," and "Shakespearean socio-ethical concepts" dominate John's life. Since the American uses these systems to comprehend the world around him, he imposes these values on the "London he [is] thrust into" and on his relationship with Lenina. John even uses Shakespearean points of view to understand the world of the New Mexican reservation: his home. Shakespeare's plays are, after all, what allow John to express his hatred of Popé, his mother's abusive lover. Shakespeare's words give "him a reason for hating Popé; and they [make] his hatred more real; they even [make] Popé himself more real."

In contrast to the godlike position that Shakespeare occupies in John's life, the English as a whole do not even remember the Bard. Certainly, the World State locks away books such as Shakespeare's works and the Bible from the general population, but the major reason why the English no longer fetishize Shakespeare is not because of his absence from their lives. They do not preserve Shakespeare's legacy or works because of the differences between their world and
Shakespeare's plays. In response to John's question why the AF English cannot understand Othello, Mustapha Mond states, "Because our world is not the same as Othello's world." English society has been modified to such a degree that the English can no longer comprehend the writer or the works most central to its cultural heritage.

Such differences between America and England are best revealed through Shakespeare's plays; and ultimately as John's fetishization of Shakespeare suggests, the idea of Shakespeare as a fetish is inescapably linked to his works. Both Garber and Bate suggest this idea, arguing that Shakespeare's continuing "presence is in the performed" and that Shakespeare's "iconic power belongs to Hamlet, Macbeth, Iago, and the rest" rather than to Shakespeare the man. Garber concentrates on King Hamlet's ghost as Shakespeare's continuing presence while Bate includes several more characters. Both scholars essentially agree, though, that Shakespeare's legacy, continuing presence, and fetishization are based in his plays rather than on his vague, almost wholly unsubstantiated biography. In fact, as Garber notes, Shakespeare "whoever he is, or was" is more an idea now, more a cultural icon than a biographical person. Even Huxley, in "Shakespeare and Religion," cleverly notes that Shakespeare "penned no memoirs" and
that "he merely left us Shakespeare's Complete Works . . . [w]hatever else he may have been." 40

Reflecting the observations of Garber, Bate, and Huxley, the fusion of Shakespeare and his works—the works being the manifestation and living form of the man—create the sustained presence of the American-bound Shakespeare in Brave New Word. He exists and is continually renewed through his plays, mostly, "through the extent and variety of the Shakespearian [sic] references and quotations . . . [which] are spread through the novel, in eleven of its eighteen chapters." 41 John Savage, always keeping his fetish at the forefront of his experience, provides the "great majority" of these quotations and references "in mouth and mind," 42 and he "speaks . . . very largely in quotations from Shakespeare." 43 The plays are mostly present in Brave New World in this way, and they most significantly suggest the difference between Shakespeare's world and America—the world of emotion, imperfection, and art—with that of AF England—the world of science, eugenics, and stability.

Essentially, Shakespeare's plays help accentuate the difference between the polar ends of social and human stability and suggest which end the American Reservation Savages and the AF English occupy. AF England has advanced past social instability which is a necessary ingredient for
art, especially tragedy. Edward Lobb argues this, noting that "[w]ithout conflict and isolation three can be no tragedy" and that "[a] properly organized society simply precludes tragedy." World Controller Mond makes a similar assertion in Brave New World:

You can't make flivvers 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.

Mond's list is not only what the AF English culture has achieved. It is also a list of the very ingredients of tragedy, especially Shakespearean tragedy. Family relations, lovers' quarrels, jealousy, desire, love—Old World England has evolved into a society without these archaic frailties and has become the socially progressive, eugenicized New World: a place that hasn't "any use for old things" like Shakespeare, like social/human volatility and imperfection. In New World England of Huxley's novel, those like Mond who govern society "don't want people to be attracted by old things" like Shakespeare and social instability; they want them to "like the new ones."
Opposed to this type of society, Brave New World's Southwestern America maintains certain relics of social interaction that make it a proper place to preserve Shakespearean literature and, thus, a significant part of Old World culture. A comparison of Mond's previously quoted description of AF England with the description of the American Reservation supports this idea.

As if moving back in time from New World England and the World State to an earlier time in human history, Lenina and Bernard leave Santa Fe and "[cross] the frontier that separate[s] civilization from savagery" and the New World from the Old. They see, at the foot of the dividing fence, a scene rife with implications of human-dominated, violent natural selection that would make Huxley's grandfather proud. Littering the ground surrounding "the geometrical symbol of triumphant human purpose," Lenina and Bernard survey

a mosaic of white bones, a still unrotted carcase dark on the tawny ground marked the place where deer or steer, puma or porcupine or coyote, or the greedy turkey buzzards drawn down by the whiff of carrion and fulminated as though by poetic justice, had come too close to the destroying wires.

Once they arrive at the Reservation, "it [is] as though the whole air [has] come alive and [pulses], [pulses] with the indefatigable movement of blood." The English visitors
also see "the dirt, the piles of rubbish, the dust, the
dogs, the flies" of the place, things no longer present in
Fordian England. Huxley even describes a representative
member of the reservation that contrasts with the robust
health of the New World English:

An almost naked Indian was very slowly climbing down the
ladder . . . . His face was profoundly wrinkled and
black, like a mask of obsidian. The toothless mouth had
fallen in. At the corners of the lips, and on each side
of the chin, a few long bristles gleamed almost white
against the dark skin. The long unbraided hair hung down
in grey wisps round his face. His body was bent and
emaciated to the bone, almost fleshless.

Bernard and Lenina also see mothers breast feeding their
children, a "revoltingly viviparous" and "indecent" scene,
and are exposed to "[a] dead dog . . . lying on a rubbish
heap" and "a woman with a goiter . . . looking for lice in
the hair of a small girl."

Such scenes contrast with the engineered healthiness and
social stability of AF England, and the final lines of John
Savage’s discussion with Mustapha Mond at the end of
chapter twelve sum up the ultimate difference between the
cultures and, in turn, why Shakespeare can be preserved in
America and not England and thus why America is the Old
World of Brave New World. John asserts that he "like[s] the
inconveniences" of "fear and rage" while the Controller
claims the New World English do not, preferring "to do
things comfortably."\textsuperscript{54} John’s response to this statement is the very core of Shakespeare’s and all literary works. He exclaims that he doesn’t “want comfort.” Rather, he wants “God . . ., poetry . . ., real danger. . . , freedom . . ., goodness . . ., and sin.” Then by saying “I claim them all,” John asserts his right to grow old and ugly and impotent; the right to have syphilis and cancer; the right to have too little to eat; the right to be lousy; the right to live in constant apprehension of what may happen to-morrow; the right to catch typhoid; the right to be tortured by unspeakable pains of every kind.\textsuperscript{55}

Such human and social imperfections are the fabric of Shakespearean literature; and as much as AF England does not reflect these qualities, the American Savage Reservation is a place rife with imperfect human experience. Therefore, it is also a place where Shakespeare can be preserved, venerated, and understood.

As much as English society has progressed, Fordian Southwestern America has not. Reflecting Shakespeare’s plays, the region has maintained social instability and human volatility. In comparison to AF England, the American Southwest of Brave New World is aligned with “the ancient order of things” and “early or bygone times”\textsuperscript{56} like the world of Shakespeare’s plays. Fordian England mightily contrasts with this characterization; and in Brave New
Word, the regions customarily associated with the terms Old World and New are inverted. Rather than England, Southwestern America—Turner and Thoreau’s New World of the New World—is the preserver of ancient, bygone times and an archaic social structure most clearly revealed through the major icon/fetish of customary Old World/English culture: Shakespeare and his works. As Huxley suggests in his Hearst Essay “New World Drama,” the Elizabethan Shakespeare and his works and themes are essentially relics of the Old World anyway. Thus, because it preserves Shakespeare and his literature, Huxley recasts America as the Old World while simultaneously recreating England—because of its rejection of Shakespeare and his literature—as the New.

