

University of Pardubice

Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Dystopian Themes in *Brave New World* and *The Hunger Games*: A Comparison

Bc. Bára Müllerová

Master's Thesis

2019

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Akademický rok: 2017/2018

ZADÁNÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE (projektu, uměleckého díla, uměleckého výkonu)

Jméno a příjmení: **Bc. Bára Müllerová**
Osobní číslo: **H17339**
Studijní program: **N7310 Filologie**
Studijní obor: **Anglická filologie**
Téma práce: **Porovnání dystopických témat v dílech Brave New World a The Hunger Games**
Zadávací katedra: **Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

Zásady pro vypracování

Cílem diplomové práce je porovnat dvě dystopické novely, Brave New World a The Hunger Games, z hlediska jejich motivů a struktury, a posléze obhájit paralely, které se mezi oběma díly objevují i navzdory jejich rozlišnému dobově-kulturnímu kontextu. Před samotnou juxtapozicí se diplomantka zaměří na literární žánr dystopie a stručně představí jeho historický vývoj v anglicky mluvících zemích. Dále také vymezí pojmy „utopie“ a „anti-utopie“ s ohledem na jejich novodobé rozlišení v akademické literatuře. Navazující analýza se postupně soustředí na podobnosti mezi Brave New World a The Hunger Games v oblasti klíčových témat (kritika totalitárních politických systémů, zneužití vědy a technologie), archetypů fiktivních postav a metafor, které dané novely provázejí, přičemž dojde k zohlednění tématiky nastíněné v teoretických kapitolách.

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:

Rozsah grafických prací:

Forma zpracování diplomové práce: **tištěná**



Seznam doporučené literatury:

- Baker, David Weil. 1999. *Divulging Utopia: Radical Humanism in Sixteenth-Century England*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Booker, M. Keith. 1994. *Dystopian Literature: A Theory and Research Guide*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Booker, M. Keith. 1994. *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Booker, M. Keith. 2002. *The Post-Utopian Imagination: American Culture in the Long 1950s*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Bruce, Susan. 1999. *Three Early Modern Utopias*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Claeys, Gregory. 2017. *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Claeys, Gregory. 2010. *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Cambridge University Press.
- DeKoven, Marianne. 2004. *Utopia Limited: The Sixties and the Emergence of the Postmodern*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Goodwin, Barbara. 2001. *The Philosophy of Utopia*. London: Routledge.
- Gordin, Michael D., Helen Tilley, and Gyan Prakash. 2010. *Utopia/Dystopia: Conditions of Historical Possibility*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jacoby, Russell. 2005. *Picture Imperfect: Utopian Thought for an Anti-Utopian Age*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Levitas, Ruth. 2010. *The Concept of Utopia*. Bern: Peter Lang Publishing.
- MacKay Demerjian, Louisa. 2016. *The Age of Dystopia: One Genre, Our Fears and Our Future*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Molan, Tom. 2000. *Scraps of the Untainted Sky: Science Fiction, Utopia, Dystopia*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Mumford, Lewis. 1962. *The Story of Utopias*. New York: Viking Press.
- Rothstein, Edward, Herbert Muschamp, and Martin E. Marty. 2003. *Visions of Utopia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sargisson, Lucy. 2010. *Fool's Gold? Utopianism in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schmidt, Orville H. 2001. *Utopia: Heaven or Hell?* New York: Writers Club Press.
- Vieira, Fátima. 2013. *Dystopia(n) Matters: On the Page, On Screen, On Stage*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Yoran, Hanan. 2010. *Between Utopia and Dystopia: Erasmus, Thomas More, and the Humanist Republic of Letters*. Plymouth: Lexington Books.

Vedoucí diplomové práce: **doc. Šárka Bubíková, Ph.D.**
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání diplomové práce: **30. dubna 2018**

Termín odevzdání diplomové práce: **31. března 2019**



prof. PhDr. Karel Rýdl, CSc.
děkan

Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D.
vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2018

Prohlašuji:

Tuto práci jsem vypracovala samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využila, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.

Byla jsem seznámena s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., autorský zákon, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Souhlasím s prezenčním zpřístupněním své práce v Univerzitní knihovně.

V Pardubicích dne 21. 8. 2019

Bára Müllerová

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, doc. Mgr. Šárka Bubíková, Ph.D., for her guidance, encouragement, and immense patience. I would also like to thank my family for their support.

Annotation

In this master's thesis, two dystopian novels, *Brave New World* and *The Hunger Games* (referring only to the first volume of the series), are analyzed as individually standing products of the same literary stream which in their own ways adhere to the themes, motifs, and clichés typical for the genre. Subsequently, the two pieces are juxtaposed in terms of similarities as well as differences in order to assess the constancy of the dystopian genre regardless of the time period or the distinct historical and cultural context contributing to the creation of such novels. The intermission between the release of the former book (*Brave New World*) and the latter book (*The Hunger Games*) spanning almost 80 years, the two works offer a debilitating insight into oppressive cultures that present themselves as utopian despite being strongly dystopian and laying their foundations on the repression and exploitation of the lower classes. Taking into consideration this initial resemblance of the focal topic which each of the authors chose as the primary and defining point of their respective books, this thesis attempts to trace further parallels between the two pieces when breaking them into smaller categories such as main themes, character archetypes, and the overall message of the storyline. Simultaneously with this effort, however, this paper also aspires to locate and explain any differences emerging in the same aforementioned categories (themes, archetypes, metaphors). That is done by examining how historical context may have shaped the authors' personal (yet culturally motivated) outlook on the dystopian genre in terms of how to portray an oppressed society.

The thesis is divided into three major parts and the juxtaposition itself. Firstly, an insight into the history of dystopia as a literary genre is provided in detail, focusing on its metamorphosis from utopia into anti-utopia and, finally, into dystopia as the contemporary reader knows it, all the while establishing that the selected novels do indeed belong to this vast category of literature. Secondly, dystopia is examined more closely through its typical themes, archetypes etc., using the two selected novels as a vivid illustration of these factors in practice. Thirdly, historical context preceding and accompanying the origins of the books is offered in order to classify them as products of their own individual cultures (British and American, respectively), delineating possible reasons for the authors' varying approaches when creating and describing a dystopian world and its society. And lastly, the two novels are put side by side and contrasted in regards to the central motifs employed by each of the authors, concentrating on drawing comparisons as well as distinctions between the two pieces. As such, this paper strives to demonstrate that even two authors of different epochs and cultures can write corresponding works; not because they would respond to the same situation, but in spite of the fact they react to different times and problems and create completely unique worlds and works.

Key words

dystopia; utopia; historical context; juxtaposition; *Brave New World*; *The Hunger Games*

Název

Porovnání dystopických témat v dílech *Brave New World* a *The Hunger Games*

Anotace

Předmětem této magisterské teze je komparační analýza románů *Brave New World* a *The Hunger Games* (tím se zde míní pouze první díl stejnojmenné trilogie) jakožto produktů téhož literárního žánru, dystopie, z nichž každý po svém zpracovává motivy, archetypy a metafory pro tento žánr typické. Cílem tohoto srovnání je dokázat, že mezi těmito zdánlivě zcela vzájemně nesouvisejícími knihami lze nalézt přesvědčivé paralely i přes určité jejich rozdílnosti, a že dystopická tradice je v případě těchto dvou novel silnější než dobový a kulturní kontext. Časové rozpětí mezi *Brave New World* a *The Hunger Games* dosahuje téměř osmdesáti let, přesto obě díla poskytují vysilující pohled do společností ovládaných totalitním režimem a založených na útlaku a využívání nižších tříd, kritizují vědu a techniku a zdůrazňují totéž sdělení. Tyto stěžejní podobnosti ústředních motivů umožňují nahlížet na obě novely se záměrem vyhledat mezi nimi další, detailnější spojitosti, například co se týče již zmíněných motivů a archetypů. V tezi ale zároveň dochází i k lokaci a objasnění případných autorských rozdílů, aby se zabránilo napadnutelnosti či neobjektivitě konečného závěru, který z analýzy vyplývá. Z tohoto důvodu práce zkoumá nejen dystopický žánr a daná díla samotná, ale také zohlední spojitost mezi *Brave New World* a britskou historií a *The Hunger Games* a historií americkou, čímž vysvětlí jisté spisovatelské osobitosti prevalentní v obou dílech.

Teze je rozdělena do tří teoreticko-praktických částí a následné juxtaopozice. Prvně dochází k osvětlení vzniku a vývoje dystopického žánru od utopie přes anti-utopii po dystopii, jak ji dnešní čtenář zná. Souvisle s tím je vysvětleno, v čem se tyto tři termíny liší a proč *Brave New World* a *The Hunger Games* skutečně patří do žánru dystopie, přestože představují světy, v nichž by měla existovat utopie. Dále se práce zaměří na dystopii jako takovou a její hlavní náměty v obou novelách. Zatřetí dojde k poskytnutí dobového a kulturního kontextu předcházejícího a provázejícího vznik obou děl, aby se lépe ozřejmila jistá specifika, která novely odlišují. Nakonec se obě díla do většího detailu porovnají s pomocí několika vybraných klíčových motivů, metafor atd. K tomuto kroku autorka práce přistupuje s přesvědčením, že paralelismus mezi oběma knihami je přece jen výrazně silnější než body, ve kterých se tematicky rozchází, a že i dva spisovatelé z různých dob a kontinentů mohou sdělit tu samou zprávu, přestože nereagují na ten samý impuls.

Klíčová slova

dystopie; utopie; dystopie s tváří utopie; dobový kontext; porovnání; *Brave New World*;
The Hunger Games

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	9
1 Dystopia.....	12
Utopia.....	12
Anti-Utopia.....	17
Dystopia.....	18
2 Worlds Wearing Utopian Faces.....	22
Parallelism, Not Dichotomy.....	22
The Role of the State.....	26
The Role of Science and Technology.....	30
3 Cultural Context.....	40
“White Man’s Burden” Britain.....	41
Segregated America.....	45
4 <i>Brave New World</i> and <i>The Hunger Games</i> : A Comparison.....	49
Themes.....	50
Archetypes.....	57
Metaphors.....	58
Conclusion.....	60
Resumé.....	64
Bibliography.....	70

Introduction

As the short annotation indicates, in this master's thesis it is attempted to create a comprehensive comparison between the novels *Brave New World* and the first volume of *The Hunger Games* series, a book of the same name (*The Hunger Games*). The books are treated throughout the paper as two pieces belonging to the same literary stream and utilizing similar – if not the same – themes in many aspects of the individual authors' storytelling. However, when taking into awareness the writers' vastly varying cultural experiences as people who were born at different times and in different continents, the two works are analyzed not only for their corresponding motifs, but also for those in which they visibly contrast. Preceding the juxtaposition itself, an extensive theoretical insight into what dystopia is and how the authors' cultural contexts could have shaped their writing is provided, supported by practical illustrations of these claims which are supplemented by a variety of excerpts from the respective pair of books central for this analysis.

Brave New World was written by Aldous Huxley, a British writer, and published in 1932. As such, it could be classified as a piece of the Interwar Period when peace was deemed uncertain and therefore its value was all the more cherished. Adhering to the desolate atmosphere of his time, Huxley's novel presents a seemingly utopian society whose key goal is to bring comfort, (regulated) progress, and happiness to its peoples. Every citizen of the postapocalyptic world is provided for, even the members of the lowest castes. The society as a whole, however, is deeply hierarchical, using the lower classes as menial workers, or rather as tools whose mental and physical capabilities had been preconditioned to amount to nothing but labour by the use of genetic modifications, i.e. by scientific techniques developed and implemented by the members of the upper class who remain in absolute control of the civilization and its advancements. Given this major condition – that the world can only work for as long as each member of the society adapts to their a priori chosen function which was moreover picked for them by the ruling class – *Brave New World* serves as a moral contemplation as to how far the humankind is willing to go and how many of its own it is willing to sacrifice and suppress in order to maintain a lifeless, mindless semblance of peace.

Written by an American author Suzanne Collins almost 80 years after the release of *Brave New World*, the first volume of *The Hunger Games* saga, named *The Hunger Games* after the series' umbrella title, follows a similar premise. The plot unfolds to depict a postapocalyptic, strongly hierarchical society in which the ruling class lives in the illusion of perfection and peace while all of the remaining lower classes toil and starve to provide for the upper crust. Unlike in Huxley's novel, in Collins's saga the initial utopian facade is more distinctly merged with the themes of dystopia from the very beginning as it is told from the viewpoint of one of the world's

“underdogs.” Additionally, the utopian-dystopian overlap emerges clearer in Collins’s work because of the absence of genetic preconditioning keeping the masses sated and sedated, which in the series does not exist and is instead supplemented by heavy propaganda, usurpation of freedom of speech, and steadfast, sometimes even violent oppression – all of which later spark rebellion rather than complacency. (Although *The Hunger Games* also implements brainwashing as a part of the ruling regime’s regular routine, it is a motif that does not appear until the release of the later volumes of the saga.) Identical to Huxley, Collins thus describes a world where the pampered upper class lives in its private utopia and has absolute control over the impoverished and repressed lower classes, proposing that such a “utopian” dream can only prevail for as long as the mute masses do not grow a voice.

Although each work consists of idiosyncratic ideas and offers a slightly new look at the dystopian genre and therefore implies an individualistic authorial approach from Huxley and Collins, their books definitely do share a fair amount of similarities when looked at closely. For that reason, a cohesive and exhaustive comparison of the two works is offered below, focusing on motifs and themes, character archetypes, and key metaphors. Before stipulating what shall be the exact focus of this thesis, however, it may be equally as important to give a full disclaimer in regards to what the thesis does *not* focus on. The disclaimer shall be given in order to prevent confusion and to defer inquiries aimed at topics and issues that are not central or even remotely related to the course of the following analysis.

This thesis does not strive to concentrate on Suzanne Collins’s entire trilogy, given that the magnitude of the three pieces combined would tremendously exceed Huxley’s comparatively compact novel in terms of length, complexity, and development of the central plotline. The decision to choose the first volume of the series instead of e.g. the second or the third one as the particular piece to be contrasted with *Brave New World* is that these two novels are the most similar in their internal structure, seeing that they both rely on very comparable themes and plot points (as shall be illustrated later on).

Neither does this thesis strive to examine the writers’ private lives and purely personal motivations which may have led them to create their most acclaimed pieces, but instead it focuses on the period in which they live(d) and on culturally based experiences which may have contributed to shaping the way Huxley and Collins decided to construct their fictional realms. Allowing this “distance” from the individual, this paper is able to treat *Brave New World* and *The Hunger Games* as two distinct yet eerily similar products of the same literary genre – dystopia – created by writers who transcend their own culturally and historically pre-given outlook and instead follow a strong artistic tradition.

By this point, a question must have been raised by potential readers who might wonder why these two books in particular, and not any other pair or set of books, function as the main material for this thesis. The answer may be slightly subjective. As a student of literature, the author of this thesis has been conditioned (hopefully not in the dystopian sense) to see parallels, analogies, and cross-references when reading literature of practically any kind. Because of the now unshakeable habit, the connection between Huxley and Collins's works has always stood as apparent to them, and in the remaining text this possibly random choice shall be explained, defended, and, optimistically, it will gain its ground as equally apparent even in the readers' minds.

To provide terminological specifics intended to make the reading of this thesis more comprehensible to the potential readers, it is crucial to mention that the author distinguishes the following expressions: utopia, a utopia, and Utopia. "Utopia," capitalized thusly, in this paper refers precisely and only to a mythical topographic place envisioned and coined long before Huxley and Collins's times; "utopia," without any additional articles, refers precisely to the identically called literary genre; and "a utopia," with a preceding indefinite article, refers precisely to a fictional world (society) unrelated to More's Utopia aside from the general idea of a fabled, ideal place. The term "dystopia" is approached in the same fashion.

Last but not least, the methodological approach selected for the structure of this paper is an eclectic synthesis of theoretical information and definitions supplied and supported by concurrent practical evidencing. The determination of the combination method as the most effective for the purpose of this paper depends on the author's previous experience and comfort gained with the method when writing their bachelor's thesis. The quote the author's own unchanged reasoning for choosing this approach:

The methodology determined as the most efficient was an eclectic synthesis subsisting of definitions, interpretations, and information from varied and valid sources in the theoretical part in order to preserve the economical medium that is a bachelor's thesis. The practical part, meaning the actual application of these definitions, interpretations, and information to the subject novel, then merges with theory continuously throughout the paper. The method was selected to better illuminate theoretical proposals and demonstrate the main hypothesis.¹

In this case, the main hypothesis declares that Huxley and Collins's books both belong to the dystopian stream of literature, and that despite being the products of distinct eras and historical backgrounds, they unite in key themes and largely address the same topics.

¹ Bára Müllerová, introduction to "Cultural Clash in *The Mountain Is Young* by Han Suyin" (Bachelor Thesis, University of Pardubice, 2017), 10.

1 Dystopia

In the introductory part of this thesis, the claim is already raised that the examined novels, *Brave New World* and *The Hunger Games*, are two distinct yet eerily similar products of the dystopian genre. Before delving deeper into the actual juxtaposition of these two pieces, however, it is crucial to explain in which manner they actually adhere to the genre to even be classified as such and treated thusly throughout the analysis. For that reason, “dystopia” as a theoretical term shall be defined in the following subchapters, including its historical development across the ages. In connection to the search for a general definition and the main evolutionary points of the literary stream, focus shall be specifically put on three major sub-categories (or developmental stages) dystopia could be divided into.

Utopia

Ironically, the origins of dystopia lay in what could be (imprecisely) classified as its polar opposite – the unattainable utopia whose roots shall presently be traced in order to better understand dystopia in its three major stages.

It all had started with peace brought upon with “Community, Identity, Stability”² like in *Brave New World* and ended with violent Peacemakers like in *The Hunger Games*. What had originally been a novel and fantastic quest to envision a paradise on earth soon instead became a chase to fabricate the worst imaginable scenario where there is little left to live for. How and why this evolution – or devolution – of human expectation happened and when it began shall presently be discussed.

Taking the liberty of omitting the Platonic approach to (a) utopia as a place or a philosophical-political approach, this section of the thesis shall concentrate on utopia purely as a literary stream, and even more specifically so in English-speaking countries.

The roots of utopian writing are majorly, if not outright unanimously, linked to Thomas More’s 1516 opus magnum, *Utopia*,³ whose undeniable influence on the genre is apparent not only due to the fact that the novel prompted an influx of works operating on the same premise, but also due to the fact that the title of the novel remains the very term to encapsulate the genre to this day. Naming his novel “no place” (and sparking discussions about its homophonous relationship with the word *eutopia*, translated as “good place” and serving thus as a pun),^{4 5} Thomas More

2 Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World* (London: Vintage Classics, 2004), 1.

3 Michael D. Gordin, Helen Tilley, and Gyan Prakash, “Utopia and Dystopia Beyond Space and Time,” in *Utopia/Dystopia: Conditions of Historical Possibility*, ed. Michael D. Gordin, Helen Tilley, and Gyan Prakash (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 1.

4 Edward Rothstein, “Utopia and Its Discontents,” in *Visions of Utopia*, ed. Edward Rothstein, Herbert Muschamp, and Martin E. Marty (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 2.

5 Carol Farley Kessler, *Charlotte Gilman Perkins: Her Progress Towards Utopia, with Selected Writings* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1995), 7, accessed July 17, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=Ex3avKz2NIwC&printsec=frontcover&dq=gilman+utopia+herland&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjtwOr6_rvJA

unwittingly named a whole stream of literature that would later evolve (or devolve) into anti-utopia and dystopia. A neologism and a newly (re-)explored concept during its era, Utopia and the subsequently developing utopian genre were shaped by the main stream of the then ethical stance, Humanism.⁶ This stream of thinking endeavoured to imagine and, ideally, reach “perfect or Utopia-like worlds” in connection to the Humanist “claim to be exercising moral and political leadership.”⁷ Therefore, Utopia and her literary successors presented what More and his contemporaries considered to be, broadly speaking, a better place and a better state of mind.

In America, Jean Pfaelzer ascribes the greatest rise of the utopian novel to the last two decades of the 1800s.⁸ Pfaelzer notes the sudden leap from the more practical, travel-oriented American dream to find one’s own utopia on earth to the establishment of a unified stream of literature, and calls it an echo of the voices of “social theoreticians, Populists, trade unionists, and feminists who announced that solutions to the problems wrought by industry, immigration, and urbanization were now available.”⁹ In short, she labels the growing popularity of utopia in America as a response to the end of an era of problems; an end which opened the door to a more optimistic outlook on the future.

Marianne DeKoven dates the escalation of interest in American utopianism to approximately the same period, pointing several decades ahead of Pfaelzer’s dating to include the Antebellum era as a factor.¹⁰ Her reasoning is such that utopianism, in its core, is deeply interwoven with the ideas of abolitionism and English enlightenment,¹¹ indicating yet again that the human tendency to fabricate paradisiacal places stems from the need for something better, healthier, and more functional than the recent state of affairs can offer.

While the “boom” of English and American utopian literature differs temporally, the two approaches to writing utopia intrinsically coincide in the effort to publish works of fiction that react

hXB5KYKHflZAwUQ6AEIRTA#v=onepage&q=utopia%20herland&f=false.

6 Hanan Yorán, introduction to *Between Utopia and Dystopia: Erasmus, Thomas More, and the Humanist Republic of Letters* (Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2010), 12.

7 David Weil Baker, introduction to *Divulging Utopia: Radical Humanism in Sixteenth-Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999), 5, accessed July 17, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=goaWHuoMMq0C&pg=PA5&dq=utopia+humanism&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwizh_TskrzjAhXawsQBHSXjB7QQuwUINzAB#v=onepage&q=utopia%20humanism&f=false.

8 Jean Pfaelzer, *The Utopian Novel in America, 1886-1896: The Politics of Form* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1984), 5, accessed July 17, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=M19J3ZjN2vYC&printsec=frontcover&dq=The+Utopian+novel+in+America,+1886-1896&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwip-oz9kLzjAhVSxaYKHV2wA_0Q6AEILDAA#v=onepage&q=The%20Utopian%20novel%20in%20America%2C%201886-1896&f=false.

9 Pfaelzer, *The Utopian Novel in America*, 5.

10 Marianne DeKoven, *Utopia Limited: The Sixties and the Emergence of the Postmodern* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), accessed July 17, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=obNS29D94tkC&pg=PA363&lpg=PA363&dq=marianne+utopia+limited&source=bl&ots=h3BA8Ba46-&sig=ACfU3U06gTfW2nUsMw4KX0ECv0x8bEgt0Q&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiDsobYsb7jAhWNblAKHUFOApoQ6AEwB3oECAkQAQ#v=onepage&q=utopia&f=false>.

