

# A Post-Lacanian and Postmodern Interaction with the Utopian Project of Modernity: Ideology and Power in Brave New World

Michael O'Brien (University of Glasgow)

## **Introduction**

Ideology and power function in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* as products of desire, produced and sustained in 'socio-symbolic formations' (Žižek 1997, p.1) instituting coercive structures of control and domination in the facilitation of 'obscene enjoyment' (Žižek 2009, p.86) for a technocratic aristocracy. That is to say: ideology and power are visible in *Brave New World* through the symbolic order in which the technocrats have come to deploy institutional processes and language. Institutions and language are used to serve enjoyment. The World State's proclaimed function of stability is a shared 'ideological fantasy' (Žižek 2009, p.86) interpellating subjects minds and bodies instrumentally through processes of 'subjugation [...] and [...] control' (Foucault 1976, p.44) using such disciplinary mechanisms as systemic and symbolic violence, hegemony, language, and biopower to fuel obscene enjoyment. Both technocrats and subjects take pleasure in power, harnessing it in a shared 'desire network' (Daniella-Dick 2013, p.1). This desire is an 'assemblage [...] fundamentally libidinal and unconscious' (Deleuze & Guattari 2004, p.40). A feedback loop between self and state results in a perpetual reproduction of desire. Desire becomes both the means and the ends of ideology and power in *Brave New World*. This sharing of desire allows power-sharing between the base and the superstructure. Not simply coercive, power constitutes

the World State's inhabitants as much as being deployed by them. The citizenry enjoy the ideological fantasy as much as the technocrats. Both the citizenry and the technocrats are coerced by and implicit in deploying 'obscene enjoyment'.

Reading *Brave New World* with this framework of Žižekian, Foucauldian, and Deleuzian ideas provides evidence that Huxley's sociological project for 'the royal road to a better world' explores how desire, ideology and power have come to function throughout the history of society (Huxley 2012, p.1). Huxley examined desire, ideology and power to find how agents could harness their potentialities to transform real-world societal structures and processes. Huxley concluded nothing material was as adept as his 'non-attached man' to affect societal change, stating, 'the ideal man is the non-attached man [...] non-attached to wealth, fame, social position [...] science, art, speculation and philosophy' (Huxley 2012, p.4). Huxley believed this turn away from material oblivion towards spiritual transcendence was the ultimate ideological move, the only move powerful enough to create meaningful and long-lasting change in society. Ultimately Huxley's utopian project fails; his system of ideas is limited by a certain sense of duality, which does not allow him to come to terms with industrial modernity. He only manages to find individual transcendence beyond the dystopian materialism of the West by rejecting it completely.

Whilst the current analysis of *Brave New World* will depend upon reference to Žižekian, Foucauldian, and Deleuzian concepts, the analytical methodology will rely mostly upon combining Žižekian ideology critique with Foucauldian discourse analysis. There is not enough space to go into any great depth with Deleuze; suffice to say his definition of desire will play just a supporting role. Ultimately this analysis aims to show that Huxley's *oeuvre* generally, and *Brave New*

*World* in particular, are often an early literary equivalent of post-Lacanian and postmodern ideology critique. This highlights an isomorphic correspondence between literary methodology and critical methodology. The fact this isomorphic correspondence is an omnitemporal 'Dialogue Across Decades' lends further credence to the theory that humanity holds a collective (un)conscious utopian drive.

### **Huxley's Oeuvre**

Huxley's entire *oeuvre* features examinations of ideology and power. *Brave New World* was written with the purpose of defining 'the social milieu of post-World War I England' (Baker 1990, p.1) with the protagonist Bernard Marx, 'a social symbol, a paradigm of the whole life of the community' (Huxley 1969, p.383). By the end of his *oeuvre* Huxley concluded his 'non-attached man' was the ultimate force for change. His definitive utopia, *Island* (1962), fails due to Huxley's inability to integrate industrial modernity within his favored utopian system. The imagined island of Pala adopts a conservative approach to industrialization and is selective in its use of technology. This is effectively an evasion of the problems posed by hyper-industrialization in the West; Huxley's only solution to the problem is to avoid it. The fiction of Kim Stanley Robinson is much more proficient at adapting Western industrialization to proto-utopian conditions, specifically within the texts *Pacific Edge* (1990) and *Red Mars* (1992). Hena Maes-Jelinek argues that in his early novels, *Crome Yellow* (1921), *Antic Hay* (1923) and *Those Barren Leaves* (1925), Huxley 'exposes the spiritual disease of the post-war generation' highlighting 'the futility and immorality of a social class which seeks oblivion in pleasure' (Maes-Jelinek 2013, p.1). Maes-Jelinek's reading exposes qualities in Huxley's work which highlight the Žižekian notion of 'obscene enjoyment' in elitist power. These post war novels dealt with the 'predicament of the