In Brave New World, then, Shakespeare has made a cultural and geographical shift from England to America. This shift helps create an inversion of the Old World and the New since the culture of Hamlet, King Lear, and Othello more closely resembles life on the New Mexican Reservation than life in AF England. Thus in accordance with Mond’s argument, the Americans are better able to understand, appreciate, and preserve Shakespeare because of their archaic culture. This issue helps align America with the Old World and one of its major figures: Shakespeare.
The transplantation of the comprehension, valuation, and preservation of Shakespeare to America from England in *Brave New World* is a major indicator that the customary Old World no longer exists in Europe but, rather, in America. America is therefore reconstructed as the Old World through its preservation of a major Old World figure and by living in denotative Old World ways. England, conversely, is the bastion of progression, development, and human and social eugenics. There is an inversion, then, in the usual New World/Old World dynamic that the transmigration of Shakespeare and the preservation of him as a fetish figure help to achieve.
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CHAPTER 5

INVERSION THROUGH RELIGION

Of the subjects that dominated Huxley’s life and permeate his works, only religion approaches—and perhaps even eclipses—Shakespeare. As I suggest and examine in the fourth chapter of this thesis, Huxley’s passion for both these topics found an oddly coincidental union in the final essay of his life: “Shakespeare and Religion.” In this essay, Huxley examines the cooperative and complementary relationship he believes exists between Shakespeare and religion; and the concluding lines stylistically and argumentatively suggest a balance between the two subjects and predict their mutual destinies. These lines read: “We are well on the way to an existential religion of mysticism. How many kinds of religion! How many kinds of Shakespeare!”

As I also explore in chapter four of this thesis, Shakespeare and religion interact in Brave New World as well, most significantly through John Savage’s fetishistic approach to Shakespeare. Such amorphous spirituality, or “religion of mysticism” as Huxley terms it, is the type of
denominationless approach to the religious impulse that scholars such as Milton Birnbaum and June Deery associate with Huxley’s works and biography as well as what Huxley himself spiritually identified with. A significant distinction exists, though, between this generalized spirituality and the type of systemic, organized religion relevant to the Old World/New World inversion of Brave New World.

Huxley was a dedicated, life-long student of religion, and he understood that religion is a multifaceted, difficult-to-define term:

And what about “religion”? The word is used to designate things as different from one another as Satanism and satori, as fetish-worship and the enlightenment of a Buddha, as the vast politico-theologico-financial organisations known as churches and the intensely private visions of an ecstatic. A Quaker silence is religion, so is Verdi’s Requiem. A sense of the blessed All-Rightness of the Universe is a religious experience and so is the sick soul’s sense of self-loathing, of despair, of sin, in a world that is the scene of perpetual perishing and inevitable death.

Huxley’s concept of “vast politico-theologico-financial organizations known as churches” most closely reflects the function of religion in the New World/Old World inversion of Brave New World. Specifically, the inversion centers on organized forms of worship socially sanctioned and collectively participated in in order to venerate transcendent figure(s) and/or concept(s).
This definition of religion reflects those of Samuel Johnson's dictionary and the OED which define the term as a "system of divine faith and worship" and what one might consider the religious rites and rituals of holy participation. Additionally, religion as a function of the Old World/New World inversion of *Brave New World* closely resembles the extension of William James' definition of religion, namely the "ecclesiastical organizations" that "secondarily grow" out of "the feelings, acts, and experiences of individual men in their solitude, so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider the divine" [James' italics]. This definition contrasts with James' description of religious mysticism which he, like Huxley and John Savage, believes acts as "the root and centre . . . [of] personal religious experience" and which he defines as ineffable, noetic, transient, and passive.

Therefore while Huxley argues that "[r]eligion is not merely a complex of behaviour-patterns and organizations" but also "a set of beliefs," the term religion also refers to the institutional types of religious organization, "the complex of behaviour-patterns," and the "organizations" and "denominational forms" of religion. These best characterize religion's role in the Old World/New World inversion.
inversion of *Brave New World*; and however one refers to them—as "denominational forms" of religion, as "ecclesiastical organizations," or as "vast politico-theologico-financial organizations known as churches"—Huxley presents two socially organized religious systems in *Brave New World*: the American Reservation Savages' syncretistic religion and the technologically enhanced, orgiastic sex cult of Fordian England.

Huxley describes the American Savages' "religion . . . [as] half fertility cult and half Penitente [Huxley's italics] ferocity."\(^{13}\) Additionally, John Savage implicitly links his religious experiences with the Penitentes,\(^ {14}\) and Edward Lobb argues that the American Savages' religion is a "syncretistic . . . nature-cult which demands ritual punishment and sacrificial victims."\(^ {15}\) Peter Firchow suggests that Huxley "combin[es] an Indian fertility cult with a Christian penitential ritual" to create the American Savages' religion\(^ {16}\); and finally, Raymond Legg comes to many of the same conclusions, noting that the religion of the American Savages is "a religious syncretism" that employs "syncretistic ceremonial rites."\(^ {17}\) The Fordian English religion, in contrast, is nowhere near as widely defined or discussed by Huxley scholars. Therefore, I dedicate some of the latter part of this chapter to categorizing it as a
technologically enhanced, orgiastic sex-cult like those of the ancient world.

These two religious systems differ in important ways that set-up essential contrasts between the two religions and that help establish Brave New World's New World/Old World inversion. The American Savages' religion is frozen in traditional practice and embodies "the ancient order" and "early or bygone" orthodoxies of its root religions: Puebloan spiritualism and Christianity. Therefore, in the America of Brave New World, the temporal New World is the mainstay of a primitive, older form of religion. It is no longer, as De Tocqueville argues, the region where Old World/European religion is modified, innovated, and recreated. Rather, America is the Old World where archaic religious practices and traditions are maintained. In comparison, the orgiastic sex cult—or "Solidarity Services" and "Community Sings" of the AF English is actually quite advanced even though it has ancient roots. Therefore, unlike De Tocqueville's Old World Europe that maintains religious tradition and practices older forms of religion, England, the representative of the Old World in Brave New World, is the region of religious innovation.

While certain aspects of each religious system do arise periodically throughout Brave New World, Huxley presents
the English and American religious practices in two major
scenes: a fact that stands in marked contrast to the
pervasiveness and nearly continual presence of Shakespeare
in the novel.24 As Dominic Baker-Smith writes, “In Brave New
World religion features scarcely at all: the Savage mutters
with romantic obscurity about God and, when haunted by
unclean thoughts, provides a convincing imitation of St
[sic] Benedict rolling on thorns and nettles.”25

Huxley introduces the American Savages’ religious
practices just after Bernard and Lenina arrive at the New
Mexican reservation. The pair is immediately thrust into
the ceremony which is clearly a syncretistic blend of
Pueblo traditions, Christianity, and the more generalized
nature/fertility cultism Edward Lobb, Peter Firchow, and
Huxley suggest. However, the use of the nebulous and ill-
deﬁned terms “nature cult” and “fertility cult” are wholly
unnecessary because the American Savages’ religion can be
linked explicitly with the well-deﬁned and well-studied
Puebloan and Christian traditions.

This argument is substantiated by the snake handling
aspect of the American Savages’ religion. After passing
“two Indians”—one of whom carries a “writhing snake”—Lenina
and Bernard enter the ceremonial kiva and see the ceremony
dance leader pull “a pair of black snakes” out of “a big
wooden chest. After the worshiping American Savages respond to this action with "a great yell," the leader then "[dips] back into the chest for more" snakes: "[m]ore and more, black snakes and brown and mottled-he [flings] them out." The ceremonial participants then proceed to dance with the snakes, "[r]ound and round . . . snakily, with a soft undulating movement at the knees and hips."  