11 DeKoven, *Utopia Limited*.

to the present situation, be it a situation political, social, or other, as well as offer ways to potentially remedy the respective problem. One of the major American writers of the time was Edward Bellamy, whose *Looking Backwards*, published in 1888, corroborates the idea that the then utopian literature focused on “America based on economic stability and principles of justice.”¹² As such, the American utopia closely copies her nearly four hundred years older sister, the English Humanist utopia, coming full circle.

Dating thus five hundred years back, utopia lives from the times of English Humanism to present, all the while serving as a source of material and inspiration for contemplation and creation to numerous authors. To name some of them and their famously utopian pieces: Sir Francis Bacon (*New Atlantis*, 1626),¹³ H. G. Wells (*A Modern Utopia*, 1905),¹⁴ and Charlotte Perkins Gilman (*Herland*, 1915).¹⁵ Despite maintaining a strong and long-lasting tradition, utopia eventually meets its decline as its counterparts, anti-utopia and dystopia, dominate the market, a more renowned contemporary name (such as Ursula K. Le Guin, whose works explore multiple directions of utopia and dystopia alike)^{16 17} breaking the mould every now and then.

Assuming that such temporal delineation of the utopian epoch as it is assessed in the preceding paragraphs is accepted, focus can finally be shifted to what utopia as a stream of thinking translated into literature *is*.

A utopia is an ideal place. Or is it? When conceptualized into a literary stream as well as when treated as a mere topographical space in which to exist, (a) utopia is often seen as a paradox. It is so due to its previously mentioned intricate and “dubious” etymology. As stated before, the word itself presents two possible interpretations of its meaning, translating directly to a “good place” or “no place” owing to homophony. That in itself presents numerous opinions regarding utopia’s original

12 Richard Grey, *A Brief History of American Literature* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 132.

13 Susan Bruce, introduction to *Three Early Modern Utopias*, ed. Susan Bruce (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 28, accessed July 17, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=zzOkOTaKebEC&printsec=frontcover&dq=ursula+le+guin+utopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi_wP-R-bvjAhVHwcQBHe2dAekQuwUIRDAD#v=onepage&q=utopia&f=false.

14 Justin E. A. Busch, introduction to *The Utopian Vision of H. G. Wells*, ed. Justin E. A. Busch (London: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2009), 10, accessed July 17, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=suNUaA1Q1JIC&printsec=frontcover&dq=wells+utopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjEmZXL_bvjAhVOyaYKHYYXWDj0QuwUILjAA#v=onepage&q=a%20modern%20utopia&f=false.

15 Kessler, *Charlotte Gilman Perkins*, 9.

16 Laurence Davis, “The Dynamic and Revolutionary Utopia of Ursula K. Le Guin,” in *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin’s The Dispossessed*, ed. Laurence Davis and Peter Stillman (Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005), 3, accessed July 17, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=9goKmJQaMzEC&printsec=frontcover&dq=ursula+le+guin+utopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi_wP-R-bvjAhVHwcQBHe2dAekQ6AEIMTAB#v=onepage&q=ursula%20le%20guin%20utopia&f=false.

17 Tony Burns, *Political Theory, Science Fiction, and Utopian Literature: Ursula K. Le Guin and The Dispossessed* (Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2008), 153, accessed July 17, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=zzOkOTaKebEC&printsec=frontcover&dq=ursula+le+guin+utopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi_wP-R-bvjAhVHwcQBHe2dAekQuwUIRDAD#v=onepage&q=utopia&f=false.

meaning. Fátima Vieira notes this “tension”¹⁸ created by Thomas More, and her observation is validated by other theorists.

Lyman Tower Sargent, for example, calls utopia (“no place”) “unfortunately spelled”¹⁹ and prefers instead to use its homophone, eutopia (“good place”) when discussing the matter. Andrew Milner similarly uses utopia as a neutral term which has the possibility to become either eutopia or dystopia,²⁰ echoing Sargent’s opinion. Anne Lake Prescott then calls the pun “bleak” and “provocative,” but observes that its effect is nowadays lost to the prevalence of utopia as an all-embracing expression,²¹ adding to the elusiveness of the word. Peter Edgerly Firchow, on the other hand, appears to appreciate the ambiguity as it allows “basking a little in the august tradition of Sir Thomas”²² when interpreting and subsequently coming up with one’s own wordplay. Whether a person decides to view the pun as quaint, though, or as a cause of complications in their quest to gouge out the term’s proper definition, it cannot be denied that it is clever in its thought- and doubt-provoking nature. The author of this thesis shall hereafter take the liberty of opting for the “unfortunate” spelling of utopia and in revelling in its double meaning fully since this paper analyses the many faces and layers of “x-topian”²³ thinking and often highlights their numerous overlaps, specifically when presented in the novels of Huxley and Collins.

In the tricky task to take into consideration both the potential perfection and non-existence of a utopia, the definition of the entire concept may differ from person to person, just as the spelling itself does. Lewis Mumford fuels utopia’s ambiguity in declaring that it stands for “the ultimate in human folly or human hope;”²⁴ Frederick Jameson points out the tendency to think of it “as a place, or if you like a nonplace,”²⁵ as is seen in Huxley’s seemingly utopian World State

18 Fátima Vieira, “The Concept of Utopia” in *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*, ed. Gregory Claeys (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 5, accessed July 17, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=sFCuoqyKv9QC&printsec=frontcover&dq=utopian+literature&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjIv57_jLzjAhVO2aYKHUriBbwQ6AEIKTAA#v=onepage&q=tension&f=false.

19 Lyman Tower Sargent, “Do Dystopias Matter?” in *Dystopia(n) Matters: On the Page, On Screen, On Stage*, ed. Fátima Vieira (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013), 11.

20 Andrew Milner, “Changing the Climate: The Politics of Dystopia,” *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 23, no. 6 (December 2009): 828.

21 Anne Lake Prescott, “More’s *Utopia*: Medievalism and Radicalism” in *A Companion to Tudor Literature*, ed. Kent Cartwright (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 280, accessed July 17, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=fqqLzE1h5O0C&pg=PA280&dq=pun+eutopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwixwIrqyb7jAhWGyKYKHRhDDD oQ6AEIKTAA#v=onepage&q=eutopia&f=false>.

22 Peter Edgerly Firchow, introduction to *Modern Utopian Fictions from H. G. Wells to Iris Murdoch* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007), accessed July 17, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=DG5Kjp2qvAQC&pg=PT19&dq=pun+eutopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwixwIrqyb7jAhWGyKYKHRhDD DoQ6AEIRzAE#v=onepage&q=pun%20eutopia&f=false>.

23 The term “x-topian” is used by the author of this thesis as an impromptu umbrella term to embrace utopia and eutopia as one and to simultaneously refer to their overlap with anti-utopia and dystopia.

24 Lewis Mumford, *The Story of Utopias* (New York: Viking Press, 1962), 1.

25 Frederick Jameson, “Utopia as Method, or the Uses of the Future” in *Utopia/Dystopia: Conditions of Historical Possibility*, ed. Michael D. Gordin, Helen Tilley, and Gyan Prakash (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 21.

or Collins's Capitol; Lucy Sargisson calls it both "an attitude and a method;"²⁶ and Ruth Levitas shifts the focus from explanations on what utopia can be *for*;²⁷ denoting that utopianism is, apart from a stream of literature contained to lifeless books, something that has the potential to shape humankind further. Indeed, even Krishan Kumar, one of the leading voices in the utopian discussion, claims that "Thomas More did not just invent the word 'utopia,' ... he invented the *thing*."²⁸ ²⁹ The *thing*, in his own words, is "a novel and far-reaching conception of the possibilities of human transformation,"³⁰ meaning that utopia is as much as a mere genre as it is a goal – a ubiquitous, cross-cultural goal to reach betterness, whether a utopia is reachable or not. Kumar's take on the concept furthermore uses utopia as a foundation to speak about social theory³¹ in reference to the Marxist and Rousseauian conviction of that human "perfectibility can be realized,"³² an idea not dissimilar especially to Huxley's world where eugenics, conditioning, and conforming all play a part in hatching humans who are perfect for their designated roles.

Granted, although the approach of socialists to utopia, represented e.g. by Marxism which "at once conveys the most powerful of utopian visions of the future and presents the most devastating critique of 'utopianism,'"³³ is not the main aim of this thesis, it is still important to remember that literature is shaped by the moods and needs of any given society at any given time, and any given society is then in turn influenced by literature. In the utopian sphere, it is visible in the endless endeavour to heal, secure, and ameliorate when creating fictional societies.

Allowing at last for a closing thought on utopia in its strictly literature-oriented meaning, it is a sub-stream of imaginative literature and "one of the most important means by which any culture can investigate new ways of defining itself and exploring alternatives to the social and political status quo"³⁴ – with what results, remains a question of individual speculation and evaluation.

26 Lucy Sargisson, *Fool's Gold? Utopianism in the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 239.

27 Ruth Levitas, "For Utopia: The (Limits of the) Utopian Function in Late Capitalist Society," in *The Philosophy of Utopia*, ed. Barbara Goodwin (London: Routledge, 2001), 25-26.

28 Due to the impossibility of procuring a copy of Kumar's work firsthand, the two following citations are taken and cited second-hand from a section of Ruth Levitas's book which is preoccupied with the dissection of Kumar's standpoint.

29 Ruth Levitas, *The Concept of Utopia* (Bern: Peter Lang Publishing, 2010), 191, accessed July 17, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=PZSvIrCri6AC&pg=PA191&lpg=PA191&dq=thomas+more+did+not+just+invent+the+word+utopia+in+a+typical+witty+kumar&source=bl&ots=QNKASF9dtS&sig=ACfU3U1K2HwLO-cPUHkoTWYYOv8SS1jtvQ&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi-4ZXw1r7jAhXMa1AKHTcvC54Q6AEwAHoECAoQAQ#v=onepage&q=thomas%20more%20did%20not%20just%20invent%20the%20word%20utopia%20in%20a%20typical%20witty%20kumar&f=false>.

30 Levitas, *The Concept of Utopia*, 191.

31 Krishan Kumar, "The Ends of Utopia," *New Literary History* 41, no. 3 (Summer 2010): 555.

32 Kumar, "The Ends of Utopia," 556.

33 Maurice Meisner, *Marxism, Maoism, and Utopianism: Eight Essays* (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1982), 6.

34 M. Keith Booker, introduction to *Dystopian Literature: A Theory and Research Guide* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1994), 3.

When considering these definitions and viewpoints, it can be summarized that literary utopia, despite demarcating a fictional place, more so puts emphasis on the fictional people who live there and on their little societies rather than on topography itself. As such, utopia is people-oriented – *us*-oriented. It reacts to periods of past unrest, reflects mainstream (political, philosophical etc.) moods, and, last but not least, offers a(n) (un)reachable better future.

Anti-Utopia

In contrast to the preceding section on utopia (and the subsequent section on dystopia), anti-utopia shall be defined in short, the brevity of this chapter residing in the fact that, unlike utopia and dystopia, anti-utopia is not a motif central to Huxley or Collins's novels. Nevertheless, it is crucial to define it as a concept, if only to prevent the notion that it can be treated interchangeably with dystopia.

Anti-utopia, in its simplest sense, is “a true antonym”³⁵ of the word utopia. Where utopia represents a world designed and intended to be flawless, excellent, and humane, anti-utopia functions as its polar opposite, introducing a realm designed and intended as bad by default. By the same token, dystopia might incorrectly be considered a true antonym of utopia as well because of its assumed synonymity with anti-utopia; however, it is not a *true* antonym. Upon further reflection, a distinction can be seen.

Demir Alihodžić and Selma Veseljević Jerković elaborate on the issue of synonymity and antonymity of the terms utopia, anti-utopia, and dystopia by declaring that while utopia and anti-utopia are indeed antonymous, anti-utopia and dystopia cannot be treated as synonymous. According to them, dystopia is a “subgenre of anti-utopia, wherein anti-utopian texts serve to discredit the mere possibility of ever achieving a utopian social order.”³⁶ It can be deduced that just as anti-utopia and dystopia are not in perfect harmony, utopia and dystopia are not in perfect contrast because their relationship is, upon reflection, scalar rather than oppositional. While anti-utopia defies and criticizes utopia,^{37 38} dystopia mirrors the origins and intentions of utopia, but develops in its own way. In other words, dystopia “provides a warning” in outlining possible wrong directions in which a fictional – or real – world could go, by which means it also shows “potential for change and therefore hope for the future”³⁹ because it serves as a cautionary tale. Oddly enough,

35 Milner, “Changing the Climate,” 831.

36 Jelena Pataki, “To Read and Learn: The Necessity for a New Definition of Dystopia and Bridging the Gap Between the Old and Contemporary Dystopias,” review of *The Boundaries of Dystopian Literature: The Genre in Context*, by Demir Alihodžić and Selma Veseljević Jerković, *Anafora*, April 2016.

37 Levitas, *The Concept of Utopia*, 192.

38 Gregory Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 280.

39 Louisa MacKay Demerjian, introduction to *The Age of Dystopia: One Genre, Our Fears and Our Future*, ed. Louisa MacKay Demerjian (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016), 3, accessed July 17, 2019,

dystopia thus shares utopia's original thought in the desire for something better. In that respect, dystopia is a continuation of utopia, not its enemy; it is a flawed or failed attempt to live in a society initially designed to be good.

In short, utopia is a dream, anti-utopia is a nightmare, and dystopia is a reality which arises when the former fails. Having thus procured a sufficient differentiation of these definitions, the focal point of this paper, dystopia, may be discussed in more detail.

Dystopia

Although theorists such as Kumar and Sargent refer to utopia as a genre on the wane in relation to the beginning of the 20th century and the then European-American "boom" of dystopian literature,^{40 41} dystopia did not replace utopia as a newly born idea. Contrarily, the sub-genre (or, if preferred, parallel genre) dates back almost as far as utopia itself. While its greatest rise in popularity must be ascribed to the last century, its origins "lie in Mennipean satire, realism, and the anti-utopian novels of the nineteenth century,"⁴² with its first occurrence being attributed to the English writer and bishop Joseph Hall's *Another World* (ca. 1605) as "the first specimen of the European dystopian fiction."⁴³ That puts the geneses of utopia and dystopia into a fairly small time frame which spans a mere one hundred years, suggesting that once a society devises a dream, it also promptly comes up with an all too realistic depiction of its failure in practice. One can only muse whether the initial ignition to envision a dystopia instead of a utopia may have corresponded to the agelong utopian/eutopian ambiguity.

Whilst gaining popularity around the same time, European and American dystopian tradition also reacts to the same impetus. Firstly, it responds "to the infelicitous, violent, and plainly criminal attempts to realize utopian projects, with well-known counter-productive results,"⁴⁴ for example "historical metanarratives (such as Marxism) that facilitate the imagination of a better future,"⁴⁵

[https://books.google.cz/books?](https://books.google.cz/books?id=Pyv5DAAAQBAJ&pg=PA10&dq=origin+dystopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiWqaWlo8HjAhWBwMQBHRjGBEoQ6AEIOzAC#v=onepage&q=dystopia&f=false)

[id=Pyv5DAAAQBAJ&pg=PA10&dq=origin+dystopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiWqaWlo8HjAhWBwMQBHRjGBEoQ6AEIOzAC#v=onepage&q=dystopia&f=false](https://books.google.cz/books?id=Pyv5DAAAQBAJ&pg=PA10&dq=origin+dystopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiWqaWlo8HjAhWBwMQBHRjGBEoQ6AEIOzAC#v=onepage&q=dystopia&f=false)

40 What is essential to point out is that neither of the theorists consider the decline as timely and due, as instead they profess their support for the genre as something which is still needed in the contemporary society.

41 Lyman Tower Sargent, "In Defense of Utopia," *Diogenes* 53, no. 1 (February 2006): 12; Kumar, "The Ends of Utopia," 549.

42 Tom Molan, preface to *Scraps of the Untainted Sky: Science Fiction, Utopia, Dystopia* (Colorado: Westview Press, 2000), 6.

43 Douwe Wessel Fokkema, *Perfect Worlds: Utopian Fiction in China and the West* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011), 61.

44 Fokkema, *Perfect Worlds*, 16.

45 M. Keith Booker, *The Post-Utopian Imagination: American Culture in the Long 1950s* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2002), 53, accessed July 17, 2019, [https://books.google.cz/books?](https://books.google.cz/books?id=YsIWWh79W9Y4C&printsec=frontcover&dq=inauthor:%22M.+Keith+Booker%22&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj0ne2OgcjiAhXC0qYKHUV7CEo4ChC7BQhBMAM#v=onepage&q=dystopia&f=false)

[id=YsIWWh79W9Y4C&printsec=frontcover&dq=inauthor:%22M.+Keith+Booker%22&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj0ne2OgcjiAhXC0qYKHUV7CEo4ChC7BQhBMAM#v=onepage&q=dystopia&f=false](https://books.google.cz/books?id=YsIWWh79W9Y4C&printsec=frontcover&dq=inauthor:%22M.+Keith+Booker%22&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj0ne2OgcjiAhXC0qYKHUV7CEo4ChC7BQhBMAM#v=onepage&q=dystopia&f=false)

the criticism of which sparked a stream of novels focusing on oppressive regimes (e.g. George Orwell's 1984). Secondly, dystopia replies to a multitude of scientific advances,⁴⁶ questioning the consequences of human progress (e.g. H. G. Wells's *The Time Machine*, 1895). Other, more imminently gruesome historical occurrences of the 20th century, primarily the First and Second World War, must be mentioned as factors contributing to the peak of the literary genre as well. However, whether it is communism⁴⁷ or Marxism, science or wars, dystopian writers are to this day united in reflecting past and future failures and presenting a sceptical point of view on the fate of humankind. Apart from its apocalyptic facade, though, dystopia also serves as a form of "social critique"⁴⁸ and warning, as the section on anti-utopia has already suggested. These trends are illustrated in the works of Huxley and Collins, who, as shall presently be evidenced, combine the motifs all at once, seeing that they unify postwar settings, repressive regimes, and science gone too far while maintaining a critical tone.

The primary point in exploring what makes *Brave New World* and *The Hunger Games* textbook examples of dystopia is the (omni)presence of totalitarianism. In the experience of "the blood bath of communism – Stalinism, Maoism, Pol Pot, and the rest,"⁴⁹ the reason is apparent for the creation of Huxley's World State and Collin's Capitol with its contiguous districts, both of the places being overseen by one figure in total control of the world and both favouring the highest social class, the Alphas and the Capitolians, respectively. Before proceeding further, it is important to note that Huxley's novel actually precedes many of the greatest 20th century tragedies and leading oppressive regimes. However, *Brave New World* nevertheless reacts to what Russell Jacoby succinctly summarizes as "the rest" (see previous citation), seeing that Huxley refers to Soviet communism by naming one of the characters Lenina.⁵⁰ Personal beliefs thus aside, even Huxley, who was not much bothered by communism,⁵¹ alludes and adheres to the recent dystopian trend. He presents a strongly totalitarian and hierarchical society where liberty is linked to the choice "to be insufficient and miserable."⁵² This argument sets a precedent for the Controller and his selected governing body to claim the authority to operate everyone's lives in order to prevent this threat of misery. The pretext, as in many real-life political ideologies, is that sacrifices regarding personal freedom must be made in order to maintain stability. The seemingly benign and beneficial dominion

46 M. Keith Booker, *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1994), 5.

47 Booker, *The Dystopian Impulse*, 48.

48 Andrew Feenberg, *Alternative Modernity: The Technical Turn in Philosophy and Social Theory* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 43.

49 Russell Jacoby, *Picture Imperfect: Utopian Thought for an Anti-Utopian Age* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 8.

50 Jacoby, *Picture Imperfect*, 9.

51 Jacoby, *Picture Imperfect*, 9.

52 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 40.

of the Controller moreover comes at a price only to those who are unfortunate enough to realize the price itself, that is their foregone freedom, and who despite being conditioned to like their “unescapable social destiny”⁵³ find themselves rebelling against it, whether in thought or in action. As such, Huxley’s dystopia lies in its nearly loving, hardly escapable nature.

Collins then presents the same premise of a totalitarian, hierarchical society, but emphasizes the distinction between the upper class’s utopia and the lower classes’ dystopia by telling the story not through an existentially and ethically tortured members of the privileged class who to their detriment “kn[ow] that they [are] individuals,”⁵⁴ but through a member of the impoverished and repressed lower class. Katniss Everdeen, the protagonist, comes from the poorest of the Capitol’s pseudo-colonies, District Twelve, where “you can starve to death in safety.”⁵⁵ The sarcastic description that postulates literal starvation as a condition to safety is an uncanny reminder of the glorified stability which comes at the price of emotional starvation in Huxley’s novel. Collins stresses the Capitol’s caring-yet-uncaring control over the lower castes throughout the novel, for example when Katniss reflects on the unfairness of the societal and geographical setup:

Maybe being the least prestigious, poorest, most ridiculed district in the country has its advantages. Such as, being largely ignored by the Capitol as long as we produce our coal quotas.⁵⁶

In this excerpt, the author describes a society which highly prioritizes its “lapdogs”⁵⁷ from higher ranked districts, not dissimilarly to Huxley’s Alphas and perhaps Betas. She moreover hints at the ubiquitous supervision of the Capitol, suggesting its far-reaching authority.

Despite this point-of-view reversal, due to which Katniss’s experience differs from that of Bernard Marx, a privileged Alpha and the protagonist of *Brave New World*, the overall structure of the World State and the Capitol coincide the following aspects: division into strict social classes, unequal distribution of privileges amongst its peoples (mental resources for Huxley and material resources for Collins), and supremacy of a single representing ruler in power (the Controller for Huxley and President Snow for Collins).

Connectedly to social stratification, dystopia also “reflects a new society in which the principal social cleavage divides the masters of the modern technical system from those who work and live within it,”⁵⁸ suggesting that not only elitism in politics, but also in academia is a factor in defining this stream of fiction. Science, the right to employ it, and its consequences indeed cover

53 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 12.

54 Huxley, *Brave New World* 58.

55 Suzanne Collins, *The Hunger Games: Special Edition* (U.S.A.: Scholastic, 2018), 6.

56 Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 203.

57 Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 161.

58 Feenberg, *Alternative Modernity*, 42.

a prominent part of the analyzed novels. To focus on the very basics for the purpose of this chapter, both authors set their stories in futuristic states, employ specific lexical terms, and heavily describe various products of technology – real and fictional alike.

Huxley's World State is a product of a past war and economic crisis, arising from the "choice between World Control and destruction."⁵⁹ It is a place where everything dates to either B.F. or A.F. (Before Ford and After Ford, an allusion to the contemporary industrialist Henry Ford), where questionably "great" names of the past are conceptualized to refer to technological advancements (bokanovskification), and where the citizens can enjoy a dose of *soma* (a recreational drug) and go to the feelies (a cinema where the viewer physically experiences the same stimuli the actors do). The only catch is, people are born out of tubes, genetically modified to fit their societal roles, and conditioned after birth to adapt to the roles better.

