Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter now, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Steffi Delcourt April 3, 2013

Creative Chaos:

The Role of Creativity in *Brave New World, 1984, Fahrenheit 451,* and *Walden Two*

by

Steffi Delcourt

Dr. John Bugge
Adviser

English Department

Dr. John Bugge

Adviser

Dr. Paul Kelleher

Committee Member

Dr. Marshall Duke

Committee Member

2013

Creative Chaos:

The Role of Creativity in *Brave New World, 1984, Fahrenheit 451,* and *Walden Two*

By

Steffi Delcourt

Dr. John Bugge

Adviser

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

English Department

2013

Abstract

Creative Chaos:

The Role of Creativity in *Brave New World, 1984, Fahrenheit 451,* and *Walden Two*

By Steffi Delcourt

This paper aims to comment on the role creativity plays within three dystopian texts, *Brave New World*, *1984*, and *Fahrenheit 451*, and one utopian, *Walden Two*. As I examine creativity through Romantic and classical theories of creativity, as well as the psychological creativity model the Domain-Individual-Field Interaction Model, I find that creativity was much more present in these rigid societies than I had expected. In keeping with the Romantic theory, creativity becomes the way that John the Savage, Helmholtz Watson, Winston Smith, and Guy Montag express their rebellious impulses and advocate for a society in which individuality and creative freedom are valued over communal happiness. I compare this position from my dystopian texts to the classical model found in *Walden Two* and evaluate whether creativity is an essential element of humanity, according to utopian and dystopian literature.

Creative Chaos:

The Role of Creativity in *Brave New World, 1984, Fahrenheit 451,* and *Walden Two*

By

Steffi Delcourt

Dr. John Bugge

Adviser

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

English Department

2013

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank everyone who has helped me survive the process of writing a thesis. To my friends, particularly Amanda: thank you for patiently listening to me explain and re-explain my ideas until they made sense. Your confusion helped me to sort out mine. To my family: thank you, Mama and Papa, for keeping me on track and motivated to finish this paper. I would especially like to thank my committee members. To my advisor, Dr. John Bugge: I cannot tell you how much I appreciate all your advice about the entire process over the past year. Your advice and critiques about my writing has helped me become a better writer and a better scholar. Dr. Paul Kelleher and Dr. Marshall Duke: thank you for taking the time to be a part of this process and to hear me out during our conversations. I could not have created this topic, nor taken it in such a direction, without your input and expertise guiding me along the way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Chapter One: Creativity: Individuality or Mass Entertainment? 11

Chapter Two: The Domain-Individual-Field Interaction Model and Dystopian Literature 34

Chapter Three: A Rebellious Force for Freedom or a Group Effort? 70

Conclusion 94

Bibliography 98

Appendices 103

“We prefer to do things comfortably.”

“But I don’t want comfort. I want God, I want poetry, I want real danger, I want freedom, I want goodness. I want sin.”

“In fact,” said Mustapha Mond, “you’re claiming the right to be unhappy.”

“All right then,” said the Savage defiantly, “I’m claiming the right to be unhappy.”

Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World*

INTRODUCTION

In Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, John the Savage claims his right to poetry. "I want God, I want poetry, I want real danger, I want freedom, I want goodness. I want sin," he tells Mustapha Mond, asserting his claim to creativity as an inalienable right (Huxley 240). His insistence that concepts such as creativity, individuality, and freedom must be present in society mirrors that of dystopian writers. In describing a perfectly imperfect society, authors of dystopias insist that, despite the dictates of society, creativity and rebellion exist. As I read the classic utopian and dystopian novels, the authors' persistent declarations that creativity affects society caught my attention. Even though it has only a temporary effect on society, creativity is present, whether the governments endorse or sanction it.

Much of critical literature on utopian and dystopian literature is concerned with defining the differences between the categories.[1] Where does one genre end and the other begin? According to the online Oxford English dictionary, a utopia is "a place, state, or condition ideally perfect in respect of politics, laws, customs, and conditions," whereas a dystopia is "an imaginary place or condition in which everything is as bad as possible" (OED "Utopia," "Dystopia"). After reading classic utopian and dystopian literature and reviewing critical commentary on them, I conclude that utopias and dystopias are essentially the same. They both involve strict societies that regulate how its inhabitants should live, dictate measures that will cause the greatest happiness, and severely punish those who deviate from the norm.

---

[1] For more clarification in reference to definitions of utopian and dystopian literature, see Margaret Atwood's *In Other Worlds: SF and the Human Imagination*, as well as the third essay of Northrop Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism*, and Chad Walsh's *From Utopia to Nightmare.* For further information on the history of the utopian genre, refer to Lewis Mumford's *The Story of Utopias* and *Ideal Commonwealth.* The former outlines the progression of utopias from Plato up through the beginning of the 20th century, while the later contains excerpts from the more famous utopias. Other authoritative sources that cover the classic as well as more modern concepts of utopia and dystopia include: Doyne Dawson's *Cities of the Gods: Communist Utopias in Greek Thought;* Ruth Levitas' *Concept of Utopia*; Merlin Coverley's *Utopia;* Rüsen, Fehr, and Rieger's collection of essays *Thinking Utopia: Steps into Other Worlds*; Arthur Morgan's *Nowhere was Somewhere*; and Elisabeth Hansot's *Perfection and Progress: Two Modes of Utopian Thought.*

To me, utopias and dystopias differ in only two things: narrative perspective and authorial intent. The attitude the protagonist adopts toward his society determines whether a society is utopian or dystopian. As Chad Walsh[2] states, "one man's utopia may also be a dystopia to the person who has a different utopia" (Walsh 74). If the character is positive and enthusiastic about his civilization, the book is typically a utopia; in contrast, if the protagonist abhors the controlling government, his world is a dystopia. Additionally, the author's intention for his work must be a factor for how the reader perceives it.[3] Before the nineteenth century, a majority of writers focus on utopian perspectives. It was not until works such as Samuel Butler's *Erewhon*, H.G. Wells' *The Time Machine*, and E.M. Forster's *The Machine Stops* gained popularity in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century that the genre of dystopian literature began to thrive.

The governments in power in utopian and dystopian literature alike dictate a particular lifestyle to their citizens. Rigid and hierarchical, the governments impose a structural and strictly defined daily life, leaving little freedom for individuals to make their own choices. Part of this ruling methodology includes harshly sanctioning the misfits of society with inflexible regulations consisting primarily of exile or euthanasia.[4] This kind of society restricts the rights and expressions of "the importance of basic feelings – sex, love, selfishness [or individuality], fantasy," and creativity, to name a few (Weber 88). I noticed creativity appears more often than not in utopian and dystopian literature. Creativity piqued my curiosity; as a concept, it is simple enough and appears to be important to humans, yet it is not directly linked to a biological need.

---

[2] Chad Walsh was an early twentieth century literary and religious scholar.
[3] Walsh expands upon this notion in his book *From Utopia to Nightmare.*
[4] Utopias with these policies include: Plato's *Republic*, More's *Utopia*, Butler's *Erewhon,* Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, and Huxley's *Island.* Dystopias with these policies include: Huxley's *Brave New World,* Orwell's *1984*, Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*, Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *Herland*, Marge Piercy's *Woman on the Edge of Time*, and Margaret Atwood's three novels of speculative fiction *The Handmaid's Tale, Oryx and Crake,* and *The Year of the Flood.*

Furthermore, the concepts of a person's individuality and freedom are intrinsically involved in the practice and expression of creativity. I asked myself, why is creativity such a dominant presence in this body of literature? Why is it there?

At this point, I shall define my terms, as the definitions I use for terms such as creativity and art do not correlate with their more colloquial usages. Throughout this paper, I will abide by Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi's definition of creativity as the creation of something novel that has value (Csikszentmihalyi *Creativity*).[5] Artistic creativity will refer to the creation of something novel that has artistic or literary value. As this is the form of creativity that most interests me in utopian and dystopian literature, it is necessary to distinguish it from other types of creativity. Pure artistic creativity is an elaboration on artistic creativity; in this case, a novel, artistically-valued item is made for its own purpose and without an ulterior motive, which refers back to a more Kantian perspective.[6] I consider art to represent a product of artistic creativity, including but not limited to a book, a painting, or a piece of music. These definitions, however, do not account for differences in the quality of the creativity. They merely identify the general concept of what I am addressing in this paper. For differentiating between the quality of creative products, I defer to the terms high art and low art. The expression high art signifies that the creative product is of good quality and with an aesthetic value. Additionally, it is respected by those who judge artistic creativity. Low art, alternatively, is a low quality product of creativity that is not respected and has little to no aesthetic value.

Strictly speaking, creativity should not exist in utopias or dystopias. Creativity is discouraged through not only laws forbidding and eliminating certain art, but also the extremely

---

[5] Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi is a psychologist who specializes in the psychology of creativity. He is one of the psychologists on the forefront of the field.

[6] Immanuel Kant, an eighteenth century German philosopher, wrote *The Critique of Judgment* on his parameters for what should be defined art. He believed that an artistic object could only be art if it has no overbearing motive for its existence; it must exist because it is art and not because it supports a message.

rigid structure their societies assume. Through his ecological model, creativity psychologist D.M. Harrington "saw the role of the social system in the creative process as capable of creating or destroying, of extending or limiting the potential of particular acts" (Dacey and Lennon 85).[7] According to psychological studies evaluating the environments of classrooms, creativity in children is discouraged when instructors impose a rigid system that does not allow deviation or alternative answers,[8] employ a "low tolerance for failure,"[9] and provide an environment where peer pressure to conform increases[10] (Dacey and Lennon 71). All three of these conditions are present in utopian and dystopian societies. The governments will not release any modicum of control over their subjects, and any attempts to deviate from society's set parameters results in severe punishment. Moreover, pressure from one's peers to conform to the status quo takes on eminence in utopias and dystopias. And yet, creativity is still present in the texts I will consider: the three dystopias *Brave New World, 1984,* and *Fahrenheit 451*, and the utopia *Walden Two*.

Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, written in 1932, follows the interactions of three primary characters in the World State centered in London: John the Savage, Bernard Marx, and Helmholtz Watson. While on a romantic week-long vacation with Lenina Crowne at the Indian reservation, Malpais, Marx meets John. He learns that John's mother was once a part of Fordian society[11] and his unknown father a director of a central hatchery unit in the World State. Marx cannot help himself and invites John back to the World State in order to disgrace the Director.

---

[7] For more information, refer to Dacey and Lennon's *Understanding Creativity.*

[8] A study by Koestner, Ryan, Bernierei, and Holt in 1984 found that when students were given "controlling' instructions about neatness, their creativity level suffered in comparison to those who received "informational" instructions (Dacey and Lennon 71). For more information, refer to Dacey and Lennon's *Understanding Creativity.*

[9] A study by Sternberg and Lubart in 1995 suggests that a low tolerance for failure produces students who are unwilling to take risks and be inventive with their work. For more information, refer to Dacey and Lennon's *Understanding Creativity.*

[10] Studies by Torrance in 1968, 1970, and 1988 demonstrate the influence peers have on others' creative impulses. Research by Amabile in 1989 and 1996 supports this conclusion. For more information, refer to Dacey and Lennon's *Understanding Creativity.*

[11] The people of the World State are often referred to as members of Fordian society because of their reverence for Henry Ford, the celebrated automobile innovator and inventor of the assembly line. Citizens worship Ford as a god, referring to him as "our Ford" (Huxley 23).

Once there, John becomes a novelty item, and society gathers to gawk and hear the Savage congratulate them on their heightened civilization. After a period of time, though, the Fordian values and customs, typified in Crowne's seduction attempt, disgust John. He rejects their company, taking relief in his smuggled volume *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* and in his discussions with Marx and Watson. Unable to cope with Fordian society, especially after his mother's death, John rebels and throws a supply of the World State's wonder drug *soma* out the window. Watson, a fast friend of John's and disillusioned by society in his own right, helps John in his rebellion and causes World Controller Mustapha Mond to summon them to his headquarters. Watson and Marx are exiled to the faraway Falkland Islands. John is forbidden from joining them, and so he runs away to his own hermitage in southern Surrey. The interference of the Fordian society eventually drives John to commit suicide.

1984, written by George Orwell in 1949, records Winston Smith's struggle to accept the Party's control over his life. He discovers his own mind and his own discomfort with the Party as he journals in an old blank diary he found in a circumspect antique shop. Smith does not act directly against the Party until he meets Julia, a mechanic in the Ministry of Records. They meet around the city to consummate their relationship once or twice a month until they find a hidden bedroom in the attic of the same antique shop. Smith's love for Julia inspires him to be more daring and embrace his rebellious side. When O'Brien, an Inner Party member, approaches Smith to join the Rebellion known only as the Brotherhood, Smith leaps at the opportunity. However, O'Brien arrests Smith and Julia as they read *the book*, a heretical text written by the ultimate rebel Emmanuel Goldstein. O'Brien spends months orchestrating and performing Smith's torture and recalibration to society. Smith emerges from his imprisonment a reinvented man who subscribes entirely to the Party's agenda and to the supremacy of Big Brother.

In Ray Bradbury's novel *Fahrenheit 451* published in 1953, the protagonist whose disillusionment we follow is Guy Montag, a fireman who burns books. Montag is content with his life until he meets Faber and Clarisse, two oddballs in society. The fireman's discussions with the old bibliophile and the curious young intellectual, respectively, cause him to question why he burns books. Montag steals upwards of twenty books from various houses he burns, but does not seize the opportunity to read them until about a year after he begins pilfering from fires. His fire captain, Beatty, challenges Montag to destroy his own books when he reveals Montag's stockpile, but Montag cannot bring himself to continue burning books. Instead, he kills Beatty and, with Faber's help, flees the city to find a group of academics led by Granger, a former writer. Montag is with these men when the city is bombed and completely destroyed. The novel ends with the troupe of academics and Montag travelling back to the ruins to search for any survivors.

The only utopia I will examine – *Walden Two* written by B.F. Skinner and published in 1948 – chronicles the exposure of Burris, a psychology professor, and his friends Mary, Steve, and Rodge to the charms of the utopian society Walden Two. After some initial prompting by Steve and Rodge, Burris reaches out to Frazier, a former colleague and the mind behind Walden Two. Frazier invites the three, and whoever else they wish to invite, to visit the compound for a week or so; the men, accompanied by Steve's and Rodge's fiancées Mary and Barbara and Burris's current colleague and a philosophy professor Castle, accept Frazier's offer immediately. Frazier acts as their personal guide, shepherding the group from building to building and extolling the virtues of his perfect utopian society. He is challenged at almost every step of the way by Burris, Castle, and Barbara. What begins as a trip of curiosity for Burris transforms into his slow, but steady conversion. Although he leaves the compound with Castle, Rodge, and

Barbara, Burris realizes that he wishes to return to Walden Two by the time he reaches the bus station. This account ends with Burris describing his journey back to Walden Two. It is there he reveals that this book has been written at the request of Frazier and the Office of Information.

To understand how creativity functions in my chosen texts, I will use literary and psychological theories of creativity. After ascertaining the saturation of creativity in all of the featured societies, I will look to see how the Romantic theory of creativity operates in dystopias as opposed to the classical theory in the utopia. Then, I will apply Csikszentmihalyi's psychological model of creativity, the Domain-Individual-Field Interaction Model, to see if the dystopian or utopian novels hold a stronger claim to creativity when defined objectively as the interaction between a domain, an individual, and a field. I chose to use Csikszentmihalyi's model of creativity as opposed to one of Sigmund Freud's or Robert Sternberg's theories because of the nature of my textual evidence.[12] Since utopian and dystopian works describe the society as well as the principal characters, I believe that Csikszentmihalyi's model is the most appropriate one to apply, as it focuses on the interaction between the individual and his context. Although the protagonists of *Brave New World* and *1984* are revealed in enough detail that I could apply a person-centric psychological model such as those of Freud and Sternberg to them, I would not be able to do so with those from *Fahrenheit 451* or *Walden Two*.

Despite regulations against it, all three dystopias support a strong creative presence; *Walden Two* boasts a milder, but still present, creativity. I will discuss further in Chapter One how the societies in *Brave New World* and *Fahrenheit 451* foster a strong dichotomy between

[12] Sigmund Freud is an Austrian psychologist and widely considered to be the father of psychoanalysis. His theories – particularly the Oedipal complex, the idea of repression and sublimation, and the id, ego, and superego – are often used in literary theory.
Robert Sternberg, like Csikszentmihalyi, is a psychologist specializing in the field of the psychology of creativity. Over the past 25 to 30 years, he has proposed several influential theories on creativity, such as the propulsion theory of creativity. For more information on Sternberg, or the history of the psychological study of creativity, refer to Dacey and Lennon's *Understanding Creativity: The Interplay of Biological, Psychological, and Social Factors* and Csikszentmihalyi's *Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention.*

high and low art as the governments endorse some creative products and individuals, but not others, whereas the Party in *1984* simply writes or edits any creativity present in Oceania until it all conforms to the current opinion of Big Brother. On the other hand, Frazier promotes creativity, and especially its communal nature, in *Walden Two* to its visitors. In my second chapter, I will examine creativity as it appears in *Brave New World, 1984, and Fahrenheit 451* through Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi's psychological model of creativity, the Domain-Individual-Field Interaction Model. This model proposes that in order for creativity to occur, creative individuals must be in contact with a domain and a field. After these two levels of analysis, I will show in my third chapter how in dystopian literature, creativity – and the protagonists John the Savage, Helmholtz Watson, Winston Smith, and Guy Montag – are represented as a rebellious force in keeping with the Romantic theory. Here, I will compare the dystopias to *Walden Two*. The utopia assumes a unique combination of the classical theory of creativity with Skinner's own psychological theory of behaviorism. I will look at how the role of creativity changes with such a paradigm shift.

I have chosen these four novels because they have three intrinsic similarities: they lived in the same period of time and so have similar historical influences; all were paradigmatic representatives of utopian and dystopian literature; and all addressed creativity specifically and in detail. Each of these books has been written in approximately the same time period. *Brave New World* is the oldest of the four books, being written in 1932. The dates of publication for *1984, Fahrenheit 451*, and *Walden Two* cluster around 1950, with the first written in 1949, the second in 1953, and the third in 1948. The authors confronted similar worlds; Huxley, Orwell, and Skinner lived through the first World War, and Orwell, Skinner, and Bradbury experienced the travesty of World War II. All watched the rise of socialist and communist doctrines and the

threats that such communities can pose on the state of the world, as well as the rise of psychology's prevalence in the public domain with the advent of Freud's psychoanalysis and Skinner's behaviorism. As a result, the four authors had comparable historical contexts and platforms.

Additionally, each novel acts as an exemplar for its respective genre. *Brave New World* and *1984* are two of the foremost archetypal dystopias written; both embody nightmare worlds that transcend the page and continue to be taught in classrooms around the world. *Fahrenheit 451* is regarded as one of Bradbury's masterpieces. And the lyricism of the writing in each has raised these books into literary classics, let alone dystopias. The appeal of *Walden Two* rests on its combination of classic and modern utopian styles. Skinner bases his utopia firmly in classical tradition, mimicking the discussion format that classical utopias such as Plato's *Republic*, Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*, and Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backwards* adopt. However, Skinner is careful to distinguish his novel as a modern utopia. In *Walden Two*, Frazier highlights the replicability that Walden Two has as a utopia. While other utopias can only exist out of time[13] or in an isolated location,[14] "any group of people could secure economic self-sufficiency with the help of modern technology and the psychological problems of group living could be solved [and establish another Walden Two] with available principles of 'behavioral engineering'" (Skinner, *Walden Two* 10). Unlike previous utopias, Walden Two can exist anywhere.

These four novels all explicitly address artistic creativity in their content. The dystopias heavily focus on authorizing some, but not all, creativity for public consumption. Banal entertainment replaces high art in *Brave New World* and *Fahrenheit 451*, and *1984* destroys any

[13] Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward, 2000-1887* transports the protagonist Julian West over 100 years into the future to a new utopian civilization.
[14] Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* is located on an island in the middle of nowhere. Samuel Butler's *Erewhon* and James Hilton's *Lost Horizon* both are centered on a remote location that is hard to reach. All three utopias operate on the idea that they are severely isolated from society in general.

meaning behind significant products of creativity through translation into the bastardized language Newspeak. *Walden Two* considers creativity more extensively than any other utopia, classic or modern. While the utopia treats creativity in a manner similar to More's *Utopia* and Bellamy's *Looking Backward,* Skinner devotes significantly more artistic thought to unraveling the creativity and how the community creates and enjoys their art.

By the end of this paper, I hope to comment on why creativity is emphasized so strongly across the genre of utopian and particularly dystopian literature. Is it merely a device used by dystopian authors to ensure a rebellion and so drive their plot? Or, by including creativity as the measure of rebellion, are Huxley, Orwell, and Bradbury proposing that creativity is an essential part of human nature? I will also attempt to reconcile the answers I provide to these questions with how *Walden Two* treats creativity. Ultimately, the Romantic notion of creativity as a property of freedom and individuality triumphs over the classic utopian consideration of creativity as a pastime.

CHAPTER ONE

Creativity: Individuality or Mass Entertainment?

In order to understand the role of creativity in the dystopian novels *Brave New World*, *1984*, *Fahrenheit 451,* and the utopia *Walden Two*, its initial context, presence, and the reaction to it in the plots must first be understood. The totalitarian governments featured in the dystopias strongly bias their societies against high art, feeding the masses a lower quality that is meant to distract them. As a professed utopia, *Walden Two* presents a similarly strict government that instead promotes a more positive, but less intense outlook on creativity. All three dystopias are saturated with the endorsed low art. However, illicit artifacts of artistic creativity linger around the edges of society. The disparity in quality of allowed and forbidden creativity suggests that those in command of dystopian communities worry disproportionally about the power of high creativity. I will discuss the repercussions of official dystopian reactions toward high art, as well as the importance of patronage of the arts in *Walden Two*.

BRAVE NEW WORLD

The World State in *Brave New World* promotes three key elements in society: "Community, Identity, [and] Stability" (Huxley 3). The affairs and management of the World State revolve around upholding these tenets, especially stability, the "primal and the ultimate need" humanity feels (Huxley 43). Fordian society willingly adopts totalitarianism and developmental manipulation in order to balance community and the public's identity into steady stability. Ten World Controllers, with Mustapha Mond acting as the Resident Controller for the Western Europe Sector, oversee daily operations that occur in their jurisdictions – from management of the reproduction assembly line to the research results released to the public – and work to ensure people's happiness and "well-being" (Huxley 177). By voluntarily submitting to

a ten-part hierarchical dictatorship after a devastating Nine Years' War,[15] Fordian members allow their identities to be predetermined and accept the good of the community over all else in order to preserve stability and the resulting happiness.

