

# Dialogue of Cultures and Cultural Primitivism in Anti-Utopian Novel of the First Half of the 20th Century

SVETLANA DOLZHENKO

TYUMEN STATE UNIVERSITY

RUSSIA

*The article considers the problem of the dialogue of cultures as it is represented in the anti-utopian novels of the first half of the 20th century. The author points out the typological features of the novels "We" by Evgeny Zamyatin, "Brave New World" by Aldous Huxley and "1984" by George Orwell and investigates the place and the role of the dialogue of cultures in the light of Mikhail Bakhtin's concept and tendency toward cultural primitivism as the result of totalitarian influence in the imaginary world of anti-utopia.*

*Key words: dialogue, culture, anti-utopia, interaction, cultural values, cultural primitivism*

The flourishing of anti-utopia falls in the 20th century. It is connected both with the rise of the utopian consciousness and with the contemporary attempts to implement, to bring into movement the social mechanisms by which mass mental subjugation based on the then-current scientific achievements became a reality in the first decades of the 20th century.

Various writers, Evgeny Zamyatin, George Orwell, Ray Bradbury, Herbert Franke, Anthony Burgess and Aldous Huxley, all addressed this subject. Their anti-utopian works emerged as a signal, warning about a possible oncoming decline of the civilization. Anti-utopian novels have much in common: each author speaks about the loss of morality and spirituality by the current generation; every anti-utopian world reflects only the existence of basic instincts and emotional engineering.

Unlike utopia, where the ideal commonwealth is only a small part of humanity in a secluded location on the planet, anti-utopia seeks to conquer the world. This global view is the result of 19th century social utopianism of the universal scope, which in its turn, is the result of unifying and equalizing nature of the technology and life regimentation, hidden in a developed industrial system. Many researchers say that the 20<sup>th</sup> century is not the era of the appearance of anti-utopias, but their propagation, as A. Batalov observed, "Even Dostoevsky rushed - rushed all his life - between utopia and dystopia" (BATALOV 1989: 263). The anti-utopias appeared during the nucleation of the conflict between individual and the state. This conflict between the individual and the state, freedom and regimentation, instinctive and utopian anticipates the anti-utopian novel of the twentieth century, a roman á thèse, "the distinctly ideological purpose of which," according to G. Beauchamp, "is the assertion of marginal significance" (BEAUCHAMP 1974: 463).

In the first half of the 20th century, three novels appeared sequentially which possessed some salient anti-utopian features: E. Zamyatin's *We* (1924), A. Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932), and G. Orwell's *1984* (1949).

Western critics all unite in the idea that to varying degrees, anti-utopias are quintessentially ideological novels: they engage the reader in what Frederick Jameson calls a "theoretical discourse," whereby a range of thematic possibilities are posited and polarized against each other, yet the novels eventually reveal a definite philosophical and socio-political outlook for which fiction proves to be a convenient medium<sup>1</sup>. As Gorman Beauchamp notices:

*The purpose of the dystopian writer differs diametrically from that of the utopian, he faces the same artistic challenge, to create an imaginary world both vivid enough to convince us of the validity of his thesis yet consistent with his ideological premises* (BEAUCHAMP 1974: 463).

Moreover, anti-utopian novels essentially deal with power: power as the prohibition or perversion of human potential; power in its absolute form that, to quote from *1984*, tolerates no flaws in the pattern it imposes on society. Anti-utopias show, in extreme terms, power functioning efficiently and mercilessly to its optimal totalitarian limit.

Anti-utopias dramatize the eternal conflict between individual choice and social necessity: the individual resenting the replacement of his private volition by compulsory uniformitarian decisions made by impersonal bureaucratic machinery. The sphere of binary opposition expands further to cover such dialectical dualities as emotion and reason, creative imagination and mathematical logic, intuition and science, tolerance and judgment, kindness and cruelty, love and power, good and evil.