Snakes indeed serve various roles in nature-centered religions. Examples include snakes as symbols of life and death, regeneration, and as creator/destroyer figures. However, snake dances and snake veneration as described by Huxley in Brave New World exist as traditional parts of both Hopi/Puebloan and Pentecostal/Charismatic Christian cultures. For example, Earle R. Forrest's book The Snake Dance of the Hopi Indians outlines the Puebloan fetishization of snakes as does a short piece D.H. Lawrence wrote entitled "The Hopi Snake Dance" (1924). Peter Firchow even believes the Lawrence essay influenced Huxley's creation of the American Reservation Savages' religion. Additionally, religious anthropologists such as Jim Birckhead, non-fiction writers such as Dennis Covington, and psychologists such as Weston La Barre all outline the phenomenon of Pentecostal snake-handling. The syncretism of the American Savages' religion can be
concretely characterized like most syncretistic religions, then, as a combination of Christianity and some form of aboriginal religion.\textsuperscript{33}

The Christian and Puebloan gods and myth-figures John invokes also support this claim. For example, John compares himself to Palowhtiwa, a legendary Puebloan hero:

"I [Huxley's italics] ought to have been there," the young man went on. "Why wouldn't they let me be the sacrifice? I'd have gone round ten times - twelve, fifteen. Palowhtiwa only got as far as seven [laps around the snake pit]."\textsuperscript{34}

John also references Jesus and Pookong—or Püükon, one of the twin Puebloan war gods\textsuperscript{35}—as gods who must be appeased through sacrifice and whipping. Lenina asks John, "'Do you mean to say that you wanted [Huxley's italics] to be hit with that whip," and John responds in the affirmative, saying he'd do it "[f]or the sake of the pueblo—to make the rain come and the corn grow. And to please Pookong and Jesus."\textsuperscript{36} Peter Firchow discusses this point briefly in The End of Utopia when he suggests that Püükon's twin Balonga, "in Brave New World . . . has been replaced by Christ."\textsuperscript{37} This point certainly seems plausible since the likeness of the eagle—a war totem—and the crucifix loom over the American Savages' religious ceremony.

John also prays to a menagerie of deities, including his personal fetish Shakespeare in the process. John spends
hours on his knees praying, now to that Heaven from which the guilty Claudius had begged forgiveness, now in Zuñi to Awonawilona, now to Jesus and Pookong, now to his own guardian animal, the eagle. 

Also, in what is perhaps the most prominent single moment of religious syncretism in Brave New World, John remembers being a child and listening to the Reservation spiritual leaders, the "old men of the pueblo," as they spoke of the great Transformer of the world, and of the long fight between the Right Hand and Left Hand, between Wet and Dry; of Awonawilona, who made a great fog by thinking in the night, and then made the whole world out of the fog; of Earth Mother and Sky Father; of Ahaiyuta and Marsailema; of Mary and Etsanatlehi, the woman who makes herself young again; of the Black Stone at Laguna and the Great Eagle and Our Lady of Acoma . . . of Heaven and London and Our Lady of Acoma and the rows and rows of babies in clean bottles and Jesus flying up and Linda flying up and the great Director of World Hatcheries and Awonawilona.

All these scenes offer explicit textual evidence of the syncretistic and traditional nature of the American Savages' religion. In them, the conventional deities of Christianity and Puebloan culture are fused into one primitive religion and worshiped through one set of syncretistic, traditional religious rites that help reveal America is the Old World of Brave New World.

Furthermore, Huxley notes that the American Savages participating in the religious ceremony have "[h]ideously masked and painted" faces which—as Elsie Clews Parsons writes in her multi-volume work that Peter Firchow refers
to as a "massive study of Pueblo Indian Religion"—are an important part of traditional Pueblo ceremony. Additionally, after the participants toss the snakes to the floor at the command of the dance leader "an old man [comes] up from the underground and [sprinkles the snakes] with corn meal" while a woman sprinkles the snakes "with water from a black jar." This fetishization of corn, the sprinkling of water, and what follows this process—the presentation of a "painted image of an eagle"—are all directly borrowed from traditional, ancient Puebloan religious rites.

Then when the ceremony leaders present the eagle totem, Huxley also reveals one of the major Christian/Catholic aspects of the religion. Along with the eagle, the American Savages raise the single-most identifiable and traditional symbol of Christianity: "a man, naked, and nailed to a cross." As Huxley confirms at the end of the ceremony scene, the crucifix and the eagle then loom over the kiva and the ceremony in a partnership that once again strongly suggests the syncretistic nature of the American Savages' religion:

The eagle and the man on the cross kept guard for a little while over the empty pueblo; then, as though they had seen enough, sank slowly down through their hatchways, out of sight, into the nether world.
The mixture of Pueblo rites and Catholicism, especially Penitente influenced Catholicism, continues under the watch of these two figures as the ceremony progresses toward conclusion. A "tall man wearing the mask of a coyote" summons a boy from the crowd and whips him repeatedly as the boy circles the "writing heap of snakes." This practice of encircling a "bower" of snakes, as Parsons terms it, is part of the Puebloan Snake-Antelope ceremony. However, it also reflects the Catholic mystics' traditional practice of walking church labyrinths: "as paths of repentance and symbolic [pilgrimage]"; as symbolic journeys through "the world of sin"; as "[p]ath[s] to [r]edemption"; and/or as a type of "Easter Dance . . . through purgatory . . . [to] resurrection." The whipping also reflects both cultures: the Pueblo—who used whipping for rituals as diverse as exorcism and crop/weather ceremonies as well as for "[p]unishment, [wergild-esque] expiation, cleansing from nightmare or sickness, freeing from danger from ritual infection, or from danger of knowledge of the supernatural, inducement to the gods to send compensatory blessings, [and] imparting power"—and the Penitente Catholic.

The tradition-bound Penitentes use whipping as one of several humiliation and pain rites that include foot washing, incisions, and mock-crucifixion. The group has
its roots in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when Franciscan flagellation rites were introduced to Latin America. However, Lorayne Ann Horka-Follick argues that the ultimate roots of their practices lie in the Medieval Period. Therefore while the sect itself, properly known as Los Hermanos Penitentes, dates from the early 1800s, their customs—especially whipping which Huxley emphasizes in Brave New World—are much more archaic, medieval in fact. While perhaps not "ancient" by contemporary standards, the group would be nearly eight hundred years old by Brave New World's year of action (AF 632 or 2579 AD) and their practices would be even older still. In contrast to the contemporarily bound, New World English who are caught in an ever-refreshing present and who are engineered not "to be attracted by old things" but to "like the new ones," the traditional, Old World Penitente and Puebloan religious cultures would be significantly and perhaps even incomprehensibly ancient and archaic.