“Clever Young Man” in a confused society' (Maes-Jelinek 2013, p.4). The protagonists, Denis, Gumbriel Jr., Chelifer, and Calamy are idealistic to start with but 'are soon disappointed in their romantic expectations [...] unable to reconcile the real with the ideal [...] torn between idealism and the temptation to yield to the cynical nihilism of those with whom they associate', indicating Huxley's idealism conflicted with the social circumstances of the 1920's (Maes-Jelinek 2013, p.4). The cynical nihilism in the novels was produced by 'everyone going about in search of his own pleasure' to the detriment of spiritual progress (Maes-Jelinek 2013, p.6). This pleasure is material pleasure and is directly controlled by the industrial infrastructures deployed by the upper classes. In *Crome Yellow* Scrogan and Cardan are the result of 'nineteenth-century materialism and belief in progress', while in *Those Barren Leaves*, 'the detached observer satirizes the aimlessness and sterile agitation of a disrupted society' (Maes-Jelinek 2013, p.12-15). Both texts blame the ideology of materialism for societal defects. Every idealistic protagonist from the first three novels fails. Huxley therefore begins examining the social conditions that cause failure in *Point Counter Point* (1928). In *Point Counter Point* we have 'the beginning of Huxley's quest for meaning in life and in art', and as with the first three novels, the overarching theme is 'the refusal of man to face his own nature', however this time Huxley indicates, 'men might be reconciled with their condition if only they realized that they are parts of an organic whole to whose nature they contribute unconsciously' (Maes-Jelinek 2013, p.18). Huxley's position is then ideologically similar to Carl Jung's notion of the immaterial collective unconscious, and Huxley's 'non-attached man' suggests his preference for spiritual detachment rather than material cohesion, which opposes him to thinkers such as Emile Durkheim. In *Point Counter Point* Mark Rampion complains of, 'the horrible unwholesome tameness of our

world', a condition detrimental to individual will-to-power (Huxley in Maes-Jelinek 2013, p.20). For Rampion, 'the world is tame because people have been domesticated by the all-powerful institutions which govern modern Western civilisation'; in other words, systemic power thwarts individual and social growth and requires modification (Maes-Jelinek 2013, p.20). Huxley's early novels posit Clever Young Men and examine their failures, in *Point Counter Point* solutions are considered. In *Brave New World* (1932) Huxley's sociological experiment goes further: it is in this dystopian rendition of a technocratic nightmare that Huxley's utopian project really becomes powerful in exposing misappropriated ideology and power. By *Eyeless in Gaza* (1936) Huxley seemed to be indicating he believed man could develop beyond the chains of society. However by *After Many a Summer* (1939) Huxley shifts and enters a pessimistic stage. In this novel society is 'no longer worth improving, and [...] [Huxley] [...] is convinced that nothing will palliate the banefulness of industrialism, business and centralized governments' (Maes-Jelinek 2013, p.53). *Time Must Have a Stop* (1944) 'indicates a softening of his attitude towards contemporary man'; but Huxley 'denounce(s) the same evils in modern society' (Maes-Jelinek 2013, p.54). The pessimistic stance continues throughout *Ape and Essence* (1949), in which atomic war nearly annihilates humanity, resulting in its mutation. *Doors of Perception* (1954), although not a novel, is included here because it further exposes Huxley's position. He writes on taking mescaline and his experiences ranging from the 'purely aesthetic' to 'sacramental vision' (Huxley 1954, p.15). Mystical experiences are conveyed and he puts forward a theory of infinite perception. *The Genius and the Goddess* (1955) focuses on love and the past. The past is shown to be restrictive and Huxley suggests our emotions can guide us to the future. *Island* (1962) is Huxley's final novel and his definitive utopia. Huxley combines 'Eastern spiritualism...

with Western humanism and science to form a pragmatic, utilitarian composite', creating the most complete form of his utopian project (Curtis 2011, p.95). In *Island* Huxley is an advocate of 'religious mysticism, humanistic science, decentralized democracy, hallucinogenic drug use, birth control for rational population management, natural resource conservation and sustainable development, eugenics, psychology, art, poetry, and Deweyan liberal education' (Curtis 2011, p.95). However, the utopia fails, conflicting with industrialism. Huxley evades the problems posed by the over-industrialized West. In *Brave New World Revisited* (1958), another non-novel text, Huxley says, 'democracy can hardly be expected to flourish in societies where political and economic power is being progressively concentrated and centralized', and 'the progress of technology [...] is [...] leading to just such a concentration and centralization of power' (Huxley 1958, p.7). Huxley states, 'as the Little Men disappear, more and more economic power comes to be wielded by fewer and fewer people', going on to unify dictatorships, big business and Capitalism, as being run by 'the Power Elite' (Huxley 1958, p.7-8). Huxley blames technology for 'the concentration of economic and political power, and [...] the development of a society controlled [...] by Big Business and Big Government' (Huxley 1958, p.8). This domination desecrates progress because 'societies are composed of individuals and are good only insofar as they help individuals to realize their potentialities and to lead a happy and creative life' (Huxley 1958, p.8). For Huxley technological society 'causes increasing mental sickness', damaging 'security', rationality and the 'capacity for love' (Fromm in Huxley 1958, p.8). This technological drive is a 'Will to Order' that transfers to society and is dangerously dominative (Huxley 1958, p.9). Huxley, although not of the Frankfurt School, shared its emancipatory concerns, often quoting adherents such as Erich Fromm. Similarly Huxley's *Brave New World* shared Bertrand