Anti-utopias often tend to offer two-dimensional character types; this tendency is possibly due to the metaphorical and ideological thrust of these works. Moreover, the nightmarish atmosphere of anti-utopias seems to preclude advancing positive, assertive characters that might provide the reader with consoling hope. If such positive characters do exist, they usually prove miserably ineffectual when contending with ruthless overwhelming powers.

Anti-utopian societies, consumed and controlled by regressive dogmas, appear constantly static: founded on coercion and rigid structures, the system resists change and becomes arrested in paralysis. Anti-utopias are not associated with innovation and progress but with fear of the future. They use, however, the present as an instructive referent, offering a tacit alternative to the dystopian configuration (MALAK 1987: 10).

---

<sup>1</sup> The detailed investigation of the reception of the first anti-utopian novel *We* by E.Zamyatin by the Western critics can be found in the monograph *Retseptsiya tvorchesiva E.I.Zamyatina na Zapade* (DOLZHENKO: 2006).

Each epoch produces its mind, its way of mastering the spiritual reality. Hence in the twentieth century, there arouses a special system of understanding, whose meaning is enclosed in the logic of dialogic' appearance. Humanity was glorified by the philosophical concept of Mikhail Bakhtin, equally being the philosophy of culture, philosophy and personality. The most important meaning of the works of M. Bakhtin is that the person only in the state of nonidentity to itself, entering into co-existence (dialogue) with the uniqueness of the other, reaches true life and finds its own uniqueness, creating a new world of understanding and self-affirming spirit, that is, culture.

In 1923, as pointed out by N. Skalon, L. Yakubinsky published his famous work *The Dialogical Speech* in which he, exploring the speech activity, concluded:

*Всякое взаимодействие людей есть именно взаимо-действие; оно, по существу, стремится избежать односторонности, хочет быть двусторонним, диалогичным и бежит монолога. А диалог, как форма речевого высказывания, являясь несомненным явлением культуры, в то же время в большей мере явление природы, чем монолог. Взаимодействие "естественного диалога" и "искусственного монолога" (по терминологии Якубинского) прерывалось, и авторитарная форма речевой деятельности взяла верх. Ведь слушают того, кто имеет власть или пользуется особым авторитетом, вообще в обстановке внушающего воздействия", а само монологизирование связано "с авторитетностью, ритуалом, церемонией..." (SKALON 2004: 12).<sup>2</sup>*

In Zamyatin's *Single State*, the Unanimity dominates, but the novel is correlated with the spirit of Bakhtin's conclusions of his *Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo*. Bakhtin wrote there:

*На почве ... монологизма невозможно существенное взаимодействие сознаний, а потому невозможен существенный диалог... Всякое идеологическое творчество мыслится и воспринимается как возможное выражение одного сознания, одного духа. Даже там, где дело идет о коллективе, о многообразии творящих сил, единство все же иллюстрируется образом одного сознания: духа нации, духа народа, духа истории и т.д. ... Укреплению монологического принципа и его проникновению во все сферы идеологической жизни в новое время содействовал европейский рационализм с его культом единого и единственного разума и особенно эпоха Просвещения, когда формировались основные жанровые формы европейской художественной прозы. Весь*

---

<sup>2</sup> Every human interaction is precisely the inter-action, it in its essence, seeks to avoid one-sidedness, tends to be bidirectional, dialogical and eschews monologue." Dialogue as a form of verbal expression is, "undoubtedly a cultural phenomenon, at the same time to a greater extent a natural phenomenon than a monologue" The interaction of "natural dialogue" and "artificial monologue" (in the terminology of Yakubinsky) interrupted and authoritarian form of speech activity overcame. After all, "they listen to the one who has the power or enjoys particular reputation, all in an atmosphere of inspiring influence", and the very essence of monologue is associated "with the authority, ritual, ceremony ...".