Collins's Capitol is set in a postapocalyptic North America, standing on "a place once called the Rockies"⁶⁰ and governing over the remaining twelve (previously thirteen) districts. After suppressing the other districts' rebellion, the city stands as sovereign in every sense, using armed guards, Peacemakers, and mutated animals as a form of constant surveillance and espionage. Its inhabitants are "oddly dressed people with bizarre hair and painted faces who have never missed a meal,"⁶¹ unlike the inhabitants of the outer districts. The Capitolians spend their days in absolute leisure and luxury, their lifestyle mirroring the technological advancement of their self-contained society where everything is placed within arm's reach. And, before this minor detail is forgotten, they annually partake in watching and betting on the results of the Hunger Games, a morbid sort of reality show in which a group of teenagers fight to the death for the Capitolians' entertainment. The catch to the promised comfort is as obvious here as it is in Huxley's novel. Unless a person is born in the Capitol, they are not only deprived of the city's material wealth brought upon by progress and enslavement of the other districts, but they are also in constant danger of being selected to participate in the Hunger Games. Frighteningly enough, both worlds can share a certain degree of appeal when a person focuses solely on promises and forgets about the realities; but it is exactly the sliver of a utopia that makes dystopian literature so intricate.

As the questions of totalitarianism, science and its consequences, and the utopian/dystopian parallelism shall be due to their extensive nature touched upon in greater depth in the following chapter, titled *Worlds Wearing Utopian Faces*, the points discussed so far in this section of the thesis may be summarized thusly: The emergence and rise of utopia and dystopia as two separate yet ideologically interwoven genres dates five hundred years back, with utopia preceding dystopia

59 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 41.

60 Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 41.

61 Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 59.

by a century and maintaining its dominance until the beginning of the 20th century, during which dystopia succeeds it almost absolutely. The two streams, stemming from the same need for a better present and future, do not stand in polar opposition, as instead they share the premise of a perfect world, but treat it with different opinions on its attainability and maintenance by humans. Huxley and Collins's novels approach and exploit this tradition of thought, devising perfectly imperfect dystopias that play with the idea of a better world.

2 Worlds Wearing Utopian Faces

In the previous chapter, a brief overview of the history of the utopian genre along with its key recurring themes have been provided, along with an explanation of the complex relationship between utopia and dystopia. Subsequently, *Brave New World* and *The Hunger Games* have been classified as dystopian novels due to their major motifs. In order to further elaborate on the topics of totalitarianism, science, and the prominence of utopian elements in dystopian literature, this chapter shall focus on these matters in a more detailed manner. The focal points of this section of the paper shall be the parallelism between utopia and dystopia, the role of the state, and the role of science and technology in dystopian novels.

Parallelism, Not Dichotomy

The traceability of the utopian/dystopian parallelism does not pertain simply to their historical development as one stream reacting to the other; it is first and foremost a matter of the two thoughts coinciding in practice. To explain, what came first is ultimately irrelevant because the same development could have very well taken place even if dystopia had been the original concept, only it would have gone in reverse order. To explain *even* further: one cannot exist without the other. Since this declaration could be deemed as too general or even too radical when working only with the definitions provided in the section *Anti-utopia*, it shall presently be exemplified.

Whether it is the fictional utopian who comes to comprehend the world's imperfections, or whether it is the person whose subjugation buys the estranged utopians' comfort, the effect is the same. A utopia can be a dystopia in disguise for its own citizens, and one man's utopia can be another man's dystopia. The latter proverb may be illustrated by the disagreement of two writers and contemporaries William Morris and the already mentioned Edward Bellamy, whose utopian piece *Looking Backward* according to Morris poses "a certain danger" since "a machine-like life is the best which Mr Bellamy can imagine for us."⁶² The lack of free will and option in Bellamy's work is

⁶² William Morris, "Looking Backwards," review of *Looking Backwards*, by Edward Bellamy, *Commonweal*, June 1889, accessed July 21, 2019, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/morris/works/1889/commonweal/06-bellamy.htm>.

enough for Morris to dismiss it as dystopian, and his point of view must be accepted as equally valid as Bellamy's because they both stem from the same root: interpretational subjectivity. In fact, many thinkers have used this well-worn saying about one man's utopia being another man's dystopia in their works in pursuit to define the relationship between the two,^{63 64} but its frequent perusal does not make the thought any less potent, especially since the treatment of the two concepts as antagonistic still prevails.

The span from utopia to dystopia stands out as exemplary in Huxley and Collins's novels. In *Brave New World*, the outwardly utopian World State gains dystopian undertones when the reader realizes that although the fictional inhabitants of the place "are happy, they do not have free will."⁶⁵ Opting for the scheme of a utopia which hides its dystopian face, Huxley presents a grim choice between luxury and liberty. In *The Hunger Games*, the utopian Capitol is contrasted with its strictly governed, underprivileged districts, denoting that "colonies produce utopias for the colonists and dystopias for the colonized"⁶⁶ and that one person's heaven can be another's hell.

Centering on the mood of the protagonists stranded in their inescapable realities, the utopian/dystopian question now shall be delved into in practice. In Huxley's fallacious utopia, people *have* to be happy; in Collins's, with the exception of the Capitolians, they cannot. More than once, this is reflected in the respective protagonists' sentiments and introspective sessions as well as reinforced by other characters who are either the cause of the lack of freedom, or are assimilated to it. Bernard and his friends, who live in a world where "[e]verybody's happy now,"⁶⁷ habitually have to face positive reinforcement through sleep teaching (hypnopaedia)⁶⁸ and social conditioning. That can be noted by another character, Bernard's friend Henry, in a conversation he has with his assimilated lover Lenina:

"I suppose Epsilons don't really mind being Epsilons," she said aloud.
"Of course they don't. How can they? They don't know what it's like being anything else. We'd mind, of course. But then we've been differently conditioned. Besides, we start with a different heredity."
"I'm glad I'm not an Epsilon," said Lenina, with conviction.
"And if you were an Epsilon," said Henry, "your conditioning would have made you no less thankful that you weren't a beta or an alpha."⁶⁹

63 As the example suggests, this is in regards to pure theory and practical interpretation of existing works of literature.

64 Orville H. Schmidt, *Utopia: Heaven or Hell?* (New York: Writers Club Press, 2001), 1; Burns, *Political Theory*, 123; Linda Ruth Williams, "Dream Girls and Mechanic Panic: Dystopia and Its Others in *Brazil* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*," in *Liquid Metal: The Science Fiction Film Reader*, ed. Sean Redmond (New York: Wallflower Press, 2007), 71; Rothstein, "Utopia and Its Discontents," 4.

65 Schmidt, *Utopia: Heaven or Hell?*, 1.

66 Sargent, "In Defense of Utopia," 11.

67 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 65.

68 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 23.

69 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 64.

The World State therefore appears as a compassionate and considerate place where every person has their predestined role, is equipped to carry the role out, and is motivated to be glad that their role is exactly such. The only “minuscule” disadvantage to this system is that people who are scientifically graced with high intelligence can become aware of this unfair stratification and stagnation, suffering thus mentally, and that those with low intelligence can never even arrive to this painful enlightenment. Bernard is one of the contemplative Alphas who do realize their tragedy of being trapped within a “social body”⁷⁰ and who feel elated when they – in small ways or bigger – defy the norm. For Bernard, this tendency can be observed in his ostracism from his peers and mainstream culture, e.g. mindless music, and secondly in his affinity to nature:

“I want to look at the sea in peace,” he said. “One can’t even look with that beastly noise going on.”

“But it’s lovely. And I don’t want to look.”

“But I do,” he insisted. “It makes me feel as though...” he hesitated, searching for words with which to express himself, “as though I were more *me*, if you see what I mean. More on my own, not so completely a part of something else. Not just a cell in the social body. ...”⁷¹

In this conversation with Lenina, Bernard’s favouritism for nature over thoughtless popular culture is demonstrated and contrasted with Lenina’s happy consumerism. From that can be deduced that while the World State’s systemic erasure of individualism through biology and learning works on the majority of the population, a small portion of Alphas still maintains a certain degree of selfhood. Despite the World State’s happiness-seeking order, it is ironically this very order that in smart individuals creates room for existential doubt and unhappiness.

Probably the strongest evidence of the same world having two faces, depending on who experiences it and how he or she internalizes the effects of the place’s rules on his or her person, is presented through the character of the Savage. The Savage comes to the World State after having lived his whole life in a natural reservation void of the state’s laws and scientific advancements which have warped the rest of humankind into a manufactured mass. Upon seeing through the facade of the faux utopian nation with its pre-given, binding regulations, the Savage declaims:

“But do you like being slaves? ... Do you like being babies?” ... Grief and remorse, compassion and duty – all were forgotten now and, as it were, absorbed into an intense overpowering hatred of these less than human monsters. “Don’t you want to be free and men? Don’t you even understand what manhood and freedom are?”⁷²

70 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 78.

71 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 78.

72 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 186-187.

The declaration copies Bernard's thoughts on the spiritual deprivation which the World State's population has to accept in order to conform, but even so, it is a solitary cry of an outsider and it remains unsupported even by those who share his sentiments. After all, even though "[a]ctual happiness always looks pretty squalid with the over-compensations for misery" and "stability isn't nearly so spectacular as instability,"⁷³ Bernard decides to go on mentally wasting away in his sugarcoated dystopia, the tragedy of his character being that he does not know how to truly live otherwise.

Collins's straightforwardness in separating the utopian elements from the dystopian ones to a considerable extent follows and develops the Savage's conclusions. *The Hunger Games* is a novel which offers a point of view of an outsider who not only experiences her private dystopia on a daily basis, but who also sees the true dystopian nature of the lives of the privileged Capitolians. As a citizen of the poorest district under the Capitol's reign, Katniss describes the state of affairs with chilling pragmatism. Her experience spans from her struggle to obtain food to living in strict separation from other districts; from constant surveillance of President Snow's heavily armed Peacemakers to public executions as a threat for disobedience; from divided social classes (even amongst individual districts) to her obligation to participate in the Hunger Games, a deadly competition which only one child can win and survive. Unlike Huxley, whose deceitful illusion of a utopia lies in positively motivating people into liking the order of things and accepting their misery as something delightful and safe, Collins opts for creating a utopia whose existence relies on the combination of violence, fear, and a rare but astronomical reward to the newest victor of the Hunger Games. The last part in particular seems satisfactory enough for the less rebellious inhabitants of the outer districts to keep them silent and obedient regardless of the price. The author thus devises a nation where the oppressed are pitted against each other and deprived of resources, making them unable to unite and defend themselves because "[i]t's to the Capitol's advantage to have [them] divided amongst themselves."⁷⁴ This inequality of power and privileges are illustrated by Katniss when she explains the premise of the Hunger Games:

Taking kids from our districts, forcing them to kill one another while we watch – this is the Capitol's way of reminding us how totally we are at their mercy. How little chance we would stand of surviving another rebellion. Whatever words they use, the real message is clear. "Look how we take your children and sacrifice them and there's nothing you can do. ..."
To make it humiliating as well as torturous, the Capitol requires us to treat the Hunger Games as a festivity, a sporting event pitting every district against the others. The last tribute alive receives a life of ease back home,

73 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 194-195.

74 Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 14.

and their district will be showered with prizes, largely consisting of food. All year, the Capitol will show the winning district gifts of grain and oil and even delicacies like sugar while the rest of us battle starvation.”⁷⁵

As divided and desolate as the world that Katniss describes stands, however, it is still a utopia for the well-born, and its mitigating value for the oppressed resides in the possibility to reach a utopian standard, provided that they kill their own first. The utopia in Collins’s novel – i.e. the Capitol – then functions partly as a reminder of what the impoverished districts do not presently have due to their past rebellious “crimes,” and partly as a reminder of what they *could* have if they obey. Due to that, Collins’s fictional realm is not far from Huxley’s World State in the sense that it is conscious conforming which plays a role in the protagonist’s fate.

As one of the tributes competing in the Hunger Games, Katniss muses on the idea of such prospective comfort when she first enters the Capitol prior to the Games:

What must it be like, I wonder, to live in a world where food appears at the press of a button? How would I spend the hours I now commit to combing the woods for sustenance if it were so easy to come by? What do they do all day, the people in the Capitol, besides decorating their bodies and waiting around for a new shipment of tributes to roll in and die for their entertainment?⁷⁶

Despite Katniss’s evident and self-explanatory disdain for the coddled Capitolians, not even she is immune to an occasional thought about what it would be like to cease scraping by and live in “the artificial candy Capitol”⁷⁷ instead. The illusion of a utopia has the slightest power over her at certain times although it is not as prominent in her as in other tributes competing in the Games.

In conclusion of this subchapter, it could be summarized that Huxley’s utopia creates its own unhappy people while seeking to offer them happiness, while Collins’s utopia takes the unhappy and, with promises and threats, forces them to fight for their happiness. The Capitolians then mirror the inhabitants of the World State as utopians whose contentment is bought with ignorance and the lower castes’ labour.

The Role of the State

Political power represents a prominent factor in oppressing and depressing the marginalized; but, in a dystopian place, it also contributes to oppressing and depressing the otherwise privileged. People can suffer under a benevolent hand as well as under an iron fist, as Huxley and Collins pointedly demonstrate. As a motif in fiction, autocratic regimes can undertake a scalar approach:

⁷⁵ Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 19.

⁷⁶ Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 65.

⁷⁷ Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 104.

from subtly present to very present. In this section of the thesis, emphasis is put on the manner in which the theme of totalitarianism appears in the authors' respective novels.

Interestingly, utopianism is sometimes perceived as a concept tied with and leading to totalitarianism since it provides and promotes "a single substantive"⁷⁸ instead of diversity and freedom of choice. It is perhaps of no surprise, then, that political hegemony and the "opposition between society and individual"⁷⁹ are such strong motifs in dystopian literature. According to John Hoyles, totalitarianism is when "the monstrous becomes normal."⁸⁰ That definition resonates strongly with Huxley's world where people cannot leave their predestined castes due to their modified genetics, and it is just as resonant of Collins's world where children from formerly rebellious districts are forced to fight each other for the amusement and appeasement of the Capitolians. While in agreement with the nature of Hoyles's statement, Hannah Arendt approaches the term totalitarianism more pragmatically, linking (but not limiting) it to dictatorships and movements that "aim at and succeed at organizing masses,"^{81 82} by which she supplies a clearer image of the motivations behind such regimes. Leon Surette reinforces this definition by stating that "in a totalitarian polity, the few think of the many,"⁸³ using a gentler yet practically identical description to encapsulate the idea of individual unfreedom which comes with totalitarianism. Undoubtedly, the societies which are presented in the selected novels are organized and stratified to the last citizen, all of whom are largely stripped of autonomy with their dictatorial leaders overseeing that they stay as such. It may be questioned whether the definition "totalitarian" fits the two fictional forms of government perfectly, though.

Brian Smith reacts to Arendt specifically in relation to *Brave New World* and states that categorizing Huxley's government as totalitarian "would be inexact" because of the "absence of both fear and violence."⁸⁴ However, neither fear nor violence are absent from the subject material. Arguably,

78 Mark Olssen, "Totalitarianism and the 'Repressed' Utopia of the Present: Moving Beyond Hayek, Popper and Foucault," *Policy Futures in Education* 1, no 3 (2003): 533.

79 Booker, *The Dystopian Impulse*, 56.

80 John Hoyles, *The Literary Underground: Writers and the Totalitarian Experience, 1900-1950* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), 35, accessed July 21, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=5_zBJ7rd-0C&pg=PA75&dq=dystopia+totalitarianism&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwilocuWtcbjAhWtyqYKHRiBBjMQ6AEIRzAE#v=onepage&q=totalitarianism&f=false.

81 Hannah Arendt, preface to *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1958), 7.

82 Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 308.

83 Leon Surette, *Dreams of a Totalitarian Utopia: Literary Modernism and Politics* (London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2011), 240, accessed July 27, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=KTP89jbg4uMC&pg=PA113&dq=brave+new+world+totalitarian&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwigldqVvcbjAhV0ysQBHVtFCNEQ6AEIYjAI#v=onepage&q=totalitarian&f=false>.

84 Brian Smith, "Beyond Totalitarianism: Hannah Arendt and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*" in *Aldous Huxley Annual*, ed. Jerome Meckier and Bernfried Nügel (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2008), 77, accessed July 21, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=176I-oMT4MoC&pg=PA77&dq=dystopia+totalitarianism&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwihnqWltcbjAhXMw6YKHR2HCLI4ChDoAQgrMAA#v=onepage&q=dystopia%20totalitarianism&f=false>.

brutality is an indefinitely subtler element in *Brave New World* than in *The Hunger Games*, but it should not be disregarded altogether simply because it appears less. To exemplify the presence of weaponized violence used as a scare tactic, a scene in which a group of Delta babies is electrocuted in one of the “Neo-Pavlovian Condition Rooms”⁸⁵ as a part of their training to become what the society deems as ideal Deltas can be provided:

There was a violent explosion. Shriller and even shriller, a siren shrieked. Alarm bells maddeningly sounded. The children started, screamed; their faces were distorted with terror. ... Their little bodies twitched and stiffened; their limbs moved jerkily as if to the tug of unseen wires.⁸⁶

By enforcing genetic predisposition with sleep teaching and physical pain, the government ensures that the Deltas cannot stray from their destined path. What thus at first glance appears as a peaceful society where the more developed Alphas employ science for the sake of redefining and bettering the world is not as peaceful anymore when it is discovered that, apart from positive motivation, the government also exploits science and keeps the populace in check with negative stimuli. Connectedly, other methods of intimidation serve as a form of control in *Brave New World*. One of them is, plainly, fear. Psychological terror as a method of coercion is evident in the book for instance when Bernard is threatened with exile for his private rebellions and reacts to the prospect thusly:

The Director’s threats had actually elated him, made him feel larger than life. But that, as he now realized, was because he had not taken the threats quite seriously; he had not believed that, when it came to the point, the DHC would ever do anything. Now that it looked as though the threats were really to be fulfilled, Bernard was appalled. Of that imagined stoicism, that theoretical courage, not a trace was left. He raged against himself – what a fool! – against the Director – how unfair not to give him that other chance, that other chance which, he now had no doubt at all, he had always intended to take.⁸⁷

Bernard’s fear is apparent when confronted with the fact that exile is moreso a reality than a possibility for him in response to his perceived crimes. That such a threat can be carried out and poses a real danger for Bernard further illustrates the absolutist power of the governing body. In addition to Smith’s doubts whether Huxley’s novel portrays an autocratic political regime or not, the “flexibility”⁸⁸ of totalitarianism with its multitudinous, cross-cultural forms should be taken

85 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 15.

86 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 16-17.

87 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 90.

88 Arendt, epilogue to *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 489.

into consideration as well when defining it. In all actuality, the political regime branches into many different systems with many different beliefs, and its shape may vary from dictator to dictator, from country to country, and range from seeming uniting and charitable approach to total oppression. This proposed flexibility is doubly true when dealing merely with a fictional form of it, where authorial freedom needs to be taken into account. For that reason, the traces of totalitarianism in *Brave New World* should not be neglected or minimized – because, after all, that would be exactly what a “benevolent” dictator would want the masses to do.

Using the same principle, i.e. that dictatorships can take different forms depending on each culture and each leader, it is in no way complicated to detect the motif of totalitarianism in *The Hunger Games* either. The Capitol, emerging as victorious from the previously mentioned war which de facto enslaved the remaining twelve districts, holds the entire populace under such strict control that the city is able to affect the following: the amount of resources allotted to each district, capital and other punishments, travel, and, most devastatingly, mandatory attendance of children in the Hunger Games. To rely specifically on Katniss’s experience with political power exercised over her, her suffering manifests through starving her whole life and being selected as a tribute to compete against other children. Later on, she is also presented with a dilemma similar to Bernard’s when she challenges the Gamemakers before the Games even begin and is presented with the prospect of being punished for it. The threat elicits the following reaction from her:

What will they do to me now? Arrest me? Execute me? Cut my tongue and turn me into an Avox so I can wait on the future tributes of Panem? ... Who cares what they do to me? What really scares me is what they might do to my mother and Prim, how my family might suffer now because of my impulsiveness. Will they take their few belongings, or send my mother to prison and Prim to the community home, or kill them?^{89 90}

As can be seen, Katniss speaks of brutality in an almost matter-of-fact tone when it concerns her own person because she is so used to it. However, the autocratic Capitol still has its ways of enforcing what it wants, and that apart from economic oppression and restriction of movement across the districts includes various forms of intimidation, for example the threat of exemplarily punishing the criminal’s whole family along with them.

In another instance, when Katniss is already participating in the Games, she witnesses the gradual deaths of her rivals as well as her only friend in the deadly arena, Rue, a little girl from District Eleven. Upon seeing the mindless desolation the Capitol forces upon them, Katniss says:

89 Avox is a person punished for committing a crime by having their tongue removed. Panem is the fictional world which consists of the Capitol and the outer districts.

90 Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 103-104.

Rue's death has forced me to confront my own fury against the cruelty, the injustice they inflict upon us. But here, even more strongly than at home, I feel my impotence. There's no way to take revenge on the Capitol. Is there?

Then I remember Peeta's words on the roof. "*Only I keep wishing I could think of a way to... to show the Capitol they don't own me. That I'm more than just a piece in their Games.*" And for the first time, I understand what he means.⁹¹

While she has always been aware of the Capitol's wrongdoings and tyranny, in this scene Katniss as if rediscovers the impact and consequences of the totalitarian reign she has grown so dazed towards and which has become normalized in her mind. Incidentally, one of the very first defining aspects of totalitarianism mentioned in this chapter is the ability of the government to make its abnormal and inhuman methods look ordinary.

In two worlds where a singular political force rules with fear, violence, and erasure of individualism, the omnipresence of totalitarianism cannot be disputed. Katniss and Bernard both live in severely organized states whose citizens lack autonomy, rights, and the ability to escape their roles and even geography. Additionally, Katniss must constantly deal with insufficient food rations and the prospect of death. Although the implementation of intimidation and brutality is not as frequent in Huxley's work when compared to Collins's, it is nevertheless included and it serves to enhance Huxley's point – that a seemingly utopian society which stoops to certain methods cannot be wholly utopian anymore, regardless of the government's initial intention. Whether it is therefore the monstrous becoming normal, or the opposition between the society and the man, or whether it is various forms of scare tactics exercised over the populace, one conclusion can be reached without a doubt. Each of the fictional dystopias fits the aforementioned definitions of totalitarianism with a terrifying accuracy. The role of the World State and the Capitol subsequently crystallizes as that of a unifying force which deprive its people of different degrees of political, economical, and individual freedom, focusing specifically on autonomy of thought and action in both of the novels.