The Controllers use science and technology to predetermine the identities of the public. Scientists experiment to make test-tube babies of varying intelligences and physical builds that form society's classes, from the most intelligent to the least: Alphas, Betas, Gammas, Deltas, and Epsilons. Aside from genetic manipulation, members are exposed to class-specific training in the form of hypnopædia, or sleep-teaching. A constant stream of propaganda informs "the mind that judges and desires and decides – [it is] made up of these suggestions . . . *our* suggestions!" (Huxley 29). Through a strict conditioning of the subconscious, scientists instill and encourage people's future actions such as essential class distinctions, proper social habits, and consumption of new materials – all of which are in line with what best maintains the status quo. To ensure maximum saturation of messages, hypnopædic sessions repeat a short message hundreds of thousands of times over the course of several months' exposure: "Sixty-two thousand four hundred repetitions make one truth" (Huxley 47). This intense subconscious training allows the decisions of Fordians to be suggestible and predictable. Their likes and dislikes are universal across the World State and so can be fulfilled *en masse*. As a result, one's personal identity is subsumed into one community mentality.

The workload of civilians is purposefully kept high to prevent excess leisure time. Workers are never allowed "a moment to sit down and think" (Huxley 55). Mond believes that "it [is] sheer cruelty to afflict [the laborers] with excessive leisure," citing an experiment where

[15] Occurring some time after the institution of the World State, the Nine Years' War was almost a decade of intense and disastrous chemical and biological warfare. Prompted by resistance to the World State's implementation of policies such as hypnopædia and the caste system, the war represented the last period of rebellion against the World State. With the war's end came the end of resistance, as well as the end of religion, familial units, and high art.

unrest increases in response to reduced working hours (Huxley 224). Spare time to think encourages the formation of unwanted individualized identities, which the Fordian government believes leads to unrest as caused by the prior experiment and by the Nine Years' War. To prevent instability, the government offers other, more "solid" distractions (Huxley 55). The most popular antidote for all classes is *soma*, a hallucinatory drug marketed as a "holiday from reality" that fills just enough time with pleasant but empty contemplation until workers can reclaim the "safe . . . solid ground of daily labour and distraction" (Huxley 54, 56). Sexual promiscuity, overly complicated games that promote consumerism, and multisensory entertainment make up other "pleasant vices" the government lionizes to guarantee "a lasting civilization" (Huxley 237). These activities, apart from the benefit of being trivial and time-consuming, emphasize unity in community. A night out on the town is effectively spent "with the other four hundred" couples frequenting the same dance club (Huxley 77). The idea of community ingrains itself into the Fordians' identities. Perhaps a hypnopædic aphorism expresses this sentiment the best: "When the individual feels, the community reels," and stability is lost (Huxley 94).

The creativity in the World State at the commencement of *Brave New World* exists through scientific and artistic media. The scientific creativity predominantly concerns itself with improving the methodology for breeding and modifying human zygotes as demonstrated in the Hatchery and Conditioning Centre. Scientific processes, such as the Boskanovsky Process, are often the most successfully implemented, disseminated, and improved upon category of creativity. This endorsed strain of creativity, while an important element of Fordian society, juxtaposes itself with pure artistic creativity. Because scientific creativity focuses on

propagating community interdependence and uniformity among identities, it calls into question the nature and favorability of its counterpart.[16]

The encouraged art sustains the ideals of community, identity, stability and the collective's happiness. The only art allowed in the World State conceals ulterior motives and involves either hypnopædia or sustaining community and identity values. Advancing techniques to create humans who are more specifically prepared for their purpose in the World State will help to establish distinguished identities among the class levels. Most often, the scripts for hypnopædic conditioning – created by those involved with Emotional Engineering – assume the form of blatant propaganda. As works of creativity, they are lauded somewhat ironically as "works of art [drawn] out of practically nothing but pure sensation" and "requir[ing] enormous ingenuity" (Huxley 221).

Each hypnopædic rhyme further ingrains the policy of the World State in the listener, promoting stability in thought and society. Speakers whisper statements such as "Every one belongs to every one else," "the more stitches, the less riches," "ending is better than mending," and "when the individual feels, the community reels" into the ears of sleeping children (Huxley 40, 49, 49, 94). These aphorisms linger in their minds, structuring the individuals' development and their actions throughout the rest of their lives. Word repetition and internal rhyming schemes create a sound that, as Paul Valéry[17] posits in *Poetry and Abstract Thought,* "is repeated within" a person's mind "as if it delighted in" surviving as an echo in one's subconscious (Valéry 218). First introduced as instructional tools, these aphorisms reassert themselves as wisdom and advice within Fordians' daily conversations.

---

[16] For a look at the philosophical contrast between science and art, see *The Mirror and the Lamp.*
[17] A French poet, essayist, and philosopher who wrote critical literary theory

Purely artistic creativity supported by Fordian society – specifically mass entertainment and verbal ditties – pervade the World State. Mass entertainment engages society through multiple perceptual levels and an emphasis on community involvement. In combining visual, auditory, olfactory, and tactile sensations to produce an ambiance, the entertainment at hand captures the attention of those attending the event. Synthetic music is broadcast to the public by a combination of live bands, recorded audio tracks, scent organs, or color organs. "Feelies" alone unite all of the aforementioned sensations in a cinematic, and often pornographic, presentation. When combined with the use of *soma*, these entertainment outlets enthrall their audience into contentment, lulling people into believing that they "ha[ve] what they want. . ." and need nothing else (Huxley 77). In spite of providing this sense of security, mass entertainment does not affect members of society; it cannot incite any lasting changes in thought or feeling. Like the songs, mass entertainment is art, but banal in nature.

The popular songs "There Ain't No Bottle in All the World Like That Dear Little Bottle of Mine" and "Hug Me Til You Drug Me" are typical of their genres. The first sounds like an enthusiastic verse rounding out a jazz number, and the second as the chorus to an upbeat pop song.[18] The lyrics hold an enchanting quality to the people of the World State: they "[sing] and [are] spells and beat drums" (Huxley 193-94). However, neither have any lyrical genius. Hymns for Solidarity Services, while not labeled as entertainment *per se*, contain the same enchantment as the popular songs.[19] Following a tail-rhyme structure, the hymns combine to form a variation of a quatrain; the prevailing rhyme of the Λ sound, paired with the ending *–n* or *–m* consonant, ties together all four stanzas.[20] The last hymn becomes aphoristic in nature, with its refrain of

---

[18] See Appendix 1 for the lyrics to these songs.
[19] See Appendix 2 for the words to the Solidarity Service hymns.
[20] [Λ] is the symbol in the International Phonetic Alphabet for a stressed central vowel as in b<u>u</u>d. Examples of this within the hymns are: one, run, begun, comes, drums and fun.

"orgy-porgy" transferring into common speech as the hypnopædic rhymes have (Huxley 84). Again, these songs are distinctively classified as low art. Like the "feelies" and other mass entertainment shows, the songs are meant to be heard and experienced within a crowd.

Despite the widespread acceptance of Ford's pronouncement that "History is bunk," creative artifacts from the past still exist within the World State (Huxley 34). "Strange rumours of old forbidden books hidden in a safe in the Controller's study" float around society with little to no public confirmation (Huxley 35). This vague conjecture culminates in the Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning's deprecating speculation that "Bibles, poetry – Ford knew what" were sheltered within Mond's safe (Huxley 35). The safe houses "a whole collection of pornographic old books,"[21] including both the Old and the New Testaments of the Holy Bible, *The Imitation of Christ*, *The Varieties of Religious Experience* by William James, *Parochial and Plain Sermons* by Cardinal John Henry Newman, at least one of the works of Maine de Biran,[22] and, we must assume from Mond's knowledge, a copy of *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* (Huxley 231). In addition to those tomes safely stored away in Mond's study, one copy of the Bard's complete works survives in the Reservation on the North American Continent, outside the boundaries of the World State; for John the Savage, this book unlocks a new world of words that "rolled through his mind" and "rumbled, like the drums at the summer dances, if the drums could have spoken" (Huxley 131-132). John the Savage either mentions by name or quotes from the poem *The Phoenix and the Turtle* and the plays *Hamlet*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Merchant of Venice*, *The Tempest*, *Othello*, *King Lear,* and *Antony and Cleopatra* as he explores first the Reservation, then the civilized World State.

---

[21] In this context, pornographic is intended to mean from the time before Ford and therefore forbidden and shameful to read and understand

[22] An eighteenth to nineteenth century French philosopher whose work particularly interested Mond in *Brave New World*. He mentions this author by name on page 231.

These artifacts resonate in John as Valéry describes how poetic phrase "returns in [the reader] and repeats in [the reader]" and immediately inspire veneration in the Savage (Valéry 218).

While scientific creativity advances stability and identity, those purely artistic products of creativity endorsed by society promote the value of community. Mass entertainment serves to bring people together in what would be considered their spare time. Engaging activities are offered in a group setting: "In a crowd . . . as usual," Bernard Marx remarks when attending a wrestling championship with Lenina Crowne (Huxley 89). The crowd almost overpowers the actual attraction; Crowne spends more time socializing with her friends than watching the wrestling match. Scent or color organs are commonly found in clubs with the capacity to accommodate "four hundred couples . . . five-stepping round the polished floor" (Huxley 76); feelies are shown to crowds of "six thousand spectators" (Huxley 168). The press of the crowds, combined with a constant deluge of perceptual information from multi-modal entertainment, leaves no time for people to be alone or to consider themselves as a singular being in society. Rather, society encourages the melding of identities into a communal one through the regularly attended Solidarity Services, where twelve people harmonize into one mindset. The first hymn sung begins with the appeal "Ford, we are twelve; oh, make us one," and the third hymn resolves itself with: "For I am you and you are I" (Huxley 81, 82). The form of the four hymns that make up the Service follows their meaning; the 'o' sounds pervading the hymnal reiterate the circularity and wholeness of the service's purpose. The service culminates in copulation – the ultimate attempt at becoming one with another being.

All of the arts discussed above are unreservedly supported by the governing body. The World State, as an organization promoting stability and happiness, strictly regulates the existence of any potentially destabilizing catalyst for thought; in the World State, "every change is a

menace to stability" (Huxley 224-225). Mond elaborates to Watson and John after their arrest: "It isn't only art that's incompatible with happiness; it's also science. Science is dangerous; we have to keep it most carefully chained and muzzled" (Huxley 225). The government – and specifically Mond in *Brave New World* – has the ultimate veto power concerning the distribution of art to the general public: "all our science is just a cookery book, with an orthodox theory of cooking that nobody's allowed to question, and a list of recipes that mustn't be added to except by special permission from the head cook. I'm the head cook now," Mond explains (Huxley 225). When a piece of possibly contraband creativity comes to the notice of the World Controller, it is either hidden from the public like the forbidden tomes stashed within a safe or destroyed and therefore "brushed away . . . [with a] whisk" out of society's consciousness and into oblivion (Huxley 34-35).

The powers-that-be of the World State selectively encourage creativity, favoring the trite and inane over that which is "good" (Huxley 220). A nation that promotes the slogan "Community, Identity, [and] Stability" as paramount, the World State must regulate how its members express themselves to secure the world's order: ". . . that's the price we have to pay for stability," Mond lectures. "You've got to choose between happiness and what people used to call high art. We've sacrificed the high art. We have the feelies and the scent organ instead" (Huxley 220). Aspects of creativity are endorsed so long as they support the good of the State. However, any art that hints at upset or unrest is eliminated quickly and efficiently.

1984

Dominating Orwell's *1984,* the Party and Big Brother reign within Oceania, one of three superpowers spread across the islands of Great Britain, the American continents, Australia, and some of Africa. The government advertises its omnipotence to keep its citizens in line.

Telescreens mounted on the walls of every room "receiv[e] and transmi[t]" images and sound to the Thought Police, a governmental body dedicated to monitoring the people's actions (Orwell 3). Children – who Winston Smith disgustedly refers to as "eavesdropping little sneak[s]" – are taught to support the Party wholeheartedly and to "watc[h their parents] night and day for symptoms of unorthodoxy" (Orwell 24). To contain any personal deviation, the Party regiments daily life; similar to the strategy held in *Brave New World*, the government fills its peoples' time with work shifts and events that stress conformity and patriotism:

> In principle a Party member had no spare time, and was never alone except in bed. It was assumed that when he was not working, eating, or sleeping he would be taking part in some kind of communal recreations; to do anything that suggested a taste for solitude, even to go for a walk by yourself, was always slightly dangerous. There was a word for it in Newspeak: *ownlife*, it was called, meaning individualism and eccentricity. But this evening as he came out of the Ministry the balminess of the April air had tempted him. . . . On impulse he had turned away from the bus stop and wandered off into the labyrinth of London, . . . losing himself along unknown streets and hardly bothering in which direction he was going. (Orwell 82)

The Party's idea, like the World State's, preserves the status quo by occupying enough of the people's time to prevent them from formulating a sense of individuality.

The dictatorial government actively surrounds its inhabitants with an environment of fear. The constant supervision by other Party members, children, and the telescreens strains temperaments and prompts paranoia: "You had to live – did live, from habit that became instinct – in the assumption that every sound you made was overheard, and, except in darkness, every movement scrutinized," Smith explains (Orwell 3). O'Brien states that "Everything [except for fear, rage, triumph and self-abasement] we shall destroy – everything" (Orwell 267). This paradigm of fear and control manipulates the expression of creativity in *1984*. Because the government strictly focuses on internal continuity and an abhorrence of change, many creative processes are strongly discouraged, especially in regard to the Outer Party members and the

Proles. The creativity present in *1984* tends to be artistic in nature and involves the manipulation of words. Artistic creativity is paramount to people's daily lives, particularly those in Smith's sphere of Outer Party acquaintances. Those who work with him in the Records Department alter dangerous or contradictory information in order to "reconstruct the past" so that Big Brother's current opinion remains his single recorded opinion (Orwell 43). In addition, the Ministry of Truth's:

> primary job [is] . . . to supply the citizens of Oceania with newspapers, film, textbooks, telescreens programs, plays, novels – with every conceivable kind of information, instruction, or entertainment, from a statue to a slogan, from a lyric poem to a biological treatise, and from a child's spelling book to a Newspeak dictionary. And the Ministry had not only to supply the multifarious needs of the Party, but also to repeat the whole operation at a lower level for the benefit of the proletariat. (Orwell 43)

As in *Brave New World*, the government monitors ideas released to the general public to control what ideas influence the people's mindsets.

Much of what the public is allowed to see is altered to be devoid of any meaning and, as Oscar Wilde puts it in his essay *The Soul of Man*, "degenerates into a low and ignoble form of craft" (Wilde 248). Any classic books or poems from the past that "[have] become ideologically offensive but . . . [are] to be retained in the anthologies" the government "recall[s] and [rewrites] again and again, and [are] invariably reissued" once they conform to the Party's opinion (Orwell 42, 40). During the revision process, books are translated into Newspeak, a language of the Party's creation. In this debased form of English, the government has severely reduced lexical diversity as adjectives become simplified to the most basic descriptors. As a result, the works of "various writers, such as Shakespeare, Milton, Swift, Byron, Dickens, and some others" exist only in a bastardized form where their beauty has been eliminated, and so the public is safe from their notions (Orwell 311). If fragments of their original text survive the purge, the future

transition from Oldspeak to Newspeak will render "such fragments . . . unintelligible and untranslatable" (Orwell 310).

The Party produces novel works of inanity in addition to reducing art from the past to mere drivel. A versificator, or a "special kind of kaleidoscope," composes newspapers, novelettes and songs – with no human input whatsoever – for the proletarian[23] class (Orwell 43). Smith condemns "It was only an 'opeless fancy,"[24] one song composed by the machine, as "dreadful rubbish" (Orwell 138). The lyrics, transcribed on the page with a cockney accent overlaid onto the words, exude sentimentality and invoke clichéd conventions about lost love with every line. Simplistic internal and end rhymes contribute to the song's sophomoric sound. The song does not become "almost pleasant" to Smith's ear until a proletarian washerwoman breathes life into the song (Orwell 138).

Snippets of other songs and rhymes – the song "Under the spreading chestnut tree"[25] and the rhyme "Oranges and lemons"[26] in particular – float through the air; as he hears them, Smith is left with the impression that they are of an indescribable value. "Under the spreading chestnut tree" plays over the telescreens in the "ill-omened" Chestnut Tree Café, a local "haunt of painters and musicians" where Smith stops for the occasional gin (Orwell 55). The stanza Smith overhears follows a long 'e' end rhyme; the repetition present in the stanza not only through the end rhyme, but also through the first line and of words throughout the second and third lines reinforces the haunting nature of the song.[27] The lyrics present a threat to the listener: they hint at an inescapable betrayal from those best loved. The rhyme "Oranges and lemons," on the other

[23] Also referred to as proles
[24] See Appendix 3.1
[25] See Appendix 3.2
[26] See Appendix 4
[27] "Under the spreading chestnut tree" plays twice in *1984*, but in similar contexts. Both times, the song is played in the Chestnut Tree Café in the presence of a former rebel who has been reconverted to believe in the Party. The first time, the rebels are Jones, Rutherford, and Aaronson, three men who allegedly joined the Brotherhood and committed treasonous acts against the Party. The second time, the rebel is Smith himself.

hand, crafts a story around a list of four important London churches. The narrative is simple and develops primarily to maintain an internal rhyme with each successive church's name. No character but O'Brien can remember and repeat back the entirety of the rhyme, but the final couplet remains with those with partial memories: "Here comes a candle to light you to bed, / Here comes a chopper to chop off your head!" (Orwell 99).

"Under the spreading chestnut tree" and "Oranges and lemons" prompt a recognition of "something hard [for Smith] to describe" but evocative of nostalgia and beauty (Orwell 77). A recitation of the rhyme gave one "the illusion of actually hearing bells, the bells of a lost London that still existed somewhere or other," while the melody accompanying "Under the spreading chestnut tree" appears as "a cracked and jeering note, a yellow note . . . or perhaps it was only a memory taking on the semblance of sound" (Orwell 100, 293). In both cases, Smith believes he can hear an unutterable or imagined element. The intangible quality Smith cannot describe resonates with him in such a way that the manufactured song "It was only an 'opeless fancy" cannot. The "yellow note" lingers in Smith's mind and captures his imagination, whereas "It was only an 'opeless fancy" passes out of his mind as soon as he is distracted from the washerwoman's singing.

The Party restricts items of artistic creativity that hearken back to a previous era and that promote individualistic thinking. These objects must be searched for in "frowsy little junk shop[s]," the likes of which are not officially recognized by the Party (Orwell 6). Smith, in his wanderlust in the beginning of the dystopia, finds a steel-engraved painting and a coral paperweight in one such antique shop. The former strikes him as interesting because of its detailed depiction of another almost pastoral lifestyle, one without overpopulation and want. The engraving appeals to Smith's fancy, but the paperweight captures his curiosity. "It's a

beautiful thing," Smith muses to the shopkeeper Charrington as he first examines it (Orwell 95). The "peculiar softness . . . in both the color and the texture of the glass," as well as the central piece of coral suspended in the center endear him to the object, which he buys immediately and slips into his pocket (Orwell 95). Most significantly, it appears to Smith as "a message from a hundred years ago, if one knew how to read it" (Orwell 145). The "strange, pink, convoluted object that recalled a rose or a sea anemone" continues to haunt Smith's thinking throughout the novel, even after its destruction (Orwell 95).

Literary creativity weighs heavily on Smith; he reveres it and its products as precious and awe-inspiring. One book that Smith treats with care is *The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism,* a "compendium of all the heresies" dedicated to overthrowing the State and authored by traitor Emmanuel Goldstein (Orwell 13). Approximately 30 pages from what the public refers to as "*the book*" are excerpted in *1984* (Orwell 13). As prose, the text is didactic as one would expect from a political handbook. Instead of presenting original material, *the book* iterates instructions on how to run a country reminiscent to the Party's own policies. While *the book* tells Smith "nothing . . . new," it still "fascinate[s]" and "reassure[s]" him (Orwell 200). He takes comfort from reading the book, secure in the knowledge that "it was the product of a mind similar to his own" and so he is not alone (Orwell 200).

In the same antiques shop where he finds the paperweight and the engraving, Smith finds a "peculiarly beautiful book. . .[with] smooth creamy paper": a blank diary (Orwell 6). This book inspires within him "an overwhelming desire to possess it" (Orwell 6). It is inside this relic that Smith chronicles his thoughts, feelings and memories; the act of writing with "an archaic instrument" – a pen – on "beautiful creamy pages" becomes "the only artistic expedient available to Smith" (Orwell 6, Orwell 6, Meckier, "Poetry in the Future" 38). Smith's writings begin as

panicked ramblings. There is little usage of proper grammar; instead, it flows as if he merely records his internal commentary. As Smith grows accustomed to the use of a diary, his writing matures into highly stylized prose that documents memories of his past as well as his musings on the current state of Oceania.

On the surface the Party appears conflicted about creativity: while it does not like the presence of aesthetics, the Party supports creative products and procedures when they are applied to further the government's policy. The Party encourages its employees at the Ministry of Truth, and particularly the Records Department, to be imaginative when updating and replacing obsolete information. Any high art with iconoclastic notions is transformed into a lower form through translation into Newspeak. Even this destruction of literary art can be seen as a form of creativity; the old product is changed into a new one. After the translation extracts the message that serves the Party's needs, those in charge destroy the remnants of the original text. Additionally, the use of Newspeak is debilitating to any message other than what is preapproved by the Party. By restricting an author's vocabulary to a limited set of possibilities, "Oceania devises a[n infallible] . . . method . . . for stopping authors from writing as they please" (Meckier, "Poetry in the Future" 38).

In the end, the Party opposes creativity. Any association with a creative outlet is strongly discouraged, and official Party jobs limit interaction with creativity. The composition of popular songs occurs "without any human intervention whatever," instead relegated to a versificator (Orwell 138). Such songs must be written to fulfill the public's demand, but the Party would rather assign a machine than a human the task. Other more despicable and corrupting forms – such as pornography – are created solely for the proles' enjoyment. Party members, "other than whose who [work] on it," are forbidden "to look at" it (Orwell 43). The small act of opening a

diary "[is] not illegal," but only because "nothing [is] illegal, since there [are] no longer any laws" (Orwell 6). Nevertheless, a severe penalty exists for being caught with unendorsed art: "if detected it was reasonably certain that it would be punished by death, or at least by twenty-five years in a forced-labor camp" (Orwell 6). Furthermore, the Party believes creativity unnecessary for their society. O'Brien declares to Smith about the future of Oceania:

> "There will be no art, no literature, no science. When we are omnipotent we shall have no more need of science. There will be no distinction between beauty and ugliness. There will be no curiosity, no employment in the process of life. All competing pleasures will be destroyed." (Orwell 267)

O'Brien remains adamant that there is no need for creativity within the Party. As Smith reflects earlier in the novel, "The birds sang, the proles sang, the Party did not" and never will "sing" (Orwell 220).