Huxley also uses direct and indirect language to establish the American Savages' religion as an older, more primitive form of worship. This fact is not lost on Tilmann Vetter who writes that the religion of the American Savages—in contrast to the technologically enhanced orgiastic sex cult of the AF English—is "marked by old
religious beliefs and ceremonies."\textsuperscript{57} For example, Lenina draws a comparison between what might be termed the natural or primitive sound made by the American Savages' organic, primitive ceremonial drums, and the technologically enhanced "synthetic noises made at Solidarity Services and Ford's Day celebrations."\textsuperscript{58}

Also, as if the American Savages have reverted to a primitive form of humanity, Huxley uses an animalistic term to describe the "neighing treble" of the American women's religious song; and he characterizes the men's chant as a "deep savage affirmation of their manhood."\textsuperscript{59} The American Savages also swarm like Paleozoic insects from "underground," from "the lower world"; and amid the "sound of subterranean flute playing," they exit "underground chambers" on "ladder[s] emerging from the lower darkness . . . painted out of all semblance of humanity."\textsuperscript{60} Finally, returning to their cavernous grottoes when the ceremony ends, several of the American Savages take the Christ and Eagle totems and "[sink] slowly down through their hatchways, out of sight, into the nether world."\textsuperscript{61} Such statements suggest that the American Savages have returned, through their religion, to a more primitive, cave-dwelling time in human history. They, therefore, remain caught in the Old World.
Further suggesting an evolutionary asymmetry between the Americans and the English, the latter actually watch the Americans' religious ceremony from above and look down onto the religious participants as if on a more primeval race of mankind.\textsuperscript{62} Then continuing this metaphoric elevation opposition, the religious rites or Solidarity Services of the AF English actually take place high aboveground in a "gigantically beautiful" building called the "Fordson Community Singery" or simply the "Singery."\textsuperscript{63} Its elevation, advanced architecture, and technology stand in stark contrast to the subterranean primitiveness of the American Savages' religious ceremony and kiva; and the description of the building leaves little doubt that England is the New World.

Flood-lighted, its three hundred and twenty metres of white Carrara-surrogate gleamed with a snowy incandescence over Ludgate Hill; at each of the four corners of its helicopter platform an immense T shone crimson against the night, and from the mouths of twenty-four vast golden trumpets rumbled a solemn synthetic music. . . .

The great auditorium for Ford's Day celebrations and other massed Community Sings was at the bottom of the building. Above it, a hundred to each floor, were the seven thousand rooms used by Solidarity Groups for their fortnightly services.\textsuperscript{64}

Additionally, the Fordian ceremony itself is quite technologically advanced in comparison to American Savages' religion. Therefore, the advanced, elevated structure
complements and reflects the highly developed Fordian religious rituals. For example, when the service begins, the service leader or "President" switches on cloyingly enhanced, synthetic music:

The President . . . let loose the soft indefatigable beating of drums and a choir of instruments—near-wind and super-string—that plagently repeated and repeated the brief and unescapably haunting melody of the first Solidarity Hymn.®

An equally artificial, electronically enhanced voice eventually augments the music:

a deep strong Voice, more musical than any merely human voice, richer, warmer, more vibrant with love and yearning and compassion, a wonderful, mysterious, supernatural Voice spoke from above their heads. Very slowly, "Oh, Ford, Ford, Ford," it said diminishingly and on a descending scale.®

Artificial lights also enhance the religious ritual, lights that fade as the ceremony reaches its climax "and at the same time . . . grow warmer, richer, redder, until at last [the English worshipers] are dancing in the crimson twilight of an Embryo Store" in "blood-coloured and foetal darkness," in "red twilight."® Of course, the advanced English worshipers also have their religious ritual enhanced by the synthetic soma. Thus, their religious rites are ultimately amplified by several progressive technologies: music, designer drugs, and voice amplification. However, these high/low, advanced/primitive,
and New World/Old World oppositions represent only one sector of difference between the American and English religions that helps establish the New World/Old World inversion.

As I stated at the beginning of this chapter, the religion of the AF English—and presumably, by extension, that of the world state—has not been readily categorized by scholars. Raymond Legg refers to the AF English religion broadly as "Brave New Spirituality," but he does so as a general comment on Huxley’s spiritual pursuits and on Fordian society which he terms the "Brave New Society," not as a concentrated examination of the organized English religious ceremony itself. Similarly, Charles Holmes suggests the nature of the Fordian religion by noting that the AF English "complete [their religious] ritual by copulating on the floor"; but he neither discusses it in any detail nor overtly characterizes the religion as a sex cult.

Additionally, in The End of Utopia, Peter Firchow categorizes the AF English religion as a parody of the Mass and, in turn, argues that Christianity is "the most important shared element" between the Fordian and Puebloan societies. Firchow makes this argument partially based on the connection Lenina makes, which I’ve already mentioned,
between the "natural" and "artificial" noises of the two
religions. Specifically, he argues that her statement helps
indicate the similarities between the religions and, thus,
the larger societies.\textsuperscript{72}

Lenina's statement, though, serves merely to invite a
comparison of the two religions and does not demonstrate
that the religions are similar or even that they share
common traits. In fact, the "noises" of each service are
diametrically opposed: one is natural and Old World, the
other is synthetic and New World. Lenina's statement merely
reveals that she can only understand the primitiveness of
the American Savages through her own advanced, New World
culture. She must use what she understands and knows to
approach what she does not, in this case the American
Savages' religious rites. Therefore, by including her
comment, Huxley makes the point that Lenina is a product of
the Fordian world and that she is so out of touch with her
own primitive self that she must use what she knows—the
eugenized, advanced, and progressive—to understand what
she does not understand—the old, traditional, and ancient.

Moreover, Lenina is ultimately wrong in her connection:
the two religions are not similar. Rather, they are quite
divergent. When Lenina suggests the American Savages'
"drums beat out the same rhythms" as "the synthetic noises
made at Solidarity Services and Ford’s Day celebrations," \(^7^3\) when she says the mesa at Malpais is "[l]ike the Charing-Tower," \(^7^4\) when she links the two cultures and religions as similar in any way, she is ultimately incorrect and simply highlights the oppositions already discussed. The drum noises—natural versus synthetic—the societies—primitive vs. advanced—and religions—traditional versus technologically enhanced—are polar opposites, and the similarities Lenina believes exists between the two religions and societies actually reveal the fundamental differences between the two societies at large and the religions in particular. Because of such differences in the religions’ Old World/primitive and New World/technologically progressive natures, the religions are much more divergent than similar. Therefore, Lenina’s observations do not suggest a similarity between the religions as Firchow argues. Rather, they suggest that the two systems warrant comparison: a comparison that reveals Lenina is incorrect and that the religions and larger societies are divergent, not similar. America and its religion are traditional and Old World while Fordian England and its religion are technological and New World.

Furthermore, Firchow’s belief that Christianity acts as “the most important shared element” between “the Pueblo and Fordian societies” \(^7^5\) may indeed be valid. Certainly, not
much else if anything else binds them. Related to this belief, though, Firchow also argues that the AF English religion is simply a satire of the Mass. I agree that satire and mock-Christianity are important aspects of the Fordian religious rite, and Firchow's perceptive observations all appear legitimate: "[t]he loving-cup of strawberry ice-cream soma" seems "based on the bread and wine of the holy communion"; "[t]he Solidarity hymns appear to echo Wesley's"; and "there is even an oblique reference to the Holy Spirit in 'the enormous negro dove' at the close of the service." I would even add to Firchow's somewhat limited list: the Fordian T mentioned throughout the novel and in the Fordian "Solidarity Service" in particular is clearly a parody of the Christian Cross; the "chairs of the twelve" Solidarity Service participants situated around the table satirize the twelve apostles and/or the members of the Last Supper; the orgy can be seen as a perversion of the Christian call for fellowship and unity in faith; and talk of "the imminence of His Coming" is clearly an ironic jab at the Second Coming of Christ.