The Role of Science and Technology

Utopian in theory, yet dystopian in practice: that seems to be the prevalent notion of scientific and technological progress when focusing specifically on dystopian fiction. On a more general scale, however, modern-day advancements are often immortalized in x-topian fiction with mixed feelings and their anticipated effect on humankind ranges from beneficial to detrimental, from enlightenment to doom. The conflict is understandable. On the one hand, progress can

⁹¹ Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 236.

improve living conditions and even life expectancy; on the other hand, it can lead to dehumanization and mass destruction. As shall be illustrated followingly, Huxley and Collins share this conflicted point of view as they both portray the advantages as well as disadvantages of science and technology. However, upon a closer look, their predominantly negative and thus dystopian stance shall be emphasized.

According to Franklin A. J. L. James, “science was a central feature of modernity in Britain during the period roughly from 1890 to 1950” and as such became one of the characteristic topics for art and literature, both of which “drew heavily on contemporary science and that of the recent past.”⁹² He is not the only one to note the involvement of art in science in this time period – or involvement of science in art, if this sequence is preferred. Mark S. Morrisson, who also focuses on the rise of scientific progress as a subject matter in literature, but expands his study from Great Britain as a singular object of interest on the United States as well, links the phenomenon even more specifically to the postwar period:

In England and the United States, experiences of loss and vulnerability in a rapidly changing world were balanced by palpable excitement about a future in which the imagination’s wildest flights of fancy might be realizable – for good or perhaps for ill. Whether causing apocalyptic dread or inspiring futuristic excitement, this modernization was technological and scientific.⁹³

Judging from the turbulence and overall nature of the times as introduced by James and Morrisson, it is of no great shock that technology and science, disciplines so crucial in emerging victorious form what was then called the Great (and only) War, remained relevant in the society even after the conflict itself had ended. Not only that, but the disciplines also pervaded more branches of culture than just their self-contained academic areas. Surrounded by the growing presence and relevance of science and technology, artists such as Huxley, whose piece thematically represents the postwar preoccupation with progress and its good or bad effects on humankind, accumulated a great number of novels centering on the topic. Amongst some of the techno-utopian works which acclaim the contemporary advancements and breakthroughs are H. G. Well’s *Men Like Gods* (1923) and novels “influenced by *Looking Backwards*”⁹⁴ by Bellamy. Daniel Dinello includes into this list

92 Franklin A. J. L. James, “The Springtime of Science: Modernity and the Future and Past of Science,” in *Being Modern: The Cultural Impact of Science in the Early Twentieth Century*, ed. Robert Bud, Paul Greenhalgh, Frank James, and Morag Shiach (London: UCL Press, 2018), 130.

93 Mark S. Morrisson, *Modernism, Science, and Technology* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 2, accessed July 28, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=q_64DAAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=20th+modernism+literature+science&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjJvZabutfjAhVHaVAKHUoNCG8Q6AEIKTAA#v=onepage&q=dystopia&f=false.

94 Daniel Dinello, *Technophobia: Science Fiction Visions of Posthuman Technology* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005), 34, accessed July 28, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?>

“such technology-hyping novels as *The Crystal Button* (1891) by Chauncey Thomas, *A Cityless and Countryless World* (1893) by Henry Olerich, and *Limanora, the City of Progress* (1903) by Godfrey Sweven.”⁹⁵ The principal idea summarizing techno-utopian perspectives, as may already be evident, is the existence and employment of such advancements which “allow us to extend our physical and mental capabilities.”⁹⁶ In brief, it is the usage of recently developed or, at the point of publication, still fictional devices and processes intended to help humankind achieve efficiency and elation. This future-oriented ideology not only proposes a sort of industrial (r)evolution, but, above all, predicts its beneficial results. Consequently, positivism towards science and technology as a means of securing a hopeful, streamlined future appears as a strong feature in literary works of the era. However, it does not define the views of the artistic scene as a whole.

As has been outlined previously, dystopian thoughts in literature gained ground at the turn of the 19th century into the 20th and “have continued to flourish, especially in the United States ... along secular lines, mainly in science fiction.”⁹⁷ Owing to this shift, or rather union of subject matter, the opportunity arose for writers to combine the already well-known philosophical and political criticism with criticism of technology and science. Techno-dystopia thus “fuses two fears: the fear of utopia and the fear of technology.”⁹⁸ When combined, these fears echo the fact that “disclosing new worlds involves a complementary process of deworlding inherent in technical action,”⁹⁹ meaning that to reach the new and *uncertain*, the old and time-tested must be destroyed, an action whose consequences cannot be guaranteed. Feenberg comments on the process and perception of change in dystopian thinking thusly:

Deworlding is a salient feature of modern societies, which are constantly engaged in disassembling natural objects and traditional ways of doing things and substituting new technically rational ways. An exclusive focus on the negative aspect of this process yields ... dystopian critique.¹⁰⁰

id=ndyGAAAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=literature+science+technology+dystopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewjZ08_FutfjAhWEKVAKHY3ECGU4ChDoAQhOMAU#v=snippet&q=haunted%20utopias&f=false.

95 Daniel Dinello, *Technophobia*, 34.

96 Clint Jones and Cameron Ellis, introduction to *The Individual and Utopia: A Multidisciplinary Study of Humanity and Perfection*, ed. Clint Jones and Cameron Ellis (London: Routledge, 2016), 7, accessed July 28, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=y4G1CwAAQBAJ&pg=PA7&dq=techno-utopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewin2YLi79fjAhXTw8QBHcTWDzIQ6AEIKTAA#v=onepage&q=techno-utopia&f=false>.

97 Mihai I. Spariosu, *Modernism and Exile: Play, Liminality, and the Exilic-Utopian Imagination* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 106, accessed July 28, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=jnoYDAAAQBAJ&pg=PA106&dq=20th+modernism+literature+science+technology+dystopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewiN7r-wutfjAhWQKVAKHVC2BwKQ6AEILDAA#v=onepage&q=dystopia%20science&f=false>.

98 Gorman Beauchamp, “Technology in the Dystopian Novel,” *Modern Fiction Studies* 32, no. 1 (1986): 53.

99 Andrew Feenberg, “Modernity Theory and Technology Studies: Reflections on Bridging the Gap,” in *Modernity and Technology*, ed. Thomas J. Misa, Philip Brey, and Andrew Feenberg (Cambridge: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 2003), 96.

100 Feenberg, “Modernity Theory and Technology Studies,” 97.

Taking these fright-produced motivations suggested by Feenberg into account, the foundation to Huxley's (and, much later, to Collins's) futuristic dystopia could be found in the loss of the old, the uncertainty of the new, and the oversaturation of culture with science and technology, whose nature had proven in the Great War to be exceedingly powerful. This duality of power is subsequently what divides the opinion of the artistic scene into utopian and dystopian.

If the techno-utopian praises progress and presents it through rose-tinted glasses, it is logical to work with the premise that the techno-dystopian warns before the dangers that (too much) change can introduce, regardless of whether the political, economical, cultural etc. status quo is presently satisfactory or not. In essence, techno-dystopia criticizes "the extent to which people allow their lives to be dependent solely on science" and states the author's alarm at becoming "largely mindless and slave-like,"¹⁰¹ as is seen in *Brave New World*. Connectedly, it also has a cautionary function when depicting societies where progress goes "not only hand-in-hand with lifestyle improvements and inexpensive goods for the masses, but also with long working hours, increased child labour ... and an impoverished mass proletariat,"¹⁰² as is seen in *The Hunger Games*. Consumerism, weaponized technology, and failed science are also crucial themes in both of the novels. To offer a more particularized insight into how techno-dystopian criticism shapes the respective books, selected excerpts shall presently be juxtaposed with the provided ideas and definitions.

In the very opening scene of his novel, Huxley describes the setting as "[c]old for all the summer beyond the panes, for all the tropical heat of the room itself" and the light as "frozen, dead, a ghost,"¹⁰³ prefacing that the world whose story he is about to disclose is void of warmth and light. As modern as it can be, it lacks a certain touch of humanity as a side effect of deworlding. The reason for this absence of humanity manifests itself as Huxley goes on to explain that people are manufactured in Fertilizing Rooms and Hatcheries, mass-produced in castes from Alphas to Epsilons as a result of cloning, not unlike cars or furniture in factories. This process oversees that each member of the society genetically (i.e. physically and mentally) fits the requirements of their predestined caste, which assures that they are productive in their assigned societal task as well as satisfied with their life-long execution of it. Upon developing from their fetus stage, the synthetically created babies are moved to Social Conditioning Rooms where they receive further

101 Bartłomiej Biegajło, *Totalitarian (In)Experience in Literary Works and Their Translations: Between East and West* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2018), 28-29, accessed July 28, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=h_N0DwAAQBAJ&pg=PA35&dq=brave+new+world+totalitarian&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewigldqVvcbjAhV0ysQBHVtFCNEQ6AEIVDAG#v=onepage&q=brave%20new%20world%20totalitarian&f=false.

102 Dunja M. Mohr, *Worlds Apart?: Dualism and Transgression in Contemporary Female Dystopias* (Jefferson: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2005), 30, accessed July 28, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=RJjtAWM8ZvsC&pg=PA30&dq=dystopia+criticizes&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewiMo4CZ_dfjAhUtwcQBHb_CksQ6AEIMTAB#v=onepage&q=dystopia%20criticizes&f=false.

103 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 1.

training regarding how to act and think, which in combination with their hereditary predisposition makes them conform to the rules of their little utopia by the time they reach adulthood. In this “interesting world of human invention,”¹⁰⁴ everything is planned in advance, measured, secured; even the amount of air allotted to a developing fetus depends on its future class because there is “[n]othing like oxygen-shortage for keeping an embryo below par.”¹⁰⁵ In this introductory part of the novel, Huxley portrays a society in which science and technology have gone too far. As the exposition continues, though, it is still up to the reader to formulate their own thoughts on the moral implications that a utopia such as this one entails. Up to this point, the omnipresence of progress and mechanization in each aspect of the citizens’ lives is normalized, even glorified by the already introduced characters, seeing that technology and science are “major instruments of social stability”¹⁰⁶ in the World State and the utopians themselves see no wrong in depending on them fully.

Apart from creating and cloning human beings, and thus reshaping the entire evolutionary process, science and technology in *Brave New World* together serve as media to make people’s lives easier, further contributing to the idea of their indispensability. Indispensability, however, does not have to be synonymous with “improvement.” When exposing the manner in which the utopians lead their lives, Huxley manages to hint at the fact that although the manner itself is more modern, it is not exactly better. This may be illustrated on two excerpts which contrast the contemporary way of living with the old and rejected one:

From her dim crimson cellar Lenina Crowne shot up seventeen stories, turned to the right and as she stepped out of the lift, walked down a long corridor and, opening the door marked *Girls’ Dressing-Room*, plunged into a deafening chaos of arms and bosoms and underclothing. Torrents of hot water were splashing into or gurgling out of a hundred baths. Rumbling and hissing, eighty vibro-vacuum massage machines were simultaneously kneading and sucking the firm and sunburnt flesh of eight superb female specimens. Everyone was talking at the top of her voice. A Synthetic Music machine was warbling out a super-concert solo.¹⁰⁷

Home, home – a few small rooms, stiflingly over-inhabited by a man, a periodically teeming woman, by a rabble of boys and girls of all ages. No air, no space; an understerilized prison; darkness, disease, and smells.¹⁰⁸

For the sake of clarity, it should be noted that the two chosen excerpts appear in the novel in a short sequence, and are in all probability structured so because of Huxley’s intention to show

104Huxley, *Brave New World*, 10.

105Huxley, *Brave New World*, 11.

106Huxley, *Brave New World*, 5.

107Huxley, *Brave New World*, 30.

108Huxley, *Brave New World*, 31.

the luxurious now versus the desolate then; the innovative system versus the stagnant one; the clean versus the dirty. Interestingly, though, when analyzed minutely, one may notice the same overcrowded quality of people's living condition in the first scene as well as in the second one. In both sequences, everything is shared and loud, albeit in Lenina's part the room is garnished with brand new technology. Furthermore, the remark about "no air" in the second scene must seem especially paradoxical when contextualized with the previous paragraph which mentions that unless a utopian is born into the privileged class, he or she receives less oxygen as a fetus.

As illustrated in the previous excerpt focusing on Lenina's daily routine, the World State's citizens surround themselves with modern commodities, all of which are designed to contribute to their comfort. Amongst some of the most frequently enjoyed inventions belong for instance flying machines available for personal use,¹⁰⁹ taxicopters,¹¹⁰ and the already mentioned feelies and *soma*, a drug which keeps the user in a delighted state of mind. The latter two inventions could be considered the most popular sources of surviving each unproblematic yet mechanically mundane day. However, as shall now be established, not every utopian leaves their greatness as human inventions unchallenged. Bernard, namely, refuses to take *soma* multiple times throughout the novel, as can be demonstrated in a scene in which his colleague Benito offers him a dose:

"But, I say," he went on, "you do look glum! What you need is a gramme of *soma*." Diving into his right-hand trouser-pocket, Benito produced a phial. "One cubic centimetre cures ten gloomy... But, I say!"
Bernard had suddenly turned and rushed away.
Benito stared after him. "What can be the matter with the fellow?"¹¹¹

Bernard's negative reaction to being coerced into taking drugs is not an isolated case. The reason for selecting this scene in particular as an example is that it is layered. The reader sees not only Bernard's refusal, but also the following: the amount of peer pressure exerted over him before and after he does so, Benito's confusion with Bernard's decision, and the standardization of *soma* as a source of fun and a viable antidepressant. From Benito's unfinished speech, it can also be noted that *soma* as a product marketed to the masses is accompanied by slogans and mottos which further promote its effects and motivate the citizens' drug abuse.

In another instance, the character of the Savage is taken to the feelies and witnesses how people spend their free time in an over-engineered cinema where "pure musk" breathes from "scent organs"¹¹² and "the synthetic music machine" plays "a trio for hyper-violin, super-cello and

109Huxley, *Brave New World*, 52.

110Huxley, *Brave New World*, 148.

111Huxley, *Brave New World*, 52.

112Huxley, *Brave New World*, 146.

oboe-surrogate”¹¹³ to accompany a film whose plot the Savage later describes as base and ignoble¹¹⁴ due to its over-sexualized nature. To his shock, he is the only one who perceives the cinematic piece as such:

“I don’t think you ought to see things like that,” he said, making haste to transfer from Lenina herself to the surrounding circumstances the blame for any past or possible future lapse from perfection.

“Things like what, John?”

“Like this horrible film.”

“Horrible?” Lenina was genuinely astonished. “I thought it was lovely.

“It was base,” he said indignantly, “it was ignoble.”

She shook her head. “I don’t know what you mean.” Why was he so queer?¹¹⁵

The similarity between this and the previous excerpt is self-evident when speaking about their progression and message alike. The Savage, like Bernard, declines the usual fashion in which the utopians amuse themselves and is consequently regarded as the odd one out; the queer; the alien. What Lenina regards as entertaining and beneficial – and, ultimately, socializing – Bernard and the Savage see as degenerate, isolating, and identity-depriving because it has “been accomplished at the expense of many things that humans hold to be central to their identity, such as family, culture, art, literature ... religion, and philosophy.”¹¹⁶ Since neither of the men subscribe to the ideology accepted by the nation as a whole, that science and technology have positive consequences on the human condition, they are judged and ostracized for it by their conforming cohabitants, which in turn only heightens their feeling of being alienated and misunderstood. Despite appealing to the majority and serving to appease and numb them, the acclaimed advancements of the new age thus come with one too many conditions; conditions neither Bernard nor the Savage are always willing to agree to.

The abuse of weaponized technology in *Brave New World* has been discussed and illustrated in the preceding section of this chapter in connection to the scene where Delta babies undergo the process of conditioning reinforced by a set of electric shocks, and shall therefore not be needlessly repeated. However, it should not be forgotten that violence *does* occur in the novel, no matter how limited and scientifically sterile it is. In that respect, it is definitely not the theme of brutality itself, but the scope in which the two authors refer to it that makes Collins’s dystopia critical in more aspects than Huxley’s. While Huxley’s scepticism towards progress manifests

113Huxley, *Brave New World*, 145.

114Huxley, *Brave New World*, 148.

115Huxley, *Brave New World*, 147-148.

116Saffeen Nueman Arif, “The Civilization of Aldous Huxley’s *Brave World*,” *International Journal of Literature and Arts* 4, no. 3 (May 2016): 40.

in Bernard and John the Savage's opinion on the morality of its implementation and on the manner in which it dehumanizes people into unthinking, consumerism-oriented slaves, Collins's criticism adopts this stream of thinking and additionally proposes a more violent version of it, focusing on the atrocities done not in the name of science, but with its help. Due to her decision to factor weaponized technology into her writing so prominently, Collins considers and surpasses the question of whether progress is always good even when it is originally intended to be so, and shows in a gruesome way the realities of inventing devices deliberately designed to intimidate, suppress, and hurt. The former is demonstrated when the author describes the Capitolian lifestyle, gilded and artificial in Katniss's eyes; and the latter is displayed when Collins's narrates her story through Katniss and describes her mental and physical hardships caused by the Capitol and their machinery. Both forms of Collins's criticism may now be examined with evidence.

As hinted before, the lives of Collins's Capitolians could be envied since they are void of starvation, hard labour, and trouble, in which they resemble the lives of Huxley's Alphas. Katniss describes the inhabitants as people who speak with a "silly Capitol accent"¹¹⁷ and are "so dyed, stenciled, and surgically altered they're grotesque."¹¹⁸ They reside in their own plastic utopia whose beauty even Katniss cannot dispute when she first witnesses it. However, she promptly supplies her opinion on the estranging unnaturalness of the place:

I run to the window to see what we've only seen on television, the Capitol, the ruling city of Panem. The cameras haven't lied about its grandeur. If anything, they have not quite captured the magnificence of the glistening buildings in a rainbow of hues that tower into the air, the shiny cars that roll down the wide paved streets ... All the colours seem artificial, the pinks too deep, the greens too bright, the yellows painful to the eyes, like the flat round disks of hard candy we can never afford to buy at the tiny sweet shop in District 12.¹¹⁹

Moreover, upon arriving into the city and facing its splendour for the first time with both awe and reserve, Katniss is taken to the Remake Center¹²⁰ (how evocative of Huxley's Conditioning Rooms). There, encircled by stylists whose flamboyant looks remind her of "a trio of oddly coloured birds,"¹²¹ Katniss has to endure a thorough makeover because the Games may not be "a beauty contest, but the best-looking tributes always seem to pull more sponsors."¹²² Stating that with calm practicality, Collins does two things at the same time. Firstly, she reminds the reader of how

117Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 61.

118Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 63.

119Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 59.

120Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 61.

121Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 62.

122Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 58.

superficial the utopian society is, with its hedonistic, consumption-oriented mentality which makes the citizens see the Games as a mere reality show. And secondly, the author allows for a strong comparison between *The Hunger Games* and *Brave New World* with connection to how inhuman and immoral the society has become under the yoke of technology which leaves them worry-free to the point that they truly do not question anything.

The disastrous effect of too much mechanized progress on a person's ethics and empathy is not Collins's only concern, however. As much as she pays homage to the Huxleyian dilemma of morality and identity, she moreover introduces technology and science as a form of surveillance and oppression, letting the reader realize through Katniss's experience the detriments of too much progress with staggering clarity. The ways in which the Capitol employs inventions and devices to spy on and tyrannize the inhabitants of the outer districts are varied, and they range from simple supervision to violence. Some of the Capitol's devices include hovercrafts¹²³ used for transportation as well as pursuit; "insectlike cameras"¹²⁴ which capture Katniss's grim election to participate in the Games and broadcast her misfortune to the whole world as something glorious to see; jabberjays, "a series of genetically altered animals" used "as weapons"¹²⁵ to record the Capitol's enemies conversations; tracking devices¹²⁶ inserted under the skin of the tributes to keep track on them while they are finally in the Hunger Games arena; and, last but not least, such mechanisms that make it possible to alter sceneries and temperature. Katniss experiences firsthand (or at least encounters second-hand) all of the above, but what poses the greatest threat to her while in the arena is the very last point found on the list. As everything else, the ability of the Capitol to manipulate weather and surroundings becomes a powerful weapon in their hands:

This was no tribute's campfire gone out of control, no accidental occurrence. The flames that bear down on me have an unnatural height, a uniformity that marks them as human-made, machine-made, Gamemaker-made. Things have been too quiet today. No deaths, perhaps no fights at all. The audience in the Capitol will be getting bored, claiming that these Games are verging on dullness. This is the one thing the Games must not do.¹²⁷

In this scene, Katniss has to fight her way through an artificial wildfire which chases her (and, presumably, the other tributes as well) around the arena as though it was alive and sentient. Another instance in which the Gamemakers exploit their technological knowledge in order to endanger the tributes and make the Games more interesting happens not long after. Katniss is trapped

123Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 162.

124Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 40.

125Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 42.

126Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 144.

127Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 173.

in the vicinity of a wasp's nest and, upon examining it, realizes that the insects who inhabit it must have been modified beforehand because they remind her of a biological weapon used in the past war; similar to the jabberjay, but deadly:

It could be the ordinary leave-us-alone-and-we'll-leave-you-alone type. But these are the Hunger Games, and ordinary isn't the norm. More likely they will be one of the Capitol's mutations, tracker jackers. Like the jabberjays, these killer wasps were spawned in a lab and strategically placed, like land mines, around the districts during the war. Larger than regular wasps, they have a distinctive solid gold body and a sting that raises a lump the size of a plum on contact. Most people can't tolerate more than a few stings. Some die at once. If you live, the hallucinations brought on by the venom have actually driven people to madness. And there's another thing, these wasps will hunt down anyone who disturbs their nest and attempt to kill them.¹²⁸

Perfectly synchronized with the premise that “dystopia criticizes the ever more sophisticated techniques for ... control that go hand-in-hand with the advance of machines” and does not regard such machines as “neutral tools,”¹²⁹ the provided excerpts illustrate that the conglomerate-like¹³⁰ Capitol partly utilizes its intricate industrial power to indulge the utopians, but, more crucially, partly also to monitor, harm, and even kill the outsiders and rebels.

When summarized in short, it could be deduced that technology and science in *Brave New World* and in *The Hunger Games* alike are described as partially beneficial, but majorly mollifying devices employed to control and repress. Connectedly, techno-dystopian criticism is a heavily recurring theme in both pieces. Each novel is preoccupied with the question of dehumanization and loss of morality that excessive technological and scientific advancements may produce, whether it is in the way that a mechanized lifestyle removes the need to be critical, ethical, and individualistic, or in the way it creates artificial amusement and robs people of an actual free choice to refuse any sort of participation in this form of fun without being ostracized for it. In addition to the topic of empathy, ethics, and identity, *The Hunger Games* to a greater degree than Huxley's piece

128Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 185-186.