FAHRENHEIT 451

Whereas the previous two dystopias, *Brave New World* and *1984,* centered on governments intrinsically involved in their subjects' daily lives, *Fahrenheit 451* features a central ruling system that specializes in a *laissez-faire* approach. Far from an overreaching and overly involved administration, the police, firemen, and the "family" hold authority to oversee the community. The police, despite being an official entity representing the government, are lackadaisical at their jobs. Police operations become fodder for a public spectacle, with high speed chases and manhunts treated as live entertainment to be exploited for every sensational moment possible. The firemen act as "custodians of [society's] peace of mind, [and as] . . . official censors, judges, and executors" when necessary (Bradbury 59). These men respond to alarms raised by members of the community who suspect the housing of illicit materials within other's houses; the firemen then go to the house, search for and destroy the materials before arresting any inhabitants on scene. Their authority inspires a universal fear in society: "So many

people are. Afraid of firemen, I mean," Clarisse comments to Guy Montag at their first meeting (Bradbury 7).

Despite this intimidation, the firemen do not hold command over society; entertainment does. Frequently, members of society turn to their "families," or the actors on screen during daily television shows, for constant companionship (Bradbury 49). These "relatives" interact with people through televisions that replace entire walls in a parlor (Bradbury 53). They become personalized to each individual through special virtual manipulators that change the sound and pixels around an actor's lips to match the name of the person watching. Mildred, for one, comes to feel closer to these imaginary people than she does with her husband or any people she reads about in books. Entertainment most often serves as a distraction from destabilizing or panic-inducing threats. Throughout the novel, vague intimations of war air on various radio stations, but only Montag takes notice of a fragment of the original announcement: "A radio hummed somewhere. '. . .war may be declared any hour. This country stands ready to defend its. . .'" (Bradbury 32). It is quickly superseded by the normal sensational programming. When war is declared and a bomb launched at the city, it is obstinately ignored by the media. Instead, "the family talked and talked and talked to [the people], . . . the family prattled and chatted and said [their] name[s] and smiled at [them] and said nothing of the bomb that was an inch, now half an inch, now a quarter inch from" devastating the city (Bradbury 159). Even as their world and their lives come to an end, the people in *Fahrenheit 451* cannot tear themselves away from the absorbing mass media.

The bland entertainment fed to the masses constitutes the bulk of creativity in *Fahrenheit 451*. The wall-TVs act as distribution centers for scripted programming, live reality shows, and musical extravaganzas. These centers promote an immersion experience, where the viewer's life

merges with what is shown on screen; Mildred describes the experience as being “just like this room wasn’t ours at all, but all kinds of exotic people’s rooms” (Bradbury 20-21). Keeping up with the shows is an all-consuming task; the public spends more time learning about their “relatives” than they do those who live with them or exist around them. Meanwhile, the relatives “that [live] in those walls . . . [say] nothing, nothing, nothing and [say] it loud, loud, loud . . . No matter when [Montag] came in, the walls were always talking to Mildred” (Bradbury 44). The shows featured on the wall-TVs specialize in filling the time with meaningless content to please the most people possible. When questioned by Montag about a play in which she will participate, Mildred describes the interactive experience as such:

> They write the script with one part missing. It’s a new idea. The homemaker, that’s me, is the missing part. When it comes time for the missing lines, they all look at me out of the three walls and I say the lines. Here, for instance, the man says, “What do you think of this whole idea, Helen?” And he looks at me sitting here in center stage, see, And I say, I say –’ She paused and ran her finger under a line on the script. “‘I think that’s fine!’ And then they go on with the play until he says, ‘Do you agree to that Helen?’ and I say, ‘I sure do!’ . . .
> “What’s the play about?” [Montag asks.]
> “I just told you. There are these people called Bob and Ruth and Helen.” (Bradbury 20)

When pressed, Mildred cannot describe any central plot. In fact, no program on the air has a discernable plot. Instead, the editors rely on brevity and overdone musical cues to signify the passage of events. “Thunderstorm[s] of sound [gush] from the walls” of apartments, blasting any listeners “at such an immense volume” that the recipient feels as if he were “drown[ing] in music and pure cacophony,” a phenomenon that creates a false sense of conclusion and catharsis (Bradbury 45). When the wall-TVs are not in use, people switch over to Seashells, earbuds that act as receivers for radio programming. In this way, the inhabitants of *Fahrenheit 451*’s world are constantly bombarded with absurdities. Society’s position on creativity boils down to one essential statement made by Beatty: “I just like solid entertainment” (Bradbury 61).

Literature has disappeared in such a society. As the world population grows, books that "could afford to be different" in the past now merely insult the minorities of society (Bradbury 54). Authors become regarded as "full of evil thoughts" and are forced to "lock up [their] typewriters" or fear enraging the masses (Bradbury 57). Comic books are the officially endorsed literature of the age, but stashes of forbidden and smuggled literature exist hidden away in bibliophiles' attics and air conditioning vents. The catalog of forbidden or inflammatory books encapsulates "a million" titles, with many reported as found each night (Bradbury 34). At various houses, Montag encounters "fountain[s] of books" that topple over him, with the stream including classic novels (Bradbury 36). Countless unnamed and unattributed books that make up several of the destroyed libraries; Montag's own personal collection contains "small [books], fairly large ones, yellow, red, green ones. When he [is] done [removing them from his hiding spot] he look[s] down upon some twenty books lying at his wife's feet" (Bradbury 65-66).

All books mentioned, while having been preserved for a long enough amount of time to be read and enjoyed by someone in *Fahrenheit 451*, are fated to be incinerated. At the beginning of the novel, Montag kids to Clarisse, "Monday burn Millay, Wednesday Whitman, Friday Faulkner, burn 'em to ashes, then burn the ashes. That's our official slogan" (Bradbury 8). Society's solution to differing points of view is to embrace fire's sterilizing and consuming nature and "burn [it] all, burn everything" (Bradbury 60). Popular mentality views "a book [as] a loaded gun in the house next door" and their response is to "burn it. Take the shot from the weapon. Breach man's mind" (Bradbury 58). Instituted laws follow suit. All products of creativity must agree with each other or face the flames. As a result, all endorsed art follows the tradition set by *Brave New World* and *1984*; it becomes lowered to a "pastepudding norm" or "a nice blend of vanilla tapioca" (Bradbury 54, 57). However, in *Fahrenheit 451,* the society, not

the government, enforces its own demarcation and destruction of high art in favor of low: "It didn't come from the Government down. There was no dictum, no declaration, no censorship, to start with, no! Technology, mass exploitation, and minority pressure carried the trick, thank God," Beatty crows (Bradbury 58). The firemen's system operates based on alarms turned in by watchful neighbors and spouses. Again, society's grievance with high art is that it promotes individualistic thinking and the formation of a unique identity.

WALDEN TWO

As a professed utopia, *Walden Two* wholeheartedly embraces pure artistic creativity. "Art flourishes here," Frazier proudly boasts to Burris (Skinner, *Walden Two* 23). Located throughout the utopia's compound are "reading rooms, libraries," "acceptable galleries" according to Burris's judgment, and theaters devoted to promoting the arts (Skinner, *Walden Two* 34, 23). Housed within these spaces is a medley of art not only from the outside world, but also created by members of Walden Two. Burris is amazed by all the

> [a]nnouncements of meetings, parties, concerts, matches, and so on, [that] were caught under clips in their appropriate places. A few which I recall, not all of the intelligible to me, read: "Hedda Gabler," "Curran's Group," "Boston Symphony," "Truck Ride to Canton," "Youngsters' Dance," "AGL," "News Group," "Tap," and "Walden Code." (Skinner, *Walden Two* 77)

This assortment, including those from outside and those from within, is respected as art in the community. Even the play "The Man Who Bored Everybody" – written by a member of Walden Two as an instructional tool for the implementation of a new rule against boredom – is thoroughly enjoyed as a play. Concerts remain brief and center on the music at hand: "A piece of music," Frazier dictates to Burris, "is an experience to be taken by itself" (Skinner, *Walden Two* 78). Ample opportunity to enjoy works of creativity is offered to everyone. If a dramatic

work or performance interests the entire 1,000-member community, "it's simply [displayed or] repeated until we have all seen it" (Skinner, *Walden Two* 35).

This respect extends to the quality of creative works. Walden Two "pride[s itself] on having the best books [in its library], if not the most. . . . The result is a collection that never misses fire," with the same principle applying to all other mediums (Skinner, *Walden Two* 111-112). According to the observing Burris, the creative scene in Walden Two contains all anyone could desire. The library's collection holds "most of the books [he] had always wanted to read" as opposed to the detective stories to which he has been subjected in the past for want of time or effort (Skinner, *Walden Two* 301). Art galleries are filled with pleasing and intriguing pieces ranging from pictures to "small sculptures," and the galleries transcend their boundaries, with "most of the personal rooms [also] contain[ing] pictures or sculptures on loan from a common collection" (Skinner, *Walden Two* 142). Burris calls some pictures "fairly ambitious," but he does not say whether he is commenting on their size, scale, or artistic quality (Skinner, *Walden Two* 142). The musicians he meets during his stay profess "both competence and poise" despite their youth (Skinner, *Walden Two* 201). In fact, a solid majority of Walden Two's inhabitants seem to be creative in some respect.

It is the musical scene that captures Burris the most; when hearing a local group perform three of the choruses from Bach's *B Minor Mass*, Burris finds himself "wholly unprepared for [the performance], and [he] cowered as if [he] had received a physical blow" (Skinner, *Walden Two* 85). Finding himself overwhelmed by the spectacle, Burris tenses and becomes unable to move, much less "remember much of the chorus," until the end of the performance, when other audience members salute the singers by "clapping energetically" (Skinner, *Walden Two* 85). Skinner tries to describe the great power of the arts on the soul, much as Huxley does in *Brave*

New World. Burris reacts to the *B Minor Mass* as Watson and John react to Shakespeare: with an uncontrollable physical reaction at first, followed by an unrestrained emotional release. However, Skinner's description is weak in comparison with Huxley's writing; he cannot accurately grasp exactly what the soul is experiencing during Burris's crisis of creativity. Whereas Watson and John become active during and because of their art, Burris merely freezes in its presence.

Overall, Walden Two embraces its role as a place of "patronage of the arts" (Skinner, *Walden Two* 80). Artistic creativity is incorporated into daily life through the ever-present galleries, libraries, and performances. "Some sort of music . . . and a philosophical, poetic, or religious work" is performed at weekly Sunday meetings meant to simulate religious gatherings (Skinner, *Walden Two* 185). There is no outward limitation on acceptable types of creative products; all appear to be accepted and encouraged by society. Frazier declares that Walden Two provides "the right conditions" of "leisure," "opportunity," and "appreciation" that are needed to foster a creative community (Skinner, *Walden Two* 80, 84). As members work only four hours a day, they are free to devote the rest of their time to the "little diversion[s]" that are their interests (Skinner, *Walden Two* 300). This fundamental principle in the structure of Walden Two, Frazier argues, allows for a person to "go as far as [he or she] like[s] . . . [in devoting] all the time and energy [one] can give to [learning and perfecting one's skill at] music and remain healthy" (Skinner, *Walden Two* 81). In this instance, Frazier specifies music, but insists that "we don't specialize in anything. We have time for everything" (Skinner, *Walden Two* 81). If Frazier is to be believed, then the majority of Walden Two members are proficient in multiple artistic media.

Skinner and, in *Walden Two,* Frazier maintain that creating an ethically engaged community through a sense of order and decorum is “simply a matter of behavioral engineering” (Skinner, *Walden Two* 93). Behavioral engineering is a concept based on Skinner’s own psychological theory formulated in the 1930s; Skinner posits that, “. . . it should be possible to *produce* behavior according to plan simply by arranging the proper conditions” (Skinner, “Freedom and the Control of Men” 58). In behaviorism, it is believed that action patterns can be crafted through a judicious use of operant conditioning. In conditioning, a neutral stimulus is paired with a reinforcement or a punishment.[28] Behaviorism is applied to all aspects of educational circumstances, including ethical and intellectual schooling. Frazier believes the correct compensation to being unable to “foresee all future circumstances . . . [or] specify adequate future conduct” is to instill in his citizens “certain behavioral processes which will lead the individual to design his own ‘good’ conduct when the time comes” (Skinner, *Walden Two* 96).

Frazier’s acceptance that the unknown cannot be predicted accommodates a greater amount of creativity in Walden Two. As in *Brave New World*, the society of Walden Two allows the population to involve themselves in scientific creativity. Research and experiments are widely performed – hence the creation of the separate label Scientist for some – and their results are incorporated into daily life when possible. This research focuses on any topic, from societal efficiency such as how to carry one’s tea to a table to improving the methods in behavioral engineering. Frazier professes one of his personal goals is “. . . to make a genuine science of human behavior” that can be studied in the Walden Two community (Skinner, *Walden*

[28] Skinner uses the terms reinforcement and punishment differently than their common meanings. To give a reinforcement is to provide something in response to a behavior. However, this gift can result in the behavior either increasing or decreasing in frequency. A punishment is the withdrawal of some stimuli, which can again result in the behavior either increasing or decreasing in frequency. The result is contingent on a consistent outcome.

Two 274). Additionally, the utopian society creates a "great productive culture" for artistic creativity and a willing and nonjudgmental audience without glorifying the products (Skinner, *Walden Two* 81). In sharing the creation, praise, and appreciation of the arts, Frazier claims that Walden Two is entering "the dawn – the dawn, at least, of a Golden Age" in creativity (Skinner, *Walden Two* 83).

In *Brave New World, 1984,* and *Fahrenheit 451*, creativity becomes divided in two categories: banal, mindless entertainment and a dangerous expression of individuality. Banal forms of entertainment, endorsed by the reigning governments, act to maintain the status quo. However, they contain little to no artistic value. The dystopian protagonists often despise this low art, choosing to immerse themselves in high art. The World State, the Party, and the firemen attribute a dangerous individuality to high art. According to these governments, the smallest sense of individuality is a threat to society; as a result, they work to eliminate any high art available to the public. *Walden Two*, on the other hand, does not distinguish these two categories. Instead, Frazier proclaims that the utopian society supports all creativity and art. Although it does not have any banal art as *Brave New World* and *Fahrenheit 451* do, Walden Two does not shelter any outstanding new art. More than anything, Frazier emphasizes the communal nature of creation in Walden Two.

CHAPTER TWO

Dystopias and the Domain-Individual-Field Interaction Model

As seen in the last chapter, products of creativity saturate the cultures in *Brave New World, 1984, Fahrenheit 451* and *Walden Two.* The dystopias accept low forms of creativity but abhor higher, more dangerous forms of creativity. This high art fundamentally scares dystopian governments, and so they forbid its presence. Despite this precaution toward creativity, it continues to survive on the fringes of society. To demonstrate this, I will show how Mihalyi Csikszentmihalyi's psychological model of creativity, the so-called Domain-Individual-Field Interaction Model, is present in each of my selected texts. As long as the domain, individual, and field are present in society, so is creativity, no matter what the government mandates. Using the model, I will explain how a union of all three elements of the model results in an act of unrestrained creativity.

THE DOMAIN-INDIVIDUAL-FIELD INTERACTION MODEL

I base my study of creativity on Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi's theory of creativity, the Domain-Individual-Field Interaction (DIFI) Model, and his definition of creativity as the creation of something novel that has value. The model does not seek to explain a specific process by which art is produced, but rather the circumstances that result in creativity. According to the model, creativity occurs when three main elements – the individual, the domain, and the field – interact. Csikszentmihalyi's model focuses more on creativity's context than the individual's process because a tendency in the psychology of creativity to focus on the person behind the creativity.

An individual "provide[s] variations in a domain" (Csikszentmihalyi "The Domain of Creativity" 150). Such an individual generates unique art and "convince[s] the field that her

variations are an original extension on previous performances" already included in a domain (Csikszentmihalyi "The Domain of Creativity" 146). An individual can juggle several projects at once and often possesses traits or characteristics consistent with other creative individuals' (Feldman, Csikszentmihalyi, and Gardner). Despite encouraging further investigation into an individual's role in creativity, Csikszentmihalyi stresses the importance of context for creativity; the individual, in his opinion, is not necessarily the most important component of creativity. In his explanations of the DIFI model, Csikszentmihalyi explains the domain and field elements in more depth than that of the individual.

The domain refers to a "formally organized body of knowledge associated with a given field" (Feldman, Csikszentmihalyi, and Gardner 20). An independent entity, a domain exists outside the people involved with creativity; the products and cumulative knowledge stored in a domain have their own history and inform future generations of creative people (Feldman, Csikszentmihalyi, and Gardner; Csikszentmihalyi "The Domain of Creativity"). Boundaries between various domains "[are] often a matter of convenience" and can depend on the ruling of a particular person or field (Csikszentmihalyi "The Domain of Creativity" 153).

The products of creativity must be monitored and adjudicated; the body of people who do so are the field. Csikszentmihalyi refers to these people as "gatekeepers" to the domain, who "decid[e] whether an individual's performance meets the criteria of the domain … [or] whether [a] … performance that departs from the standard rules of the domain is 'creative' … or whether it is simply 'deviant'" (Csikszentmihalyi "The Domain of Creativity" 146, 146). According to the creativity psychologist, the field's first and foremost duty is to preserve the domain, with its addition and evolution a secondary function. He emphasizes the importance of proactive

behavior: "a reactive field," Csikszentmihalyi writes, "does not solicit or stimulate novelty" (*Creativity* 43).

In multiple works, Csikszentmihalyi proposes that creativity cannot be achieved until the three elements of the individual, domain, and field are present and interacting with each other. Because the individual "has traditionally been the focus of psychological research," Csikszentmihalyi chooses to focus on how creativity depends on "a contextual judgment" of creativity as a whole (Feldman, Csikszentmihalyi, and Gardner 24, 22). Therefore, the context surrounding and defining an individual's experiences – the domain and field – must be looked at "in relation to each other, as well as independently" in the study of creativity (Feldman, Csikszentmihalyi, and Gardner 25). Interaction is the key principle for Csikszentmihalyi; since "the causal chain [of creativity] is not a simple linear progression from individual variation to social selection to cultural retention and transmission," we must instead look at how it is the collective force of the individual, domain, and field that results in creativity (Csikszentmihalyi "The Domain of Creativity" 149).

I will trace how the DIFI model manifests itself in the dystopias *Brave New World, 1984,* and *Fahrenheit 451*. The three elements of creativity Csikszentmihalyi outlines as well as their effects can be found in the treatment of artistic creativity in dystopias. I identify Helmholtz Watson (*Brave New World*), John the Savage (*Brave New World*), Winston Smith (*1984*), and Guy Montag (*Fahrenheit 451*) as the four individuals who can be measured against the DIFI model.[29] I will first look at the creative individuals, noting the context surrounding them and their initial predisposition to creativity. Next, I will follow their exposure to the domain and how they change as a result. I will then examine the field that the individuals cultivate around them;

[29] I chose these four characters based on their involvement with creativity in each of the novels. I highlight John and Watson in *Brave New World* because they happen to be two characters who work with creativity in fundamentally different ways. In *1984* and *Fahrenheit 451,* however, only one character works with creativity to a similar extent.

revealing how the field judges the domain will in turn reveal more about the characters themselves. Finally, I show that it is only after a union of these elements has been achieved that a final creative gesture is made, and I also examine the use and quality of that creativity. It is important to note that only the interaction among all three elements results in a creative outburst. As Csikszentmihalyi outlines in his model, the three elements do not unite in a precise causal chain. The characters I highlight do not necessarily conform to the DIFI model in the order I discuss it, but the precise order is not essential for creativity. It is only the interaction that leads the characters to their final creative action.

Brave New World

In my discussion of *Brave New World,* I follow John the Savage, a visitor to the World State, and Helmholtz Watson, an Alpha-Plus Emotional Engineer. Both men are defined by their involvement with creativity. John embodies the potential influence high art has on Fordian society and vice versa; his obsession with Shakespeare destabilizes Fordian society, but living in the World State ends up destroying him. Watson, and his foray into high forms of creativity, represents the struggle that high art must take to become a force in the World State.

Throughout his life, John the Savage treasures his connection to creativity, and particularly to high art. Because he is raised on a Native American Reservation, Malpais, in New Mexico, John grows up primarily in isolation from creativity. The inhabitants of the Malpais Reservation do not encourage literacy – it is not a part of their Native American ancestors' traditions – and, as a result, cannot enjoy Shakespeare. Creativity on the reservation takes the form of the music that accompanies religious events, "summer dances," and crafts such as basket-weaving and molding pottery plate wear (Huxley 131).

Because of his isolation from Fordian society, he is also sheltered from the majority of its propaganda. John's mother Linda teaches him how to read at an early age, first using "pictures on the wall," then simple sentences like "THE CAT IS ON THE MAT" and "THE TOT IS IN THE POT" (Huxley 129). For some time, all he had to look at was *The Chemical and Bacteriological Conditioning of the Embryo. Practical Instructions for Beta Embryo-Store Workers*, an instructional manual from Linda's former job. This experience, combined with Linda's half-remembered hypnopædic rhymes and songs, constitutes the majority of his exposure to creativity until he discovers Shakespeare.

Frustrated by the difficult words and technicality of the manual, John does not pick up reading until he is given *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* around his twelfth birthday. The Bard's words entice John: they

> rolled through his mind; rumbled, like the drums at the summer dances, if the drums could have spoken; like the men singing the Corn Song, beautiful, beautiful, so that you cried; like old Mitsima saying magic over his feathers and his carved sticks and his bits of bone and stone – *kiathla tsilu silokwe silokwe silokwe. Kiai silu silu, tsithl* – but better than Mitsima's magic, because it meant more, because it talked to *him*; talked wonderfully and only half-understandably, a terrible beautiful magic, about Linda; about Linda lying there snoring, with the empty cup on the floor beside the bed; about Linda and Popé, Linda and Popé. (Huxley 131-132)

John immediately connects with Shakespeare's message, despite only understanding half of the words used. The words' rhythm and beauty echo in his mind, reminding him of magic. But this magic is special: it is personalized to his experience, "talk[ing] to *him* [*sic*]" about his life and informing his actions. John feels this way every time he reads Shakespeare. The experience shakes him, and, as a result, he wholeheartedly absorbs what the text says.