However, Firchow assumes that the mock-Christian aspects of the Fordian service wholly sum up the character of the Fordian English religion and in doing so overlooks the inherent sexuality of the Fordian religion. None of the
mock-Christian points sufficiently explain the fundamental
sexual component of the religion or its climactic orgy.
Rather, because of these components, the Fordian religion
possesses a strong likeness to sex cults such as those of
the Greeks, the Romans, and certain early Semitic
cultures, "old Canaanite festivals" in particular, whose
"religious gladness . . . tended to assume an orgiastic
character . . . ."®

Firchow relegates the ritual sexuality of the Fordian
English religion to one pithy statement: "Like the Snake
Dance, the Solidarity Service also has an underlying sexual
meaning, though here it might be more appropriate to call
it a sterility rite."® Firchow himself provides no more
clues to the existence of sexuality in the American
Savages' religion other than this single undefended
assertion. And other than the fertility connotations, which
are not necessarily sexual, of the cornmeal sprinkling and
the oblique phallic connotations of serpents, any sexuality
contained in the American Savages' syncretistic religion
seems negligible, especially when compared to the climactic
orgy of the AF English.

Also, while it is amusing, Firchow's casual statement
that the Fordian sex cult is more a "sterility right"
overlooks the fact that ancient sex cults were not
concerned with human reproduction or human impregnation. Rather, they were, as B.Z. Goldberg writes, centered on the "union of the sexes." Further supporting this assertion, Michael Maffesoli refers to sacred orgies as "the social divine" and as the "social orgasm" implying that at their root, the activities were a way of tangibly unifying people in the interest of a single goal or community. Ancient sex cults, then, used coitus as a means to: unify two people; unify a group or groups of people symbolically through this two-person union; and/or to unify a group or groups of people through orgy. Such traits certainly seem to be at the root of the English sex cult: fellowship and many becoming one, the intercourse a means of achieving solidarity and unity, the "Orgy-porgy" functioning as a way to achieve "the "Twelve-in-one." Furthermore, the Fordian English drink to their individual annihilation and seek, though orgy, to "lose their twelve separate identities in a larger being." These aspects reflect Michael Maffesoli's claim that the orgiastic "mingling of bodies in debauchery has a religious or social function": it creates a sense of erotic Nirvana and "symbolizes being together" or "polymorphism" into a transcendent being. Essentially, he argues, orgy is a "means of stating the problem of sociality or alterity," in
other words recreating the forgotten sense of "what 'being together' is" and what it means to "return to organic solidarity." ⁹¹

A comparison of Huxley's Fordian English "Orgy-porgy" dance with B.Z. Goldberg's euphemistic description of an Aphrodite worship service helps establish this even further. Huxley writes,

Round they went, a circular procession of dancers, each with hands on the hips of the dancer preceding, round and round, shouting in unison, stamping to the rhythm of the music with their feet, beating it, beating it out with hands on the buttocks in front; twelve pairs of hands beating as one; as one, twelve buttocks slabbily resounding.

. . . the dancers continued for a while to circulate, to beat out the indefatigable rhythm. . . . Then the circle wavered, broke, fell in partial disintegration on the ring of couches which surrounded - circle enclosing circle - the table and its planetary chairs. . . . it was as though some enormous negro dove were hovering benevolently over the now prone or supine dancers. ⁹²

Describing Aphroditic orgies, B.Z. Goldberg writes,

There, under the roof of the goddess of creation, [the worshippers] heard the call of the creative force and responded to it. There, heart longed for heart and flesh hungered for flesh. And the call was sharp and the hunger beyond control, they loosened all bonds and plunged head and heart into the sea of love. ⁹³

The Bible also describes certain sex cults: cults that bear a likeness to the Fordian Solidarity Services and whose "orgiastic practices" had great historical "endurance." ⁹⁴ W. Robertson Smith's previously cited passage mentions the Nabataeans and the Canaanites of Shechem, ⁹⁵ but
the Bible also repeatedly references the more generalized Canaanite fertility cults of Ashtarte and Baal; the rites of the Egyptian Bull-god Apis; and other Semitic, non-Jewish religions.

The Fordian religious orgy also parallels the rites of the Mesopotamian fertility cult of Ishtar, namely the autumnal celebration of hieros gamos, or "sacred marriage," which was a sexual union of priests and priestesses held to celebrate the reunion of Ishtar and her husband/brother/son Tammuz; their return from the underworld; and thus the rebirth of the Summer-scorched vegetation. Likewise, the English participate in the Fordian ceremony to artificially create the feeling Ford has returned; they shout, "I hear him" and "He's coming," and Ford's presence seems fulfilled by the image of the "enormous negro dove . . . hovering benevolently over" the "prone" and "supine" Fordian worshipers. Thus, this aspect of the Fordian English religion is akin to Ishtar's return from the underworld, and it corresponds with the fertility aspects of the ancient sex-cult religions. Ford, like Ishtar and the Canaanite gods, has descended into death; but through the technological enhancements of the English religion, his presence is recreated to a dazzling, albeit artificial, effect.
Additionally, the hieros gamos was an event by proxy: only the Mesopotamian priests and priestesses engaged in the sexual/orgiastic union on behalf of all the people. Thus, the Alpha-plus, Solidarity Service participants are analogous to these sacred temple workers in that they unite sexually, high in the Singery, analogous to the ziggurat temple, to ensure the coming/presence of Ford and the solidarity of the English/World State.°°®

The orgiastic rites of the Solidarity Services parallel other sex cults as well such as the Orphic/Zagreus mysteries,°°3 the Bacchinalian/Dyonisian rites,°°4 and the cult of Pan.°°5 However, important for the purposes of defining the Fordian Solidarity Service as a technologically enhanced, orgiastic sex cult akin to those of the ancient world is the fact that all the religions—the Canaanite, Mesopotamian, and the Greco-Roman—used sex as a means of unifying a community of believers and, as Jean Botté writes, as a means of honoring and serving their "gods in an anthropomorphic perspective."°°°

Both these traits are present in the AF worship service. Thus, sexuality is clearly not a peripheral issue of the Fordian religion/Solidarity Service; and its significant place prevents readers from merely categorizing the AF English religion as a parody of the Mass. The mock
Christian aspects serve as precursors to the climactic, all-important orgy and thus seem less fundamental to the religious ceremony than the sex cult tradition. Therefore, I categorize the Fordian English religion as a technologically enhanced sex cult rather than simply as a parody of the Mass. The religion’s sexuality also sets it apart from the religion of the American Savages. Therefore unlike Firchow, I believe the two religions of *Brave New World* are more divergent than convergent. Understanding the technological aspects of the Fordian religion further highlights this difference and advances the Old World/New World inversion of *Brave New World*.

Essentially, the unification of the antiquated Puebloan and Penitente traditions into the single traditional, primitive, and syncretistic religion of the American Savages creates a united bulwark of ancient religious tradition set against a larger world culture of continual advancement, eugenics, and progress. Specifically, this contrast of religious tradition and practice stands in marked contrast to the advanced, technologically enhanced sex cult of the AF English religion. This difference—namely, the placement of traditionalism in the customary New World and advancement in the customary Old World—helps establish the Old World/New World inversion of *Brave New World*.
World by recreating America as the Old World and England, the representative of Europe, as the New.

Though it differs from the nationalistic statement Huxley makes through his use of Shakespeare in the novel, there seems to be a certain amount of Euro/Anglo-centric nationalism built into religion’s role in the New World/Old World inversion as well. While the American religion of Brave New World is cast in primitiveness, the primitiveness of the Old World Americans is not limited to their religion. The entire culture from its values to its lifestyle is primitive. Thus, Huxley—by using religion as a synecdoche—seems to be commenting on America’s general primitive nature. In the novel’s historical context, this comment reflects on the United States.

Though it seems to be a European stereotype, Huxley’s nationalistic fervor of the 1920s and early 30s seeps through a bit into his presentation of the American religion and broader culture in Brave New World. Perhaps assuring himself against fears of future US dominance, Huxley is able in Brave New World to remind himself and Europe that the United States is a young culture, largely composed of frontier wilderness. Europe conversely, and England in particular, is firmly established in the history
of man and holds a definite place in world affairs and world culture.