129Roslynn Haynes, “Machines and Mechanization,” in *The Greenwood Encyclopedia of Science Fiction and Fantasy: Themes, Works, and Wonders, Volume 2*, ed. Gary Westfahl (London: Greenwood Press, 2005), 482, accessed July 30, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=3JXnz9x9sO4C&pg=PA482&dq=dystopia+criticizes&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiMo4CZ_dfjAhUtwcQBHb_CksQ6AEIOTAC#v=onepage&q=dystopia%20criticizes&f=false.

130Bill Clemente, “Panem in America: Crisis of Economics and a Call for Political Engagement,” in *Of Bread, Blood and The Hunger Games: Critical Essays on the Suzanne Collins Trilogy*, ed. Mary F. Pharr and Leisa A. Clark (London: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2012), 24, accessed July 30, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=mjL8WHxkTcoC&printsec=frontcover&dq=of+bread+blood+and+hunger+games&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj5iLeeisjiAhVqwsQBHSsgCeEQuwUIMDAA#v=onepage&q=of%20bread%20blood%20and%20hunger%20games&f=false>.

explores the notion of progress as a means of exerting violence over the oppressed, by which Collins comments on the exploitability of technology and science.

3 Cultural Context

Hitherto, the novels selected as the subject matter of this paper have been for the most part juxtaposed in terms of their parallelism, be it the sameness of the employed literary genre, the similarity of key themes, or the ways in which Huxley and Collins's critical thoughts coincide. It would be not only self-serving, though, but utterly insufficient to overlook the occasional polarity with which Huxley and Collins execute their dystopian worldbuilding. Even pieces of literature which belong to the same genre and deal with the same topic cannot be completely identical because authorial idiosyncrasy as well as cultural context must be accounted for as factors shaping each individual book. The latter, that is the cultural context contributing to the existence and contents of *Brave New World* and *The Hunger Games* as two same-thinking yet distinct pieces, shall presently be discussed in order to recognize one major difference between Huxley and Collins's fictional societies and discover its roots.

Numerous comparisons have been drawn between the Alphas and the Capitolians so far. The resemblance between the two castes is astounding, but their members only represent a portion of the respective populations. As such, the link between the two classes should not be accepted as the sole factor in determining how (dis)similar the two societies are as a whole. Certainly, more comparisons may be created between the other castes as well since it could be argued that the Beta class corresponds to District One and Two and the Epsilon class corresponds to District Twelve etc.; but that is not the point about to be argued in the following paragraphs. The point, in all actuality, is that in spite of their similar structural division into privileged and underprivileged groups, the World State and the Capitol with its subjugated districts work very differently in respect to two important themes: care and coexistence.

When inspecting the societies depicted in the selected novels, consensus can be reached that they are both identical in their inner stratification into several classes, and that privileges and rights are distributed amongst these classes in an uneven and unfair manner from highest to lowest. The way in which the castes are looked after, however, varies. As may have already been noted in the previous chapters, in Huxley's world, even the less fortunate and developed citizens are properly taken care of by the state, not excepting even certain luxuries and entertainment permitted for them to enjoy. Even Epsilons are encouraged to "consume transport" and conditioned to "love

all country sports,”¹³¹ meaning that they are simultaneously allowed to have fun and contribute economically to the well-being of the World State. Alphas, Epsilons, and the classes in between are all provided for (although the lower classes must work harder to gain the benefits which the upper classes receive for performing lighter, intellectual work). What is moreover crucial when assessing the relative benevolence of the World State in comparison to Collin’s Capitol is the fact that, unlike the utopians and the district dwellers in *The Hunger Games* who receive unequal resources and who live apart in total separation, Huxley’s entire fictional population coexists in the same geographical location. Granted, the lower classes in *Brand New World* remain depicted in subservient roles and while doing menial jobs, but they share the same utopian topography with the upper classes, a fact which substantially contributes to the fictitious illusion of equality the World’s State seemingly stands on. The Capitolians and the district dwellers, on the other hand, live in seclusion, with even the individual districts being separated from each other by “a high chain-link fence topped with barbed-wire loops”¹³² and additionally guarded by an array of Peacemakers whose job is to oversee that nobody crosses over. When factoring all of the previously established parallels between the subject matter novels, this singular distinction stands out as particularly significant, and so does the question it implies: How did this major variation arise in the first place?

“White Man’s Burden” Britain

At the very beginning of every utopian’s life in Huxley’s brave and new world is a Hatchery and a bottle with a fertilized egg inside. Alphas, Betas, Gammas, Deltas, and Epsilons all come from one place,¹³³ and they remain in that place until the day they die. In the meantime, they are expected to carry out distinct tasks chosen for them according to their ranks and dictated by their societal roles, but they ultimately share the same geographic space while doing so. Huxley illustrates this coexistence, whose essence could be described by any adjective ranging from charitable to exploitative, in a scene in which Bernard and his Alpha colleagues encounter an Epsilon. The Epsilon’s place is undeniably lower on the hierarchical pyramid of the World State than Bernard’s, but he is nevertheless depicted as a contributing member of the society:

“Roof!” called a creaking voice.

The liftman was a small simian creature, dressed in the black tunic of an Epsilon-Minus Semi-Moron.

“Roof!”

He flung open the gates. The warm glory of afternoon sunlight made him start and blink his eyes. “Oh, roof!” he repeated in a voice of rapture. He

131Huxley, *Brave New World*, 18.

132Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 4.

133Huxley, *Brave New World*, 3.

was as though suddenly and joyfully awakened from a dark annihilating stupor. “Roof!”
He smiled up with a kind of doggily expectant adoration into the faces of his passengers. Talking and laughing together, they stepped out into the light.¹³⁴

The Epsilon man, although his genetic predisposition and field of employment reduce him to a simple servant, has one basic right that his fellow members of the lower classes in *The Hunger Games* do not have: the right to peacefully coexist with the upper classes and, when the tedious working hours are over, enjoy the same form of entertainment as them.¹³⁵ Debatably, the right to live in Huxley’s utopia requires the Gammas, Deltas, and Epsilons to labour harder in order to receive it, and therefore its charitable nature could be considered disputable at best. From the very tone of this paper it may have been deduced that Huxley denounces the outwardly philanthropic political and social philosophy of the World State as hypocritical while he gradually uncovers the injustices the system sanctions in order to remain functional, which fortunately eliminates the question of ethics as already solved. Recognizing thus Huxley’s criticism, the reader already understands that the World State’s generosity is utilitarian rather than humanitarian. What is not known is Huxley’s motivation to devise a utopia where false equality amongst classes is achieved by letting them coexist.

It is stated in the novel that the members of the lower classes are racially differentiated from the members of the upper classes, the Gammas being described as sandy, the Deltas as black and hideous, and the Epsilons as Senegalese and Negro.^{136 137 138} This detail indeed must be of particular importance. Historically, non-white races have been confronted with differing forms of discrimination in Britain and America. Predictably, this difference creates a corresponding divide between the two real-life countries and their fictional reflections alike. The tendency of the British Empire to take care for its “others” in the tradition of Rudyard Kiplings’s white saviourism as it is expressed in his poem “White Man’s Burden” could be contrasted with the segregational and slaveholding tendencies of the Americas. If the idea that an author’s work is inevitably influenced by the cultural context of the country they come from is accepted, it may be proposed that Huxley’s inspiration has a strong source in the imperial ideology of the British, and that Collins derives hers from the history of America.

It is perhaps needless to explain the concept of the “white man’s burden” rhetoric of the time, but it shall nevertheless be done for the sake of clarity:

134Huxley, *Brave New World*, 50.

135See note 135.

136Huxley, *Brave New World*, 138-139.

137Huxley, *Brave New World*, 55.

138Huxley, *Brave New World*, 87.

Historians have long held that Kipling's poem offered ... a key formulation of expansion as a selfless duty, a moral justification based on idealism and racial mission for the empire ...¹³⁹

What is meant by the definition is that Kipling, as many of his contemporaries not only in the field of art, but even more so significantly in the field of politics, compared their invasion of foreign lands to a virtuous obligation of the white man; an obligation which justified him in reigning over the colonized (and, as a reward, exploiting their resources). The British intervention in colonies was for that reason deemed as a necessary step in enlightening and nurturing the "others" under the imperial rule.

Closely connected to Kipling's philosophy, British imperialism – presented by the British themselves – "is the expression of a change in the conception of the British Empire, which is no longer regarded by its citizens as an Island State with dependent colonies," but instead functions as a "single, world-embracing whole" and a "Mother Country"¹⁴⁰ to the natives as well as the so-called "others." Theoretically, the policy is founded on magnanimity, unity, and help to the less fortunate. Associatedly, it intends to integrate colonies and its peoples into the British base in order to promote a more peaceful coexistence between a mother nation and her children nations. Factually, though, the characteristics that "mark the history of the English nation" are "the development of ordered liberty and the growth of its external dominion."¹⁴¹ This statement emphasizes the urge of the British to control and regulate. Confronted with the cross-continental geographical, political, and cultural expansion of the Empire over the centuries, magnanimity, unity, and help moreso conceal a more refined method to maintain control over the colonized subjects rather than a way to relinquish it. Under the imperial rule, the colonized are still expected to provide labour and yield products and resources to the colonizer; the difference is that they continue to do so under the pretext that they have become a part of the majority. This fate is evocative of that of Huxley's Gammas, Deltas, and Epsilons.

As Laura Beers and Geraint Thomas preface in their anthology dedicated to nation-building in Britain between the wars, while "inter-war statesmen presented the nation state as a defender of democracy," the truth was that "inter-war Britain remained an imperial power."¹⁴² In other words,

139Gretchen Murphy, *Shadowing the White Man's Burden: U.S. Imperialism and the Problem of the Color Line* (New York: New York University Press, 2010), 30, accessed August 9, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=noJ0pg5otWwC&pg=PA29&dq=white+man%27s+burden+meaning+interpretation&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi_yIzH-XjAhXJepoKHbC9AA0Q6AEIKjAA#v=onepage&q=white%20man's%20burden%20meaning%20interpretation&f=false

140Felix Von Oppenheimer, *British Imperialism* (Forgotten Books, 2010), 10.

141William Harrison Woodward, *A Short History of the Expansion of The British Empire: 1500-1902* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902), 10.

142Laura Beers and Geraint Thomas, introduction to *Brave New World: Imperial and Democratic Nation-Building in Britain between the Wars*, ed. Laura Beers and Geraint Thomas (London: London Institute of Historical Research,

the propagandistic model of the time claimed Britain to operate as a democratic country, but its authenticity was undermined by the fact that the nation still maintained supremacy over its subjects. Such political mood could be a possible explanation as to why Huxley's World State assumes an almost missionary role in distributing care and presumed rights amongst the classes, and also the reason why the theme of grey morality being condoned for the "greater good" echoes so strongly throughout the novel. It is in the best interest of Huxley's statement, just as it used to be in the best interest of the leading British politicians during the imperial era, to preserve their control over the "others." Even more importantly, it was in their best interest to do so while managing to stay within the margins of philanthropic kindness. Presenting an oppressive political system as a democratic one is highly beneficial for the governing body because a well-phrased propaganda satisfies and silences the utopian citizen, regardless of whether the utopian is the white Briton (Alpha) or the "other" (Epsilon etc.).

Huxley considers all of the above and utilizes benevolence, white saviourism, and the illusion of equality as a technique to mollify the masses in his book. He only uncovers the dystopian undertone of his fictional world to the most morally and socially aware Alphas and the character of the Savage, who are then destined to live in a utopia that is their own dystopia, as has been established in chapter 2.

To furthermore contextualize British imperialism with the content of this paper, the policy entertains a white man's utopian idea that his devised system benefits the privileged and underprivileged alike although he knows that it is untrue. As such, the motherly ideology provides a moral shield to the white Briton or the Alpha in charge. Huxley explores the ethics of imperialism in many cases, notably in the scene where a selected few of the characters encounter the Controller and have the opportunity to raise their questions and objections about the state of things to him. His response encapsulates the premise of benevolent British imperialism as it has been delineated in the preceding paragraphs:

"... Happiness is a hard master – particularly other people's happiness. A much harder master, if one isn't conditioned to accept it unquestionably, than truth." He sighed, fell silent again, then continued in a brisker tone. "Well, duty's a duty ..."¹⁴³

What stands out the most in this excerpt is the Controller's remark about one's duty, seeing that it is extraordinarily suggestive of the conviction that the privileged majority (the intelligent Alphas; alternately, the white Britons) should make sacrifices in order to provide for the minority

2011), 26.

¹⁴³Huxley, *Brave New World*, 200.

(the Epsilons; alternately, the colonized). Such sacrifices are then carried out by the Britons/Alphas on their own behalf as well as on behalf of others (and, even more specifically, on behalf of the “others”) in compliance with the “white man’s burden” rhetoric. It is therefore a shared notion between the book and reality that the Britons/Alphas must exercise their power over the less developed and employ their decision-making right in impacting their own class as well as the lower classes.

Given these points, it could be concluded that the themes in Huxley’s novel are directly derived from the history of the British Empire. His decision to envision a society which operates on the basis of a hierarchical pyramid where the privileged (the Britons/Alphas) rule over the less privileged (the colonized/Epsilons etc.) may be traced to the prevailing ideologies of the time: that imperialism is a system beneficial for everyone and that it is the white Briton’s moral duty to take away or diminish the colonized’s autonomy for their own sake.

Segregated America

Entertaining the theme of racial undertones discerned in *Brave New World* and applying it to Collins’s novel, it can be discerned that the motif of the privileged majority and underprivileged minority repeats itself in the latter piece as well; only in Collins’s dystopia, it is a clash, and not coexistence, that defines the relationship between the two sections of the society. Cultural and historical context contributes to this gap within the same genre when interpreted by two authors from different countries (continents). In stark opposition to Huxley’s implementation of white saviourism and benevolent imperialism, *The Hunger Games* follow the dark tradition of American segregational and slaveholding past.

The characters who reside in Collins’s fictional country Panem are divided into the well-born utopians, living in the wealthy Capitol, and the district dwellers, who must scrape by in their fixed zones. The sole aspect which likens these people to Huxley’s characters is that they also remain in the place where they were born until the day they die; however, unlike the castes in *Brave New World*, Collins’s society is stratified in terms of class as well as geography. In other words, Collins’s characters do not share the same utopian topography, as instead they are divided by electric fences into strictly separated zones. While as good as incarcerated in their designated districts, the residents cannot travel to the Capitol, and they cannot travel amongst the individual districts in search of a more lucrative life either. Already, a heavy motif of restriction and repression based on one’s “kind” may be noted. The forthcoming section of this paper briefly outlines the American history in dealing with non-white races and compares it to the treatment of the district population in *The Hunger Games*.

Building on the colonial foundation laid out in America's first decades, "European Americans have made oppression of non-Europeans basic to the new society."¹⁴⁴ As a majority in terms of power, if not yet in terms of quantity, white colonizers who stood at the dawn of America bear responsibility for the manner in which non-white races are mistreated on the continent to this day. The history of racism in America is summarized by Joe R. Feagin thusly:

For the first 90 percent of this country's history (about 350 years) slavery or legal segregation was generally in place. ... Oppression of non-European groups is part of the deep social structure. Beginning with the genocidal killing off of Native Americans and the theft of their lands, and the extensive enslavement of Africans as laborers on those stolen lands, European colonists and their descendants created a new society by means of active predation, exploitation, and oppression.¹⁴⁵

Interesting to note is that Collins specifically states that District Twelve, the place where Katniss lives, lies in an area previously called the Appalachia.¹⁴⁶ This possibly hints at the tradition of slavery because the practice "existed in all of the Appalachian South," was "a legal institution" in the region, and "gave an economic advantage to those willing to own slaves."¹⁴⁷ Such piece of information faintly predestines Katniss's role as the colonized "other" who must yield her products, crop, and labour to the colonizer. What is an even more compelling link between slavery in America and Collins's utopia is the presence of Avoxes,¹⁴⁸ punished rebels who serve and wait on the Capitolians without any prospect of being freed from their service.

Segregation, parallel to slavery, is another theme explored by Collins. In the recent century, America witnessed "disenfranchisement and segregation of blacks" and "immigration restriction."¹⁴⁹ Each of the policies was implemented either to ensure that the "others" would not enter on the American soil, or that they would remain contained in spaces allotted to them in advance, regulating thus the presence and quantity of non-white immigrants in a space predominantly populated by white immigrants (now Americans). Spatial isolation continued even after the 1960s when a series of Civil Rights Acts "outlawed racial discrimination in employment" and "banned racial discrimination in housing."¹⁵⁰ While theoretically, the "self-enforcing cycle

144Joe R. Feagin, *Systemic Racism: A Theory of Oppression* (London: Routledge, 2006), 2.

145Feagin, *Systemic Racism*, 2.

146Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 41.

147Richard B. Drake, "Slavery and Antislavery in Appalachia," in *Appalachians and Race: The Mountain South from Slavery to Segregation*, ed. John C. Inscoe (Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 2001), 17.

148See note 93 for more detail.

149Eugene E. Leach, "1900-1914," in *A Companion to 20th-Century America*, ed. Stephen J. Whitfield (Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 15-16.

150Douglas S. Massey and Nancy A. Denton, *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), 84.

of prejudice, discrimination, and segregation was broken,”¹⁵¹ socioeconomic factors resulting from ages of injustice have contributed to the “racial composition” of “urban and suburban neighbourhood” into “black cities and white suburbs,”¹⁵² perpetuating the cycle of separation and impoverishment even without a legal support. In a similar fashion, Collins’s Capitolians have the power to prohibit travel and make trespassing unlawful for the district dwellers.¹⁵³ And it is not merely transport which is banned; spreading information about individual districts and cross-district cooperation are also restricted. Katniss muses on these facts while she is in the Hunger Games arena after she and a girl from another district bond and share small details about their lifestyles. Her thoughts on the separation can be discerned in these two scenes:

It’s interesting, hearing about her life. We have so little communication with anyone outside our district. In fact, I wonder if the Gamemakers are blocking out our conversation because even though the information seems harmless, they don’t want people in different districts to know about one another.¹⁵⁴

This bread came from District 11 ... It had been meant for Rue, surely. But instead of pulling the gift when she died, they’d authorized Haymitch to give it to me. As a thank-you? Or because, like me, they don’t like to let debts go unpaid? For whatever reason, this is a first. A district gift to a tribute who’s not your own.¹⁵⁵

While the former scene depicts how communication and information flow are limited even between two directly neighbouring districts, the latter scene (in which Katniss receives a present sent by the people from District Eleven in spite of the fact that while that year’s Hunger Games are still in duration, she is an enemy to them and to their selected pair of tributes) demonstrates that collaboration and friendliness amongst districts remain highly discouraged. In Katniss’s world, offering a helping hand to a tribute from another district may mean the death of their own because such action at the same time empowers the rival and deprives one’s own tribute of valuable resources. That alone is reason enough not to concern oneself with someone who, technically speaking, is in the same dire situation as a tribute who comes from one’s homeland.

Furthermore, the girl whom Katniss befriends, Rue, tells her about the experience of living in District Eleven, an agricultural zone which yields yearly harvested crop to the Capitol. In this scene, the themes of segregation as well as slaveholding appear:

151Massey and Denton, *American Apartheid*, 84.

152Charles M. Lamb, *Housing Segregation in Suburban America since 1960: Presidential and Judicial Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 1.

153Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 5.

154Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 203.

155Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 239.

“I’d have thought, in District Eleven, you’d have a bit more to eat than us. You know, since you grow the food,” I say.
Rue’s eyes widen. “Oh, no, we’re not allowed to eat the crops.”
“They arrest you or something?”
“They whip you and make everyone else watch,” says Rue. “The mayor’s very strict about it.”
I can tell by her expression that it’s not that uncommon an occurrence.¹⁵⁶

This short yet powerful dialogue uncovers that forced labour and physical punishments (specifically whipping) are not a rarity in more of the impoverished districts than just the one where Katniss lives.

As can be seen, all three scenes illustrate either the theme of segregation, slavery, or, in case of some, both. What appears to be the crucial motivation for President Snow and the Capitolians in implementing oppressive policies of this nature is that it contributes to their maintenance of political and economic power over the districts. By imposing a ban on travel and demanding manual labour from the lower classes, the Capitolians simultaneously ensure that nobody escapes their designated class and that the Capitol shall always be well supplied with food etc. while keeping the minority dependent on rations distributed by the upper class. However, the policies also endorse a more human-oriented motif: a severe lack of compassion which is prompted by total separation and contributes to preventing the districts from organized unification in the fight against injustice.

To conclude this brief interlude chapter, it may be deduced that while Huxley and Collins have an identical goal in mind – to picture a class system which favours the majority, disenfranchises the minority, and enforces the preservation of dominance of the upper classes over the lower classes – each author opts for non-identical narratives and themes in order to depict this disbalance. When referring to Huxley, his inspiration can be presumed to stem from his experience with imperialist propaganda and Britain’s past (and, for Huxley, present) as a colonizer. As has been evidenced, Huxley’s fictional political system operates under the guise of benevolence and reimagines the “Alpha’s burden” narrative in a futuristic state where the privileged majority allows for some (hard-earned) freedom to the underprivileged minority, but at the price of staying underprivileged from birth to death, and where the upper classes maintain their supremacy due to marketing the unequal social system devised by and beneficial to them as equal and considerate of the lower classes as well. The key strategy of Huxley’s World State in presenting itself as a progressive and humanitarian nation is the coexistence of classes, which creates the illusion of unity and charity. Collins’s inspiration, on the other hand, could be claimed to follow America’s slaveholding and

¹⁵⁶Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 202.

segregational past, seeing that her fictional Panem stands rigidly divided in class and geography alike. Unlike Huxley, whose utopian World State is ruled by a governing body which assumes a pseudo-missionary mask to keep people quiet and complacent, Collins employs separation and penalization to reach the same effect. Her fictitious district population practices obedience not out of comfort and satisfaction, but in order to avoid a worse fate than the one already imposed on them. While thus relying on the same method, that is using their respective country's historical and cultural background as a source to derive from and to create allegories to, Huxley and Collins part ways where their real-life models do. As a result, the authors imagine two similar societies whose core utopian ideologies take very distinct forms in dependence on whether the lower classes are geographically integrated into the space populated by the upper classes or not and whether they receive the same amount of care as the privileged majority for appearance's sake.

4 *Brave New World and The Hunger Games: A Comparison*

The preceding three chapters serve several purposes. Firstly, they categorize the subject matter novels, *Brave New World* and *The Hunger Games*, as two pieces emblematic of dystopian literature. Secondly, they highlight some of the core topics representative of the genre incorporated by Huxley and Collins into their respective works, such as the manner in which they portray classist societies and criticize totalitarianism and science. Thirdly, the chapters emphasize a number of narrative and critical points in which Huxley and Collins find common ground, for instance the choice to depict a postwar futuristic setting, condemn weaponized technology, and explore the grey zone of morality. What is more, the previously provided materials also take into consideration the idiosyncrasies with which the authors work with the motifs of coexistence and care, factoring thus not only the similarities between the two books, but the differences as well. The motivational force behind the latter has been linked by the author of this thesis to the varying historical and cultural contexts shaping Huxley and Collins's experience and outlook and contributing thus to their creative writing.