John's connection to Shakespeare's works is unique in *Brave New World*. No one else values the appeal of this exemplar of high art. Others on the Malpais Reservation who may have

appreciated the beauty of the language cannot; they cannot read and, moreover, have no patience for John or his interests. The tome exists on the Reservation forgotten and untouched "for hundreds of years" in a chest before Popé rediscovers it (Huxley 131). Because of her upbringing, Linda cannot and will not value Shakespeare. Upon looking at it, she declares the book "to be full of nonsense" (Huxley 131). It is "uncivilized" and therefore not worth her time (Huxley 131). Marx and Crowne become confused when John begins to recite verse. Both refuse to respect the subject matter and so are lost to John. Only Watson and Mond come close to John's adoration of the plays, but their attention stretches merely to the beauty of the words themselves. The torturous love affairs and tragic familial miscommunications fail to excite any emotion other than hilarity and ridicule in Watson or Mond. Any meaning behind Shakespeare's words cannot be sincerely felt because of their prior conditioning favoring promiscuity and degrading the family.

Helmholtz Watson, unlike John, matures entirely indoctrinated by the World State. He has spent his childhood and adult life exposed to the hypnopædic rhymes dictating his tendencies; he has been an exemplary citizen until the onset of *Brave New World*. "This Escalator-Squash champion, this indefatigable lover . . . , this admirable committee man and best mixer" cannot do wrong in the World State (Huxley 67). He participates in all that is required of him and more, assuming command and making "every centimeter [of him] an Alpha-Plus" and therefore a most desirable man (Huxley 67). In addition, he has had traditional training in the World State's endorsed creativity, presumably studying the form and style of creation of hypnopædia in preparation for his jobs.

Watson works as a lecturer for the Department of Writing in the College of Emotional Engineering and as an Emotional Engineer. He immerses himself in the creative process, writing

"for *The Hourly Radio* [and] compos[ing] feely scenarios" in addition to his professorial duties (Huxley 67). What distinguishes him from others is his "happiest knack for slogans and hypnopædic rhymes" (Huxley 67). His abilities far outdistance those of his peers and cause his superiors to say he is "'Able . . . . Perhaps,' (and they would shake their heads, would significantly lower their voices,) 'a little *too* able'" (Huxley 67). Watson's prowess sets him apart from his colleagues; however, when he notices this separation, he becomes "uncomfortably aware of being himself" and of "his mental excess" (Huxley 67).

This self-awareness directs Watson toward a search for deeper meaning, driving him further into creativity. "Sport, women, communal activities" become "second bests" to his interest "in something else," something intangible, and something he is unable to describe, but distinctly linked to his writing (Huxley 67). As a creative individual, he cannot sustain the illusion that what he currently writes is important. "Can you say something about nothing?" he asks Marx during one of their conversations (Huxley 70). Consequently, he experiments with his lifestyle, "cutting all [his] committees and all [his] girls," and feels as a result the "very odd" effect of "some sort of extra power" (Huxley 68, 68, 69). He experiences

> "a queer feeling I sometimes get, a feeling that I've got something important to say and the power to say it – only I don't know what it is, and I can't make any use of the power. If there was some different way of writing . . . Or else something else to write about . . . . You see," he went on at last, "I'm pretty good at inventing phrases – … they seem so new and exciting even though they're about something hypnopædically obvious. But that doesn't seem enough. It's not enough for the phrases to be good; what you make with them ought to be good too. " (Huxley 69)

It is this final realization about the quality of his life's work that prompts Watson to actively question his place in his domain. He realizes that he has the ability to "do something much more important. Yes, and more intense, more violent," but struggles to find a method of execution (Huxley 70). As Watson comes to terms with the banality of the World State's creativity, he

pushes himself away from its low art defined as creativity. With his recognition of the need for purposeful actions, Watson begins to develop an independent sense of self.

John the Savage is exposed to his domain through his upbringing. Beginning with the highly technical and unentertaining manual, his domain expands into *The Complete Works of Shakespeare* when Linda's lover Popé leaves the book at his home. After reading a random quatrain from *Hamlet*,[30] John is entranced by the lyrical words and quickly discards his previous reading materials as inadequate. Shakespeare's works assume great importance to John; he takes comfort in his peers not "know[ing] what reading is" and uses this as a shield so he can "pretend that he [does not] mind when [the others make] fun of him" (Huxley 130). The plays remain his source of consolation when his expectations of Crowne are thwarted. When she ruins his illusion of her as a paragon of purity, John locks himself away in his room, isolating himself from society in order to reread *Othello*. He has complete faith that Shakespeare is the answer to all his questions.

To understand the world around him, especially when he journeys into the World State, John applies concrete and abstract concepts learned from Shakespeare to what he sees. To him, the idea of a world with advanced technology and forever-beautiful people – the world he knows from Linda's rose-colored remembrances of the World State – is fantastic and wonderful. When trying to make sense of the *soma* distribution during his tour of the World State, he asks, "'What's in those' (remembering *The Merchant of Venice*) 'those caskets?'" (Huxley 164). Most notably, John compares the "feely" *Three Weeks in a Helicopter* to the plot of *Othello*: "Othello, he remembered, was like the hero of [the feely] – a black man" whose passions overrun him (Huxley 171). He labels his world according to Shakespeare's definitions. Even the name John

---

[30] Nay, but to live / In the rank sweat of an enseamed bed, / Stew'd in corruption, honeying and making love / Over the nasty sty . . . (Huxley 131; originally from Act Three, Scene Four in *Hamlet*)

bestows on the World State – “brave new world” – is a line borrowed from Miranda in *The Tempest* (Huxley 139). He wholeheartedly believes in notions of purity, honor, suffering and love – notions that, to the World State, are outdated and pornographic.

The act of reading Shakespeare becomes a religious experience to John. He treats his copy of *The Complete Works* “with religious care” and devoutly defines his life from the morals and values drawn from his readings (Huxley 171). He applies the rationale abstracted from Shakespeare’s plays to his own situations, both on the Reservation and in the World State. At Malpais, he conflates Popé with Iago and Claudius before attempting to stab Popé with the kitchen knife and maps Romeo and Juliet’s consuming love affair onto his relationship with Crowne in Fordian society. He integrates Shakespeare’s ideas about anger and love into his beliefs. With his rage against Popé, “somehow it [is] as though he had never really hated him because he had never been able to say how much he hated him. But now he had these words . . . [that] gave him a reason for hating Popé; and they made his hatred more real” (Huxley 132). The presence of high art in John’s life enhances his perception of reality. What is real before pales in comparison as John sees the world made more dramatic, more tragic – more real – than ever. And he cannot help but live through this new lens of a creative mindset. It molds not only his thoughts, but also his speech patterns. He adopts a formalized Elizabethan English that is “faultless but peculiar” to hear (Huxley 116).

Shakespeare’s words more than resonate with John; they inspire him to action. “The magic was on his side, the magic explained and gave orders,” as quotes from various plays “suddenly” spring into his head during his encounters and inform his actions (Huxley 133). As he sees Popé lying in the bed with Linda, a line from Hamlet’s plotting of Claudius’s murder comes to mind seemingly unbidden: “*When he is drunk asleep, or in his rage / Or in the*

incestuous pleasure of his bed" (Huxley 133). Motivated by Hamlet's machinations, John stabs Popé in an attempt to kill him where he sleeps. He playacts his love for Crowne through his interpretive reading of *Romeo and Juliet* for Watson, "all the time . . . seeing himself as Romeo and Lenina as Juliet," and so raises her onto an impossibly high pedestal in his mind (Huxley 184). He cannot help but prove his admiration for her: in professing his love, he cries that "I wanted to *do* something first . . . I mean, to show I was worthy of [Crowne]. . . . I'd like to undergo something nobly" (Huxley 189-190). But when Crowne interprets his affections as a need for sex and responds in kind, John absolutely refuses to engage with her. Again unbidden, the "voice of conscience thunder[s] poetically" in his mind with a quote from *The Tempest* that renounces any attempt to "melt mine honour into lust" (Huxley 192). He "thrust[s] her roughly away at arm's length," yelling obscenities like "Whore!" and "Impudent strumpet" borrowed from Othello's ravings against his accused Desdemona (Huxley 194). Ultimately, he cedes to his Shakespearean impulses and deserts the World State in favor of his own "hermitage," where he is safe and isolated from the strange temptations the World State offers (Huxley 243).

John's outbursts occur when he is under extreme duress; at these times, the World State directly challenges his morals with temptations. His predominant temptation is Crowne. Her natural allure, combined with her entreaties to lead him into sin, test his resolve for his Shakespearean values and increase the amount of "ungratified personal desire" he must sublimate (Abrams 146). Sigmund Freud[31] proposes that this repression of John's libido must be sublimated in an appropriate "discharge of instinctual energy . . . through socially approved activities" (Webster's *Third International*, as cited in Skinner, *About Behaviorism* 153). Freud,

[31] Sigmund Freud is an Austrian psychologist and widely considered to be the father of psychoanalysis. His theories – particularly the Oedipal complex, the idea of repression and sublimation, and the id, ego, and superego – are often used in literary theory.

Skinner, and Keble[32] all cite creativity as an "outlet for passionate emotion" (Skinner, *About Behaviorism* 153). By yelling quotes from *Othello* at Crowne in a moment of passion, John transforms the energy from his repressed libido into an expression of creativity; he makes use of this "safety-valve" and prevents himself from acting on his impulses (Abrams 147).

As John explores the World State, officials expose him to their low art so he can publicly vindicate the improvement that their civilization represents over his savage homeland. He learns of their hypnopædic rhymes and slogans from visits to education centers and others' conversations in which phrases like "A gramme is better than a damn" naturally occur. Parties, outings, and other entertainment options are planned for his pleasure; at Marx's request, Crowne takes John to a club featuring a scent organ and "feely" combination. However, the experience does not impress John. He walks away from "feely" thinking that Crowne "ought [not] to see things like that" (Huxley 169). He dismisses these forms of creativity as crass, "base," and "ignoble" (Huxley 170). Even Watson's poem on solitude is passed over in favor of an excerpt from Shakespeare. "'Listen to *this*,' [is John's] answer" to Watson's recitation, and he proceeds to read out a verse from *Romeo and Juliet* (Huxley 182-183). When directly asked about his thoughts on creativity in the World State, John must fall back onto his Shakespearean knowledge to express himself:

> But the new ones [products of creativity] are so stupid and horrible [John whines to Mond]. Those plays, where there's nothing but helicopters flying about and you *feel* the people kissing." He made a grimace. "Goats and monkeys!" Only in Othello's words could he find an adequate vehicle for his contempt and hatred. (Huxley 219)

Coming from an education exclusively Shakespearean in nature, John cannot accept the World State's banal and low art in his domain.

[32] John Keble is an English poet and literary theorist.

Watson accepts more art into his own personal domain. He learns and absorbs the hypnopædic rhymes as do other Fordians, as well as the other artistic media present in the World State. It is assumed that out of all Fordians, Watson is one of a few who are the most familiar with the popular domain. His jobs at the Department of Writing and as a functional Emotional Engineer require constant exploration of what is new and popular. As such, he is less judgmental about the World State's creativity. However, he still cannot fathom that the low art available is all there is:

> Words can be like X-rays, if you use them properly – they'll go through anything. You read and you're pierced. That's one of the things I try to teach my students – how to write piercingly. But what on earth's the good of being pierced by an article about a Community Sing, or the latest improvement in scent organs? Besides, can you make words really piercing – you know, like the very hardest X-rays – when you're writing about that sort of thing? Can you say something about nothing? That's what it finally boils down to. I try and I try . . . (Huxley 70)

Watson echoes John's sentiments in this passage: piercing and unsettling words are sought-after qualities for him. But whereas John sees this through the high caliber of Shakespeare's writing, Watson must make do with the low art available to him. He knows that the current art – songs, rhymes, scent organs, and the like – is not sufficient to move him. He is willing to explore further to find art that will truly pierce him.

Furthermore, Watson actively participates in his domain. He adds material to it on a regular basis under the approval of the World State. Again, his career encourages and calls for him to contribute his own material. His rhymes, sayings, radio scripts and "feely" ideas make their way throughout culture into the endorsed domain, affecting almost all World State citizens in some way. But his most significantly creative contribution, his poem on solitude, is destined to be unknown by the public. The reprimand from his boss at the Department of Writing, as well

as the official sanction of exile by Mond, leads the reader to believe that that particular poem will never be seen by the public again.

His search for artistic quality leads him, through John, to Shakespeare. After he shares his poem with John, the Savage proudly shares his verses, beginning with an excerpt from Shakespeare's poem *The Phoenix and the Turtle*. The effect on Watson is immediate:

> At "sole Arabian tree" he started; at "thou shrieking harbinger" he smiled with sudden pleasure; at "every fowl of tyrant wing" the blood rushed up into his cheeks; but at "defunctive music" he turned pale and trembled with an unprecedented emotion. (Huxley 183)

He has a similar first reaction to Shakespeare as John did: first a physical shock, then being shaken with "an unprecedented emotion." Watson does not have quite the store of Shakespearean knowledge as John and so relies on John's readings for his exposure. Despite his appreciation of the writing – "taken detail by verbal detail, what a superb piece of emotional engineering!" he exclaims – Watson cannot revere the Bard as John does (Huxley 184). Because of his upbringing, Watson cannot take the subject matter seriously, and it becomes only a "smutty absurdity" to him (Huxley 185). In the eyes of John, Watson insults the work of Shakespeare by bursting into laughter. In spite of Watson's conditioning and his conditioned reaction to Shakespeare, Watson still appreciates the rationale behind the absurdity, "know[ing] quite well that one needs ridiculous, mad situations like that; one can't really write about anything else" (Huxley 185).

Watson and John rely on the same group of people for their field, a body of people who discuss and rate the art present in their domain. These two creative individuals form their own discussion group around an unenthusiastic Linda, an extremely reluctant Marx, and Mustapha Mond. Linda and Marx, both marked by their unwillingness to participate more than superficially, feature more as preservers of the current domain. The three primary members –

Watson, John, and Mond – have meaningful discussions about the quality of creativity and the status quo.

Linda marks John's induction into creativity; John owes her both his ability to read and, through her lover, his copy of *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. She tries to control the content of his domain by declaring that only what fragments she preserves from Fordian society are any good, whereas *The Complete Works* is "full of nonsense" and barely "good enough for [him] to practise [his] reading on" (Huxley 131). Past this, she assumes a completely passive role in John's field. She refuses to, and perhaps cannot, follow him into the wonders of Shakespeare. Once she returns to the World State, she is thrilled to rediscover *soma* and withdraws completely from the outer world until she asphyxiates from lung paralysis caused by her drug use.

Watson and John include Marx in their field because he is "the only man of [Watson's] acquaintance with whom he [and John] could talk about the subjects [they feel] to be important" (Huxley 99). Whenever the two men meet to talk, "it [is] always Watson who [does] all the talking" about his concerns, with Marx assuming the role of listener (Huxley 68). Although Marx is a part of the field, he is distinctly uncomfortable during discussions of art. His jealousy of John and Watson's friendship manifests in his "revenging himself" by interrupting John's recitations of Shakespeare with crude references to orgy-porgies (Huxley 183). These rude and unpleasant remarks during readings provoke John and Watson, securing their belief that the World State's low art is unbearably inane and that their high art is worth striving to capture. Ultimately, Marx cannot commit himself fully to their beliefs: he hesitates to support either Watson or John in their endeavors. He shows neither enthusiasm nor support for either of their quests for higher forms of art.

Watson and John “[take] to each other at once,” bonding over their search for something more in poetry (Huxley 182). Each offers the other a sympathetic and critical ear, ready to hear the other’s thoughts impartially and without judgment. Watson “immediately achiev[es]” an unprecedented level of “intimacy” with John as the two bond as kindred creative spirits (Huxley 182). The two share their domains with each other: John reads Shakespeare aloud to Watson, and Watson feels at ease presenting his poem to John. John encourages Watson’s curiosity and passion for high art, particularly in verse form. In turn, Watson unreservedly supports John’s addiction to Shakespeare and is devastated to learn John will not join him in exile in the Falkland Islands.

Mustapha Mond becomes the ultimate judge of the field in *Brave New World*. As the Resident Controller of Western Europe, Mond not only has access to all products of creativity in the domain, but he is also in a position of power to respond to them. He is “one of the very few” to have read Shakespeare and other forbidden tomes (Huxley 218). Mond frees himself to discuss the works with selected others, including Watson, John and, by an extension, Marx. He explains to the naïve Savage why the beautiful and the old art forms must be outlawed from proper society and enlightens him as to what to do next. Additionally, the Controller actively chooses what knowledge is allowed for public consumption. He appreciates “masterly piece[s] of work” but must censor them when determined to be “heretical . . ., dangerous and potentially subversive” (Huxley 177). Mond follows the romantic notion that “an inspired poem . . . is sudden, effortless, and complete, not because it is a gift from without, but because it grows of itself, within a region of the mind which is inaccessible either to awareness or control” (Abrams 192). If creativity is uncontrollable by those who wield it, the government certainly cannot

contain it. An uncontrollable entity is a threat to the perfectly preserved stability of the World State; it must go.

The fates of those who venture into heretically creative venues rest upon Mond as well. He banishes Watson and Marx to far-away islands filled with other threatening members of society – a new field whose members will support and appreciate their contributions. John, however is forced to stay in the World State:

> "I went to see the Controller this morning," said the Savage at last.
> "What for?"
> "To ask if I mightn't go to the islands with you."
> "And what did he say?" asked Watson eagerly.
> The Savage shook his head. "He wouldn't let me."
> "Why not?"
> "He said he wanted to go on with the experiment." (Huxley 242-243)

In controlling the fates of creative individuals in society, Mond also controls their production. If he allows a person such as Watson to continue living in the World State, Watson will eventually express his discomfort with society's standing in a more public forum than showing his poem to a class. This sets the stability of society at risk; more poems on solitude and freedom could unduly influence others to feel the same way. Before he realizes it, Mond will have a revolution led by the people. For the sake of preserving the status quo of Fordian society, Mond must determine exactly who, and therefore what, he will let remain in the World State.

John naturally combines his life with his domain. His exposure to Shakespeare's plays defines his life, and his actions meld with those of Shakespeare's protagonists. In attempting to kill Popé and woo Crowne, he takes his enactments of honor, rage, love, and betrayal to the extreme. But it is only after he meets Watson and tries to convey the sacred universality that, to him, is intrinsic in Shakespeare's works that John commits to the polarizing nature of his adopted values. After their discussions, John forcibly refuses Crowne's advances, shouting Othello's

insults of "Damned whore" and "Impudent strumpet" at her as she retreats to the bathroom (Huxley 194).

John actively tries to force his interpretation of the world onto others through his desperate efforts at freeing a group of Deltas from their *soma* ration. John cannot understand why a group of people choose to subjugate themselves to addiction. "Don't you want to be free and men?" John cries, "Don't you even understand what manhood and freedom are?" (Huxley 212-213). For John, freedom is essential. He cannot fathom a person, much less the horde of Deltas he confronts, who would trade their mental acuity for a blissful hazed hour of drug-induced pleasure. After receiving no response to his question, he says, "I'll teach you; I'll *make* you free whether you want to or not" (Huxley 213). This episode reflects his opinion of the World State. John refuses to accept that Fordians can bear to live in such a way, with no freedom to read or write as they like, or that they prefer trashy "feelies" or mindless *soma* vacations to the depth and beauty of Shakespearean plays.

Similarly, he refuses to let the society govern his actions: "I'll be damned if I'll go on being experimented with," he proclaims "with sudden fury" when he is denied the right to join Watson and Marx in exile (Huxley 243). Instead, John forsakes all society, choosing instead the silence of solitude and independence, and leaves to create his own hermitage in southern Surrey. There he deliberately spends his first night there "praying, now to that Heaven from which the guilty Claudius had begged forgiveness, now in Zuñi to Awomawilona, now to Jesus and Pookong, now to his own guardian animal, the eagle," all the time asking for forgiveness, goodness, and purity (Huxley 244). He swears to dedicate the rest of his life to upholding such tenets as he reads about in Shakespeare and punishing himself for momentary weaknesses of his with Crowne. Even here, his creativity surfaces; he finds himself singing as he works on tools

that will "make him independent of the outside world" (Huxley 246). The extremity of his actions and beliefs appear only after he completely absorbs Shakespeare's message and has the chance to share and discuss it with Marx, Watson, and Mond.

Watson unites with his field and domain more quickly, but less violently than John does. He uses his own will power, his knowledge of the World State's low art, and his sessions talking at Marx to channel his creativity into one action: writing and sharing a controversial poem with his class.[33] In his work, Watson wants to reconcile the style of popular low art with the deeper heretical theme of solitude. He follows a similar approach to that which popular songs take; he keeps a steady end rhyme in alternating lines to give the poem rhythm. His imagery is simple: from "sticks, but a broken drum" to "stopped machine[s]" and women's "arms and respective bosoms, / lips and, ah, posteriors," the visual images reflect the important yet vapid features of life in the World State (Huxley 181). At the same time, the poem tries to describe something more – "a presence" made of "so absurd an essence / that something, which is not, / nevertheless should populate / empty night more solidly / than that with which we copulate" (Huxley 181). However, the writing is labored, as if Watson struggles to grasp what he describes. The themes of silence, absence, and solitude are obviously new ones to him; Watson's treatment does not progress past his basic description and therefore lacks emotion. And yet, he realizes the fundamental importance of his thought, despite being "a marked man" for it (Huxley 180).

1984

Unlike *Brave New World*, the world of *1984* absolutely cannot tolerate purely artistic creativity. The government already takes steps to prevent pure art from surviving in culture, translating it instead into a compromised language to conform its message to the Party's latest

[33] See Appendix 5

opinion. Winston Smith, working as a modifier of past articles, sees the original and the edited versions of newspaper articles and struggles to reconcile the two without using doublethink. When facts change or official positions of Big Brother invert, one must employ doublethink: he should be able to recognize the change, accept it, and then forget that the change ever happened. A mental activity necessary for life in Oceania, doublethink requires a certain suggestibility in a person. Smith cannot master this process and so remembers multiple versions of events; the confusion that results drives him toward creativity. Like Watson, he struggles to find and create higher forms of art, but with less success because of the Party's thoroughness in nullifying or destroying any potential high art before it enters the domain. Still, he unites Csikszentmihalyi's three components of creativity in his own act of creativity: writing his diary and reading the forbidden *book* by rebel Emmanuel Goldstein.

Smith is drawn to creativity by his innate, effortless, and inescapable ability to create. Early during his self-discovery, Smith "[wakes] up with the word 'Shakespeare' on his lips," but without any knowledge of what that word entails (Orwell 31). His discovering an old, blank diary occurs in a similarly somnambulistic state. It is "on impulse" that he turns from his routine to "[wander] off into the labyrinth of London, . . . losing himself along unknown streets and hardly bothering in which direction he was going" (Orwell 82). Without any apparent conscious control, his feet direct him to the antique second-hand shop where he purchases the diary. Once the idea occurs to him, Smith cannot get it out of his mind; he feels it compulsory to search out an old-fashioned pen and some ink to write with, believing "that the beautiful creamy paper deserved to be written on with a real nib" (Orwell 6). That Smith simply experiences creativity without any seeming control over his abilities is reminiscent of the romantic notion that creativity cannot be restrained, but will be expressed in a state of "uninhibited spontaneity and

candor" (Abrams 105); it will occur and be a force in society whether or not the governing powers wish it to be.