*европейский утопизм также зиждется на этом монологическом принципе. Таков утопический социализм с его верой во всецелые убеждения. Представителем всякого смыслового единства повсюду становится одно сознание и одна точка зрения (БАКHTIN 1972: 98).<sup>3</sup>*

In spite of all its criticism anti-utopia requires the socio-cultural norm, that is, "centered" consciousness, able to perceive, assess, and interpret a text, which - due to its inherent paradox - testifies to the exhaustion of the forms of culture, civilization and their "product" - the person. From this, by the way, arise the writer's difficulties of the protagonist of the novel *We*:

*Я верю – вы поймете, что мне так трудно писать, как никогда ни одному автору на протяжении всей человеческой истории: одни писали для современников, другие – для потомков, но никто никогда не писал для предков или существ, подобных их диким, отдаленным предкам... (ZAMYATIN 2003: 202).<sup>4</sup>*

Dialogic understanding of the culture requires communication with the self as with the other. Following Kant, to think - means to soliloquize then internally (through reproductive imagination) to hear oneself. An internal micro-dialogue is an integral part of the idea of an intercultural dialogue and communication with others via a work or a text suggests a micro-dialogue in the cultural Great Time.

The author of the novel *We*, entrusting his protagonist the narrative, chose the most efficient way of implementing artistic conception. In the inversion structure of anti-genre, the consciousness of a character - a utopian "personality" clichéd by the "rules" of a certain ideal culture - should reveal "from within." In contrast to a narrator-guide to the new world, the narrator in dystopia becomes a person through which the demonstration of the disastrous results of utopian unification is carried out.

As soon as changes take place within the hero of *We*, so changes his manuscript; it acquires the story which D-503 tells in sufficient detail, and which he describes as the genre alteration.

---

<sup>3</sup> On the basis of ... monologism a substantive dialogue is impossible ... Every ideological work is conceived and perceived as a possible expression of one mind, one spirit. Even where it is a question of a collective, of a variety of creating forces, the unity is still illustrated by the single way of consciousness: the spirit of the nation, the spirit of history, etc. .... Strengthening monologue principle and its penetration into all spheres of ideological life in modern times were facilitated by the European rationalism with its cult of one and only reason and especially Age of Enlightenment, when the basic genre forms of the European fiction were shaped. All European utopianism is also based on this monologue principle. It is the utopian socialism, with its belief in the omnipotence of persuasion. Everywhere the representative of any sense unity is the single way of consciousness and the solos point of view.

<sup>4</sup> I believe you will understand that it is harder for me to write than ever it was so many a writer throughout the whole of human history; some wrote for their contemporaries, others for posterity, but no one of them ever wrote for his ancestors or for creatures similar to his savage, remote ancestors...

Changes in the hero's mind involve changing his original intentions. The beginning of the diary is motivated by the appeal to "make treatises, manifestos, odes, and other writings about the beauty and grandeur" (ZAMYATIN 2003: 187) of the Single State. Its author voluntarily begins writing to create a poem dedicated to the structure of life which, to his mind, is the ideal form of human existence in the larger world. The protagonist D-503 himself describes the changes taking place by means of terms that Victor Erlich calls "meta-literary": "And I see with regret that instead of a harmonious and strictly mathematical poem in honour of the United State, a kind of fantastic novel is working out for me" (ZAMYATIN 2003: 255).

D-503 had to send his message to the worlds with a different experience, expressed in other languages. Thus, realizing the possibility of "other worlds," he gradually opens up his own world, because, following the concept of Bakhtin, dialogue is not only a means of revelation of a man, the man becomes what he is in the process of dialogue.

A novel about the birth of a novel, the literature on the new discovery of literature, Zamyatin's *We* is full of reflection. What begins as a mono-voice ode turns into a genre with distinct polyphonic potential. In addition to the single language of the Single State we can hear other voices, even other languages: the language of love (personified by I-330), the language of the past (Ancient House), the language of poetry (the poet R-13, who turned to be a dissident). This polyphony challenges and destroys the authoritarian political language.