With the major topics which connect as well as differentiate the subject novels being covered, the focus of the paper shall presently shift to a more particularized analysis of minor components that the two pieces comprise, including their key themes, archetypes, and metaphors. This final juxtaposition shall be done in order to prove that despite some of the important distinctions introduced specifically in the previous chapter, the books' similarities fundamentally outweigh their differences.

Themes

The following paragraphs function as a detailed study of parallelism between four themes appearing in *Brave New World* as well as *The Hunger Games*. The selection of these themes in particular lies in their omnipresence and importance throughout the respective books, marking them as relevant for a reliable and unbiased comparison.

Firstly, the theme of barbarism and civilization may be applied to. From the tone of each book, “versus” as well as a simple “and” could be placed between the two words, seeing that Huxley and Collins unanimously take pleasure in erasing the distinction between the two. While theoretically, it should be the residents of the advanced World State and the wealthy Capitol who are the most civilized in comparison to their underprivileged and less developed counterparts, the reality often strays from this presumption.

Huxley plays into the paradox of barbarism and civilization on several occasions during John the Savage’s speeches. Having grown up in a Savage Reservation where daily human lives are not mechanized and conditioning is not in practice, the Savage cannot help but criticize the progressive yet unfeeling society of the World State utopians. Most notably, he voices his opinions when he talks with the Controller:

“So you don’t much like civilization, Mr Savage,” he said.

The Savage looked at him. He had been prepared to lie, to bluster, to remain sullenly unresponsive; but, reassured by the good-humoured intelligence of the Controller’s face, he decided to tell the truth, straightforwardly. “No.” He shook his head.¹⁵⁷

The scene continues with the Savage explaining that while he appreciates the “nice things,” such as all that “music in the air,”¹⁵⁸ he instantly recalls at what cost this pleasant progress has been bought:

He passed his hand over his eyes as though he were trying to wipe away the remembered image of those long rows of identical midgets at the assembling tables, those queued-up twin-herds at the entrance to the Brentford monorail station, those human maggots swarming round Linda’s bed of death, the endlessly repeated face of his assailants. He looked at his bandaged left hand and shuddered. “Horrible!”

As is clear, the Savage cannot be reconciled with how manufactured and cloned the society of the World State is, with nobody having the liberty of self-identification.

¹⁵⁷Huxley, *Brave New World*, 192.

¹⁵⁸Huxley, *Brave New World*, 192.

Emotional fulfillment, or rather lack thereof, represents another thing the Savage misses in the utopian society and which for him labels it as uncivilized. Since everyone is the same and brainwashed to be content with the shallow range of enjoyments provided by the state, such as recreational drugs and the feelies, the World State is no place for Shakespeare and high art¹⁵⁹ in general, which the Savage bemoans.

Loosely connected to this, the Savage's disillusionment also manifests when it comes to sexual liberation of women and oversexualization of the media. One of these instances takes place in the aforementioned scene at the feelies during which the Savage calls the featured film base and ignoble due to its overly suggestive topics. Another, more dramatic example of Savage's disapproving reaction to promiscuity, which is deemed normal and natural by the citizens of the World State, happens when Lenina makes a sexual advance towards him:

The Savage caught her by the wrists, tore her hands from his shoulders, thrust her roughly away at arm's length.

"Ow, you're hurting me, you're... oh!" She was suddenly silent. Terror made her forget the pain. Opening her eyes, she had seen his face – no, not *his* face, a ferocious stranger's, pale, distorted, twitching with some insane, inexplicable fury. Aghast, "But what is it, John?" she whispered. ... "What is it?" she almost screamed.

And as though awakened by her cry he caught her by the shoulders and shook her. "Whore!" he shouted. "Whore! Impudent strumpet!"¹⁶⁰

The Savage's reaction is not only negative; it is positively revolted to the point of stooping to physical aggression. His treatment of Lenina is undeniably barbaric, yet he internalizes it as right because Lenina's forwardness does not fit his romantic ideal of how a woman should behave. Huxley therefore chooses to pose an interesting dilemma. Instead of simply switching the roles and claiming that the Savage is the civilized one, he portrays the man as someone pure in intention only, and not in action. This way, Huxley completely blurs the line between what is barbaric and what is civilized. The two concepts that should clash suddenly arise as ambiguous and unrecognizable when confronted with each other.

Collins approaches the same paradox with respect to the Huxleyian ambiguity. At the same time, she highlights the irony of the Capitolians having less compassion and humanity in them than the children from barbaric outer districts who are selected, trained, and expected by these civilized people to kill each other in the Hunger Games arena. On the one hand, Collins presents child killers. On the other hand, she presents the society which makes and moulds them into killers. Although Collins does not attempt to glamorize the actions of the children and teens who enter the arena and

159Huxley, *Brave New World*, 192-194.

160Huxley, *Brave New World*, 170.

oftentimes murder each other with visible glee, she nevertheless draws the distinction between what is barbaric and what is civilized more clearly, as shown in these excerpts:

Effie know everyone who's anyone in the Capitol and has been talking us up all day, trying to win us sponsors.

"I've been very mysterious, though," she says, her eyes squint half shut. "Because, of course, Haymitch hasn't bothered to tell me your strategies. But I've done my best what I had to work with. How Katniss sacrificed herself for her sister. How you've both successfully struggled to overcome the barbarism of your district."

Barbarism? That's ironic coming from a woman helping to prepare us for slaughter. And what's she basing our success on? Our table manners?¹⁶¹

Effie, a Capitolian woman in charge of managing and preparing Katniss (and other tributes from District Twelve) for the arena, obviously does not realize how ridiculous she must sound to Katniss. Moreover, apart from the question of civilization versus barbarism, this particular scene puts in contrast selfishness and selflessness. Effie, whose only concern is herself and who cannot find enough empathy to at least see Katniss as a person rather than a marketable product to sell to the sponsors, serves here as a complete opposite of Katniss, who would not be preparing for her death had she not volunteered to participate in the Hunger Games to save her younger sister.

In another case, Katniss witnesses Rue being killed by a boy from District One. In a fit of rage, and also to save her own life, Katniss kills him in retaliation. After the revenge is done, Katniss remarks that to hate the boy for murdering Rue is simply not enough because he does not bear the blame alone:

It's the Capitol I hate, for doing this to all of us ...

I want to do something, right here, right now, to shame them, to make them accountable, to show the Capitol that whatever they do or force us to do there is a part of every tribute they can't own. That Rue was more than a piece in their Games. And so am I.

... I gather up an armful [of wildflowers] and come back to Rue's side. Slowly, one stem at a time, I decorate her body in the flowers.¹⁶²

Despite her resentment towards the boy from District One, Katniss still sees what – or who – is the cause of her suffering. She wants to shame the “civilized” Capitolians for condoning and celebrating other people's pain, not even to awaken the last of their humanity in them, but to show them they have none. By embellishing Rue's body with flowers, Katniss pays the girl respect that the civil and refined Capitolians never could. Perhaps had the Capitolians conditioned the district dwellers to hate flowers, they would have avoided this open rebellion broadcasted on air.

161Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 74.

162Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 236-237.

The second theme which can be detected in both *Brave New World* and *The Hunger Games* is nature and its dual function as either a purgatory or an oasis. Huxley describes Bernard and Lenina's encounter with unembellished nature in a scene in which the two characters arrive at a Savage Reservation. Unused to such settings, Lenina dubs the place as "queer," which according to Bernard is "her ordinary word of condemnation."¹⁶³ The author then ventures to employ unsettling imagery of abandoned ropes turning into snakes¹⁶⁴ to display the dangers of untended nature. Lenina comments on the surroundings thusly:

"I don't like it," said Lenina. "I don't like it."
She liked even less what awaited her at the entrance to the pueblo, where their guide had left them while he went inside for instructions. The dirt, to start with, the piles of rubbish, the dust, the dogs, the flies. Her face wrinkled up into a grimace of disgust.¹⁶⁵

As clear as day, Lenina, who has only known civilization, could not envision a more unpleasant place to be in. The lack of order and hygiene distresses her and seem to her unnatural although she is in the midst of nature.

For the Savage, however, to be removed from the Reservation triggers discontent within him. Thrust into a modernized world where everything is clinical, sterile, and defined via technical terms and medical jargon, the Savage soon grows revolted and chooses to leave the place. By the same token, as has been exemplified before, Bernard prefers silence and the view of the sea and the moon over the sound of Lenina's radio, finding solace in rather than fearing natural spaces where human intervention has not yet reached.

Collins broaches the topic of nature's ambivalent role when she puts untended and manufactured scenery into opposition. As anything else designed by the Gamemakers, the Hunger Games arena presents a deadly threat to the people who enter it. Regardless of how pleasant the landscape might be to an ignorant onlooker, to the children who have to hide, hunt, and fight in the arena, nature becomes a nemesis:

I can't stop trying to imagine exactly what terrain I'll be thrown into. Desert? Swamp? A frigid wasteland? Above all I am hoping for trees, which may afford me some means of concealment and food and shelter. Often there are trees because barren landscapes are dull and the Games resolve too quickly without them. What traps have the Gamemakers hidden to liven up the slower moments?¹⁶⁶

163Huxley, *Brave New World*, 92.

164Huxley, *Brave New World*, 94.

165Huxley, *Brave New World*, 94.

166Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 139-140.

Nature in the hands of the Gamemakers therefore transforms from an oasis into a purgatory. While Katniss is a skilled hunter and navigates through forested areas well, which is why she wishes for trees, it is the woods in District Twelve that she truly yearns for. Katniss refers to the wooded outskirts of District Twelve as her personal sanctuary and even dreams of while in the arena, contrasting the man-made nature with the real one. While the first brings her death and distress, the latter only induces a feeling of calmness:

In the woods waits the only person with whom I can be myself. Gale. I can feel the muscles in my face relaxing, my pace quickening as I climb the hills to our place, a rock ledge overlooking a valley. A thicket of berry bushes protects it from unwanted eyes. The sight of him waiting there brings on a smile. Gale says I never smile except in the woods.¹⁶⁷

Aside from the beautiful description, the piece of nature mainly serves as a source of protection and tranquility to Katniss. She considers the woods a place where she can assume her true identity and where she is safe.

While some readers may interpret this excerpt moreso as a testament of Katniss's romantic involvement with Gale rather than her affinity to nature, this theory may be easily disproved. Katniss recalls the scenery more than once, and while nature remains the central motif of each of her memories, Gale does not. It is the place Katniss associates with peace, not one single person, as can be corroborated by the following two excerpts:

Sometimes when things are particularly bad, my brain will give me a happy dream. A visit with my father in the woods. An hour of sunlight and cake with Prim. ... I try to hold on to the peaceful feeling of the dream, but it quickly slips away, leaving me sadder and lonelier than ever.¹⁶⁸

These are the questions to be unraveled back home, in the peace and quiet of the woods, when no one is watching. Not here with every eye upon me. But I won't have that luxury for who knows how long.¹⁶⁹

While the comforting presence (or absence) of someone else changes in each of Katniss's recollections, the woods remain a constant. Contrasted with the all-natural yet all-artificial arena, only real nature represents Katniss's safe haven and an oasis in an otherwise dystopian world.

Thirdly, another theme detected in Huxley and Collins's novels is the cult of youth. Each of the fictional societies relies heavily either on technology which prevents aging, or on plastic surgery. Good looks and a youthful image symbolize a person's status, uniting the two utopias

167Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 6.

168Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 239-240.

169Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 359.

because of the shallow mindset of their citizens. In *Brave New World*, eternal youth is achieved by keeping people's "internal secretions artificially balanced at a youthful equilibrium" and giving them "transfusions of young blood,"¹⁷⁰ which stops aging and disease. When thus Bernard and Lenina visit the Reservation and see a native who is not decanted like the utopians, Lenina professes her repugnance:

"What's the matter with him?" whispered Lenina. Her eyes were wide with horror and amazement.

"He's old, that's all," Bernard answered as carelessly as he could. He too was startled; but he made an effort to seem unmoved.

"Old?" she repeated. "But the Director's old; lots of people are old; they're not like that."

"That's because we don't allow them to be like that."¹⁷¹

As Bernard explains this to Lenina, he adds that most of the natives "die long before they reach [the] old creature's age,"¹⁷² presumably because of bad conditions and natural diseases.

Similarly, in *The Hunger Games* lower life expectancy and eternal beauty are common in the districts and the Capitol, respectively. Katniss comments on the fact when she studies the Capitolians and their unchanging looks (that is, unchanging for the worse):

They do surgery in the Capitol, to make people appear younger and thinner. In District 12, looking old is something of an achievement since so many people die early. You see an elderly person, you want to congratulate them on their longevity, ask the secret of survival.¹⁷³

Incidentally, this cult of youth does not merely split the society into the privileged and unprivileged depending on the kind of health, beauty, and lifespan allotted to them, but it also contributes to the already raised motif of dehumanization. Stuck in their own reality, the utopians are both disgusted with the appearance of the underprivileged peoples as well as blind and uncaring to their short life expectancy. The recurring topic of lack of compassion thus reappears even in a theme as minor as this one.

Lastly, personality cult as a vital theme in each of the subject matter novels may be consulted. In Huxley's work as well as in Collins's, everything happens because of or in tribute to a particular leading figure. In the case of *Brave New World*, the piece portrays a society "where the religious or spiritual self has been hijacked and transferred to other social-control constructs," with the worship of "Our Ford"¹⁷⁴ serving as a means of unifying and placating the utopians. Additionally,

¹⁷⁰Huxley, *Brave New World*, 95.

¹⁷¹Huxley, *Brave New World*, 95.

¹⁷²Huxley, *Brave New World*, 95.

¹⁷³Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 124-125.

¹⁷⁴Charles Shaw, *Exile Nation* (Berkeley: Soft Skull Press, 2012), accessed August 12, 2019,

the Controller, who is described as a persuasive orator, represents another figure, this time political, whose effect on the masses is tremendous. In *The Hunger Games*, the role of the convincing yet unscrupulous ruler falls to President Snow. Granted, Katniss does not have the opportunity to talk to President Snow until the latter volumes of the trilogy, but the first volume alone suffices in illustrating the man's quick wit, charm, and cold intent all at once:

The anthem's playing yet again and we rise as President Snow himself takes the stage followed by a little girl carrying a cushion that holds the crown. There's just one crown, though, and you can hear the crowd's confusion – whose head will he place it on? – until President Snow gives it a twist and it separates into two halves. ... He's still smiling when he settles the second [half] on my head, but his eyes, just inches from mine, are as unforgiving as a snake's.

As can be noted, President Snow has a sharp mind which allows him to deal with unprecedented situations while maintaining a winsome front. He moreover surrounds himself with children in order to look more agreeable. His zero tolerance to rebellion, though, is obvious when he encounters Katniss face to face after her victory in the Hunger Games during which she managed to save her own life as well as her co-tribute Peeta's, which is by the President deemed an insulting display of disobedience towards him and the Capitol. To everyone present in the scene besides Katniss, however, the leader must seem charming and wise because those are the attributes which he consciously builds his public image on.

All in all, the contents of this subchapter may be summarized thusly: Belonging to the same literary genre, *Brave New World* and *The Hunger Games* largely explore and thematically depend on identical topics. To be specific, the most prominent of these themes which unite the two novels are the clash between civilization and barbarism, the presence of nature either as a purgatory or an oasis, and the cults of youth and personality. When looking at the themes minutely, correspondence between Huxley and Collins can be discovered in their ironical approach to the question of what is civilized and barbaric, their ambivalence to nature's role, and their absolute unity in describing how the cults of youth and personality contribute to moulding and controlling utopian societies.

<https://books.google.cz/books?id=JdNAfspvkOsC&pg=PT189&dq=brave+new+world+personality+cult&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjyl-GZxf3jAhW-xcQBHxbmBxoQ6AEISzAG#v=onepage&q=brave%20new%20world%20personality%20cult&f=false>

Archetypes

Archetypes are “typical or recurring”¹⁷⁵ “symbols, images, and character types”¹⁷⁶ in a work of literature. This section of the paper concentrates specifically on character types. Although both novels peruse a number of intriguing literary archetypes, the most important of them are the Outsider, the Noble Savage, and the Rebel. Interestingly, these three categories may be fittingly distributed amongst Bernard, John the Savage, and Katniss, respectively; but upon closer inspection, they all also overlap. This argument shall shortly be elaborated on when consulting the characters individually.

Bernard’s role as the Outsider becomes obvious early on during a scene in which Lenina and her friend talk about his un-Alpha-like appearance:

Fanny was shocked. “They say somebody made a mistake when he was still in the bottle – thought he was a Gamma and put alcohol into his blood-surrogate. That’s why he’s so stunted.”¹⁷⁷

Furthermore, he is described as ugly and small¹⁷⁸ and, as has been established earlier, Lenina refers to him as queer (and therefore singles him as the odd one out within the society) more than once. Bernard himself admits to feeling a sense of alienation in regards to his looks and self-identification, and only finds validation when he is treated “as a person of outstanding importance”¹⁷⁹ upon bringing John the Savage into the World State.

The archetype of the Noble Savage pertaining to John the Savage is rather self-explanatory, given that his pseudonym already contains the word “savage” and the majority of his speeches are declaimed in a desperate search for something “noble,” be it a cause, a piece of art, or behaviour.

Finally, Katniss’s role as the Rebel can be traced in her recurring subversive and sarcastic introspective moments, but it is solidified after she wins the Games in a way that circumvents the rules of the Capitol. Faced with the fury of President Snow, Katniss acknowledges to herself that she is “the instigator” of this insult towards the Capitol and as such is “the one to be punished.”¹⁸⁰

(Moreover, in the latter volumes of the series, Katniss actually becomes the symbol of rebellion.)

175 Alvin A. Lee, “Archetype,” in *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms*, ed. Irena R. Makaryk (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 508, accessed August 14, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=CTJcILG9AeoC&pg=PA508&dq=literary+archetypes&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiNjLPwg4LkAhURa1AKHSXxAgoQ6AEIOTAD#v=onepage&q=literary%20archetypes&f=false>.

176 Ambreen Safder Kharbe, *English Language and Literary Criticism* (New Dehli: Discovery Publishing House, 2009), 327, accessed August 14, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=QH91072JCpoc&pg=PA327&dq=literary+archetypes&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiNjLPwg4LkAhURa1AKHSXxAgoQ6AEIRTAG#v=onepage&q=literary%20archetypes&f=false>.

177 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 39.

178 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 39.

179 Huxley, *Brave New World*, 135.

180 Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 364.

What ties these characters together and creates yet another link between the subject matter novels, though, is the manner in which their roles transcend into each other. Whilst Bernard is an outsider in his own class, the Savage and Katniss are literal outsiders due to the fact that neither of them comes from the utopian sphere. By the same token, while John is the epitome of the Noble Savage, hints of this archetype can be found in Katniss as well because of how the utopians perceive her (barbaric) and how she acts (her sense of right and wrong in the arena). Even Bernard, an outcast who realizes the wrongdoings of the leaders of the World State and attempts to reconnect with nature and find his moral compass again, could be argued to have a certain share of the archetype in him, though it is subdued in direct contrast to John and Katniss. And, last but not least, Katniss's rebellious side can be compared to Bernard's private rebellions as well as John's open ones.

This allows for the conclusion that, when analyzed meticulously, the three characters have more in common than what a fleeting glance might yield. Each of them serves their specific function as a literary device that pushes the respective novel forward, but these functions overlap upon closer inspection and strengthen the parallelism between the books.

Metaphors

If utopia visualizes a dream and anti-utopia visualizes a nightmare, dystopia, in logical consequence, must merge these two into an ambiguous fusion of light and dark, good and bad, hope and hopelessness. To what degree one or the other prevails depends on the author; and yet, as in many cases before, Huxley and Collins again manage to form a single voice regarding the fashion in which they end their novels. In other words, when comparing the individual final chapters, a strong inclination towards an open ending may be discerned: hopeless yet mitigated by the message that hope should and *may* be found not in a (utopian) place, but in other values.

To clarify what prompts the claim that each ending at first leans towards a hopeless atmosphere rather than the opposite, John the Savage and Katniss's situation as presented by the final chapters can be used as an example. After his disunion with the World State, the Savage leaves in order to claim his right "to grow old and ugly" and "to live in constant apprehension."¹⁸¹ Contrary to what may be expected of him, he does not return to the Reservation because his contact with the "civilized utopia" has made him unable to return to the old conditions and left him with a single wish: to "be alone."¹⁸² However, even as he departs from the civilization(s) he has grown to despise, the Savage remains under the World State's constant surveillance and is denied peace and solitude. Likewise, at the end of the novel, Katniss categorically leaves the utopian Capitol.

¹⁸¹Huxley, *Brave New World*, 212.

¹⁸²Huxley, *Brave New World*, 214.

Instead of returning to her old house, though, she is assigned a new address in a different part of District Twelve as a courtesy of the Gamemakers, a gesture which removes her from both worlds she knows just as John is removed from the worlds he knows. The Gamemakers' gesture moreover brands Katniss as a stranger amongst her own and ensures that the omnipresent Capitolian cameras shall have access to monitoring her at all times. The two characters consequently reach a deadlock from which there is not only no way out, but also no way back, the power of the World State and the Capitol being too great to escape it. Deprived thus of proper autonomy even after presumably finishing their heroic journey, neither the Savage nor Katniss can break the ubiquity of this vicious, uroboros-like circle created by the utopians in spite of all of their previous actions.

An inquiry may be raised as to where the alleged aspect of hope comes from, then. First and foremost, the motif of reaching the utopian "better" should not be sought in the last chapter alone. Rather than an achieved reality, it remains an achievable possibility by the end of each novel, and Huxley and Collins once again agree when it comes to accomplishing self-betterment, humanization, and improvement. In fact, the authors answer the conundrum throughout their entire works. To understand Huxley and Collins's point, the instances in which the protagonists happen to be the most humane and overall the best version of themselves, which in turn allows them to improve their and other people's external and internal circumstances, must be considered crucial. For John the Savage, his most gracious moments include his eagerness to perform a self-mutilating ritual "for the sake of the pueblo",¹⁸³ the affection and pity he feels towards his mother even as everyone else shuns her for her altered looks, and his strive to free the utopians from their slavery to drugs. In all of these moments, John is seen performing selfless acts prompted by his interpersonal relations to other people. His experience growing up with a mother – an experience that none of the utopians have – contributes greatly to his actions and sentiments. His utopianism, i.e. his belief that he can remedy the bad, therefore does not pertain to politics, science, or topography, but to individuals. For that reason, it does not delineate a single place or system which would monitor humans and allow (or outright require) for them to be mechanized as a price for building a better world. To John, a better world is where he can help, enlighten, and feel.