Smith's predominant connection to any sort of creativity is through his vocation. He works in the Records Department at the Ministry of Truth, where he rewrites obsolete or inaccurate articles to agree with Big Brother's current position. He displays a remarkable proficiency for such a task and finds it his "greatest pleasure in life" (Orwell 43). Smith delights in the "jobs so difficult and intricate that [he] could lose [himself] in them . . . delicate pieces of forgery in which [he has] nothing to guide [him] except [his] knowledge of the principles of Ingsoc and [his] estimate of what the Party want[s him] to say" (Orwell 44). These stimulate his mind and give Smith a chance to exercise his creative skills, but in a mandated outlet. In addition to the many "tedious routine" jobs, his supervisor entrusts him with high-profile and sensitive assignments (Orwell 43). While not the only person in Oceania to possess such a skill – "as many as a dozen people" at one time are assigned "tricky" pieces of work – Smith shows a remarkable affinity for creating what is needed by the Party (Orwell 45). "Suddenly there sprang . . . ready-made" a "piece of pure fantasy" (Orwell 46). After a shaky start, Smith's diary entries are similarly completed with ease and fluidity.

To write becomes an automatic process: "He discover[s] that while he [sits] helplessly musing he ha[s] also been writing . . . printing in large neat capitals – DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER" (Orwell 18). He experiences an "interminable restless monologue . . . running inside his head, literally for years" in his day-to-day life, a quality that aids him in writing (Orwell 8). For Smith, "the actual writing [is] easy" after his initial struggle to capture his thoughts (Orwell 7). His diary provides a safe space to freely express himself and record his memories and his thoughts on the future. It is there that he asserts: "*I understand HOW: I do not*

understand WHY" and "*Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two make four. If that is granted, all else follows*" (Orwell 80, 81). Such thoughts suggest that Smith wishes for a freedom that is missing from Oceania – a freedom that allows him to satiate his curiosity and release his will from the oppressive influence of Big Brother.

Throughout *1984,* Smith is tormented by an inner conflict: he enjoys his role as a chronic reviser of history, but he cannot support the Party's continuation of the practice when coupled with doublethink. If he were released from the Party's control, I believe Smith would continue exploring his writing until he begins to craft art through fiction. He is not opposed to the creation of novel stories and information. Instead, Smith will not stand for Big Brother's constant destruction and recreation of information. The phrase from his diary, "*Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two make four,*" proposes that he yearns for some sort of stable existence of knowledge (Orwell 81); he yearns for the creation of a domain.

Since the government has translated much of what had been classic literary art into Newspeak, there is not much high art left as a domain for Smith to discover. Any books prior to 1960 are "recalled and rewritten again and again," with only "fragments of literature of the past surviv[ing] here and there, imperfectly censored" (Orwell 40, 310). If one "retain[s] one's knowledge of Oldspeak it [is] possible to read them," but invariably the older literature from prerevolutionary times undergoes an "alteration in sense as well as language" before reissued to the public (Orwell 310, 310-311). This is only done to what is deemed important enough to keep "in the anthologies": anything without such merited status is simply destroyed (Orwell 42). Orwell emphasizes literary creativity most predominantly in *1984*, but we must assume that other forms of art have also been doctored or destroyed to comply with Big Brother's positions. Smith must have been exposed to the classics at some point in order to wake with Shakespeare's name

"on his lips," (Orwell 31). Beyond that, the Party's Newspeak campaign proves too successful, even infiltrating the old antique shop so the shelves "contai[n] nothing but rubbish" (Orwell 97).

As a result of the Party's annihilation of art, Smith's current domain consists of the scraps of proof that creativity still exists in Oceania. Prominently featured in his collection are the paperweight and painting found in his secluded room inside the antique shop. Both are objects of beauty that capture Smith's attention and imagination and that hearken back to a less restrictive time. The paperweight, with a piece of coral embedded in it, has a "peculiar softness" and asymmetry to it, prompting Smith to consider it as "a message from a hundred years ago, if one [knows] how to read it (Orwell 145). The painting is more stylistically artistic as "a steel engraving" but, in depicting a London church long since demolished, it also acts as a reminder of the past (Orwell 96). Both become symbols of Smith's longing to discover and experience creativity despite the Party's resistance. But to him, the most beautiful piece of creativity comes not from humans, but from a bird that sings in the unsullied countryside: the music is like "a kind of liquid stuff that poured all over him and got mixed up with the sunlight that filtered through the leaves," cleansing his mind of any extraneous thoughts (Orwell 124). He doggedly keeps his search for creativity alive, believing with "unreasonable hope" that, like the churches, high art "still exist[s] somewhere or other, disguised and forgotten" (Orwell 107, 100).

Smith actively searches out the literary artistic creativity – and low art at that – is present in Oceania at the fringes of society. He appreciates the "driveling song" created by a versificator that a proletarian woman sings, admiring the "almost pleasant sound" she gives it (Orwell 218, 138). He pieces together the complete nursery rhyme on the churches of London by talking to three people who have separated themselves from society, Charrington, Julia, and O'Brien. As he finds more, the content of the rhyme echoes within him: he "ha[s] the illusion of actually

hearing bells, the bells of a lost London that still existed somewhere or other, disguised and forgotten" (Orwell 100). He overhears a stanza of a song containing "something hard to describe" while sitting near three falsely accused and condemned traitors at the Chestnut Tree Café (Orwell 77). It returns to him as he revisits the Café under less fortunate circumstances later in *1984*. The church rhyme and the song about a chestnut tree ring in Smith's head, far outlasting any propaganda that the Party introduces to him. They distract him from his world and cause him to consider the possibility of a hidden community that lives as if the past were still present. As in *Brave New World*, the possibility of another way of life is unacceptable to the government; those who believe in it must be isolated or sacrificed for the good of the community. Additionally, these two verses voice a subtle threat to society. Both feature actions that benefit the individual at any cost, even to the point of violence: the narrator threatens to "chop off [one's] head!" in the rhyme's last line (Orwell 99).

Surely the most substantial element of Smith's domain, Emmanuel Goldstein's *The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism,* comes to Smith through O'Brien. Known "simply as *the book*" to Party members, Goldstein's manifesto holds Smith's attention as the supreme example of creativity forbidden for its anti-establishmentarian content (Orwell 13). Despite its reputation as a heretical book, its chapter titles mimic the slogans of the Party, with the first reading "Ignorance is Strength" and the third "War is Peace" (Orwell 184, 185). One must assume the second chapter reads, "Freedom is Slavery" (Orwell 4). This book "fascinate[s]" and "more exactly … reassure[s]" Smith (Orwell 200).

> In a sense, [the book] told him nothing that was new, but that was part of the attraction. It said what he would have said, if it had been possible for him to set his scattered thoughts in order. It was the product of a mind similar to his own, but enormously more powerful, more systematic, less fear-ridden. The best books, he perceived, are those that tell you what you already know. (Orwell 200).

As shown by this passage, Smith is not concerned with a passage's beauty or support of romantic notions about the individual, as Watson and John are. Instead, he seeks that which agrees with his own train of thought. The text is didactic in nature, dictating instructions for running an ideal country as is expected in a work outlining political theory. But, like the other art Smith encounters, it is not its status as high or low art that draws him to it. It is his hope that there are other people like him hidden in Big Brother's organization who cherish products of creativity as he does.

In keeping with this hope, he adds to his personal creative collection through his diary entries.[34] His entries contain memories of his past and his meditations on the state of society. Often, Smith discovers his own opinions as he completes a diary entry. In part, he records his thoughts for himself to assert his individuality and his sanity. He must first rush through a description of a night at the movies, explaining the outrage a proletarian woman has against a particularly violent film, before he can assume a semblance of that outrage and channel it toward Big Brother. It is only through his frantic writing, then the pause afterwards, that he finds he absentmindedly doodles the phrase "DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER" (Orwell 18). After one more bout of panic-ridden scrawling – "*theyll shoot me i dont care theyll shoot me in the back of the neck i don't care down with big brother they always shoot you in the back of the neck i dont care down with big brother*" – Smith accepts his identity as an rebel. The effects of his acceptance are immediately noticeable in his writing; he becomes more eloquent and philosophical, writing in a stylized voice and with a definite purpose. Despite professing himself to be "a lonely ghost uttering a truth that nobody would ever hear," Smith feels that it is not "by making yourself heard but by staying sane that you carried on the human heritage" (Orwell 27,

---

[34] See Appendix 6

28). His writing is driven primarily by his need to know himself and so “preserv[e him] from actual madness” rather than a need to be heard (Abrams 147).

However, early in his writings, Smith dedicates his diary to his future audience with a salutation:

> *To the future or to the past, to a time when thought is free, when men are different from one another and do not live alone – to a time when truth exists and what is done cannot be undone:*
> *From the age of uniformity, from the age of solitude, from the age of Big Brother, from the age of doublethink – greetings!* (Orwell 28)

Clearly it is important to Smith that he be heard by someone. Later, he specifies his audience member: “He [is] writing the diary for O’Brien – *to* O’Brien; it [is] like an interminable letter which no one would ever read, but which was addressed to a particular person and took its color from that fact” (Orwell 81). It is not enough for Smith to know he is creative and see his own product in front of him. He needs someone to be part of his field and validate his actions, as Csikszentmihalyi suggests in the DIFI Model.

Smith’s core group of people with whom he shares his domain grows out of his search for creativity and includes Charrington, Julia, O’Brien, and, by extension, Emmanuel Goldstein. Charrington is the owner of the antique shop in which Smith finds the diary, paperweight, and his secret room. The proprietor exudes a “vague air of intellectuality, as though he had been some kind of literary man, or perhaps a musician,” a quality that intrigues Smith (Orwell 94). Charrington indulges Smith’s curiosity for beautiful items, prompting him to buy the diary and the paperweight and showing him the secluded room. Additionally, he recites the first bit of the London church nursery rhyme that subsequently becomes stuck in Smith’s head. For some reason Smith cannot explain, he trusts Charrington. The old salesman watches over Smith’s journey into creativity, providing encouragement, conversation, and, most importantly, a

sanctuary where he explores creativity hidden from the oversight of the Thought Police and the Party.

Julia predominantly acts as a catalyst for Smith's experiments with creativity. It is the sight of her at a Two Minutes Hate that causes Smith to "suddenly [decide] to come home and begin [writing in] the diary" (Orwell 9). She also provides another missing line of the London church rhyme for Winston. She primarily ignores the arts: "She 'didn't much care for reading,' she said. Books were just a commodity that had to be produced, like jam or bootlaces" despite, or possibly because of, her job working on machines in the Fiction Department (Orwell 130). Smith attempts to include her in his creativity explorations, but she merely humors him. Pacifying him with statements such as, "Read it aloud. That's the best way. Then you can explain it to me" and "Yes, my love, I'm listening. Go on. It's marvelous," Julia promptly falls asleep once Smith begins to read (Orwell 200-201, 201). In this way, she parallels Marx's role in *Brave New World.* She only contributes to the field's discussion with her abilities to act as a sounding board for Smith's ideas. Her anti-Party ways incite Smith to find *the book* in the first place; the more he bonds with Julia and her strong distaste for the government, the more he believes the answer to his search for creativity will be found in this piece of iconoclastic literature.

O'Brien acts completely through the domain. His excuse for conversing with the Outer Party member concerns the latter's proficiency in Newspeak; it is under the pretense of showing Smith the tenth edition of the dictionary that O'Brien manages a meeting in private with Smith. O'Brien assumes a role similar to that of Mond in *Brave New World*: he oversees and appears to be one of the "master brain[s] in the Inner Party" responsible for discerning what is and is not accepted into Oceania's domain (Orwell 45). While at O'Brien's apartment, Smith witnesses

him "[pull] the speakwrite toward him and [rap] out a message" approving three of seven items while immediately halting production on the sixth, describing it as "doubleplus ridiculous verging crimethink" (Orwell 168). He is the one to give the order to "unproceed" on a certain product of creativity and so assumes authority over the domain (Orwell 168). By encouraging Smith to expand his knowledge of low and high art, O'Brien tricks Smith into incriminating himself by reading Emmanuel Goldstein's *book*. Smith feels now, and again during his interrogation in the Ministry of Love, that O'Brien is "a person who could be talked to" and with whom he wants to talk (Orwell 252). It is through this trap that O'Brien has the grounds to arrest both Smith and Julia. O'Brien possesses a unique freedom in the Party; he has the option to write about whatever subject matter that he wants. He chooses to wield this power to ensnare dissident members of society through *the book*: "I wrote [*the book*]," he reveals to Smith. "That is to say, I collaborated in writing it" (Orwell 261).

In Romantic theory, individuality leads to creativity; however, for Smith, creativity and identity exist in a reciprocal arrangement. As we learn more about Smith as an individual, he becomes more creatively active. His diary takes prominence and becomes a vehicle through which Smith learns the contents of his own mind. As he becomes closer with Julia and Charrington, Smith becomes awestruck over beautiful objects and nursery rhymes. Something inside him draws him toward O'Brien as a friend he can trust. Once he meets O'Brien, Smith channels his creative impulses toward learning more about *the book.* He is not arrested by the Thought Police for crimethink until he makes the fateful decision to read *the book*. All three areas of Csikszentmihalyi's model converge in Smith. As a result, Smith begins to create a stable and individual identity from which he can author art. However, his arrest ultimately ends his creative development.

FAHRENHEIT 451

Guy Montag undergoes a complete transformation in his attitude toward creativity. Beginning as a fireman, Montag disdains high art, instead preferring shouting banalities found on his television set. But as he interacts with his domain and gathers a field around himself, Montag develops a need for a deeper level of creativity.

At the onset of the novel, Montag is a fireman whose job it is to burn any illicit books that surface in society and the houses that hide them. He stomps out any reported sign of creativity by burning books, the houses that shelter them and the people who cherish them. By virtue of his job, he is surrounded by the products of creativity, but he does not officially partake of them – much like Julia in *1984*. At first, Montag almost unconsciously participates in creativity. When he steals a book from a fire, Montag feels as if he does "nothing," with "his hand [doing] it all, his hand, with a brain of its own, with a conscience and a curiosity in each trembling finger" (Bradbury 37). His hand, not he, has "turned thief" (Bradbury 37). This notion of uncontrollability, with his hand acting on its own accord, hearkens back to the ease of Smith's skill with creativity: like the creativity lauded by the Romantic theorists, it will not be contained but must exert itself in the world. Again, as with Smith, the opportunity to read the books is ever present: every so often, "he'd [glance] at a single line" (Bradbury 34). Other exposures happen serendipitously, with books "[lighting] . . . in his hands" and opening to pages where he has "only an instant to read a line" (Bradbury 37). His curiosity results in a slow collection of approximately twenty books by the time his practice is discovered.

In a time where people are turned to "faces with gray colorless eyes, gray tongues, and gray thoughts looking out through the numb flesh of the face" by the media's inanity, Montag sees the missing color in life through his involvement with creativity (Bradbury 139). Initially,

Montag struggles against the call of creativity, "drop[ping] the book" that falls directly in his grasp (Bradbury 37). He cannot escape creativity, though. The bits and pieces of high art he picks up emblazon themselves in his mind "as if stamped there with fiery steel" (Bradbury 37). The beginning phrase from fairy tales, "once upon a time," integrates itself into his conversation with Beatty (Bradbury 34). Even a year before the action of the novel, Montag seeks out a conversation with Faber on creativity and art. After their conversation, Faber produces his own address, adding somewhat sarcastically to Montag, "'For your file . . . in case you decide to be angry with me.' 'I'm not angry,' Montag [says], surprised" (Bradbury 75). His lack of anger and action against Faber's illicit ideology displays Montag's own connection with creativity. Despite "[knowing that] if he reache[s] out, he might pull a book of poetry from [Faber's] coat," Montag cannot will himself to harm him or his books, a phenomenon that is repeated with the lady whose library he burns (Bradbury 75). Instead, Montag treasures his capacity to memorize, if not understand, quotes here and there from the books he collects.

As mentioned previously, Montag steals moments to read when they present themselves. His opportunities arise from the chaos during a book burning. He glances at lines from random assortments of books, from fairy tales to contemplative essays. During these brief moments, Montag occasionally rescues a book from the fire "with wild devotion, with an insanity of mindlessness" (Bradbury 37). Over the course of a year, he collects "some twenty books" and hides them in the ventilation system of his house (Bradbury 66). There appears to be no system with which he selects his books. Described by Montag as "small ones, fairly large ones, yellow, red, green ones," his collection is the product of mere happenstance (Bradbury 65).

The collection is discovered, or at least hinted at, when Beatty visits a sick Montag. Beatty grants him a period of leniency, stating that it is "a natural error" of "curiosity alone":

“We let the fireman keep the book twenty-four hours” (Bradbury 62). Montag and Mildred spend their stolen day reading and rereading the books, sometimes “read[ing] a page as many as ten times, aloud,” trying to make some sense of the words (Bradbury 71). Unfortunately for Montag, there is no immediate connection with the literature. He reads it, yes, but cannot understand it. “Poor Montag,” he thinks to himself, “it’s mud to you too” (Bradbury 74). The best he can do is memorize the words, hoping that “if [he] read[s] fast and read all, maybe some” will sink in” (Bradbury 78). He turns to the books as solace from the over-interactive world around him. When Montag is on the train to Faber’s house, the bible becomes an alternative on which to focus instead of the repetitive blaring slogan for Denham’s Dentrifice. To overpower the constant advertisement, he shouts, “Lilies of the field. . . . *Lilies,* I said!” but all he can hear in return is “the train radio vomit[ing] . . . in retaliation, a great tonload of music made of tin, copper, silver, chromium, and brass” (Bradbury 79).

In order to understand his domain, Montag must turn to his field for “help . . . [and for] a teacher” (Bradbury 74). Clarisse, Montag’s seventeen-year-old neighbor, makes him consider why he yearns for books and the written word, but dies before he fully comes to realize his own motivations. Mildred and her friends, Mrs. Phelps and Mrs. Bowles, are as unwilling to join him as they are unhelpful to Montag. Beatty and Faber both expose Montag to new corners of the domain, but it is only the wandering bibliophiles who help him develop his understanding and his own creative means.

At the age of seventeen, Clarisse is an oddity in the world of *Fahrenheit 451*. She purposefully walks to her destinations, listens when others talk, and contributes to conversations in a meaningful way. Instead of accepting what happens about her, Clarisse questions the reasoning of it. Like Smith, she understands how, but not why society is the way it is. In their

first conversation together, she impertinently asks Montag, “Do you ever *read* any of the books you burn?” after learning he is a fireman (Bradbury 8). It is this inquisitiveness that makes “men like Beatty . . . afraid of her” (Bradbury 67). She infects Montag with a similar curiosity as their relationship progresses. In the end, she inspires Montag to be more like her: “I kept putting her alongside the firemen in the House last night, and I suddenly realized I didn’t like them at all, and I didn’t like myself at all any more” (Bradbury 67). Even though she dies early in Montag’s self-discovery, her presence informs his perusal of the domain: Montag “know[s the authors’] words point, one way or another, to Clarisse” (Bradbury 72). Each quote he comes up against, he compares to Clarisse and asks, “Is that what it was in the girl next door?” (Bradbury 72).

Mildred, like Marx to John in *Brave New World*, is an unwilling accomplice to Montag. She becomes part of his field simply because that the house in which he hides his books is “[her] house as well as [his]” (Bradbury 65). When he tells her of his secret stash of literature, he apologizes for not telling her and not knowing the reason behind his collecting: “I didn’t really think,” he professes, “But now it looks as if we’re in this together” (Bradbury 66). Much to her dismay, he forces her into reading the books together, but she cannot understand why. She reacts violently to their presence in her house, “back[ing] away as if she were suddenly confronted by a pack of mice” and “breathing rapidly” as if she were having a panic attack (Bradbury 66). Her frustration extends past Montag’s behavior to the books themselves. Mildred cannot bring herself to like them and, as a result, is utterly unhelpful as Montag reasons out their content. “Books aren’t people,” she exclaims after kicking at a book, “You read and I look all around, but there isn’t *anybody*!” (Bradbury 73). Finally, after Montag attempts to educate her friends in poetry, Mildred breaks. While he is out of the house, she reports him to the fire station after dragging and mutilating the books.

Mildred's friends, Mrs. Phelps and Mrs. Bowles, are not much better. Silly, air-headed women, Mrs. Phelps and Mrs. Bowles are only interested in what directly concerns themselves. This emptyheadedness provokes Montag one night; amid their declarations of hatred for poetry, he shuts off the televisions and recites Matthew Arnold's "Dover Beach" to the two women. His effort is not completely wasted, however. The reading, initially encouraged by Ms. Phelps, sends her to tears and incoherency. "I – I . . . don't know, I just don't know, oh, oh . . . ." she blubbers afterwards (Bradbury 100). But Mrs. Bowles counteracts this encouraging display of emotion with her own anger and negativity:

> Mrs. Bowles stood up and glared at Montag. "You see? I knew it, that's what I wanted to prove! I knew it would happen! I've always said poetry and tears, poetry and suicide and crying and awful feelings, poetry and sickness; *all* that mush! Now I've had it proved to me. You're nasty, Mr. Montag, you're *nasty*!" (Bradbury 100-101).

Both storm out of the house and later report Montag to the fire station. Montag considers this a failure on his part, but their reactions drive him toward closer collaboration with Beatty, Faber, and the others he meets.

The fire captain Beatty, in command of Montag's squad, takes it upon himself to educate Montag – much as Charrington does with Smith in *1984* – about the danger of books. He adopts a paternal tone, gentle but firm, as he lectures Montag, explaining the repercussions that come with reading. Beatty dismisses the seriousness of Montag's error, speaking almost flippantly on the subject. When questioned further by Montag, Beatty grants the renegade fireman 24 hours to read his books with the warning that "if he hasn't burned [them] by then, we [will] simply come burn [them] for him" (Bradbury 62). Beatty represents himself as an authority on literature's content as well as destruction. "Montag, take my word for it," he entreats, "I've had to read a few [books] in my time, to know what I was about, and the books say *nothing*!" (Bradbury 62).