In the novel *1984* by G. Orwell, the diary also plays an important role - it begins with the protagonist Winston Smith's revolt against the truth of Big Brother. Having bought an old book with yellowed sheets, an object of the past cultures, at a frowny little junk-shop in a slummy quarter of the town and making the first record, he suddenly begins to reflect on an addressee of his diary:

*For whom, it suddenly occurred to him to wonder, was he writing this diary? For the future, for the unborn. His mind hovered for a moment round the doubtful date on the page, and then fetched up with a bump against the Newspeak word doublethink. For the first time the magnitude of what he had undertaken came home to him. How could you communicate with the future? It was of its nature impossible. Either the future would resemble the present, in which case it would not listen to him: or it would be different from it, and his predicament would be meaningless (ORWELL 1949: 7).*

In both novels, the readers of the diaries are to be the representatives of the other worlds, other eras, and the fear of their authors lies in potential misunderstanding. In this, the novels are correlative with Bakhtin's concept of the authorship crisis (created in the 1920s).

The authors of the anti-utopias reveal the futility of attempts of any social system "to stop" the historical time, to preserve the status quo. This intention bears the end of the society's development and its complete degradation.

The privileged elite in the novels by Zamyatin, Huxley, Orwell declares war to the history, liquidating books, rewriting newspaper articles, replacing the facts of the past, breaking the links between generations, destroying the institution of the family, thus trying to eliminate the cultural dialogue (again we appeal to Bakhtin, for whom dialogue is the communication of different cultures and, in turn, culture - is a form of communication between people, a dialogue form).

The meeting of two cultures takes place in a special intellectual space - "space of history," where the historical consciousness is formed and further developed. That development of the historical consciousness cannot be allowed by the rulers of the anti-utopias, so O'Brien says to Winston Smith: "You are outside history, you are non-existent" (ORWELL 1949: 239).

In *Brave New World*, history is considered to be quite useless information, because it is easier to fight off interest in it than ever to destroy it:

*"You all remember," said the Controller, in his strong deep voice, "you all remember, I suppose, that beautiful and inspired saying of Our Ford's: History is bunk. History," he repeated slowly, "is bunk."*

*He waved his hand; and it was as though, with an invisible feather whisk, he had brushed away a little dust, and the dust was Harappa, was Ur of the Chaldees; some spider-webs, 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? (HUXLEY 1998: 33)*

In anti-utopias there is always Kantian "nature area" and "area of freedom," in *We* they are divided by the Green Wall, in *Brave New World* the Reservation is inhabited by savages who do not fit the Other Place, in *1984* there are proles, being the majority of the inhabitants of Oceania but who are still in a semi-wild, ignorant state, and members of the Inner Party. In the "nature area" a human belongs entirely to the sensual (phenomenal) world in which the ability to reflect on and analyze exists only as a prerequisite. On the contrary, in the "area of freedom" everything is based on expediency, the motto of *Brave New World* is the slogan "COMMUNITY, IDENTITY, STABILITY."

In the Single State everything is built on expediency. D-503 states this crucially important for the ideology of the Single State law: "...работа что есть в человеке, - рассудка - сводится именно к непрерывному ограничению бесконечности на удобные, легко перевариваемые порции - дифференциалы" (ZAMYATIN 2003: 230).<sup>5</sup>

According to N. Skalon, cognition, relegated to the rational rules and regulations, is a form of coercion. It is a canon, excluding any "question mark" (SKALON 2004: 59).

---

<sup>5</sup> ... the work of the highest thing in man, the reason, boils precisely down to the uninterrupted limitation of infinity into convenient, easily digestible portions, or differentials.

But expelled from the scope of the State and destroyed beyond its borders (for bringing down almost to the level of primates the tribe is unable to formulate abstract problems) antinomies come to life on the junction of these two spheres. Ascending to the self-consciousness the hero of the novel begins to feel acutely his "marginality," which is manifested in the fact he realizes the attachment to these two worlds (D-503 discovers something "turbulent and hairy" within himself) and - simultaneously - delimitation of them.