Similarly, Katniss acts in the most typically utopian manner when she expresses sympathy with others, be it her allies or enemies. Examples of her actively working towards ameliorating the unfavourable can be found in her interpersonal interactions, just as in John's case. Throughout the novel, Katniss is defined through her close bond with her family and friends. Her humane side appears e.g. when she poaches in the woods in spite of the ban to help her sister, mother, and fellow

¹⁸³Huxley, *Brave New World*, 100.

residents from District Twelve who buy from her at “the black market.”¹⁸⁴ It is thanks to people like Katniss that District Twelve can make do with their rationed resources. Another, even more compelling instance of her putting herself in danger in order to protect the people she loves and respects is when she volunteers to participate in the Games in order to save her sister Prim, the originally chosen tribute for District Twelve, and when she embellishes Rue’s dead body with flowers despite facing repercussions for her solidary and subversive act. To Katniss, a better world is where she can protect, respect, and love.

In consequence, both authors propose that home is other people, echoing the closing thoughts from chapter 1 of his thesis that utopia is people-oriented, and declare that a utopia is invalid and alienating unless it builds on humanistic rather than utilitarian values. This central metaphor at the same time carries a strong message that systemic dehumanization and oppression are too high a price for a perfect utopia where the erasure of imperfection goes hand in hand with erasure of individuality, and it also creates the strongest correlation between the two respective books as of yet – because where time and place divide the two novels, the five hundred years long utopian/dystopian tradition unites them again.

Conclusion

As any substantial piece of academic writing which does not merely strive to summarize what has already been said by other voices in the same field and focusing on the same matter, but aspires to solve a new question, this master’s thesis analyzes a previously underexplored topic, redefines outdated definitions and delineations, and contextualizes ideas and conclusions with recent and relevant theoretical sources in order to achieve credibility as well as novelty of thought. While this paper primarily concentrates on a comparatively straightforward subject matter, that is the comparison of two contemporary novels categorized as belonging to one solid literary stream, the dystopian genre, the analysis of the subject matter itself is conducted while factoring a wide range of themes. Due to that, the final work offers a particularized insight into the question of what could possibly link two pieces of literary work whose place and date of publication spans two continents and almost a whole century. It provides a thorough juxtaposition of two previously (minimally to this extend) unjuxtaposed novels that takes into consideration the genre as a whole and the main recurring themes that define it, compares the incorporation of these themes into the respective novels, and discerns possible traces of the historical and cultural context shaping each author’s topical focus.

¹⁸⁴Collins, *The Hunger Games*, 5.

The primary objective of this thesis is to propose and justify the assertion that *Brave New World* and *The Hunger Games* unite thematically and metaphorically in spite of the geographic and temporal divide between their respective publications. This is done while relying on a research method which simultaneously outlines theoretical frameworks and contextualizes these given hypotheses with selected excerpts from the subject matter books, an approach which allows for an immediate exemplification and clarification of claims. Certainly, the opening chapter of the thesis requires a denser quantity of theory in order to establish important facts while the closing chapter is majorly interpretation-driven and works with practical illustrations; however, the paper in its entirety employs an eclectic synthesis of theory and practice, ensuring a more comprehensive and exhaustive result.

The body of this thesis is divided into four key chapters, three of which discuss separate topics for the purpose of laying the groundwork for the final part. The topics are furthermore subdivided into smaller sections in which the correlation between *Brave New World* and *The Hunger Games* is already being detailed and asserted. Seeing that the subject matter of this paper has been streamlined for coherence, consistency, and centrality of the point being proven to focus specifically on similarities, a certain economicality of topic has been adopted by the author of this thesis, who aspires to offer an in-depth point of view on a narrow subject rather than a generalized one on a subject too broad to sufficiently explore in a medium as limited as a master's thesis. Despite that, each chapter inspects the novels from a different angle and offers its own conclusion.

Firstly, the dystopian genre is introduced in terms of historical development in English-speaking countries and inspected via its relationship to its predecessor, utopia. In the opening section, utopia is placed on a timeline and explained conceptually and etymologically. After that, main motifs and important figures connected to utopian thinking and writing are mentioned in order to better illuminate the development and reach of the genre at the time. In the middle section of this chapter, anti-utopia is defined in reference to and reliance on recent sources. This is conducted with the intention of declining the outdated statement that anti-utopia is synonymous with dystopia. The last section of this chapter then finally consults dystopia as a concept and a literary genre. Mirroring the segment dedicated to utopia, a timeline of the development of dystopia as a genre is provided, relevant literary figures contributing to this stream of literature are mentioned, and, most importantly, the parallel instead of polar relationship between utopia and dystopia is hinted at with the objective to resume the topic of their resemblance in the following chapters.

Secondly, dystopia as a continuation of utopia (as opposed to it being treated as utopia's antithesis) becomes the centre of discussion, as do major dystopian motifs. The aim of this part of the paper is to challenge the ambiguous nature of (a) utopia while reflecting the genre's (and ideology's)

theoretical requirements and literary forms with the reality of what (a) utopia in practice could mean to an individual. This rumination on the utopian/dystopian overlap results in the author's claim that utopia and dystopia, streams which are oftentimes treated as antagonistic, in fact philosophically meet and merge because a "utopia can be a dystopia in disguise for its own citizens, and one man's utopia can be another man's dystopia."¹⁸⁵ The aspects which may make a utopia dystopian for a portion of a populace – or, indeed, for an entire populace, whether they are aware of it or not – are considered in connection to the issues raised in the opening section of this chapter, *Worlds Wearing Utopian Faces*. As a result, two fundamental motifs prominent in dystopian literature and in the examined novels in particular are then chosen for further investigation. These motifs are politics and progress, concepts whose exploitability makes them perfect topics for a dystopian novel. When speaking specifically about *Brave New World* and *The Hunger Games*, politics and progress are furthermore narrowed down to totalitarianism, science, and technology.

When discussing the role of totalitarianism, science, and technology in reshaping Huxley and Collins's initial utopias into dystopias, three significant conclusions may be drawn. Both novels present strongly totalitarian worlds where an unchallenged governing body systematically unifies its people to the point of erasing their political, economic, and philosophical autonomy as well as the ability to self-identify. Both novels also criticize the vulnerable nature of science and technology as enterprises that, when pushed too far, may be hazardous to humankind and exploited for the purpose of systemic oppression. Last but not least, the question of weaponized technology specifically is raised and warned against by each author.

Thirdly, to provide a balanced and unbiased volume of information when creating a comprehensive and reliable juxtaposition, some of the key differences that demonstrate in which ways Huxley and Collins's narrative methods vary instead of correspond are introduced and their roots clarified. It is evidenced in the chapter dedicated to cultural context that while both authors devise fictional societies which are divided into privileged and underprivileged castes, their approach differs when it comes to portraying how these castes coexist and are taken care of. Whereas Huxley proposes a seemingly all-embracing and beneficial model where all social classes coexist within one utopian sphere and may, under certain circumstances, enjoy the same means of enjoyment, Collins envisions a utopia which exists only for the well-born, the lower classes being destined to live in segregated spaces and be forced to labour under the threat of physical punishments. For that reason, Huxley's Britain and Collins's America undergo an inspection in relation to their history with the intention to discover the impetus for this vital storytelling distinction. Historical and cultural context are thereafter applied to the novels in order to explain the disparity between the utopia in *Brave New*

¹⁸⁵See chapter *Parallelism, Not Dichotomy*.

World, which is evaluated to assume the “white man’s burden” standpoint of imperial Britain towards the minority, and the utopia in *The Hunger Games*, which incorporates the segregational and slaveholding tradition of the Americas.

Lastly, whilst considering all of the previously discussed topics exploring the distinctions as well as the similarities between the subject matter novels and relying on the prevalent correspondence between them, the analysis of the main themes, archetypes, and metaphors enforces the already established parallelism. Identically to utopia and dystopia being treated as ambivalent yet too similar to ignore their overlap, *Brave New World* and *The Hunger Games* are ultimately compared as two pieces of literature which thematically and philosophically correlate despite Huxley and Collins’s minor authorial idiosyncrasies and dissimilar historical and cultural experiences. This conclusion is reached through an extensive analysis of the following: the topics of e.g. civilization versus barbarism, the ambiguous role of nature, the archetypes of the Outsider, Noble Savage, and Rebel, and the novels’ powerful message: that a utopia is other people, not a place. To Huxley and Collins, being utopian means a continuous and joint effort to empathize, enlighten, and humanize, not control, utilize, and mechanize.

Resumé

V obsahu této magisterské práce dochází prvně k literárnímu rozboru a následně ke vzájemnému porovnání novel *Brave New World* a *The Hunger Games* jakožto děl, které z hlediska námětu náleží do dystopického žánru a tematicky se shodují v mnohých aspektech narace, kritiky, zprostředkovaných poselství atd. V tezi tudíž nejde o pouhé prostudování stěžejních témat a projevů dystopie coby literárního žánru v jednotlivých dílech, ale o srovnání metod, jimiž Aldous Huxley a Suzanne Collins, autoři daných novel, s těmito dystopickými tématy pracují a jaké závěry z nich vyvozují. Hlavním z motivů pro uskutečnění tohoto výzkumu je singularita dané problematiky, tedy juxtapozice právě těchto dvou děl s cílem mezi nimi vyhledat dostatečné množství námětových paralel. Ačkoliv kniha *Brave New World* patří mezi nejznámější symboly dystopické literatury a *The Hunger Games* do této kategorie zdatně míří (a dá se tedy logicky vyvodit, že se oběma novelami již zabýval a stále zabývá velice rozsáhlý počet akademických prací, jejichž zaměření a hloubka předpokládaně nechává jen málo místa pro další podstatný výzkum, který by do diskuze přinesl významné nové poznatky), neexistuje zatím žádná ucelená práce, která by tato díla komplexně srovnala za účelem mezi nimi najít rozdíly, podobnosti, anebo obojí. Tato teze proto zkoumá velice známá díla z předtím neprozkoumaného hlediska, aby autorčin výsledný závěr nebyl pouhopouhým zopakováním dávno sdělených a odsouhlasených pravd, ale aby oznámil něco nového a vlastního.

Motivací pro selekci právě a pouze novel *Brave New World* a *The Hunger Games*, když dystopický žánr ve své šíři nabízí nezměrné množství dalších děl, které si mohou být obsahově ještě bližší, je ve skutečnosti jejich zdánlivá odlišnost. Aldous Huxley, britský spisovatel a myslitel, publikoval svůj román *Brave New World* (přeložený do češtiny jako *Konec civilizace*) v roce 1932, tj. v meziválečném období minulého století. Suzanne Collins, americká spisovatelka, začala publikovat trilogii *The Hunger Games*, jejíž stejnojmenný první díl *The Hunger Games* (přeložený do češtiny jako *Hladové hry*) je předmětem této teze, v roce 2008. Toto téměř osmdesátileté rozpětí v kombinaci s rozdílnou národností obou autorů poskytuje jakousi iluzi rozporu, protože na první pohled by se dalo předpokládat, že dva spisovatelé odlišných dob a kultur nutně musí vytvořit díla, která se rozcházejí nejen kvůli idiosynkratickému stylu, ale i tematicky. Huxley a Collins ale tento předpoklad střetu vyvracejí, jak vysvětluje předkapitola „Introduction“ této teze.

Jak předchozí odstavec nastiňuje, v úvodním segmentu této magisterské práce dochází ke stručnému představení románů *Brave New World* a *The Hunger Games* s ohledem na jejich rozdílný dobový kontext a překvapivě podobná shrnutí obsahu. Huxleyho futuristická novela je popsána jako meziválečné dystopické dílo, v němž společnost jeví se jako utopická ve skutečnosti

uplatňuje rigidní kastovní systém, který rozděluje obyvatele na vyšší a nižší vrstvy a ve kterém jsou sociální role předem naprogramované vyšší vrstvou díky vědeckým pokrokům umožňujícím klonovat a geneticky modifikovat člověka. Z toho důvodu je Huxleyho společnost velmi hierarchická a omezující, a ačkoliv je jejím mottem stabilita a pohodlí pro všechny obyvatele, není tomu tak pro nikoho, kdo se pokusí neuposlechnout nebo odlišit. Jako takový tudíž román *Brave New World* představuje morální zamyšlení nad tím, jakou cenu stojí za to zaplatit za mír, který zároveň připraví lidstvo o individualitu a radost, a kam až je přístupné zajít a jaké množství nadvlády a kontroly držené nad lidstvem je přijatelné, když původním záměrem za tímto negativním výsledkem může být snaha naopak dosáhnout výsledku pozitivního. S těmito základními fakty je následně porovnáno stručné shrnutí obsahu *The Hunger Games*. Také Collins píše o zdánlivě utopické společnosti zasazené do poválečné budoucnosti a rozdělené do nerovných sociálních vrstev, kde je komfort a bohatství vyšších tříd zajištěn fyzickou prací utlačovaných obyvatel a kde opresivní politický systém dohlíží na to, aby nikdo neunikl svému osudu a nemohl rebelovat proti státu. Navzdory tomu, že Collins přistupuje k tématice dvojsmyslnosti mezi konceptem utopie a dystopie s mnohem větším důrazem na „to špatné,“ i její fiktivní svět pokládá otázku, jak humánní může být utopie, v níž lidé nejsou svobodní.

Přestože klíčovým předmětem teze je komparativní analýza daných novel, první kapitoly se věnují převážně teorii, do níž jsou s postupem hutněji a hutněji zapracované praktické výňatky z obou knih obohacené o autorčiny interpretativní poznatky, až celá práce vyvrcholí v kapitole poslední, kde už autorka teze pracuje téměř samostatně. K této kombinované metodě teoreticko-praktického postupu, která nejprve nadnese premisu, poté ji teoreticky podpoří s pomocí spolehlivých akademických materiálů, a nakonec ji ilustruje na výňatech ze samotných novel, je přistoupeno za účelem vytyčení tematického rámce a poskytnutí informací a definicí nutných k lepšímu pochopení probírané látky.

Teoretičtější část teze představuje kapitola první, „Dystopia“ (česky „Dystopie“). V tomto segmentu jsou vymezeny termíny „utopie“, „anti-utopie“ a „dystopie.“ Konceptu utopie se tato práce věnuje jak z historického, tak z filozoficko-literárního úhlu pohledu. Podkapitola „Utopia“ (česky „Utopie“) doloží vznik utopie jakožto myšlenky a literárního směru v anglických mluvících zemích s ohledem na její odlišnou dataci v Británii a Americe, představí nejvýznamnější autory spojované s utopickým žánrem a vysvětlí etymologickou (a v souvislosti s tím i konceptuální) nejednoznačnost samotného slova „utopie“. Ve spojitosti s touto interpretační dualitou utopie buď jako „dobrého místa“, anebo „neexistujícího místa“, se tato podkapitola zamyslí nad (ne)dosazitelností utopického ideálu a přesune smysl utopianismu z místa na lidstvo – z myšlenkového toku zaměřeného na topografii k ideologii zabývající se lidskou nadějí a schopností

tuto topografickou utopii vytvořit a udržet. Podkapitola „Anti-Utopia“ (česky „Anti-utopie“) redefinuje zastaralé vymezení tohoto konceptu jakožto synonyma pro dystopii a vytváří tak mezi těmito dvěma výrazy jasnou hranici. Přestože jak anti-utopie, tak dystopie vychází z utopie a reagují na ni, jejich individuální podstata se liší. Zatímco anti-utopie získává definici konceptu, který popírá utopii a představuje její naprostý opak, dystopie se stává jakýmsi pomezím mezi utopií a dystopií: představuje padlý svět, v němž původní záměr lidstva byl vybudovat utopii, ale kvůli morálnímu či jinému selhání se odvrací od ideálu a představuje neideální realitu.

V návaznosti na toto nové vymezení předělu mezi anti-utopií a dystopií se poslední podkapitola, „Dystopia“ (česky „Dystopie“), věnuje literárnímu žánru samotnému a zkoumá ho stejně jako předtím utopii. Dochází k časovému a důvodovému vymezení vzniku dystopie, zmínění důležitých dystopických autorů a nastínění stěžejních témat a motivů dystopického žánru. Zde se konečně zohlední literární prvky daného žánru vůči jejich přítomnosti v *Brave New World* a *The Hunger Games*, čímž dojde k nespornému zařazení obou knih do literárního směru dystopie. Nutno dodat, že již zde začíná systematické srovnání zkoumaných novel z hlediska zasazení (obě se odehrávají ve futuristickém reálném světě, tj. v Británii v případě Huxleyho a v Americe v případě Collins, po zažehnutí válečného konfliktu) a motivů (jak Huxley, tak Collins zasazují děj do států ovládaných totalitním režimem a přivedených kvůli přílišnému vědeckému a technologickému vývoji na samotný pokraj lidskosti). Motivy totality a zneužitelnosti vědy a technologie posléze do hloubky probírá následující kapitola, stejně tak jako poskytuje detailnější studii dvojsmyslného vnímání utopicko-dystopické problematiky a jejího odrazu v posuzovaných knihách.

V kapitole „Worlds Wearing Utopian Faces“ (česky „Světy s utopickou tváří“) dochází k upevnění již přednesené premisy, že dystopie vychází z utopie, ukazuje však její realistickou cenu a následky v případě lidského selhání. Sekce „Parallelism, Not Dichotomy“ (česky „Paralelismus, nikoliv dichotomie“) rozebírá spřízněný vztah utopie a dystopie coby dvou směrů, které mohou přecházet v jeden ať už úmyslně, či ne. Když se vezme v potaz, že Huxley pracuje s utopií, v níž by měli být všichni šťastní – a to i nižší vrstvy, přestože její členové jsou tvořeni státem jako geneticky a mentálně znevýhodnění dělníci –, je poněkud ironické si uvědomit, že jsou to právě privilegovaní a mentálně vyvinutí protagonisté žijící si ve větším komfortu, kdo si uvědomují dvojí tvář světa, v němž žijí. Huxley tak představuje paradox: v utopii stavěné tím způsobem, aby nejvíce zvýhodňovala privilegované, si právě oni uvědomují svou nesvobodu a nerovnost ostatních, čímž trpí jejich morální citění. Materiálně tudíž mohou žít v utopii, ale mentálně jsou odsouzeni žít ve své privátní dystopii. Collins reflektuje vpád dystopie do utopie podobně. V jejím fiktivním světě také existuje zvýhodněná většina a utlačovaná menšina,¹⁸⁶ přičemž těžce pracující a hladovící

186, „Většina“ a „menšina“ je zde myšleno kvalitativně, nikoliv kvantitativně.

menšina si trpce uvědomuje, že vyšší třída si užívá čistě utopického života na jejich úkor. Stejně jako Huxley tedy dochází k závěru, že utopie pro jednoho může být dystopie pro druhého.

„The Role of the State“ a „The Role of Science and Technology“ (česky „Úloha státu“ a „Úloha vědy a technologie“) jsou podkapitoly, které se vrací ke klíčovým dystopickým motivům zastoupeným specificky v *Brave New World* a *The Hunger Games*, zatímco souběžně analyzují podobnost autorského přístupu k jejich zakomponování. První sekce dokládá přítomnost totalitních politických režimů v obou novelách. Protagonisté obou děl, Bernard (*Brave New World*) a Katniss (*The Hunger Games*), žijí ve striktně organizovaných státech, kde individualita a autonomie nemají místo a kde nikým a ničím nezpochybnitelná vláda kontroluje, reguluje a mnohých případech trestá své obyvatelstvo. Zastrášování, peer pressure a neustálá propaganda pomáhají udržet lidi bez vlastního hlasu a nutí je uvěřit, že je to takhle vlastně lepší. Obě hlavní postavy si proto musí navigovat cestu „utopii“, kde málokdo sdílí jejich morální kompas jako v případě Bernarda a kde státní orgány představují otevřeného nepřítele jako v případě Katniss. Dodatečně také oba fiktivní světy staví do konfliktu jednotlivce a společnost.

Co rozjíví témata nesvobody, propagandy a zastrášování jsou v dílech Huxleyho a Collins věda a technologie, kterým se věnuje specificky podkapitola „The Role of Science and Technology.“ Daný segment ilustruje, jak oba autoři kritizují nezastavitelný pokrok a zneužitelnost vědy a techniky jako zbraní proti nepřizpůsobivým a odměny pro ty poslušné. Otázkou ovšem je, jestli taková odměna, která z lidí dělá frivolní a povrchní stroje (a v Huxleyho případě z nich vytváří skutečně modifikované klony), vůbec odměnou je. V tom smyslu Huxley a Collins opět souhlasí, že techno-utopie se může snadno zvrtnout do techno-dystopie, obzvlášť když věda a technika představují mocnou zbraň v rukou vlády.

Poslední teoreticko-praktická kapitola se týká dobového kontextu předcházejícího a provázejícího vznik *Brave New World* a *The Hunger Games*, jmenovitě koloniální historie Britského Impéria a Americké minulosti coby otrokářské mocnosti a segregované země. Aby tato magisterská teze neztratila objektivitu pod záminkou vykonstruování silnějšího argumentu, část o kulturním kontextu se zcela odkloní od tématu paralelismu mezi oběma díly a soustředí se pro změnu na to, v čem se od sebe knihy odklánějí. Vzhledem k tomu, že Huxley a Collins žijí (žili) a tvoří (tvořili) ve dvou odlišných stoletích a na dvou odlišných kontinentech, je téměř nevyhnutelné, že se určité motivy v knihách obou autorů rozcházejí. Specifické kulturní prostředí a zázemí přece jen vytváří specifické zkušenosti, které přesahují rámeček osobního idiosynkratického stylu.

U Huxleyho se dá toto tvrzení dohledat v jeho volbě představit utopii, která se po vzoru „benevolentního“ Britského Impéria stará o své sociálně znevýhodněné občany (přestože je samo důvodem, proč jsou tito občané znevýhodněni). Huxley ve své knize jednoznačně odkazuje

na imperialistickou tradici své země, obsaženou v ideologii „bělošského břímě“ (která má kořeny ve stejnojmenné básni Rudyarda Kiplinga „White Man's Burden“). Přestože je tedy jeho utopie rigidně rozdělená do vrstev, mezi nimiž není fyzická a mentální rovnost, nižší vrstvy žijí pospolu s vrstvami vyššími a mají přístup k té samé technologii a zábavě. De facto tudíž sdílejí určitá práva privilegovaných, ale musí je stejně jako kdysi britské kolonie vykoupit manuální prací. Naproti tomu Collins rozčleňuje svůj fiktivní svět na utopii a dystopii nejen sociálně, ale i geograficky. Vytváří tak utopické hlavní město Kapitol, kde žije pouze smetánka a dvanáct přilehlých krajů, kde v naprosté segregaci od Kapitolu a také jeden jednotlivý kraj od druhého žijí ostatní obyvatelé. Ti podstupují fyzické tresty za jakoukoliv neposlušnost a odevzdávají veškeré své zdroje Kapitolu, který následně rozhoduje o jejich rozdělení. Osud lidí odříznutých od Kapitolu tudíž odráží osudy Afroameričanů, nejprve zotročených a později segregovaných rasovou většinou.