Later, when taunting Montag, Beatty flaunts his literary knowledge, quoting authors from Sir Philip Sydney to Alexander Pope. His knowledge and willingness to discuss literature with Montag sets him apart from the majority of the people immediately available to Montag; however, his contributions serve mainly to confuse Montag and "mudd[y] the waters" (Bradbury 107). It is Beatty who declares books devoid of meaning, and it is his condemnation of reading poetry as "silly" and his threat to Faber that spurs Montag to action, when he burns the fire captain with flame thrower (Bradbury 117).

Faber undertakes a similarly antagonistic approach to his partnership with Montag as does Beatty. Instead of outwardly condemning literature as a whole, Faber ridicules many of Montag's ideas before planning his own revolution. Montag believes that his mission should be to preserve knowledge from the books at hand; Faber cannot understand the point, declaring that the only response survivors will have for "men quoting Milton" will be to "gather up their stones to hurl at each other" (Bradbury 87, 87-88). He refuses to contemplate the idea of book preservation, substituting his own plan for Montag's. Faber suggests they "print extra books and arrange to have them hidden in firemen's houses all over the country, so that seeds of suspicion would be sown among these arsonists" (Bradbury 85). His central focus on anarchy and destruction taints his further interactions with Montag; because of Faber, pages are ripped out of the Bible, an anthology of poetry burns, firemen destroy Montag's house, and Montag becomes a fugitive from the law.

Despite his outwardly hostile manner, Faber assumes the role of "a teacher" in Montag's mind (Bradbury 74). A former English professor at a liberal arts college, Faber captures Montag's mind with the wonder of "an hour of monologue, a poem" and the comment, "I don't talk of *things,* sir … I talk the *meaning* of things. I sit here and *know* I'm alive" (Bradbury 75).

Faber represents a "quiet, nourishing flame of the independent creative imagination" who becomes a constant companion for Montag through wireless ear pieces of Faber's own design (Watt 23). He reads The Book of Job to Montag to calm his mind and coaches Montag through his confrontation with Mrs. Bowles and Mrs. Phelps, as well as the succeeding one with Beatty. His final advice to Montag – sending him to haunt the old railroad lines in search of homeless "old Harvard degrees" – directs the disgraced fireman to his final field connection (Bradbury 132).

Living on the outskirts of society is a group of five professors and intellectuals wanted for book possession in major cities. After escaping the Mechanical Hound,[35] Montag discovers these men in the thick of the forest. From the beginning, Montag knows these men are different from any others who create his field; these old men's

> voices were turning the world over and looking at it; the voices knew the land and the trees and the city which lay down the track by the river. The voices talked of everything, there was nothing they could not talk about, [Montag] knew, from the very cadence and motion and continual stir of curiosity and wonder in them. (Bradbury 146)

Their sheer intellect astonishes and slightly intimidates Montag. All come from intellectual, if not academic, backgrounds: one clergyman, one author and three professors from Cambridge University, Columbia University, and the University of California, Los Angeles. All five have been ousted from their former positions in society. Unlike Faber and Beatty, these people are "not out to incite or anger anyone yet" (Bradbury 152). More sympathetic than Montag's previous two mentors, these academics focus on "keep[ing] the knowledge [they] think [they] will need intact and safe" (Bradbury 152). They share with Montag the common goal of saving books and the knowledge they contain. This society spans the nation, forming "the loose

---

[35] The Mechanical Hound is a robotic dog used by the firemen to track and subdue renegade members of society. With eight legs, a body made of metal, and a mouth armed with hypodermic syringes, the Hound is said to be impossible to escape.

network" that has accumulated "thousands on the roads" over twenty years, with each man devoted to remembering a text (Bradbury 153). By memorizing the books and "pass[ing] the books on to [their] children, by word of mouth," these men and women ensure the preservation of crucial knowledge in anticipation of a time when people "come 'round in their own time, wondering what happened" (Bradbury 153). They accept Montag as "a [fellow] hopeless romantic" and create a space in their community for him and his offering of the Book of Ecclesiastes (Bradbury 82). In having chosen the Ecclesiastes, Montag offers a remembrance, if not a knowledge yet, of the Bible's warning against the presumption of dictating what is best for humanity.

As Montag's interest in reading peaks, so does his will to save literature. After 24 hours of reading books, Montag's curiosity turns into confusion. On his own, he does not understand their meaning, declaring the content to be "mud to [him] too" (Bradbury 74). His confusion drives him to "find a teacher" in Faber, but their meeting does not provide Montag's envisioned solution (Bradbury 74). By reciting poetry, he ventures on his own to force Mrs. Phelps and Mrs. Bowles to accept literature, but fails. It is not until he flees the city and meets the roving academics that Montag fully becomes creative. To Montag, this means he remembers parts of the Book of Ecclesiastes and Revelation perfectly. He feels "the slow stir of words, the slow simmer" that John, Watson, and Smith all experience so violently (Bradbury 165). Additionally, Montag finally understands the content of what he has read; he sorts through the books in his head and selects the lines he believes will be most meaningful to others when he shares them. He chooses Revelations 22.2, a verse which reads of hope of a better future for survivors.[36]

---

[36] Revelations 22.2: "*And on either side of the river was there a tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month; And the leaves of the tree were for the healing of nations*." (Bradbury 165)

What Montag achieves in the end, the academic men he meets already possess. These men embody the interaction among the model's elements domain, individual, and the field. All begin as intellectuals, with a particular book to save in mind. These five men, along with the thousands spread across the nation, compile their stores of knowledge and literature, discussing and reliving debates of old through their interaction with each other. Their dedication molds the men into "libraries on the inside," as they memorize books they have known as well as any others they have come across which they believe worthy of inclusion (Bradbury 153). Granger, the leader of this particular group, explains the process to Montag:

> It wasn't planned, at first. Each man had a book he wanted to remember, and did. Then over a period of twenty years or so, we met each other, traveling, and got the loose network together and set out a plan. The most single thing we had to pound into ourselves is that we were not important, we mustn't be pedants; we were not to feel superior to anyone else in the world. We're nothing more than dust jackets for books, of no significance otherwise. (Bradbury 153)

Their incorporation of the domain into themselves is complete. They refer to themselves as libraries with "books on file behind their quiet eyes" (Bradbury 155). The men "were waiting, with their pages uncut, for the customers who might come by in later years" and want to peruse the walking library (Bradbury 155). They even joke about their status as mere "dust jackets for books" with each other. "Don't judge a book by its cover," one jokes as they notice Montag staring at their faces (Bradbury 155). When Montag yearns for creativity, he wants to emulate this complete unity of domain, individual, and field. He, like the other academics, wishes "to be of some use in the world" (Bradbury 152).

CHAPTER THREE

A Rebellious Force for Freedom or a Group Effort?

As I have shown how creativity manifests itself in *Brave New World, 1984,* and *Fahrenheit 451* in my previous chapter, I now transfer my attention to a rationale for its presence. The four creative individuals I have previously discussed – John the Savage, Helmholtz Watson, Winston Smith, and Guy Montag – integrate their creative and rebellious inclinations while enhancing their creativity. These four men gain more awareness of their selves and their motivations while becoming disillusioned with society. As they complete Csikszentmihayi's Domain-Individual-Field-Interaction Model, the men become more resistant to society; John, Watson, Smith, and Montag all must use either a creative process or product to express their rebellion.

Each government in power in the three dystopias subscribes to the Romantic theory of creativity: that creativity is fundamentally an unstable and uncontrollable force. By rebelling, the characters upset the stability of their civilization and end up fulfilling their governments' expectations of creativity. As a result, the governments treat members of society who are creative and those who are rebellious as equal threats; governments fear the mere presence of creativity as much as they do a full-scale rebellion. This parallel treatment extends to the art itself; for example, as the World State hides or quietly disposes of unwanted art, so does the government hide or quietly eliminate unwanted creative or rebellious people. Those in power quell both creativity and rebellion almost immediately. The longer the person or the method of creativity is outside the government's control, the harsher the society punishes the accused perpetrator. However, the rebellious feelings that John, Watson, Smith, and Montag harbor do

not spring from a need to destroy, then rebuild the existing society. Instead, they act predominantly from their need for a society that harbors intellectual and creative freedom.

However, Skinner divides creativity from individuality and freedom in *Walden Two*. Skinner adopts a classicist view of creativity – that creativity is a nonthreatening pastime used as relaxation. I further investigate Skinner's combination of a classical theory of creativity with his own person prerogative of behaviorism and determine whether creativity suffers from his theoretical applications.

Brave New World

As they are seen to fulfill each of the three elements of the Domain-Individual-Field Interaction Model, John the Savage and Helmholtz Watson steadily become more rebellious. They chafe against society's hold over them, finding ways to circumvent any obstacles that bar their paths. With the union of his creative spirit and his domain of Shakespeare, John develops a strong standard of morality and propriety, which the World State does not uphold to his liking. His illusion about this "brave new world" shattered, John turns reclusive (Huxley 139). He voluntarily withdraws from society, much to the chagrin of his aghast host Bernard Marx. In seeking seclusion and solitude with his precious volume of Shakespeare as his sole company, John openly flouts the plan that Fordian society had concocted for him. He publicly advocates a state of being that is contrary to the World State's tenets – that of solitary individualism. The longer he lives in the World State, the more he refuses to participate in any planned activities such as tours or parties thrown in his honor. He surfaces for discussions with his field, Marx and Watson, or for a rendezvous with Lenina Crowne, but each successive experience only serves to disillusion him more; he turns to Shakespeare following each disappointment, immersing himself

further in the ideals from an Elizabethan world and becoming more alienated from Fordian society.

But when he submerges himself in the subject matter of Shakespearean plays while consistently meeting with his field, John finally acts out his outrage to a ridiculous extreme. He first attempts to free a group of Deltas from their addiction to *soma*. The Savage cannot understand why people subscribe to the World State's propaganda supporting stolid and hazed contentment – principally when this contentment is brought on by a drug that will cause one to asphyxiate after enough abuse – when they can experience all emotions through Shakespeare's writing. He interferes with the Deltas' *soma* distribution, ultimately throwing the hated drug that has killed his mother out the window and so openly defying the World State's policies for promoting widespread and regulated happiness. Finally, John throws off the World State's influence over him in favor of solitude. After refused the opportunity to relocate to the Falkland Islands with Watson and Marx, John flees civilization and creates his own hermitage in Surrey. He completely rejects the central tenets of "Community, Identity, and Stability," claiming the right to isolation and to variability in his emotional state. Through John, Huxley demonstrates that one need not add to the domain in order to develop his individuality through high art. Instead, John breaks away from society and asserts his rights as an individual after reading and absorbing Shakespeare's message, proving that high art's influence is stronger on an unconditioned person than that of the World State's.

Watson's rebellions manifest themselves in a similar withdrawal from society as John's, but not to the degree that the Savage carries his message. As he discovers he is more alone in society than he previously believed, Watson drops his activities to see what results may occur. He is a prominent member within society; others notice his removal from society and question

his motives. In forsaking overly complicated games, his abundant lovers, and ingestion of *soma* – all of which are highly encouraged and promoted by the World State as guaranteed methods to obtain happiness – Watson rejects Fordian standards for happiness. He takes his resistance to typical Fordian prescriptions one step further, channeling his newfound energy into writing a poem chronicling his attitude toward his newly experienced solitude. Here Watson becomes an artist; he is able to express his emotional turmoil in a productive and creative manner, as opposed to John, who can never quite realize his artistic potential. Watson shows his students at the Department of Writing his poem in order to "engineer them into feeling as [he] felt when [he] wrote the rhyme" (Huxley 180). His experimentation with his routines are frowned upon by society, but not outlawed by any means. However, when he involves impressionable students in his self-discovery through art, and art of his own creation at that, those in higher positions than he quickly intervene and remove him from the situation. They must act in order to protect the students from being tainted or further influenced by Watson's growing individuality.

After he meets John and has the opportunity to exchange ideas with him, Watson joins the Savage in his actions against Fordian society. When John tries to free the Deltas from *soma*, Watson delays just a moment before leaping into the fray to aid his friend and member of his field. They both believe in "the possibility of loveliness, the possibility of transforming even the nightmare into something fine and noble" (Huxley 210). John in particular clings to the hope that by fighting against the "nightmare" of the World State's impositions on society, he can transform Fordian society into a place where "fine and noble" thoughts, such as those from Shakespeare, can prosper in the people's minds. John and Watson fight against the indistinguishable masses that typify the World State's population in order to try and enhance others' quality of life.

As Watson and John act out against society in *Brave New World*, they rebel through their creative endeavors. For John, it is his immersion in Shakespeare that prompts him to disagree with the world order. His utter belief in values gleaned from Shakespeare's plays forces him to realize he can never accept the conditions that come with living in the World State. He cannot live according to his own principles when they are slighted and ridiculed by those around him, and so he comes to disagree forcibly with the order of the World State. The Savage tries to change Fordian society to accept, or at least accommodate, his beliefs through his failed conversion attempts, first of Watson and Crowne verbally and then of the Deltas physically. The words "brave new world" from *The Tempest,* used so triumphantly in his past to refer to Fordian society, "moc[k]" him before transforming into "a challenge, a command" to better the world around him (Huxley 210).

Watson holds a more concrete command over creativity during his resistance. His "basic uprising [against society]. . . is artistic" in nature (Meckier, "Poetry in the Future" 34). Watson uses his own poem to advertise his dislike of Fordian society values and to identify others who may sympathize with his views. Additionally, he promotes Shakespearean values – namely individuality, freedom, and beauty – that he absorbs from keeping company with John.[37] Watson is more subtle at expressing where he deviates from Fordian ideals, but nevertheless, his condemnation of the World State's authoritative control over people's lives is as strong as John's.

---

[37] I attribute individuality, freedom, and beauty as Shakespearean values first and foremost because John learns these values through his exposure to Shakespeare's *Complete Works*. As he immerses himself in the plays, he immerses himself in literature that is saturated with characters who experiences the extremes of these categories. Characters experience extreme individuality, confusion of identities, willful assumption of other's identities, gaining their freedom, losing their freedom, being indebted and so accountable to their friends and their enemies, assuming the paradigm of beauty, or being transformed quite literally into an ass in plays such as *A Midsummer Night's Dream, Much Ado About Nothing, Othello, The Merchant of Venice, Hamlet,* and *Twelfth Night*, to name a few. It is Shakespeare's mastery in manipulating these values that captivates John, and why John immerses himself in the literature.

John and Watson's actions threaten the stability of Fordian society, especially when they target large groups of suggestible people such as students and Deltas. The Shakespearean concepts that the two absorb do not align with the World State's focus on community and stability. As a result, the government considers them a risk that will not be tolerated further. Mond takes steps to manage not only John and Watson, but also the effects of the commotion they cause.

These protocols mimic those undertaken when there is a piece of art that is "potentially subversive": through ridicule and strict containment (Huxley 177). John and his beliefs are exploited for humor by Fordian society. Throughout visit to the World State, he is touted as an oddity with old-fashioned and nigh- unheard-of values, but society tolerates him and his absurdities because of his novelty value. However, after he publicly breaks with Fordian society and relocates to his hermitage, he is made a spectacle. Captured on film as he performs self-flagellation, John rises in fame as a star of an erotic "feely" *The Savage of Surrey*. Fordians seek out his sanctuary and taunt him, egging John on into another bout of mutilation by shouting, "We – want – the whip!" repeatedly (Huxley 257). He is a source of entertainment and exaggerated ridiculousness. Members of the World State adopt a similar position when exposed to concepts found within Shakespeare. Mothers, fathers, love, honor, chastity – all values originating from Shakespeare – are considered dirty, smutty, and too ridiculous to consider seriously. Any discussion of these ends in "uncontrollable guffawing" from those raised in the World State (Huxley 184).

Such ridicule is mirrored in Marx's earlier irreverent interruption of John's Shakespeare recitation and by Watson's uncontrollable laughter during a sentimental moment of *Romeo and Juliet*. John takes these reactions personally and turns "pale with a sense of outrage" any time

his beloved subject matter is affronted (Huxley 185). Repeated exposure to this ridicule causes John to lose his head. He cannot handle the overwhelming mockery and instead becomes absorbed into a frenzy driven by "that desire of unanimity and atonement" instilled in all members of Fordian society (Huxley 258).

John is ultimately contained like his beloved Shakespearean texts. The government does not actively destroy him, but his novelty factor, combined with the commercial popularity of his "feely," attracts negative attention to him so that the crowds John seeks to avoid are drawn to him. Despite, or perhaps because of, John's loud protestations against sexual encounters, the crowd involves him in an impromptu orgy. Upon reflection of his participation in such a promiscuous and unchaste exercise, John cannot live with his actions. He has betrayed his own beliefs so severely that he cannot live with himself; he hangs himself from the roof of his hermitage. It is somewhat fitting that his life ends in tragedy. In his conversation with Mond, John "claim[s] the right to be unhappy" in exchange for poetry (Huxley 240). During life, society pigeonholes John into an oddity to be considered when in need of a laugh. With his death, his influence is contained. Likewise, Mond locks away any remaining copies of Shakespeare's plays inside his safe, hidden from the public.

Watson's influence is also contained, but through less drastic measures. He is shunned and driven to the outskirts of society with other oddballs who have also experimented in a domain the government considers heretical. As a result, the World State exiles Watson, relocating him to the Falkland Islands. There, he can continue writing, but any poetry or other forms of art he creates will be contained to a similar exile, doomed only to be seen by those he includes in his new field and never to be seen by the public.[38] However, this benevolence toward creative people does not stem from spontaneous sympathy on the part of the World Controller.

[38] Huxley explores this possibility in his later work, *Island*.

When considering Watson's sentence, Mond says casually, almost as an afterthought: "It's lucky . . . that there are such a lot of islands in the world. I don't know what we should do without them. Put you all in the lethal chamber, I suppose" (Huxley 229). If a specific geographic formation did not exist, those who reach for beauty and the truth would be utterly destroyed instead of allotted their own, semi-utopian island life.

John and Watson's rebellious natures are not fueled by a deep-seated need to overthrow the World State, but by "a new cause for intellectual excitement" (Meckier, "Poetry in the Future" 32). They struggle against the status quo because they wish to create an environment that allows them, and others like them, a certain amount of intellectual and creative freedom. Although their actions may seem like an attack on the establishment, John and Watson are trying to remain faithful to their own beliefs. When they discard the Deltas' *soma* distribution, they band together under the statement, "Ford helps those who help themselves" (Huxley 213). John and Watson operate as an independent entity, free from the propaganda supporting drug habits. While they spread the concept of manhood and freedom to the Deltas, they declare themselves "Men at last!" (Huxley 213). It is only at this moment that both men act as free men operating under their own volition, but they seem to combine Shakespearean ideas of masculinity with those of individuality and freedom. Watson and John must reach the culmination of their creative journeys in the World State – and in particular after they share their Shakespearean values – before either feels ready to declare himself, or the other, "men at last." The two of them want to escape the oppression of the World State, John because he does not want to conform to society and instead wishes for independence, and Watson because he wishes for the freedom to explore creativity and art as he wishes. For this reason, Watson embraces his exile, requesting "a

thoroughly bad climate" because he "believe[s] one would write better if the climate were bad. If there were a lot of wind and storms, for example . . ." (Huxley 229).

1984

In comparison with John the Savage and Helmholtz Watson, Winston Smith is more timid in his rebellions – writing in his diary, having sex with Julia, and reading *The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism* encompass all of his rebellious activities. Yet he is the most serious about his rebellion of any of the highlighted creative individuals. Smith's discovery of his inner creativity, and his inner dissatisfaction with the Party, lasts the better part of ten years:

> What was happening was only the working-out of a process that had started years ago. The first step had been a secret, involuntary thought; the second had been the opening of the diary. He had moved from thoughts to words, and now from words to actions. The last step was something that would happen in the Ministry of Love. He had accepted it. The end was contained in the beginning. (Orwell 159)

His journey begins with his discovery of a picture of three traitors. This picture is tangible proof that the Party slanders three men in order to condemn them for acts of treason. Smith immediately destroys the picture, but its existence implants a seed of doubt about the Party in his mind that bothers him still ten years later.

In acquiring an old blank diary, Smith finally acquires the opportunity to exercise his creative and rebellious tendencies through his own writing, as opposed to the destructive and deconstructive writing he practices daily at the Records Department. He progresses from writing a simple diary entry to fulfilling an uncontrollable urge to profess his absolute disapproval of Big Brother and his policies. Within the diary, he chronicles his arguments against policies and his own private rebellions against the strict Party values. His final entry is the most defiant of all, despite consisting of four aphorisms and a passage copied from a children's history book. In this

passage, Smith utters his lack of faith in the current Party system as opposed to the proletarian class. He ends on the phrase: "*Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two make four. If that is granted, all else follows*" (Orwell 81). Through his quotation, Smith attempts to express his wish for creative stability. He wants to be guaranteed that adding two and two together will always equal four, and that slowly, other facts and events in history will follow suit. He wants the freedom to know the truth and to know that what he writes will "physically survive" for future generations to see (Orwell 27). The diary's transitional tone from frantic to collected accurately reflects Smith's attitude toward his own seditious beliefs; he is confident that his thoughts, not the Party's, are the correct ones to uphold.

Smith's relationship with Julia and O'Brien leads not only to the formation of his field, but also to his ultimate act of rebellion. Smith connects with Julia in an emotional and physical relationship that flouts all that the Party wants to stamp out in humanity: spontaneity, passion, commitment, and sex. Julia's vehement dislike of the Party – "about whom she talk[s] with an open jeering hatred" – and their oppression of Outer Party members causes Smith to love her more (Orwell 122). At one point, Smith describes their love as "a blow struck against the Party . . . a political act" (Orwell 126). Even though both partners despise the Party, they are not openly rebellious until they meet and converse with O'Brien, Smith's last member of his field. With O'Brien, both must commit to their rebellion against the Party and affirm their willingness "to do anything which is likely to cause demoralization and weaken the power of the Party" in front of O'Brien before he will trust them (Orwell 172). Afterwards, he entrusts them with *the book*, Emmanuel Goldstein's manifesto *The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism* and, according to O'Brien, essential reading for anyone who wishes to join the Brotherhood, the underground revolutionary movement against the Party.

With the exception of his relationship with Julia, Smith's major acts against the Party involve a concrete creative product, the diary and *the book*. Both books become manifestos for Smith, with the former his personal one where he has expressed himself artistically, and the latter his revolutionary manual that will guide him in his future steps of rebellion. The mere idea of the books' existence is highly discouraged in society; interacting with one, let alone both, is certain to be discovered and reported by the Thought Police. He discovers and molds his own rebellious notions as he writes entries into his diary. Additionally, he draws inspiration from *the book*; even though he does not learn any new or revolutionary information from the forbidden text, the orderliness of thoughts so similar to those he harbors himself comforts Smith.