Russell's emancipatory concern, expressed in *The Scientific Outlook*, that science would become used for domination. Russell stated, 'all real power will come to be concentrated in the hands of those who understand the art of scientific manipulation', which is extremely close to Huxley's position (Russell 1962, p.237). Robert Baker observes Huxley wrote on the Marquis de Sade concerning de Sade's 'desire for mastery' regarding 'instrumental reason' as a dominative 'Enlightenment ideology' and therefore anticipated *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, by the Frankfurt School's Adorno and Horkheimer (Baker 2001, p.41).

### **Discourse/Ideology**

Although much of Huxley's emancipatory thinking was close to the Frankfurt School, frameworks such as Adorno's and Horkheimer's analyses of 'mass culture as generative ideological control' lead 'critical theorists into an aesthetic model of individuation' with the emancipatory project becoming an individual battle against the totalising concept (Day 2004, p.13). Žižek's focus on a Politics of Truth through analyses of the 'ideological privileging of the fetish object' and the 'fetish-denkverbot structure of ideology', coupled with Foucault's discourse analysis, allows the collective action of *Brave New World* to be more fully undermined than with other Frankfurt School aesthetic approaches (Day 2004, p.13).

For Feldner and Vighi, Foucault's discourse analysis provided 'historicist frameworks which conceptualized epistemic practices and technologies of power as historically situated and contingent', aiming to 'reveal a positive unconscious of knowledge' (Vighi & Feldner 2007, p.141). Discourse analysis 'reveal(ed) the historical a priori of ideas, rationalities and knowledge systems, their mute ground or unconscious condition of possibility' (Vighi & Feldner 2007, p.144). For Foucault truth is always bound to the 'interplay of power and knowledge', and

truth never resides outside of power (Vighi & Feldner 2007, p.144). For Foucault ideology is formed unconsciously in culture as part of knowledge/power. Žižek sees value in discourse analysis, Feldner and Vighi put it thus, 'every ideological stance we assume is always-already parasitized by an intricate network of discursive devices whose function is to structure our point of view in advance', and for Žižek the diagnostic nature of discourse analysis measures how ideology emerges as part of discursive formations (Vighi & Feldner 2007, p.148).

For Žižek ideology is the 'generative matrix that regulates the relationship between visible and non-visible, between imaginable and non-imaginable' thereby rendering a psychoanalytical account of ideology as split between visible reality and hidden 'appearance beyond appearance', this hidden appearance being the domain of 'obscene enjoyment' (Vighi & Feldner 2007, p.145). Žižek observes previous ideology critique was constructed on the premise that ideology was a false reality obscuring the real. This perception of ideology as 'distorted representation of true' was shared by Foucault (Vighi & Feldner 2007, p.147). For Žižek, Foucault's discourse failed to examine 'how the coercive power of ideology derives from ideology's duplicitous links with the Real qua disavowed modes of enjoyment' (Vighi & Feldner 2007, p.147). Discourse analysis assumes it is not possible 'to draw a clear line of demarcation between ideology and actual reality', but Žižek attempts to reach the core of ideology through subjectivity (Vighi & Feldner 2007, p.148).

### **Ideology/Symbolic Violence**

In Chapter One of *Brave New World* as the reader is introduced to the 'CENTRAL LONDON HATCHERY AND CONDITIONING CENTRE' there is the opportunity to reach for the core of ideology through subjectivity (Huxley 2007, p.1). The reader experiences the