Samotná závěrečná analýza obsažená v kapitole „*Brave New World and The Hunger Games: A Comparison*“ (česky „Srovnání“) následně nejen nastíní další významné prvky a poselství, které *Brave New Worlds* a *The Hunger Games* činí tolik podobnými, ale především obhájí argument, že i přes rozpětí osmdesáti let a dvou kontinentů se význam obou děl nesporně shoduje, a to i ve světle informací předložených v kapitole předešlé.

Podstatným pro podrobnou argumentaci se stává rozčlenění poslední kapitoly na subsekcce literární motivy, literární archetypy a metafory, přičemž kromě posouzení prevalence a sdělnosti těchto prvků v *Brave New Worlds* a *The Hunger Games* jednotlivě dochází i k jejich simultánnímu posouzení z hlediska vzájemné podobnosti. Metodou komparace se tak dá zcela zřejmě zjistit, že Huxley a Collins nejenže využívají identické literární techniky, ale především je využívají s identickým úmyslem. V podkapitole „Themes“ (česky „Témata“ či „Motivy“) autorka dokazuje, že oba spisovatelé nahlíží na konflikt mezi civilizovaností a barbarstvím ironicky, jelikož se při setkání privilegovaných a utiskovaných tříd často ukazuje, že hranice mezi tím, co je civilizované a barbarské se buď smazává, anebo se role přímo obrací. Se stejnou ambivalencí nahlízejí autoři i na roli přírody jakožto oázy, anebo očiště. Dále se v obou románech vyskytuje motiv kultu mládí, díky jehož rozšíření a vlivu se lidé v utopické společnosti snadno stávají plytkými a sebestřednými figurkami, což (jak už bylo řečeno výše) napomáhá vládě odvrátit jejich pozornost od zásadních společenských a etických problémů, na nichž opravdu záleží. S tím se váže také kult osobnosti, který Huxley a Collins popisují jako další metodu k zastrašení či ukolébání davu.

Podkapitola „Archetypes“ (česky „Archetypy“ či „Typy literárních postav“) nahlíží na tři nejvýznamnější postavy, které se v novelách vyskytují: Bernarda, Johna (přezdívávaného Divoch) a Katniss. Každé z postav je přidělen jeden archetyp s ohledem na to, jakou roli v knize hraje; zároveň

však dojde k identifikaci jistého typového přesahu mezi postavami. Ačkoliv Bernard pro svou nepřizpůsobivost představuje učebnicový příklad archetypu Outsidera neboli Člověka zvenčí, i John a Katniss v sobě z této role něco nesou, protože oba doslova pocházejí zvenčí utopie. Johnova hlavní úloha je archetyp Vznešeného divocha, ať už pro jeho divošský původ nebo pro jeho ideály a lásku k umění, ale i Bernard, který tíhne k přírodě, emocím a morálce a Katniss, pro kterou je příroda druhým domovem a která má oproti lidem z Kapitoly ušlechtilé cíle, tuto roli chvílemi plní. Katniss pak představuje archetyp Rebelu, jelikož jí není cizí ilegální lov, má „podvratné“ myšlenky a dokonce vyhraje Hladové hry způsobem, který tvůrce a pravidla Her uráží a vzpírá se jim. Také Bernard a John ale projevují rebelské myšlenky a občas i činy – Bernard svou neochotou ztratit identitu, John svým protestem a odchodem z utopie.

V naprostém závěru teze se ukáže, že Huxley i Collins po celou dobu svého psaní tvoří tutéž metaforu: že utopie je v lidech. Protagonisté obou románů se totiž chovají podle zásad utopianismu, tj. podle přesvědčení, že utopii je třeba stavět na osvětlení, empatii a snaze zlepšit stávající situaci, vždy skrz vztahy k jiným lidem. Do těchto vztahů patří rodina, přátelé a spojenci hlavních postav, ale také cizinci a nepřátelé. Dosažitelnost utopického stavu se tak přesouvá z úsilí vybudovat regulovaný systém v ideálním geografickém umístění na čistě lidský faktor, čímž v obou dílech dojde k redefinici samotného smyslu utopie z utilitářské na humanitární.

Bibliography

Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1958.

Arif, Saffeen Nueman. "The Civilization of Aldous Huxley's Brave World." *International Journal of Literature and Arts* 4, no. 3 (May 2016): 38-43.

Baker, David Weil. Introduction to *Divulging Utopia: Radical Humanism in Sixteenth-Century England*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999. Accessed July 17, 2019,

[https://books.google.cz/books?](https://books.google.cz/books?id=goaWHuoMMq0C&pg=PA5&dq=utopia+humanism&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwizh_TskrzjAhXawsQBHSXjB7QQuwUINzAB#v=onepage&q=utopia%20humanism&f=false)

[id=goaWHuoMMq0C&pg=PA5&dq=utopia+humanism&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwizh_TskrzjAhXawsQBHSXjB7QQuwUINzAB#v=onepage&q=utopia%20humanism&f=false](https://books.google.cz/books?id=goaWHuoMMq0C&pg=PA5&dq=utopia+humanism&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwizh_TskrzjAhXawsQBHSXjB7QQuwUINzAB#v=onepage&q=utopia%20humanism&f=false).

Beauchamp, Gorman. "Technology in the Dystopian Novel." *Modern Fiction Studies* 32, no. 1 (1986): 53-63.

Beers, Laura and Geraint Thomas. Introduction to *Brave New World: Imperial and Democratic Nation-Building in Britain between the Wars*, edited by Laura Beers and Geraint Thomas. London: London Institute of Historical Research, 2011.

Biegajło, Bartłomiej. *Totalitarian (In)Experience in Literary Works and Their Translations: Between East and West*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2018. Accessed July 28, 2019, [https://books.google.cz/books?](https://books.google.cz/books?id=h_N0DwAAQBAJ&pg=PA35&dq=brave+new+world+totalitarian&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUK)

[id=h_N0DwAAQBAJ&pg=PA35&dq=brave+new+world+totalitarian&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUK](https://books.google.cz/books?id=h_N0DwAAQBAJ&pg=PA35&dq=brave+new+world+totalitarian&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUK)
[EwigldqVvcbjAhV0ysQBHVtFCNEQ6AEIVDAG#v=onepage&q=brave%20new%20world%20totalitarian&f=false](https://books.google.cz/books?id=h_N0DwAAQBAJ&pg=PA35&dq=brave+new+world+totalitarian&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUK)

Booker, M. Keith. Introduction to *Dystopian Literature: A Theory and Research Guide*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1994.

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

Booker, M. Keith. *The Post-Utopian Imagination: American Culture in the Long 1950s*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2002. Accessed July 17, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=YsIWh79W9Y4C&printsec=frontcover&dq=inauthor:%22M.+Keith+Booker%22&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj0ne2OgcjiAhXC0qYKHUV7CEo4ChC7BQhBMAM#v=onepage&q=dystopia&f=false>.

Bruce, Susan. Introduction to *Three Early Modern Utopias*, edited by Susan Bruce. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Accessed July 17, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=zzOkOTaKebEC&printsec=frontcover&dq=ursula+le+guin+utopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi_wP-R-bvjAhVHwcQBHe2dAekQuwUIRDAD#v=onepage&q=utopia&f=false.

Burns, Tony. *Political Theory, Science Fiction, and Utopian Literature: Ursula K. Le Guin and The Dispossessed*. Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2008. Accessed July 17, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=zzOkOTaKebEC&printsec=frontcover&dq=ursula+le+guin+utopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi_wP-R-bvjAhVHwcQBHe2dAekQuwUIRDAD#v=onepage&q=utopia&f=false.

Busch, Justin E. A. Introduction to *The Utopian Vision of H. G. Wells*, edited by Justin E. A. Busch. London: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2009. Accessed July 17, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=suNUaA1Q1JIC&printsec=frontcover&dq=wells+utopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjEmZXL_bvjAhVOyaYKHXYWDj0QuwUILjAA#v=onepage&q=a%20modern%20utopia&f=false.

Claeys, Gregory. *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Clemente, Bill. "Panem in America: Crisis of Economics and a Call for Political Engagement." In *Of Bread, Blood and The Hunger Games: Critical Essays on the Suzanne Collins Trilogy*, edited by Mary F. Pharr and Leisa A. Clark, 20-29. London: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2012. Accessed July 30, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=mjL8WHxkTcoC&printsec=frontcover&dq=of+bread+blood+and+hunger+games&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj5iLeeisjiAhVqwsQBHSsgCeEQwUIMDAA#v=onepage&q=of%20bread%20blood%20and%20hunger%20games&f=false>.

Collins, Suzanne. *The Hunger Games: Special Edition*. U.S.A.: Scholastic, 2018.

Davis, Laurence. "The Dynamic and Revolutionary Utopia of Ursula K. Le Guin." In *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's The Dispossessed*, edited by Laurence Davis and Peter Stillman, 3-36. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005. Accessed July 17, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=9goKmJQaMzEC&printsec=frontcover&dq=ursula+le+guin+utopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi_wP-R-bvjAhVHwcQBHe2dAekQ6AEIMTAB#v=onepage&q=ursula%20le%20guin%20utopia&f=false.

DeKoven, Marianne. *Utopia Limited: The Sixties and the Emergence of the Postmodern*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004. Accessed July 17, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=obNS29D94tkC&pg=PA363&lpg=PA363&dq=marianne+utopia+limited&source=bl&ots=h3BA8Ba46-&sig=ACfU3U06gTfW2nUsMw4KX0ECv0x8bEgt0Q&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiDsobYsb7jAhWNblAKHUFOApoQ6AEwB3oECAkQAQ#v=onepage&q=utopia&f=false>.

Demerjian, Louisa MacKay. Introduction to *The Age of Dystopia: One Genre, Our Fears and Our Future*, edited by Louisa MacKay Demerjian. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016. Accessed July 17, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=Pyv5DAAAQBAJ&pg=PA10&dq=origin+dystopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiWqaWlo8HjAhWBwMQBHRjGBEoQ6AEIOzAC#v=onepage&q=dystopia&f=false>.

Dinello, Daniel. *Technophobia: Science Fiction Visions of Posthuman Technology*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005. Accessed July 28, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=ndyGAAAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=literature+science+technology+dystopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjZ08_FutfjAhWEKVAKHY3ECGU4ChDoAQhOMAU#v=snippet&q=haunted%20utopias&f=false.

Drake, Richard B. "Slavery and Antislavery in Appalachia." In *Appalachians and Race: The Mountain South from Slavery to Segregation*, edited by John C. Inscoe, 16-26. Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 2001.

Feagin, Joe R. *Systemic Racism: A Theory of Oppression*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Feenberg, Andrew. *Alternative Modernity: The Technical Turn in Philosophy and Social Theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Feenberg, Andrew. "Modernity Theory and Technology Studies: Reflections on Bridging the Gap." In *Modernity and Technology*, edited by Thomas J. Misa, Philip Brey, and Andrew Feenberg, 74-104. Cambridge: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 2003.

Firchow, Peter Edgerly. Introduction to *Modern Utopian Fictions from H. G. Wells to Iris Murdoch*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007. Accessed July 17, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=DG5Kjp2qvAQC&pg=PT19&dq=pun+eutopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwixwIrqyb7jAhWGyKYKHRhDDDoQ6AEIRzAE#v=onepage&q=pun%20eutopia&f=false>.

Fokkema, Douwe Wessel. *Perfect Worlds: Utopian Fiction in China and the West*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011.

Gordin, Michael D., Helen Tilley, and Gyan Prakash. "Utopia and Dystopia Beyond Space and Time." In *Utopia/Dystopia: Conditions of Historical Possibility*, edited by Michael D. Gordin, Helen Tilley, and Gyan Prakash, 1-21. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Grey, Richard. *A Brief History of American Literature*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Haynes, Roslynn. "Machines and Mechanization." In *The Greenwood Encyclopedia of Science Fiction and Fantasy: Themes, Works, and Wonders, Volume 2*, edited by Gary Westfahl, 481-485. London: Greenwood Press, 2005. Accessed July 30, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=3JXnz9x9sO4C&pg=PA482&dq=dystopia+criticizes&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiMo4CZ_dfjAhUtwcQBHb_-CksQ6AEIOTAC#v=onepage&q=dystopia%20criticizes&f=false.

Hoyles, John. *The Literary Underground: Writers and the Totalitarian Experience, 1900-1950*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991. Accessed July 21, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=5_zBJ7rd0C&pg=PA75&dq=dystopia+totalitarianism&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwilocuWtcbjAhWtyqYKHRiBBjMQ6AEIRzAE#v=onepage&q=totalitarianism&f=false.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. London: Vintage Classics, 2004.

Jacoby, Russell. *Picture Imperfect: Utopian Thought for an Anti-Utopian Age*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

James, Franklin A. J. L. "The Springtime of Science: Modernity and the Future and Past of Science." In *Being Modern: The Cultural Impact of Science in the Early Twentieth Century*, edited by Robert Bud, Paul Greenhalgh, Frank James, and Morag Shiach, 130-146. London: UCL Press, 2018.

Jameson, Frederick. "Utopia as Method, or the Uses of the Future." In *Utopia/Dystopia: Conditions of Historical Possibility*, edited by Michael D. Gordin, Helen Tilley, and Gyan Prakash, 21-44. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Jones, Clint and Cameron Ellis. Introduction to *The Individual and Utopia: A Multidisciplinary Study of Humanity and Perfection*, edited by Clint Jones and Cameron Ellis. London: Routledge, 2016. Accessed July 28, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=y4G1CwAAQBAJ&pg=PA7&dq=techno-utopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwin2YLi79fjAhXTw8QBHcTWDzIQ6AEIKTAA#v=onepage&q=techno-utopia&f=false>.

Kessler, Carol Farley. *Charlotte Gilman Perkins: Her Progress Towards Utopia, with Selected Writings*. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1995. Accessed July 17, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=Ex3avKz2NIwC&printsec=frontcover&dq=gilman+utopia+herland&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjtWOr6_rvjAhXB5KYKHfIZAwUQ6AEIRTAE#v=onepage&q=utopia%20herland&f=false.

Kharbe, Ambreen Safder. *English Language and Literary Criticism*. New Dehli: Discovery Publishing House, 2009. Accessed August 14, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=QH91072JCpoC&pg=PA327&dq=literary+archetypes&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiNjLPwg4LkAhURa1AKHSXxAgOQ6AEIRTAG#v=onepage&q=literary%20archetypes&f=false>.

- Kumar, Krishan. "The Ends of Utopia." *New Literary History* 41, no. 3 (Summer 2010): 549-569.
- Lamb, Charles M. *Housing Segregation in Suburban America since 1960: Presidential and Judicial Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Leach, Eugene E. "1900-1914." In *A Companion to 20th-Century America*, edited by Stephen J. Whitfield, 3-18. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Lee, Alvin A. "Archetype." In *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms*, edited by Irena R. Makaryk, 508. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000. Accessed August 14, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=CTJcILG9AeoC&pg=PA508&dq=literary+archetypes&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiNjLPwg4LkAhURa1AKHSXxAg0Q6AEIOTAD#v=onepage&q=literary%20archetypes&f=false>.
- Levitas, Ruth. "For Utopia: The (Limits of the) Utopian Function in Late Capitalist Society." In *The Philosophy of Utopia*, edited by Barbara Goodwin, 25-43. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Levitas, Ruth. *The Concept of Utopia*. Bern: Peter Lang Publishing, 2010. Accessed July 17, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=PZSv1rCri6AC&pg=PA191&lpg=PA191&dq=thomas+more+did+not+just+invent+the+word+utopia+in+a+typical+witty+kumar&source=bl&ots=QNKASF9dtS&sig=ACfu3U1K2HwLO-cPUHkoTWYYOv8SS1jtvQ&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi-4ZXw1r7jAhXMa1AKHTcvC54Q6AEwAHoECAoQAQ#v=onepage&q=thomas%20more%20did%20not%20just%20invent%20the%20word%20utopia%20in%20a%20typical%20witty%20kumar&f=false>.
- Massey, Douglas S. and Nancy A. Denton. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Meisner, Maurice. *Marxism, Maoism, and Utopianism: Eight Essays*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1982.
- Milner, Andrew. "Changing the Climate: The Politics of Dystopia." *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 23, no. 6 (December 2009): 827-838.

Mohr, Dunja M. *Worlds Apart?: Dualism and Transgression in Contemporary Female Dystopias*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2005. Accessed July 28, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=RJjtAWM8ZvsC&pg=PA30&dq=dystopia+criticizes&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiMo4CZ_dfjAhUtwcQBHb_-CksQ6AEIMTAB#v=onepage&q=dystopia%20criticizes&f=false.

Molan, Tom. Preface to *Scraps of the Untainted Sky: Science Fiction, Utopia, Dystopia*. Colorado: Westview Press, 2000.

Morris, William. "Looking Backwards." Review of *Looking Backwards*, by Edward Bellamy, *Commonweal*. June, 1889. Accessed July 21, 2019, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/morris/works/1889/commonweal/06-bellamy.htm>.

Morrisson, Mark S. *Modernism, Science, and Technology*. London: Bloomsbury, 2017. Accessed July 28, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=q_64DAAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=20th+modernism+literature+science&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjJvZabutfjAhVHaVAKHUoNCG8Q6AEIKTAA#v=onepage&q=dystopia&f=false.

Müllerová, Bára. Introduction to "Cultural Clash in *The Mountain Is Young* by Han Suyin." Bachelor Thesis, University of Pardubice, 2017.

Mumford, Lewis. *The Story of Utopias*. New York: Viking Press, 1962.

Murphy, Gretchen. *Shadowing the White Man's Burden: U.S. Imperialism and the Problem of the Color Line*. New York: New York University Press, 2010. Accessed August 9, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=noJ0pg5otWwC&pg=PA29&dq=white+man%27s+burden+meaning+interpretation&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi_yIzH-_XjAhXJepoKHbC9AA0Q6AEIKjAA#v=onepage&q=white%20man's%20burden%20meaning%20interpretation&f=false.

Olssen, Mark. "Totalitarianism and the 'Repressed' Utopia of the Present: Moving Beyond Hayek, Popper and Foucault." *Policy Futures in Education* 1, no 3 (2003): 526-552.

Oppenheimer, Felix Von. *British Imperialism*. Forgotten Books, 2010.

Pataki, Jelena. "To Read and Learn: The Necessity for a New Definition of Dystopia and Bridging the Gap Between the Old and Contemporary Dystopias." Review of *The Boundaries of Dystopian Literature: The Genre in Context*, by Demir Alihodžić and Selma Veseljević Jerković. *Anafora*, April, 2016.

Pfaelzer, Jean. *The Utopian Novel in America, 1886-1896: The Politics of Form*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1984. Accessed July 17, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=MI9J3ZjN2vYC&printsec=frontcover&dq=The+Utopian+novel+in+America,+1886-1896&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwip-oz9kLzjAhVSxaYKHV2wA_0Q6AEILDAA#v=onepage&q=The%20Utopian%20novel%20in%20America%2C%201886-1896&f=false.

Prescott, Anne Lake. "More's *Utopia*: Medievalism and Radicalism." In *A Companion to Tudor Literature*, edited by Kent Cartwright, 279-294. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010. Accessed July 17, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=fqqlzE1h5O0C&pg=PA280&dq=pun+eutopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwixwIrqyb7jAhWgyKYKHRhDDDoQ6AEIKTAA#v=onepage&q=eutopia&f=false>.

Rothstein, Edward. "Utopia and Its Discontents." In *Visions of Utopia*, edited by Edward Rothstein, Herbert Muschamp, and Martin E. Marty, 1-29. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Sargent, Lyman Tower. "Do Dystopias Matter?" In *Dystopia(n) Matters: On the Page, On Screen, On Stage*, edited by Fátima Vieira, 10-13. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013.

Sargent, Lyman Tower. "In Defense of Utopia." *Diogenes* 53, no. 1 (February 2006): 11-17.

Sargisson, Lucy. *Fool's Gold? Utopianism in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Schmidt, Orville H. *Utopia: Heaven or Hell?* New York: Writers Club Press, 2001.

Shaw, Charles. *Exile Nation*. Berkeley: Soft Skull Press, 2012. Accessed August 12, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=JdNAfspvkOsC&pg=PT189&dq=brave+new+world+personality+cult&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjyl-GZxf3jAhW-xcQBHbxmBxoQ6AEISzAG#v=onepage&q=brave%20new%20world%20personality%20cult&f=false>.

Smith, Brian. "Beyond Totalitarianism: Hannah Arendt and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*." In *Aldous Huxley Annual*, edited by Jerome Meckier and Bernfried Nugel, 77-104. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2008. Accessed July 21, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=176I-oMT4MoC&pg=PA77&dq=dystopia+totalitarianism&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwihnqWl tcbjAhXMw6YKHR2HCLI4ChDoAQgrMAA#v=onepage&q=dystopia%20totalitarianism&f=false>.

Spariosu, Mihai I. *Modernism and Exile: Play, Liminality, and the Exilic-Utopian Imagination*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. Accessed July 28, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=jnoYDAAAQBAJ&pg=PA106&dq=20th+modernism+literature+science+technology+dystopia&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiN7r-wutfjAhWQKVAKHVC2BwKQ6AEILDAA#v=onepage&q=dystopia%20science&f=false>.

Surette, Leon. *Dreams of a Totalitarian Utopia: Literary Modernism and Politics*. (London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2011. Accessed July 27, 2019, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=KTp89jbg4uMC&pg=PA113&dq=brave+new+world+totalitarian&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwigldqVvcbjAhV0ysQBHVtFCNEQ6AEIYjAI#v=onepage&q=totalitarian&f=false>.

Vieira, Fátima. "The Concept of Utopia." In *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*, edited by Gregory Claeys, 3-27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Accessed July 17, 2019, https://books.google.cz/books?id=sFCuoqykV9QC&printsec=frontcover&dq=utopian+literature&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjIv57_jLzjAhVO2aYKHUriBbwQ6AEIKTAA#v=onepage&q=tension&f=false.

Williams, Linda Ruth. "Dream Girls and Mechanic Panic: Dystopia and Its Others in *Brazil* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." In *Liquid Metal: The Science Fiction Film Reader*, edited by Sean Redmond, 64-74. New York: Wallflower Press, 2007.

Woodward, William Harrison. *A Short History of the Expansion of The British Empire: 1500-1902*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902.

Yoran, Hanan. Introduction to *Between Utopia and Dystopia: Erasmus, Thomas More, and the Humanist Republic of Letters*. Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2010.