The Party equates creativity with potential antagonistic or oppositional behavior; as a result, Smith's colleague Ampleforth disappears, taken to the Ministry of Love. Ampleforth's great offense, Smith later learns, is that he "allowed the word 'God to remain at the end of a line" of one of Kipling's poems in order to preserve the rhyme structure, a decision that Ampleforth vigorously defends even while in the Ministry of Love (Orwell 231). The majority of the people that Smith associates with as a field – O'Brien, Charrington and Emmanuel Goldstein – are in league with the Party. They convert any aspects of creativity that appealed to the rebellious and creative side of Smith to reveal him as a disillusioned member of society. Goldstein's *book*, a product of collaboration by O'Brien and other unnamed authors, has been created specifically for the purpose of entrapping people like Smith, on the cusp of revolutionary behavior. While Emmanuel Goldstein may or may not be a fiction of the Party's, O'Brien and Charrington both encourage Smith to reveal himself through their own knowledge of creativity. Their knowledge of the rhyme "Oranges and lemons" sharpens Smith's curiosity for artistic creativity; he takes unnecessary risks to learn the rest of the rhyme and exposes himself as vulnerable to creativity.

As Charrington arrests Smith and Julia, he reiterates the last two lines of "Oranges and lemons": "*Here comes a candle to light you to bed, here comes a chopper to chop off your head*" (Orwell 222). The irony of the lines now become clear: Charrington, the original "candle" that illuminates Smith's metaphorical path through creativity, as well as his literal path to the bed in the apartment, transforms into the executioner ready, by his arrest sentence, to "chop off [his] head." In the end, it is O'Brien's contribution of *the book*'s promise of a freer world through rebellion that ensnares Smith.

If the Party learns of anyone with iconoclastic leanings, it does not simply make fun of or contain the threat, as the World State does in *Brave New World*. Iconoclasts are treated like pieces of prerevolutionary literature being translated into Newspeak: they are saved, but broken down into basic elements before being rebuilt in accordance with Big Brother's beliefs. For literature, this is done by converting the words into a bastardized language, then substituting tenets of Big Brother's philosophy for any heretical thoughts. For rebels, guards and members of the Inner Party supervise the systematic destruction of Smith mentally and physically. Afterwards, O'Brien takes over Smith's retraining and combines lectures on the proper beliefs of the Party with periodic bouts of electrocution until Smith wholeheartedly and unreservedly believes in the Party's agenda. As O'Brien explains to Smith,

> You are a flaw in the pattern, Winston. You are a stain that must be wiped out. Did I not tell you just now that we are different from the persecutors of the past? We are not content with negative obedience, nor even with the most abject submission. When you finally surrender to us, it must be of your own free will. We do not destroy the heretic because he resists us; so long as he resists us we never destroy him. We convert him, we capture his inner mind, we reshape him. We burn all evil and all illusion out of him; we bring him over to our side, not in appearance, but genuinely, heart and soul. We make him one of ourselves before we kill him. (Orwell 255)

This process occurs in full to Smith; O'Brien uses the Brotherhood and *the book* as bait for the two lovers' arrest. Despite his best efforts to resist, Smith cannot hold out against O'Brien's and the Ministry of Love's techniques. The Party replaces Smith with a new and improved Smith. He becomes like the works of "Shakespeare, Milton, Swift, Byron, Dickens, and some others" after a translation into Newspeak takes place: banal, stripped of any original feeling, and reduced of any deeper meaning (Orwell 311). He ends the novel knowing one fact: "He [has] won the victory over himself. He love[s] Big Brother" (Orwell 297).

For most of the action of the novel *1984*, Smith sincerely appears to want to overthrow the Party's control of Oceania, especially after he meets with O'Brien and obtains *the book*. However, the last two aphorisms that Smith writes in his diary lead me to think otherwise: "*I understand HOW: I do not understand WHY*" and "*Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two make four. If that is granted, all else follows*" (Orwell 80, 81). Both statements suggest a curiosity that does not fit with a rebel bent on the total destruction of the state. Like Watson, Smith yearns for a society that will allow him a measure of intellectual and creative freedom. However, Smith also looks for a stability that Watson has no need for; because of the span and thoroughness of the Party's revisions of history, Smith cannot trust the facts to be correct.

FAHRENHEIT 451

Like these protagonists, Guy Montag also performs increasingly seditious acts as he interacts more with his domain and his field. He begins by rescuing a book from a house he burns for his job; he describes the rescue as unbidden, with his hand acting independently of his body. As he collects approximately twenty more books over the course of the year, it is clear that some part of Montag wishes to preserve these books, possibly for his own enjoyment, but also possibly to allow copies of illicit material to exist outside of the public's awareness.

Montag does not awaken from this trance-like state and assume responsibility for the thefts of the books until after he meets Clarisse. His conversations with the spunky seventeen-year-old seem to spur him into acting with more deliberateness, but only Faber's influence makes Montag consider a plan of action that would effect change on the system as a whole. The two bibliophiles plot to topple the fireman system by planting books within firemen's houses, then calling in the alarm "so that seeds of suspicion would be sown among those arsonists" (Bradbury 85). Montag succeeds in planting several books at one fireman's house as he escapes the city, but cannot manage to pull together his and Faber's connections before the bomb destroys the city. His true acts of creativity come after he flees the city and frees himself from any notions of rebellion. In the forest, when he meets the traveling academics, Montag realizes his purpose is not to destroy creativity, nor the system that destroys creativity; instead, he must treasure and preserve the art for generations to come.

After his conversations with Clarisse, Faber, and Beatty, Montag attempts his two culminating acts of rebellion against the public. First, he tries to impress high art and creativity upon three emptyheaded women. During his attempt, Montag challenges his wife Mildred, as well as her two friends Mrs. Phelps and Mrs. Bowles, to think about the content of their conversations. To Montag, the three women exemplify how banal entertainment has corroded minds into fragmentary and flighty tools for judgment. He hopes that by waving a book underneath the women's noses, they will come to realize with him the idiocy of most entertainment streamed directly to the public's living room walls. Approaching the task with altogether too much passion and not enough control over himself, he fails miserably to attain the impression he wants. Instead of converting the women, he solidifies their dislike of literature and poetry and sends them scurrying home to report his performance to the firemen. Still,

Montag is acting against the status quo and trying to find others who sympathize with him. Soon afterwards, when he discovers he has been reported to the firemen and has to burn his house to the ground, Montag resists arrest and murders the fire captain Beatty before Beatty can reveal Montag's connection with Faber. He leaves the firemen disorganized and leaderless, which drastically damages the system. On the run from the police and the firemen, Montag flees to the outskirts of town, where he connects with a group of roving academics. With them, Montag can plan on how to reintroduce creativity back into society in the aftermath of the bomb.

Montag's rebellious activities, like Smith's and Watson's, directly involve products of creativity. He rescues books from the flames, prolonging their survival for another several weeks and giving himself time to read them. He supplements his attempt to convert Mrs. Phelps, Mrs. Bowles, and Mildred to creativity by reading Matthew Arnold's *Dover Beach* to them. Although Mildred chooses this poem by random, its content reflects Montag's current emotional state. He is confused as to which side he should fight for, and so has become part of the "ignorant armies [who] clash by night" (Bradbury 100). It is only by the lifting of his ignorance at the end of the novel that Montag realizes the full potential of the creativity he has read. Montag commits murder, and a murder of a high-profile person within society, in order to protect his anarchical plans. In his slaughter of Beatty, Montag kills him using the flame thrower that he directed off his own house. He turns his tool of creative destruction into one that burns those who would do the same to creativity.

The police and the firemen reign supreme in the society in *Fahrenheit 451*. They are responsible for assessing and eliminating threats toward society's collective happiness and stability. Because of the public's history of intolerance toward differences in opinions, if art exists that is above the artistic level of a comic book or a five-minute television romance, it is

labeled as dangerous and burnt. The reason Faber gives for "why books are hated and feared" is simple: "They show the pores in the face of life. The comfortable people want only wax moon faces, poreless, hairless, expressionless. We are living in a time when flowers are trying to live on flowers, instead of growing on good rain and black loam" (Bradbury 83). The public is reticent to experience any form of creativity that highlights controversies or debatable issues; they no longer want to think for themselves or experience the mental stimulation that creativity provokes. As a result, policemen and firemen – "men like Beatty [–] are afraid of" curious individuals like Clarisse (Bradbury 67). Such people are dealt with, metaphorically, in the same way as their art: they are burnt, exposed to society as book-lovers and oddities to be avoided. The practice of burning one's entire house along with his library is an extremely public affair; the burnings often become spectacles in and of themselves.

The idea that Faber latches onto is one of chaos and destruction; the older bibliophile believes that "their basic hope should be a remolding of the entire society" (Watt 29). However, even though the plan to plant books inside other firemen's homes is originally Montag's idea, he is not enthusiastic about seeing it through, and neither is it the one that he clings to through his manhunt. He favors a more peaceful plan – shared by the five academics he joins in the woods – to preserve as many books as possible through memory, saving them for a future time when people are interested again. Although Faber ridicules this plan initially, Bradbury's tone at the end of the novel remains cautiously optimistic of its success.

Ultimately, Montag wishes for the same environment as does Watson and Smith: he wants a society that promotes intellectual and creative freedom, where people are not condemned for wanting to follow their curiosity and develop their own ideas. The books Montag's hand decides to rescue from a fiery death reflect the importance of individuality. Each quote that is

singled out and highlighted during Montag's 24-hour reading period relates to self-discovery and "that favorite subject, Myself" (Bradbury 72). The most explicit quote is the first one referenced: a satirical line from *Gulliver's Travels* reads, "It is computed that eleven thousand persons have at several times suffered death rather than submit to break their eggs at the smaller end" (Bradbury 68). In this scenario, 11,000 people value their individuality over bowing to society's pressure to conform to accepted practices. Even in Beatty's dream conversation between himself and Montag, Montag favors the position endorsing freedom, knowledge, and intellectual power and freedom, as opposed to Beatty's determined focus on pure power and the vapidity of the written word. This can also be seen through Montag's struggle to think for himself. It is not until the end of *Fahrenheit 451* that Montag can fully understand and articulate the knowledge he has access to, but he spends the majority of the novel becoming more adept, despite blunders made with Mildred, Mrs. Phelps, and Mrs. Bowles.

The World State, the Party, and the firemen target the four creative individuals John the Savage, Helmholtz Watson, Winston Smith, and Guy Montag because their creative impulses threaten the stability of society. The dystopian novels continuously refer back to the Romantic theory of creativity in which creativity is an uncontrollable and uncontainable force, a "flood [that] is even madness" in and of itself (Huxley 43). According to the World State, the Party, and the firemen, "man is dangerous because of his mind and spirit," and therefore, it is his mind and spirit that must be subdued (Walsh 150). Each governmental power makes laws to respond to creativity and those who promote it: mental control, biological alterations, and the threat of exile or euthanasia are among the most popular strategies. However, none can completely rid society of the presence of creativity.

The four men's creativity stimulates feelings of individuality, autonomy, independence, and freedom. In Oscar Wilde's essay *The Soul of Man,* he describes such men as "the real men, the men who have realized themselves" and so become dissatisfied with their lives (Wilde 233). This dissatisfaction then fuels their later creative and rebellious exploits. These men act as the "saving remnant" for society and "[try] to change it from within to something better – or if that is impossible they are ready to leave and create a saner world elsewhere" (Walsh 164). Springing from ideals of freedom and individuality, creativity becomes synonymous with rebellion in dystopian literature. But what about in *utopian* literature?

Utopian Theories of Creativity

At first glance, utopian and dystopian attitudes toward creativity appear similar. Time and again, it is emphasized that art must have a use within society. According to Chad Walsh, unless it serves "some practical purpose or create[s] desirable social attitudes," art is marginalized or "actively discouraged" in utopian society (Walsh 63). Marie Louise Berneri further condemns the treatment of creativity in utopias. Labeling the treatment as "ferocious in its suppression of the freedom of the artist," she goes on to lambast "the Utopian state" for their requirement that artists "must all become the servants and propaganda agents of the State" (Berneri 8) – a demand most similar to that which the World State and the Party demand of their inhabitants. This idea stems from Plato's *Republic,* the oldest of recorded utopias, in which Plato, through the voice of Socrates, ousts poets and other similarly creative people from his perfect republic. He asserts that not only does their art represent nature inadequately and therefore dishonestly, but also that its influence takes people out of their right minds, transporting them into such a state wherein they, much less the government, cannot control

themselves. Because the philosopher-king must have the final approval over all content, artists are given no freedom to create (Plato).

Other utopias assume a more subtle tone toward creativity. Utopias such as Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* and Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* are dismissive of creativity but, at the same time, propose that creativity is flourishing within their nation. In her book *Bread and Roses: An Utopian Survey and Blue-Print*, Ethel Mannin proposes that utopias "incorporate [art] into daily life as much as possible" and refuse to entertain the idea that art ought to be "something apart in museums, galleries, [or] concert halls" (Mannin 91, 89). Art, to utopians, is "all that [is] pleasing to the sight" (Mannin 88). As a result, art maintains a constant presence in utopian society, according to Mannin. *Looking Backward* in particular emphasizes this idea of daily exposure to the arts; their libraries and music stations are always available to those with free time and the inclination. However, art quickly becomes relegated to the sidelines of utopian society. Its dominant role is a hobby for when civilians are finished doing their share of labor; only a few people are allowed to undertake careers involving artistic creativity. Even then, those who choose such a career are kept from interacting with the majority of society.

Whereas dystopias distance themselves from art and describe it as a dangerous threat, Mannin posits that those who live in utopias "are used to beautiful things, so that beauty, too, is not something apart, related to something called 'Art,' but it also is a part of daily life" (Mannin 90). In *Walden Two*, B.F. Skinner holds with the utopian tradition and maintains the classical theory of creativity, where creativity does not hold an immense sway over people. Creativity acts as a pastime, and does not captivate people as romantic theory professes; it is not, as it is for the dystopian novels, a key to individuality or freedom. Instead, Mannin characterizes art as more of a tool used "sometimes purely for delight, sometimes for the illumination of life" that is

to be appreciated daily (Mannin 91). *Walden Two* lauds its culture of creativity without dismissing it quite so completely to the fringes of society.

And yet, Skinner dedicates the most effort to detailing the presence of creativity and influence on Walden Two than other utopian writers. He combines the classical theory of creativity with his own psychological theory, behaviorism. In *Walden Two*, all are brought up with the training of operant conditioning, where actions are encouraged or discouraged by the application of reinforcements or punishments: “a person’s behavior is controlled by his genetic and environmental histories rather that by the person himself as an initiating, creative agent” (Skinner, *About Behaviorism* 189). Any action an individual takes, therefore, is not a choice, but determined by his pattern of prior actions.

Skinner refuses to admit that freedom exists in society, much less in creativity. In *Walden Two*, as well as his other texts describing of behaviorism, Skinner attests that it is “by skillful planning” that “we *increase* [*sic*] the feeling of freedom” (Skinner, *Walden Two* 248). It is this “illusion” – an extremely realistic illusion, but still only an illusion – that he gives to citizens of Walden Two (Skinner, *Walden Two* 76). In this way, Skinner, through Frazier, sustains the perception that the artist is not free, but at the same time free to create as his own wants and needs dictate. However, this freedom cannot sustain a creative drive. Skinner writes *Walden Two* as a response to and, in his mind, an improvement upon Henry David Thoreau’s original *Walden*. Whereas *Walden* records the benefits of a free, independent life and of solitude, Skinner declares the opposite in *Walden Two*. Individuality, freedom, and solitude become irrelevant when a secure community atmosphere is present.

By treating creativity in such a way, Skinner attempts to demonstrate how, in his society, creativity does not follow the Romantic theory and, as such, is not threatening to the status quo

of society. However, he is unable to prove his point successfully. Frazier keeps trying to distance freedom and, consequently, individuality from creativity.

Frazier states in *Walden Two* that, "We shall never produce so satisfying a world that there will be no place for art" (Skinner, *Walden Two* 116). In this phrase, he appears to admit that creativity and art breed from dissatisfaction in the world. However, the rest of the novel, as well as Skinner's theory of behaviorism, profess the opposite. "On the contrary," Frazier continues, "Walden Two has demonstrated very nicely that as soon as the simple necessities of life are obtained with little effort, there's an enormous welling up of artistic interest" (Skinner, *Walden Two* 116). This language is mirrored in Skinner's theory:

> Man's success in freeing himself from the irritations and dangers of his physical environment and from the punitive and exploitative aspects of his social environment has been perhaps his greatest achievement. It has left him free to develop other kinds of behavior with highly reinforcing consequences – in the sciences, arts, and social relations. At the same time it has given him the feeling of freedom, and perhaps no feeling has caused more trouble. (Skinner, *About Behaviorism* 197)

In this light, there is nothing mysterious about creativity; it is not prompted by a "lack of satisfaction of the basic needs," "chaos" in the surrounding society, or by personal unhappiness on the part of the artist (Skinner, *Walden Two* 116). Rather, it is merely a natural impetus released by the fulfillment of basic needs.

In this theory, creativity becomes nothing more than a reinforcement of "accidental variations in behavior" that result in a "beautiful" or "successful" outcome (Skinner, *About Behaviorism* 114, 115, 115). In addition, Frazier belittles the importance of individual experience in creativity: "The fact of the matter is . . . the end of your personal history [of how Burris makes his journey back to Walden Two and is received at the compound] doesn't mean a damn, one way or the other" (Skinner, *Walden Two* 299). An individual's journey is not

important when it comes to creativity's final product; only the product matters. This emphasis on creativity led me to look at *Walden Two* through the lens of Csikszentmihalyi's Domain-Individual-Field Interaction Model. In keeping with the model, I will be able to see if creativity – as I have measured in the dystopias – exists within *Walden Two*, or if Skinner's perception is not an accurate portrayal of creativity.

The domain at Walden Two becomes a specialized collection; those responsible for what enters Walden Two's cultural repertory from the outside world select the finest art possible. "We pride ourselves on having the best books, if not the most," Frazier reports (Skinner *Walden Two* 111). Every so often the librarians and curators purge the shelves, assessing the creative value of what is present in society and discarding what does not measure up to their standards. The collection in Walden Two, then, is one "that never misses fire" (Skinner *Walden Two* 112). With only two to three thousand volumes, the library ensures that all members of society "get something vital every time [they] take a book from the shelves" (Skinner *Walden Two* 112). Most, if not all, of what is created by those residing in Walden Two is added to the domain. Frazier brags about art's rapid development and production in society: "Naturally we will develop our own genre," given enough time (Skinner *Walden Two* 83).

Walden Two is a paradigm of Csikszentmihalyi's concept of a field. Frazier has designed the community to be entirely self-sufficient and interdependent. All members of the society take part in creativity with each other, with individuals often adding to or completing others' works, and contribute to the collective "patronage of the arts" present in Walden Two (Skinner, *Walden Two* 80). They read, listen, experience, and judge the art that is made by other people from Walden Two. The community provides instantaneous feedback, even on works in progress. An author learns how children like his unfinished story as he sits behind a focus group

while "occasionally turn[ing] his head" to hear the children's reaction (Skinner *Walden Two* 198). This immediate feedback loop strengthens the ultimate creative product.

As Csikszentmihalyi highlights in his psychological model of creativity, Frazier, and therefore Skinner, focuses primarily on the context surrounding creativity, including the preexisting collection of art and the people who decide what is included. In his description to his guests, Frazier says that Walden Two provides "the right conditions" of "leisure," "opportunity," and "appreciation" for creativity, in an environment that encourages collaboration (Skinner *Walden Two* 84). Frazier adopts an extreme version of this perspective; while Csikszentmihalyi allows an individual's contribution some weight in his argument, Frazier refuses to allot any importance to the individual. On the contrary, he proposes that the group mentality outweighs individual contribution. One man may begin a musical composition, but it is equally likely that "it's finished for him by enthusiastic friends" (Skinner *Walden Two* 82). Frazier devalues any potential benefit from being a unique individual, belittling the small, if existent, benefit genes provide. Prominently featured in Walden Two is the equality among people's abilities. Skinner agrees with Mannin's statement that in a utopia, "every man is a special kind of artist" with his own potential (Mannin 89). Frazier says of society in Walden Two, "We overflow with gratitude – but to no one in particular. We are grateful to all and to none" and so hold no one's work as superior over others (Skinner *Walden Two* 157). The lack of distinction between people, especially between the people who are creative and those who are not, perpetuates "generalized gratitude toward the whole community" to the detriment of the individual (Skinner, *Walden Two* 157).

Skinner by no means says that the individual is not necessary for creativity. However, he suggests that whatever role an individual has in creativity is negligible when compared with the

effect of the community. The "right conditions" – opportunity, appreciation, and leisure – become more important than the individual's contribution to creativity (Skinner *Walden Two* 84). The question becomes: can creativity still exist without a focus on the individual? For all Frazier's talk of new compositions and the creation of a "new genre," he devalues Walden Two's original art (Skinner *Walden Two* 83). As Walsh writes,

> you can't have it both ways. You can have a society aquiver with creativity – arts, sciences, technological breakthroughs, everything – or you can have a safe and stable society. You can't choose both. The reason is that creativity and destructiveness are both parts of man's restlessness and imagination; they are two sides of the same coin. If you get rid of one, you get rid of the other. Thus a highly creative society, such as Periclean Athens or Elizabethan England, is certain to be filled with social turmoil – discontent, plots, rebellions, fanaticism. An extremely stable society may indeed carry on the creative traditions of the past – as China under the later emperors continued to produce exquisite potter and verse – but the wilder flights of creativity will not be found. (Walsh 148)

Walden Two certainly has individuals who make art, but those products cannot be high art. The utopian community fails to sustain the individual component of Csikszentmihalyi's model, specifying that the person acting through creativity is inherently creative. Additionally, the diminishment of individuality and freedom, personal or artistic, leads to a devaluation of the creativity itself. What is at one time special and revolutionizing becomes merely commonplace.

CONCLUSION

Creativity acts as a catalyst, despite its differing representations, in the three dystopian novels *Brave New World, 1984,* and *Fahrenheit 451* and the utopian novel *Walden Two*. The dystopias adhere to the Romantic theory of creativity, where creativity is an inherently dangerous and cataclysmic element that must be suppressed. *Walden Two*, on the other hand, assumes a more classical perspective – that creativity is a skill to be perfected in one's free time – while mixing it with Skinner's personal philosophy of behaviorism. I examined creativity's presence through a separate psychological model, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi's Domain-Individual-Field Interaction (DIFI) Model. This model places more emphasis on the context surrounding creativity than the individual himself, and proposes that there must be a domain and field present in addition to the person in order for there to be creativity (Csikszentmihalyi *Creativity*).