The essential conflict of the advanced Fordian and primitive American religions and larger cultures in Brave New World, then, reveals something broader about the interaction of the temporal/historical New and Old Worlds, namely that English and larger European establishment dominate American primitivism. Of course, this idea seems to be mostly a burst of nationalistic fervor as Huxley was well aware of the emergence of America as a superpower. In Brave New World, though, Huxley was free to contain America, let Europe and England dominate, and thus reinvent the inter-war world according to his own conservative design. The New World/Old World inversion of Brave New World ultimately stands, therefore, as Huxley’s literary attempt—whether inadvertent or deliberate—to check the progress of modernity and the shift of political, economic, and military power from Europe to America, that is, from the Old World to the New.
Notes


3 "Shakespeare and Religion," 175.
"Ibid.

5 Milton Birnbaum, Aldous Huxley's Quest for Values and "Aldous Huxley's Quest for Values: A Study in Religious Syncretism" and June Deery, Aldous Huxley and the Mysticism of Science and "Analogies between Mysticism and Science in the Works of Aldous Huxley. In the interest of disclosure, I must note that I found one exception to this statement. Unlike most critics who discuss Huxley's religious beliefs without denominational label and who prefer instead to describe them as "spiritualism" and/or "mysticism," Raymond Legg-in his dissertation "The Intellectual Tourist: A Study of Aldous Huxley's Spirituality"-labels them quite specifically as "universal Unitarian spirituality" (iv). Such a view, though, is distinctly atypical. See n.1 for the other, more typical critical evaluations of Huxley's religious life.


7 "Shakespeare and Religion," 165.

8 The quotation is from Samuel Johnson's A Dictionary of the English Language (New York: AMS Press, 1967, s.v., "religion[2]"). See also Robert Gordon Latham's dictionary of the same name: A Dictionary of the English Language (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., et al., 1872). According to the title page of this work, it is "founded on that of Dr. Samuel Johnson as edited by the Rev. H.J. Todd, M.A. with numerous emendations and additions." One such addition is to the definition of religion, and it reflects my statement that the term refers to "[r]eligious rites" (s.v., "religion[3]"). Additionally, the OED definition of religion is quite similar to both the Johnson and the Latham. It holds that religion is an "[a]ction or conduct indicating a belief in, reverence for, and desire to please, a divine ruling power" and, of utmost relevance to this chapter, "the exercise or practice of rites or observances implying this." Additionally, the OED suggests that the term implies "[a] particular system of faith and worship" and like Latham "religious rites" (The Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd ed., s.v., "religion"[3.a., 1b., and 4.a.]).


10 See n.23 for John Savage's statement on personal religious experience and the works listed in n.1, n.5, and n.6 for Huxley's.
The Varieties of Religious Experience, 342, 343-44.


See Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 124:

... suddenly, on the screen ... there were Penitentes of Acoma prostrating themselves before Our Lady, and wailing as John had heard them wail, confessing their sins before Jesus on the cross, before the eagle image of Pookong. ... Still wailing, the Penitentes rose to their feet, stripped off their upper garments and, with knotted whips, began to beat themselves, blow after blow.

"The Subversion of Drama in Brave New World" (International Fiction Review 11, no.2 [Summer 1984]), 99.


Both quotations are from The Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd ed., s.v., "old-world."

Pueblo and Puebloan are collective terms that include several Southwestern Indian groups—often classified by language—such as the Zuñi and the Hopi. See Richard Ford, Albert Schroeder, and Stewart L. Peckham, "Three Perspectives on Puebloan Prehistory" (In New Perspectives on the Pueblos. Ed. Alfonso Ortiz. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1972). In Brave New World, Huxley references the Pueblo generally and the Zuñi and Hopi tribes specifically and does so both directly and indirectly. For simplicity's sake and because Huxley often makes no clear distinction as to his reference, I use the terms Pueblo and Puebloan freely and interchangeably throughout this chapter. This is unless, of course, Huxley makes a distinction in which case I follow his lead. Like the religion he creates for the American Savages, then, Huxley's approach to Native American culture at-large and his use of this tradition seems quite syncretistic.

De Tocqueville compares and contrasts the New World and Old World forms of religion—that is, Christianity—quite extensively in Democracy in America (Ed. and trans. Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2000). See, for example, "On Religion Considered as a Political Institution; How It Serves Powerfully the Maintenance of a Democratic Republic Among the Americas" (275-77); "Indirect Influence the Religious Beliefs Exert on Political Society in the United States" (278-82); "On the Principal Causes that Make Religion Powerful in America" (282-88); "How, in the United States, Religion Knows How to Make Use of Democratic Instincts" (417-24); "On the Progress of Catholicism in the United States" (424-25); "What Makes the Mind of Democratic Peoples Lean toward Pantheism" (425-26); "Why Certain Americans Display Such an Exalted Spiritualism" (510-11); and...
"How Religious Beliefs at Times Turn the Souls of the Americans toward Immaterial Enjoyments" (517-21). Some especially pertinent quotations follow: "[The English Americas] brought to the New World a Christianity that I cannot depict better than to call it democratic and republican" (275); "[American] priests are turned away or turn themselves away from government" (276); "Religion . . . , among the Americans, never mixes directly with the government of society" (280); "In America, religion is a world apart . . . ." (423); "One finds here and there in the heart of American society souls altogether filled with an exalted and almost fierce spiritualism that one scarcely encounters in Europe" (510); and

The philosophers of the eighteenth century explained the gradual weakening of beliefs in an altogether simple fashion. Religious zeal, they said, will be extinguished as freedom and enlightenment increase. It is unfortunate that the facts do not accord with this theory.

There is a certain European population whose disbelief is equalled only by their brutishness and ignorance, whereas in America one sees one of the freest and most enlightened peoples in the world eagerly fulfill all the external duties of religion . . . . Among [Europeans], I had seen the spirit of religion and the spirit of freedom almost always move in contrary directions. Here I found them united ultimately with one another: they reigned together on the same soil. (282)

Per Lenina's statement, "It reminds me of a lower-caste Community Sing" (Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 86), Huxley leads the reader to believe that "Solidarity Services" are reserved for the upper-caste Alphas and the Community Sings for the Betas, Gammas, and Deltas. However, various other parts of the novel suggest that Community Sings are participated in by all, including the Alphas, while the Solidarity Services are reserved for the highest level of society (see Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 40, 61-66). Huxley neither clarifies this issue nor does he describe or offer a scene from a Community Sing. He only explores the Solidarity Service in depth. Therefore in my attempt to explore and define the Fordian English religion, I deal only with the Solidarity Service.

See n.20. However, one other particularly pertinent quotation from Democracy in America that suggests the Old World/Europe is the seat of traditional and older forms of religion follows:

In America, religion is perhaps less powerful than it has been in certain times and among certain peoples, but its influence is more lasting. It is reduced to its own strength, which no one can take away from it . . . .