He comes to the experience of his "specialness," originality, uniqueness. And it is antinomy, not disharmony of existence that has to be got over because it belongs to the areas which not only differ from each other in the degree of "perfection – imperfection," but deny each other. Moreover, the hero is in a situation of metamorphosis, ready - literally - to be born again: "Было два меня. Один я – прежний. Д-503, номер Д-503, а другой... Раньше он только чуть высовывал свои лохматые лапы из скорлупы, а теперь вылезал весь, скорлупа трещала, вот сейчас разлетится на куски и... и что тогда?" (ZAMYATIN 2003: 225).<sup>6</sup>

The dynamism of the world-picture of the world, approved by Zamyatin, is emphasized by the fact that the images of Shakespeare, Dostoevsky, and the Buddha form the part of the interior in the apartment of the Ancient House. Underlined here the succession of general cultural traditions, providing not only "genre memory" (the notes of D-503), but the memory of the person as the value, does not preclude accent shift of the meaning of these traditions. The hero falls in the spiritual situation: finding personal consciousness, he thus finds himself in the troubled field of culture. The selection and due to choice act is required.

In the novel of Huxley, the important value for John the Savage is *The Completed Works by W. Shakespeare*, the author conveys the feelings of the hero, as he read the first lines of the book: "The strange words rolled through his mind; rumbled, like talking thunder; like the drums at the summer dances, if the drums could have spoken; like the men singing the Corn Song, beautiful, beautiful, so that you cried" (HUXLEY 1998: 125).

The spinning wheel of the Ancient House in Zamyatin is the symbol of life: birth, death and rebirth. To escape from this wheel one has to be a follower of the Buddha, able to reach Nirvana, that is the absolute peace. However, for Zamyatin the truth lies not in peace, but in dynamics. And as in a dream D-503 sees whirling colors:

*Тот самый странный, 'королевский' инструмент – и дикая, неорганизованная, сумасшедшая – как тогдашняя музыка – пестрота красок и форм. Белая плоскость*

---

<sup>6</sup> There were two of me. I saw into myself from outside. One was the former I, Number D-503, whereas the other... Formerly, he had only poked his hairy paws a little way out of the shell, but now the whole of him was crawling out, the shell was cracking, it would fly to pieces at any moment and... And then what?

– *вверху; темно-синие стены; красные, зеленые, оранжевые переплеты древних книг; желтая бронза – канделябры, статуя Будды...*(ZAMYATIN 2003: 204).<sup>7</sup>

The complexity of the world, its meaningfulness, the very ability to develop result from the diversity of culture, monuments, artifacts which are still stored in the Ancient House.

Children and books are equalized as symbols of potential infinity of development, change, formation. Conceptual "explosion" is able to anticipate and thereby extinguish the social explosion, fraught with destruction both children and books, turning a man into a number. In this sense becomes indicative one scene of *Brave New World*, in which children are, inculcated the feeling of disgust to flowers (sensual sphere) and books (cognitive sphere):

*Books and loud noises, flowers and electric shocks - already in the infant mind these couples were compromisingly linked; and after two hundred repetitions of the same or a similar lesson would be wedded indissolubly. What man has joined, nature is powerless to put asunder* (HUXLEY 1998: 20)

In this sense, the Ancient House of *We* is the topos of culture, mating the traditional values (life, family, children) and the ability to innovate in spiritual activities. The latter are based on the inexhaustible meanings accumulated by the previous development of culture.

In anti-utopian novels man is declared to be the value embodying the unity of the "real world" and "the other world" (in other words, phenomenal and noumenal). The separation of these worlds leads, as shown in the novel, to confrontation, conditioned by static nature of self-regulation, the lack of dynamic (asymmetric) impetus for the development and interaction. Total unity (for any reason) leaves no place for individual initiative of the mind, deprived of freedom - or even possibility - of expressing thoughts.