In all texts, creativity is linked to the concepts of individuality and freedom. For those texts using the Romantic theory of creativity, high art becomes dangerous through its association with individuality and freedom: As Wilde writes, "Art is Individualism, and Individualism is a disturbing and disintegrating force" (Wilde 250). The endorsed low art distances itself and, at times, directly opposes these ideals. Because the governments concerned worry about maintaining the status quo, they take drastic actions against perceived threats, i.e. creativity, and succeed in reducing or eliminating its potentially rebellious influence. John the Savage is driven to suicide. Helmholtz Watson is deported to a distant archipelago where he may write what he wants far away from the public eye. Winston Smith is reprogrammed to be without any creative or rebellious impulse, and then presumably killed. Guy Montag is forced out of society, declared "dead" by the police, and left to survive in the wilderness with other academics (Bradbury 149). Even when using the DIFI Model, I found that questions of individuality and artistic freedom

motivate the protagonists' simultaneous creative and rebellious actions. In each case, the protagonist represents a threat because he immerses himself in creativity and shows signs of wanting more freedom and individuality.

Walden Two instead obscures the shared connection among individuality, freedom, and creativity. Because the utopia applies the classical theory to its society, creativity seems to be less of a threat. A perfected skill does not inspire a revolution to overhaul the governing system; it is merely a way to pass the time during the day. In addition, the utopian compound Walden Two centers on a communal lifestyle. All members of society live in a tightly-knit community which deemphasizes individuality in favor of the good of the group, further weakening creativity's sway. Skinner's incorporation of behaviorism undermines freedom's link with creativity. As the psychological theory does not allow for the existence of freedom, the importance of artistic freedom should decrease. Ultimately, *Walden Two* attempts to show that creativity does not need to be destructive or threatening to society. Additionally, the society eliminates creativity's connection to freedom and individuality – a bond that the Romantic theory stresses.

By linking creativity with individuality, freedom, and rebellion, the novels' authors raise the question of creativity's true purpose. Is creativity there simply as a destabilizing element that liberates the soul, as the Romantic theory states? Or is it an essential part of the human experience that the dystopias do not account for? To some extent, creativity is the romantic ne'er-do-well that it appears to be. The protagonists act out their dissatisfaction with society through their creative endeavors. These actions become violent and are directed to change the foundation of their society. However, the stress laid on the connection between creativity and rebellion instills some doubt into my mind. What are the intentions of Huxley, Orwell, or

Bradbury in using creativity as the catalyst? There is the possibility that the authors are simply exploiting a common convention to propel their plot forward and bring a threat against the horrid government to fruition.

But is that it? If so, then dystopias become purely political and one-dimensional in their message. The impetus behind creativity's inclusion is to bring about the destruction of a government. Studying utopian and dystopian literature would become an exercise of applying and condemning political theories as ineffective and destructive.

I believe there is more to dystopias than only the political or revolutionary aspects. If authors such as Aldous Huxley, George Orwell, or Ray Bradbury portray a perfectly imperfect world, they must necessarily have characters react to the political state of the world and their treatment at the hands of the governing bodies. But rebellions in dystopias are not there for their own sake; instead, the political activism brings to light the voids left by dystopian governments. The novels describe what essential element of humanity has been neglected by the government and, in doing so, define what is an essential quality of being human. In this case, Huxley, Orwell, and Bradbury all emphasize the importance of creativity to humanity. They create "men who have realized themselves, and in whom Humanity gains a partial realization" and juxtapose these "real men" with societies that cannot accommodate humanity (Wilde 233). The governments in dystopias do not understand how to harness the power of humanity in such a way as to maintain totalitarian control of their public. As a result, they must ban creativity from their societies.

What then about utopian literature? As a representation of a perfect society, it should allow for and encompass all of humanity, including creativity. Csikszentmihalyi states that, "there is no evidence . . . to prove that a delightful setting induces creativity" (Csikszentmihalyi,

Creativity 135). On the contrary, a peaceful and idyllic location can foster great amounts of productivity, as attested by Thoreau's *Walden* and allegedly demonstrated in Bellamy's *Looking Backward* and Skinner's *Walden Two*. However, Romantic theorists cannot help but think that they must choose between "a just and happy society with much of the great literature rendered impossible by happiness, or an unjust, agonized, nasty society with an occasional Shakespeare or Dostoievski" (Walsh 66-67). Skinner's stress on creativity's presence without individuality and freedom in the conventional senses suggests an anxiety on his part to prove the opposite: that creativity, stability, and happiness are not mutually exclusive conditions of life.

In his earnestness to include creativity as an assumed part of society, Skinner neglects the "chaos" and the freedom that creativity provides humanity (Skinner, *Walden Two* 116). His haste to declare creativity an equally universal trait in keeping with Mannin's declaration that "every man is a special kind of artist" overpowers his argument, and so Skinner's defense of creativity falls flat (Mannin 89). His descriptions of creativity as "mutations" or "accidental variations in behavior," instead of supporting his notion of an everyday creativity, belittle the role creativity plays in humanity (Skinner, *About Behaviorism* 114). Skinner's treatment of creativity becomes too mechanical to allay a common Romantic fear that a utopian society will prove to be "simply a bore" (Walsh 66). By ignoring Wilde's conception of creativity as "a disturbing and disintegrating force," Skinner degrades his own society's humanity into something more robotic than human (Wilde 250). Skinner rejects John the Savage's "right to be unhappy," and so loses the rolling, rumbling words of "a terrible beautiful magic" (Huxley 240, 132).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

"Dystopia." *Online Oxford English Dictionary.* 2013. <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/58909>.

"Utopia." *Online Oxford English Dictionary.* 2013. <http://www.oed.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/220784>.

Bellamy, Edward. *Looking Backward, 2000-1887.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1917.

Bradbury, Ray. *Fahrenheit 451.* 1953. New York: Ballentine Books, 1979.

Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. *Herland*. 1915. New York: Pantheon Books, 1979.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. 1932. New York: HarperPerennial, 1998.

Huxley, Aldous. *Island*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1963.

More, Sir Thomas. *Utopia.* London: Chatto & Windus, 1908.

Orwell, George. *1984*. 1949. New York: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1977

Plato. Lee, Desmond, trans. *The Republic.* 2nd ed. London: Penguin Group, 1987.

Skinner, B. F. "Freedom and the Control of Men." *Utopia*. Ed. George Kateb. New York: Atherton Press, 1971.

Skinner, B. F. *Walden Two*. 1948. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.

Skinner, B. F. *About Behaviorism.* New York: Knopf, 1974.

SECONDARY SOURCES

LITERARY SOURCES

Abrams, M. H. *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Atkins, John. *George Orwell: A Literary Study*. London: The Ditchling Press Limited, 1954.

Atwood, Margaret. *In Other Worlds: SF and the Human Imagination.* 2011. New York: Anchor Books, 2012.

Bammer, Angelika. *Partial Visions: Feminism and Utopianism in the 1970s*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Berneri, Marie Louise. *Journey Through Utopia*. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1951.

Bloch, Ernst. *The Principle of Hope*. Trans. Neville Plaice, Stephen Plaice, and Paul Knight. Vol 1, 2, 3. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1986.

Bolton, W. F. *The Language of 1984: Orwell's English and Ours*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1984.

Brown, E. J. *Brave New World, 1984, and We: An Essay on Anti-Utopia*. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1976.

Coverley, Merlin. *Utopia*. Harpenden: Pocket Essentials, 2010.

Davis, Laurence. "Morris, Wilde, and Le Guin on Art, Work, and Utopia." *Utopian Studies*. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2009. 213-248. Web. 10 Oct. 2012.

Dawson, Doyne. *Cities of the Gods: Communist Utopias in Greek Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Fortunati, Vita. "'It Makes No Difference': A Utopia of Simulation and Transparency." *Modern Critical Interpretations: George Orwell's 1984*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia, PA: Chelsea House, 1987. 109-120.

Frye, Northrop. "Varieties of Literary Utopias." *Utopias and Utopian Thought.* Ed. Frank Manuel. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966. 25-49.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000, c1957. Print.

Frye, Northrop. *Modern Century.* Toronto: Oxford University Press Canada, 1991.

Grossman, Kathryn. "'Through a Glass Darkly': Utopian Imagery in *Nineteen Eighty-Four." Utopian Studies 1*. Ed. Gorman Beauchamp, Kenneth Roemer, and Nicholas Smith. Lanham: University Press of America, Inc., 1987. 52-60.

Hansot, Elisabeth. *Perfection and Progress: Two Modes of Utopian Thought*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1974.

Harris, Roy. "The Misunderstanding of Newspeak." *Modern Critical Interpretations: George Orwell's 1984*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia, PA: Chelsea House, 1987. 87-94.

Howe, Irving. "*1984*: Enigmas of Power." *Modern Critical Interpretations: George Orwell's 1984*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia, PA: Chelsea House, 1987. 95-107.

Kant, Immanuel. *The Critique of Judgment.* 1952. Trans. by James Creed Meredith. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.

Kateb, George. "Introduction." *Utopia.* Ed. George Kateb. New York: Atherton Press, 1971. 1-28**.**

Kateb, George. "Utopia and the Good Life." *Utopias and Utopian Thought.* Ed. Frank Manuel. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966. 239-259.

Kateb, George. *Utopia and its enemies.* New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.

Kramer, Leonie. "Utopia as Metaphor." *Utopias: Papers from the annual symposium of the Australian Academy of the Humanities.* Ed. Eugene Kamenka. Melbourne; New York: Oxford University Press, 1987. 134-144.

Kumar, Krishan. *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times*. Oxford: T. J. Press Ltd, 1987.

Levitas, Ruth. *The Concept of Utopia*. Hertfordshire: Simon & Schuster International Group, 1990.

Levitas, Ruth, and Lucy Sargisson. "Utopia in Dark Times: Optimism/Pessimism and Utopia/Dystopia." *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination.* Ed. Rafaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan. New York: Routledge, 2003. 13-28.

Mannin, Ethel. *Bread and Roses: An Utopian Survey and Blue-Print*. London: MacDonald & Co LTD, 1944?.

McGiveron, Rafeeq O. "What 'Carried the Trick?': Mass Exploitation and the Decline of Thought in Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451." Modern Critical Interpretations: Ray Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia, PA: Chelsea House, 2001. 109-120.

Meckier, Jerome. "Onomastic Satire: Names and Naming in *Brave New World*." *Aldous Huxley Annual,* Vol. 3. Ed. Jerome Meckier and Bernfried Nugel. Munster, Germany: Lit, 2003. 155-203.

Meckier, Jerome. "Poetry in the Future, the Future of Poetry: Huxley and Orwell on Zamyatin." *Renaissance and Modern Studies: Visions of Dystopia*. Ed. Richard Cardwell and Ed. Peter Coveney. Nottingham, England: The University of Nottingham, 1984. 18-39.

Meckier, Jerome. "Shakespeare and Aldous Huxley." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 2. Washington, D. C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1971. Web. 10 Oct 2012. 129-135.

Morgan, Arthur. *Nowhere was Somewhere: How History Makes Utopias and How Utopias Make History*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1946.

Morley, Henry. "Introduction," *Ideal Commonwealths.* New York: The Colonial Press, 1901.

Morton, A. L. *The English Utopia.* London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1952.

Morris, Charles. *Varieties of Human Value*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Morris, James M. and Andrew Kross. *Historical Dictionary of Utopianism.* Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2004.

Mumford, Lewis. *The Story of Utopias*. New York: Boni and Liveright Publishers, 1922.

Polak, F. L. *The Image of the Future.* New York: Oceana Publications, 1964.

Polak, Frederik. "Utopia and Cultural Renewal." *Utopias and Utopian Thought.* Ed. Frank Manuel. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966. 281-295.

Ricther, Peyton. "Introduction." *Utopias: Social Ideals and Communal Experiments*. Ed. Peyton Ricther. Boston: Holbrook Press, Inc., 1972. 1-25.

Robertson, P. J. M. "Criticism and Creativity VI: George Orwell and Northrop Frye." *Queen's Quarterly*, vol. 92, issue 2. Kingston, Ontario: Queen's Quarterly, 1985. 374-384.

Rüsen, Jörn; Fehr, Michael; and Rieger, Thomas, ed. *Thinking Utopia: Steps into Other Worlds*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2005.

Sargent, Lyman Tower. "The Problem of the 'Flawed Utopia': A Note on the Costs of Eutopia." *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination.* Ed. Rafaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan. New York: Routledge, 2003. 225-232.

Sargisson, Lucy. *Utopian Bodies and the Politics of Transgression.* New York: Routledge, 2000.

Spencer, Susan. "*The Post-Apocalyptic Library: Oral and Literate Culture in Fahrenheit 451 and A Canticle for Leibowitz.*" *Modern Critical Interpretations: Ray Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia, PA: Chelsea House, 2001. 63-74.

Stephens, Anthony. "The Sun State and its Shadow: On the Condition of Utopian Writing." *Utopias: Papers from the annual symposium of the Australian Academy of the Humanities.* Ed. Eugene Kamenka. Melbourne; New York: Oxford University Press, 1987. 1-19.

Valéry, Paul. Trans. Charles Guenther. "Poetry and Abstract Thought." *The Kenyon Review.* Vol. 16, No. 2. Ohio: Kenyon College, 1952. Web. 26/1/2013.

Walsh, Chad. *From Utopia to Nightmare*. London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd, 1962.

Watt, Donald. "Burning Bright: *Fahrenheit 451* as Symbolic Dystopia." *Modern Critical Interpretations: Ray Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia, PA: Chelsea House, 2001. 21-38.

Weber, Eugene. "The Anti-Utopia of the Twentieth Century." *Utopia.* Ed. George Kateb. New York: Atherton Press, 1971. 81-90**.**

Wilde, Oscar. "The Soul of Man." *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde.* Ed. Joesephine Guy. Vol 4. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. 231-268.

Williams, Raymond. "George Orwell." *Modern Critical Interpretations: George Orwell's 1984*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia, PA: Chelsea House, 1987. 9-18.

Williams, Raymond. "Observation and Imagination." *Orwell*. Suffolk: The Chaucer Press, Ltd., 1974. 41-53.

Yutang, Lin. *The Importance of Living*. New York: The John Day Company, 1937.

PSYCHOLOGICAL SOURCES

Csikszentmihalyi, Milaly. "Genes Versus Memes: Notes from the Culture Wars." *Changing the World: A Framework for the Study of Creativity.* Ed. David Henry Feldman, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, and Howard Gardner. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 1994. 159-172.

Csikszentmihalyi, Milaly. "The Domain of Creativity." *Changing the World: A Framework for the Study of Creativity.* Ed. David Henry Feldman, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, and Howard Gardner. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 1994. 135-158.

Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly. *Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention*. New York: HarperPerennial, 1996.

Dacey, John S. and Kathleen H. Lennon. *Understanding Creativity: The Interplay of Biological, Psychological, and Social Factors*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1998.

Feldman, David Henry, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, and Howard Gardner. "A Framework for the Study of Creativity." *Changing the World: A Framework for the Study of Creativity.* Ed. David Henry Feldman, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, and Howard Gardner. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 1994. 1-46.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Lyrics to Popular Songs within *Brave New World*

1. "There ain't no Bottle in all the world like that dear little Bottle of mine" (Huxley 76)

Bottle of mine, it's you I've always wanted!
Bottle of mine, why was I ever decanted?
    Skies are blue inside of you,
    The weather's always fine;
For
There ain't no Bottle in all the world
Like that dear little Bottle of mine

2. "Hug me till you drug me" (Huxley 166)

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

APPENDIX 2: SOLIDARITY SERVICE HYMNS 1-4 FROM *BRAVE NEW WORLD*

1. Hymn 1 (Huxley 81)
Ford, we are twelve; oh, make us one,
Like drops within the Social River;
Oh, make us now together run,
As swiftly as thy shining Flivver.

2. Hymn 2 (Huxley 81)
Come, Greater Being, Social Friend,
Annihilating Twelve-in-One!
We long to die, for when we end,
Our larger life has but begun.

3. Hymn 3 (Huxley 82)
Feel how the Greater Being comes!
Rejoice and, in rejoicings, die!
Melt in the music of the drums!
For I am you and you are I.

4. Hymn 4 (Huxley 84)
Orgy-porgy, Ford and fun,
Kiss the girls and make them One.
Boys at one with girls at peace;
Orgy-porgy gives release.

APPENDIX 3: LYRICS TO POPULAR SONGS IN *1984*

1. "It was only an 'opeless fancy"
"*It was only an 'opeless fancy*
It passed like an Ipril dye,
But a look an' a word an' the dreams they stirred
They 'ave stolen my 'eart awye!" (Orwell 138)

"*They sye that time 'eals all things,*
They sye you can always forget;
But the smiles an' the tears across the years
They twist my 'eartstrings yet!" (Orwell 141)

2. "Under the spreading chestnut tree"
"*Under the spreading chestnut tree*
I sold you and you sold me:
There lie they, and here lie we
Under the spreading chestnut tree." (Orwell 77)

APPENDIX 4: NURSERY RHYMES RECITED IN *1984*

1. The Churches of London

"*Oranges and Lemons, say the bells of St. Clement's,*
You owe me three farthings, say the bells of St. Martin's,
When will you pay me? say the bells of Old Bailey,
When I grow rich, say the bells of Shoreditch.
Here comes a candle to light you to bed,
Here comes a chopper to chop off your head!"

(Fragmentary occurrences throughout Orwell's *1984*. First two lines: page 99. Third line: page 146. Fourth line: page 178. Fifth and sixth line: page 99, 146, 222)

APPENDIX 5: HELMHOLTZ WATSON'S POEM ON SOLITUDE

Yesterday's committee,
Sticks, but a broken drum,
Midnight in the City,
Flutes in a vacuum,
Shut lips, sleeping faces,
Every stopped machine,
The dumb and littered places
Where crowds have been: . . .
All silences rejoice,
Weep (loudly or low),
Speak – but with the voice
Of whom, I do not know.
Absence, say, of Susan's,
Absence of Egeria's
Arms and respective bosoms,
Lips and, ah, posteriors,
Slowly form a presence;
Whose? and, I ask, of what
So absurd an essence,
That something, which is not,
Nevertheless should populate
Empty night more solidly
Than that with which we copulate,
Why should it seem so squalidly? (Huxley 181)

APPENDIX 6: WINSTON SMITH'S DIARY ENTRIES

"Suddenly he began writing in sheer panic, only imperfectly aware of what he was setting down. His small but childish handwriting straggled up and down the page, shedding first its capital letters and finally even its full stops:

April 4th, 1984. Last night to the flicks. All war films. One very good one of a ship full of refugees being bombed somewhere in the Mediterranean. Audience much amused by shots of a great huge fat man trying to swing away with a helicopter after him. first you saw him wallowing along in the water like a porpoise, then you saw him through the helicopters gunsights, then he was full of holes and the sea round him turned pink and he sank as suddenly as though the holes had let in the water. audience shouting with laughter when he sank. then you saw a lifeboat full of children with a helicopter hovering over it. there was a middleaged woman might have been a jewess sitting up in the bow with a little boy about three years old in her arms. little boy screaming with fright and hiding his head between her breasts as if he was trying to burrow right into her and the woman putting her arms around him and comforting him although she was blue with fright herself. all the time covering him up as much as possible as if she thought her arms could/keep the bullets off him. then the helicopter planted a 20 kilo bomb in among them terrific flash and the boat went all to matchwood. then there was a wonderful shot of a childs arm going up up up right up into the air a helicopter with a camera in its nose must have followed it up and there was a lot of applause from the party seats but a woman down in the prole part of the house suddenly started kicking up a fuss and shouting they didnt oughter of showed it not in front of the kids they didnt it aint right not in front of kids it aint until the police turned her turned her out i don't suppose anything happened to her nobody cares what the proles say typical prole reaction they never – " (Orwell 8-9)

"DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER
DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER
DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER
DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER
DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER" (Orwell 18)

"*theyll shoot me i dont care theyll shoot me in the back of the neck i don't care down with big brother they always shoot you in the back of the neck i dont care down with big brother –*" (Orwell 19)

"*To the future or to the past, to a time when thought is free, when men are different from one another and do not live alone – to a time when truth exists and what is done cannot be undone:*

From the age of uniformity, from the age of solitude, from the age of Big Brother, from the age of doublethink – greetings!

Thoughtcrime does not entail death: thoughtcrime IS death." (Orwell 28)

[end of first entry]

"*It was three years ago. It was on a dark evening, in a narrow side street near one of the big railway stations. She was standing near a doorway in the wall, under a street lamp that hardly gave any light. She had a young face, painted very thick. It was really the paint that appealed to me, the whiteness of it, like a mask, and the bright red lips. Party women never paint*

their faces. There was nobody else in the street, and no telescreens. She said two dollars. I –" (Orwell 63)

"*I went with her through the doorway and across a backyard into a basement kitchen. There was a bed against the wall, and a lamp on the table, turned down very low. She –*" (Orwell 64)

"*She threw herself down on the bed, and at once, without any kind of preliminary, in the most coarse, horrible way you can imagine, pulled up her skirt. I—*" (Orwell 67)

"*I turned up the lamp. When I saw her in the light –*" (Orwell 68)

"*When I saw her in the light she was quite an old woman, fifty years old at least. But I went ahead and did it just the same.*" (Orwell 69)

[end of second entry]

"*If there is hope, it lies in the proles*." (Orwell 69)

"*Until they become conscious they will never rebel, and until after they have rebelled they cannot become conscious*." (Orwell 70)

Copied from a children's history book: "*In the old days, before the glorious Revolution, London was not the beautiful city that we know today. It was a dark, dirty, miserable place where hardly anybody had enough to eat and where hundreds and thousands of poor people had no boots on their feet and not even a roof to sleep under. Children no older than you are had to work twelve hours a day for cruel masters, who flogged them with whips if they worked too slowly and fed them on nothing but stale breadcrusts and water. But in among all this terrible poverty there were just a few great big beautiful/houses that were lived in by rich men who had as many as thirty servants to look after them. These rich men were called capitalists. They were fat, ugly men with wicked faces, like the one in the picture on the opposite page. You can see that he is dressed in a long black coat which was called a frock coat, and a queer, shiny hat shaped like a stovepipe, which was called a top hat. This was the uniform of the capitalists, and no one else was allowed to wear it. The capitalists owned everything in the world, and everyone else was their slave. They owned all the land, all the houses, all the factories, and all the money. If anyone disobeyed them they could throw him into prison, or they could take his job away and starve him to death. When an ordinary person spoke to a capitalist he had to cringe and bow to him, and take off his cap and address him as 'Sir.' The chief of all the capitalists was called the King, and –*" (Orwell 72-73)

"I understand HOW: I do not understand WHY." (Orwell 80)

"*Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two make four. If that is granted, all else follows.*" (Orwell 81)

[end of third entry]