In Europe, Christianity has permitted itself to be intimately united with the powers of the earth. Today these powers are falling and it is almost buried under their debris. It is a living [thing] (Mansfield and Winthrop's insertion) that someone wanted to attach to the dead: cut the bonds that hold it back and it will rise again. (286, 288)

Certainly, the Fordian English occasionally make the "sign of the T" across their torsos (Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited 17,
62, 114, 135) and frequently invoke the name of "our Ford" (Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited 16-17, 20-22, 24-25, 28, 32, 34, 39, 40, 42, 61-65, 69, 71-72, 74, 79, 84, 91, 93, 107, 116-117, 138, 143, 147, 162-165, 175, 182, 190, 194). Also, John Savage practices certain Puebloan emetic purification rituals with mustard and water (see the index of Elise Clews Parsons, Pueblo Indian Religion [2 vols. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1939], s.v., "Emesis" and Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited 185, 190) and carries his practice of self-flagellation to the very end of the novel (see Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited 186-99). The reverent spirituality with which John approaches Shakespeare can also be interpreted as an example of pervasive religion in Brave New World (see chapter four of this thesis, "Inversion Through Shakespeare") as can John's self-flagellation and ultimate suicide that the Penitente aspects of his religion demand (see Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 199). However, rather than institutional religion, all these examples suggest a personal spirituality and personal religious experience akin to that described by James, Huxley, and even John Savage who says to Mond, "Isn't it natural to feel there's a God? . . . it is natural to believe in God when you're alone - quite alone, in the night, thinking about death . . ." (Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 180). Aspects such as these, then, while providing a somewhat significant spiritual/religious presence throughout the book, do not negate my argument that there are two central presentations of the institutional religious rituals and practices of the American Savages and the AF English.

24See chapter four, "Inversion Through Shakespeare," especially n.41 and n.43.

25"Aldous Huxley and the Utopian Parable" (In Aldous Huxley Between East and West), 110.

26Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 83, 87.

27ibid., 87.

28ibid.
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31 The End of Utopia, 71.


34 Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 89.

35 In Puebloan tradition, Pūkón/Pookong has a twin brother named Balonga; and the pair are referred to as "War Brothers" or "War Twins." For more information on the War Twins, see the sources Peter Firchow references in The End of Utopia: H.K. Haeberlin, "The Idea of Fertilization in the Culture of the Pueblo Indians" (Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association 3 [1916]) and Pliny Earle Goddard, The Indians of the Southwest (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1913). See also Elsie Clews Parsons, Pueblo Indian Religion (see the index, s.v., "War Brothers or Twins") and Hamilton A. Tyler's Pueblo Gods and Myths (Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1964. See the index, s.v., "War Twins").

36 Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 89.

37 The End of Utopia, 74.

38 Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 187.

39 ibid., 98.

40 ibid.

41 ibid., 87.

42 The End of Utopia, 73. See "Fetishes: Mask: Mask Image" in Pueblo Indian Religion, 339-348. However, Parsons' consideration of face painting and masks in Pueblo life and ceremony is much more extensive. Therefore, see also her index, s.v., "Mask(s)" and "Painting."

43 Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 87.
"For a discussion of the Pueblo fetishization of corn, see "Fetishes: Corn Fetish" in Pueblo Indian Religion (319-323) and s.v., "Corn meal" in the index. For the religious and social functions of eagles and the likenesses of eagles, see the index of Pueblo Indian Religion, s.v., "Eagle." Also, the process of sprinkling the snakes with corn meal and water follows that of the Puebloan Snake-Antelope ceremony cited at n.49.

Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 87.

See Pueblo Indian Religion, 510-13. Note that Parsons' description of the Snake-Antelope ceremony—snakes in a pit covered with cornmeal encircled by dancers—is virtually identical to that of Brave New World's American Savages.


In the earliest pages of the book, the D.H.C. notes that the year is AF 632 (Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 2). AF, of course, is an abbreviation of "After Ford"; and therefore, since Henry
Ford died in 1947, it can be supposed that the Gregorian/Western year in which the action of *Brave New World* occurs is 2579 AD.

56 *Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited*, 37, 40, 168.

57 *Aldous Huxley Between East and West*, 3.

58 *Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited*, 86. See also 83, 87.

59 *Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited*, 86.

60 *ibid.*, 86, 87.


62 *Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited*, 86.

63 *ibid.*, 61.

64 *ibid.*

65 *ibid.*, 62

66 *ibid.*, 64.

67 *ibid.*, 65-66.


69 *ibid.*, 117.


71 *The End of Utopia*, 75.

72 *ibid.*

73 *Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited*, 86.
"The enormous negro dove" can be found in Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 66.

See Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 17, 62, 114, 135, especially the statement that, "All crosses had their tops cut and became T's" (40). Also, Lenina wears a "T" around her neck as one would a cross (134, 136, 148), and London's Charing Cross district has been replaced by "Charing T" (46, 48, 83, 120, 188).

See Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 61.

See, for example, Ephesians 4: 1-6, 13 and 1 Corinthians 1:10, 7. Also, compare Huxley's description of the Fordian religious ceremony to the words from Peter Scholtes and Carolyn Arends' hymn—based on John 13:35—"They Will Know We Are Christians By Our Love" (Los Angeles: F.E.L. Publications, Ltd./ASCAP, 1966). In Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, Huxley writes,

The group was now complete, the solidarity circle perfect and without flaw. Man, woman, man, in a ring of endless alternation round the table. Twelve of them ready to be made one, waiting to come together, to be fused, to lose their twelve separate identities in a larger being. (62)

Lines from the hymn's first verse read,

We are one in the Spirit, we are one in the Lord.
We are one in the Spirit, we are one in the Lord.
And we pray that all unity may one day be restored. . . .

This line also seems to have a strong sexual meaning since those intoning it are anticipating intercourse and male ejaculation. Perhaps this word play is part of the parody, then. Religious and sexual overtones are mixed in the phrase just as in sex cults and in the Fordian religious service itself.


W. Robertson Smith, The Religion of the Semites (New York: Schocken Books, 1972), 261. In particular, Smith mentions the Canaanite "vintage feast" festival at Shechem (261) and notes that "[a]mong the Nabataeans
and elsewhere the orgiastic character of the worship often led in later times to the identification of Semitic gods, especially Dusares, with the Greek Dionysus (261).

84 The End of Utopia, 75.

85 The Sacred Fire, 147.


87 This idea seems central to Thomas Cahill’s explicitly detailed anecdote that describes Sumerian Moon/Ishtar-cult temple sex, or “sacred couplings” (45). See The Gifts of the Jews (New York: Nan A. Talese/Doubleday, 1998), 39-47. Cahill writes:

Dressed in elaborate ceremonial garb, [hundreds of Sumerians] gather solemnly around the terrace on which the [ziggurat temple] is built. ... [A]n adolescent boy has been bound [to an altar]. He is naked ... [and naked] Priestesses of the highest order ... are massaging the boy with gentle foreplay. ... [T]he high priestess appears ... [and] mounts the boy with the assistance of her sisters, who shriek their encouragement in a frenzy that only grows higher as the priestess rides the boy, at first with rhythmic dignity, then with increasing agitation ... and both bodies, writing in sweat, appear to be not so much earthly bodies as inhuman forces of the cosmos. ... [The hundreds of other Sumerians grow] wild and ecstatic. Ripping open their robes and pawing themselves, they bay upward to the event on the ziggurat’s height and to the moon itself. (43-44)

See also, Nancy Qualls-Corbett, The Sacred Prostitute (Toronto: Inner City Books, 1998), 24: “[The Venereal New Year’s Festival] culminates in the hieros gamos, the sacred marriage. ... The chosen sacred prostitute ... unites with the reigning monarch ... [and] this union assures ... ‘the fixing of [the Roman people’s] destinies’” (S.H. Hooke, Babylonian and Assyrian Religions [Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1963], 54). Likewise, John Allegro, in The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross, suggests the religious sex acts of the Sumerians were part of lamentation processes meant to draw the penis of the sleeping fertility god to life so he could fertilize the fallow fields (83-90). In this way, the sexual union of the sacred couple—or entire tribe through orgy—ensured the people could collectively be fed through the regeneration of the agricultural year.

88 Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 65.

89 ibid., 62.

90 The Shadow of Dionysus, 35.

91 ibid., 3.

92 Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 65-66.
The Sacred Fire, 161.

The Shadow of Dionysus, 34.