In the plots of anti-utopias the identity of the hero is marked by an equal sign of resistance, protest against the transformation of the individual in the "cog" in the state mechanism, that is, against the obliteration of the concept of personality. The hero of George Orwell's *1984* initially does not like and does not trust the government, but he takes the open position of a rebel only at the time of his last breakup, when he is in the frightful room 101 in response to O'Brien's triumphant prophecy about the conquest of matter and consciousness and finds the strength to say: "I don't know -- I don't care. Somehow you will fail. Something will defeat you. Life will defeat you." (ORWELL 1949: 238)

---

<sup>7</sup> That same strange "royal" musical instrument, and a savage, disorganized medley of colours and forms, likes the music of those times. A white surface overhead, dark-blue wall, the red, green and orange bindings of ancient volumes, the yellow bronze of chandeliers and a statue of the Buddha...



It is no coincidence that in the works of anti-utopian orientation a personality is embodied in a kind of aesthetic mouthpiece, carrying the idea of societal culture transformation. Anti-utopian personality aspires to uphold its personal "system quality" under conditions of dramatic, often – tragic, confrontation with a society that is entirely subordinate to the state. The culture of anti-utopian "free" society is - essentially - a system of the restrictions and prohibitions created by mankind through education, morals and laws aimed at suppressing undesirable for societal manifestations of individuals that reinforces sustainable forms of civilization in playable intellectual products.

Important and fundamental impact on the social culture has the power, namely, the political regime, in which the individual is enclosed within certain limits and deprived of the opportunity of self-expression. In the course of the narration protagonists come to the realization of their personal isolation and significance. The dialogue for D-503 begins as the awareness of unlikeness, which happens to him in a state of ambivalence when removed from himself, he is able to see and hear:

*...Понимаете: даже мысли. Это потому, что никто не "один", но "один из". Мы так одинаковы...*

*Она:*

*- Вы уверены?*

*Я увидел острым углом вздернутые к вискам брови – как острые рожки икса, опять почему-то сбился, взглянул направо, налево – и... (ZAMYATIN 2003: 191).<sup>8</sup>*

Actually, this dialogue is the beginning of awareness by the protagonist his-self, an element of existence, in terms of Bakhtin's concept, for a dialogue between two people or characters, for Bakhtin is the existence, the spiritual reality.

All the characters are defeated in a duel with the state, which at the time of the classic anti-utopia experiences its strongest, victorious phase, the culmination period. The tendency to the self-consciousness and the free moral choice in this world cannot become "epidemic" – that is the burden of some, who are urgently isolated from "happy babies." In short, Bernard Marx is to be sent "to the islands" specially designed for the intellectuals of his type, and the freedom-loving speeches of the Savage become a laughingstock. Having realized it, the Savage commits suicide. Winston Smith is destroyed physically, mentally and emotionally. After brain-washing and shock therapy, he feels, that "it was all right, everything was all right, the struggle was finished. He had won the victory over himself. He loved "Big Brother" (ORWELL 1949: 24). Zamyatin's protagonist is exposed to the Great

---

<sup>8</sup> Even thoughts, you see. It's because no one is 'alone', each is 'one of'. We are identical...

She: - Are you sure?

I saw the brows tilted up at an acute angle to the temples, like the sharp horns of *x* and for some reason I lost my bearings again, looked to the right, to the left, and...

Operation and at the end he is happy: "Потому что я здоров, я совершенно, абсолютно здоров. Я улыбаюсь - я не могу не улыбаться: из головы вытащили какую-то занозу, в голове легко, пусто" (ZAMYATIN 2003: 340).<sup>9</sup>

All anti-utopias end with a triumphant victory over individuality. Though, however, the rebel-protagonist discovers that he is not alone; others like him exist, physically or psychologically beyond utopia's walls: the Savages of *We*, the (perhaps only apocryphal) Brotherhood of 1984. It is to these savings remnants that the rebel seeks to escape; it is they who embody the cultural primitivism.

The most correct evaluation and the best conclusion have been made by Robert Philmus:

*While the retreat to nature from the computerized technocracy is not represented as a practical alternate way of surviving in a world dominated by the totalitarian technocracy, it is a compensatory gesture in the direction of pointing out the institutionalized imbalance in the insanely rational utopia. Nature, that is, becomes the scene of a life of emotional and instinctual expression as opposed to the repression in the rational state* (PHILMUS 1970: 158).

From N. Berdyaev, A. Huxley took the epigraph to *Brave New World*, in which one can hear the appeal to avoid utopias and return to non-utopian, less "perfect" but more free society. In Berdyaev's accent (Huxley was objectively in solidarity with), we can note the distinct retrospectivism: i.e. "free society" is not "ahead" but "behind," because it is necessary to return to it. The subject is not the socio-political formation, the model social community but the need to maintain the individual in its activity. As Bakhtin noted, "I think" means "I act with the thought" (In: PESHKOV 1996: 97).

The strength of society consists in diversity of opinions, without dissent there can be no progress of culture. Totalitarianism, in whatever clothes it may dress itself, leads only to regress - both the moral and the economic. This current of thought and this course of action brings nothing but decay for the humanity, and therefore we can safely attribute it to an absolute evil. The main and most formidable enemy of totalitarianism is the personality. Culture is not able to develop under the situation of personality's inactivity, and the person cannot create culture in government bans. Hence under totalitarian pressure there is no other choice for the culture but to remain at the level of primitivism. The only way out is seen in the dialogue between the cultures of "real world" and "the other world," which do not part, but converge at the "point" called a man.

In the 1920s, Bakhtin created his concept of authorship crisis, and if the "crisis of authorship" refers to the "crisis of life" in its falling away "from the absolute future"

---

<sup>9</sup> Because I'm fit, I am completely, absolutely fit. I smile, because I cannot help smiling. They've pulled a kind of splinter out of my brain and my head is now light and empty.

(BAKHTIN 1979: 179), that, as correctly noted by D. Bak, only reinforces the need to understand the "possibility of authorship, the eligibility of artistic expression as the cornerstone issues of the day" (BAK 1995: 187). Anti-utopian novels by E. Zamyatin, A. Huxley and G. Orwell demonstrated the possibility to keep the genre and the genre thinking as a condition of interpersonal, intercultural and social communication.

### **Bibliography**

- BAKHTIN, Mikhail (1972): Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaya literatura.
- BAKHTIN, Mikhail (1975): Voprosy literatury i estetiki. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaya literatura.
- BAKHTIN, Mikhail (1979): Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva. Moskva: Iskusstvo.
- BAK, D.P. (1995): Estetika M. M. Bakhtina v kontekste genezisa idei istoricheskoy poetiki. In: Bachtinologia. Issledovaniya, perevody, publikatsii. Sankt Peterburg.
- BATALOV, Eduard (1989): V mire utopii. Pyat' dialogov ob utopii, utopicheskom soznanii i utopicheskikh eksperimentach. Moskva: Politizdat.
- BEAUCHAMP, Gorman (1974). Future Words: Language and Dystopian Novel. In: Style vol.8, pp. 462-476.
- DOLZHENKO, Svetlana/ BELOZYOROVA Julia (2006): Retsepsiya tvorchestva E.I.Zamyatina na Zapade. Ishim: IGPI im. P. P. Ershova.
- HUXLEY, Aldous (1998): Brave New World. New York: Perennial Classics.
- MALAK, Amin (1987). Margaret Atwood's "The Handmaid's Tale" and the Dystopian Tradition. In: Canadian Literature. Vancouver, BC no. 112, pp.9-16.
- ORWELL, George (1949): 1984. London: Secker&Warburg.
- PESHKOV, I. V. (1996): M. M. Bakhtin: ot filosofii postupka k ritorike postupka. Moskva.
- PHILMUS, Robert (1970): Into the Unknown: The Evolution of Science Fiction from Francis Godwin to H. G. Wells. Berkley: University of California Press.
- SKALON, Nikolai (2004): Budushchee stalo nastojashchim (Roman Zamyatina "My" v literaturno-filosofskom kontekste). Tyumen: Ekspres.
- ZAMYATIN, Evgeny (2003): Antologia Satiry i Yumora Rossii XX veka. Moskva: Eksmo.