See n.83. For the Biblical references to the Canaanites of Shechem, see Genesis 33:18-34:1-31 and Judges 9:27. As for the Nabataeans, they are mentioned in the Apocryphal book of 1 Maccabees at 5:25 and 9:35 but not directly in the Bible itself. The Nabataeans' traditional founder-Nebaioth, the firstborn son of Ishmael-is mentioned in Genesis 25:13, 16; 28:9; and 36:3. However, the "consensus of modern scholarship no longer relates the Nabataeans to [him]" (Philip C. Hammond, "Nabateans" [In The Oxford Companion to the Bible. Ed. Bruce Metzger and Michael Coogan. New York: Oxford UP, 1993], 542).

Also referred to as Ashtoreth, Ashtaroth, and Astarte (Greek), Ashtarte is the Canaanite counterpart of Aphrodite. Her cult is referenced in Judges 2:13-14, 10:6-7; 1 Kings 11:5, 33; and Jeremiah 7:16-20; 44:15-28. In Jeremiah, she is referred to as the "Queen of Heaven, a syncretism of Astarte and [her Mesopotamian equivalent] Ishtar" (Susan Ackerman, "Astarte" [In The Oxford Companion to the Bible], 64).

There are many manifestations of and epithets for Baal in the Bible. For some examples, see Numbers 25:3 (Baal of Peor); Judges 2:11, 6:25; 1 Kings 16:32, 18:25, 19:18; Jeremiah 19:5; and Romans 11:4. See also The Oxford Companion to the Bible, s.v., "Baal."

See Exodus 32:1-6: "... the people rose early and sacrificed burnt offerings and presented fellowship offerings. Afterward they sat down to eat and drink and got up to indulge in revelry" (32:6).

See, for example, Deuteronomy 12, 13, 23:17; 1 Kings 14:24, 15:12, 22:46; 2 Kings 23:7; Isaiah 1:10-15; Hosea 4:14; the Apocryphal book The Wisdom of Solomon 12:5; and The Oxford Companion to the Bible, s.v., "Idols, Idolatry."


Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited, 64-66.

As outlined in n.21, the Alpha-plus members of Fordian England seem to be the only Solidarity Service participants.

The myth of Zagreus is the central myth of ancient Greek "Orphism." This mystical cult's practices involved orgies and ripping apart and consuming animal flesh as a reference to the myth. In this myth, Zagreus is the infant son of Zeus and Persephone. Thus, he is half god and half man. When Hera finds out about Zeus' unfaithfulness, she
instigates the Titans to destroy Zagreus. Enraged, Zeus destroys the
Titans; and to prevent the ultimate death of Zagreus, Zeus eats his
son's heart. Zagreus is then reborn as Dionysus through another mortal
woman named Semele. In some versions of the myth, the newly created
Dionysus is still referred to as Zagreus. Thus, the newly created being
has mixed ontology: he is both his recreated self and what he was
before. Similarly paradoxical, mankind was made from the ashes of the
Titans who were evil but who had consumed Zagreus who was divine. Thus,
mankind was created as both good and evil. See Luc Brisson, "Orphism"
(In Sexual Ambivalence: Androgyne and Hermaphroditism in Graeco-Roman
Antiquity. Translated by Janet Lloyd. Berkeley: U of California P,
2002); Fritz Graf, "Dionysian and Orphic Eschatology: New Texts and Old
Questions" (In Masks of Dionysus. Ed. Thomas H. Carpenter and
Christopher A. Faraone. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993); W.K.C. Guthrie,
Orpheus and Greek Religion: A Study of the Orphic Movement (New York:
Norton, 1967); George Luck, "King Midas and the Orphic Mysteries" (In
Ancient Pathways and Hidden Pursuits. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P,
2000); Mark P.O. Morford and Robert Lenardon, Classical Mythology, 5th
ed. (White Plains, NY: Longman, 1995), 298-312; Charles Segal, Orpheus:
The Myth of the Poet (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1989); and John
Warden, ed., Orpheus: The Metamorphosis of a Myth (Toronto: Toronto UP,
1982).

See Thomas H. Carpenter and Christopher A. Faraone, eds. Masks of
Dionysus; Edith Hamilton, Mythology (New York: Penguin/Mentor, 1991),
54-62; Karl Kerényi, The Religion of the Greeks and Romans; Michael
Maffesoli, "Bacchus the Federator" (In The Shadow of Dionysus), 119-34;
Mark P.O. Morford and Robert Lenardon, Classical Mythology, 5th ed.,
218-250; Walter Frederich Otto, Dionysus: Myth and Cult, trans. Robert
B. Palmer (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1965); and H.J. Rose, Religion in
Greece and Rome. Also, the Dionysian and Orphic mysteries intersect in
many ways. Therefore, several of the works listed and some of the
information given in n.103 are also pertinent to this note.

Kathleen Atlass and James Redfield (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988) and
Mark P.O. Morford and Robert Lenardon, Classical Mythology, 5th ed.,
218-250.

Religion in Ancient Mesopotamia, 158.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Neither the reasons for Brave New World’s Old World/New World inversion nor the methods used to achieve it have been exhausted by this thesis. For example, the reason for inversion may not be only bound by the twentieth century. It may be a result of the entire, often difficult, history of interaction between Europe and America and, more specifically, between England and America. Also, there are certainly many more methods of inversion present in Brave New World than the two I discuss. The experience of Linda, John Savage’s mother, stands as an excellent example.

Her imposed emigration from the Fordian England New World to the American Old World Savage Reservation and her later return to New World England offer insight into the natures of each culture, the differences between them, and how Huxley recreates America as the Old World and England as the New. Related to this is John Savage’s own journey from America to Fordian England and the effect this migration has on him and on the Fordian New World he enters. Indeed, John’s experience could be interpreted as a parallel of
Huxley's own movement from Old World traditionalism into New World modernity: a move he made, as Peter Firchow argues, reluctantly and with trepidation.\(^1\)

However, applications of this thesis' methodology are not limited to flushing out ways the New World/Old World inversion is achieved or why it is achieved. For example, an intriguing extended study that applies the Old World/New World dynamic of *Brave New World* would involve the idea that John Savage is modeled on or a parody of D.H. Lawrence.\(^2\) One might consider how the experiences of each figure in the Old and New Worlds compare, whether Lawrence and John Savage are ultimately New World or Old World literary figures, and why each e/immigrated between Europe and America.

Furthermore, some of Huxley's other novels such as *After Many a Summer Dies the Swan* (1939)\(^3\) and *Ape and Essence* (1948)\(^4\) offer interaction between Old World Europeans and New World Americans. Huxley's recently discovered and published play *Now More Than Ever*\(^5\) also deals with the political and economic Transatlantic relationship; and while this play and Huxley's novels may not contain an inversion of the Old World and New World like *Brave New World*, worthy inquiries into these works would include studies of how the Old World and the New are characterized.
in the novels, how they interact, and what Huxley achieves by putting them in correspondence with one another.

Huxley was clearly interested and involved in the twentieth century Transatlantic relationship between Europe/England and America/the United States. His essays, biography, fiction, and drama bear this out. And because he bridged the divide between the Old World and the New World biographically, culturally, and politically and because the interaction of the two worlds of the Western Hemisphere stands as a significant aspect of Huxley's life and works, this thesis' central concern with the New World/Old World, Anglo-American interaction stands not only as an appropriate approach for studying Huxley, his works, and their places in Anglo-American Modernism as a whole. It stands as a necessary one.
Notes

1See Reluctant Modernists: Aldous Huxley and Some Contemporaries (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2002).

2See Peter Firchow, "Wells and Lawrence in Huxley's Brave New World" (Journal of Modern Literature 5 [1976]).
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