'objective or symbolic' violence of the World State, and how this violence is 'embodied in language and its forms', this embodiment highlighting the rationalistic, ideological, will-to-order of the technocrats (Valentić 2008, p.2). Objective/symbolic violence is not composed of physical acts, it is rather a violence that appears to be 'the non-violent zero-level [...] a perturbation of the "normal" peaceful state of things' but is in actual fact 'invisible objective violence' (Žižek in Valentić 2008, p.2). The symbolic violence of the technocrats is immediately visible in the imposing capital letters and the choice of words that make up the technical nomenclature of the sign; the repeated letter "c" connoting hissing serpentine deception with the alliteration of /s/. This sign is purposed to dominate the psyches of the civilian populace. 'CENTRAL' and 'CENTRE' are words imbued with desire/power, symbolically displaying a rationalistic will-to-order over the natural universe; their ideological power is sensed through the order they bring to the perceiver's thoughts. The word 'centre', necessarily, semantically, denotes/connotes 'kernel', 'nucleus' and 'source' in the mind of the perceiver. The technocrats have purposefully constructed the physical conditioning centre as the kernel/nucleus/source of all activity in *Brave New World*. The word CENTRE denotes this nucleus of activity. The actual architectural structure of the 'CENTRE' is the physical manifestation of a rationalistic will-to-order. Obscene/perverse use of eugenics displays rationalistic will-to-order, and desire for power, and enjoyment in this power is *symbolised* by the forceful language of the signs. This symbolised enjoyment becomes objective when the reader bears witness to the actually enjoyed forceful behaviour of the technocrats, to be highlighted later. 'HATCHERY' in its symbolic violence dominates, and is objectively symptomatic of the pathological will-to-order over the human race held by the technocrats. The symbolic power of

'HATCHERY' necessarily produces master/slave connotations signifying the subjugation of the populace to the level of animal-like sub-human beings in the mind of the reader. The physical subjugation of humanity through biopolitical technologies wielded within the objective institution will be returned to later. Obscene enjoyment at the core of the technocratic ideology can be experienced subjectively through the manifest content of the objective violence in the form of the symbolic capitalisation of the scientific nomenclature. The libido of the technocratic fantasy is visible in the forceful penetration of language. Likewise the 'positive unconscious of knowledge' is witnessed in words, such as 'CONDITIONING CENTRE' whereby truth bound to power/knowledge forms the unconscious experience of subjectivity, both in the underlying message broadcast by the institutional sign (i.e. the underlying message which says, 'YOU ARE INTEGRATED BY OUR RATIONALISTIC WILL TO ORDER'), and in its internal practices, i.e. conditioning people, literally forming their unconscious (and conscious) experiences of subjectivity. There is a twofold irony in a sign that forms the unconscious experience of subjectivity while advertising its operation. The primary irony is in satirising the operations of symbolic domination in the real world. The secondary irony is that although the unconscious experience of subjectivity sensed through the sign is dominative, it is also the key to intellectual emancipation, if subjects become conscious. Bernard Marx is aware of 'obscene enjoyment', discursive formations, generative matrices, the positive unconscious of knowledge, symbolic subjugation, and structural domination, but cannot stop enjoying the system.

The motto of the World State is a Huxleyan rendition of 'objective violence' in the guise of 'the non-violent zero level', the words 'COMMUNITY, IDENTITY, STABILITY', suggesting The World State's proclaimed function of stability is the objective non-

violent zero level (Huxley 2007, p.1). However, this non-violent zero level is imposed through discursive formations; it is an ideological position which structures the world-citizens' viewpoints before they structure their own. 'Stability' is therefore a shared 'ideological fantasy' supported historically through discourse, a point to be returned to later. The disciplinary mechanism in this instance is the non-violent zero level, which interpellates subjects minds in symbolic form; the 'subjugation and control' is accepted as the host shares the obscene enjoyment of the process, enjoying his/her servitude, as with the pleasures of the drug Soma, promiscuity, and games like Centrifugal Bumble-Puppy.

### **Power/Discourse**

The environmental descriptions of the laboratory are renditions of a 'pallid' and 'pale' space, as 'dead' as a 'ghost', engaging the reader in the judgemental condescension of a perversely imagined, symbolic and real technocratic fantasy (Huxley 2007, p.1). As the perverse Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning enters the perverse environment of the Fertilising Room he clearly loves dominating, and gives a tour of the facility, the reader witnesses the disciplinary language used to support the shared 'ideological fantasy' of 'stability' that interpellates subjects' minds and bodies. The disciplinary use of language directly betrays the 'obscene enjoyment' earlier symbolized in the rationalistic will-to-order of the signs. Here, obscene enjoyment is observed directly through the objectively violent manner in which the Director delivers his speech. Both the content of the Director's speech to the Students and the method of its delivery highlights 'the power/language relationship', which plays out as 'power in discourse' (Fairclough 1993, p.43). In *Language and Power*, Norman Fairclough analyses language to highlight how power relations operate in contemporary social institutions.

Fairclough discusses 'Power in face-to-face spoken discourse', and analyses 'discourse where participants are unequal', using the example of a doctor overseeing a group of medical students at a premature baby unit (Fairclough 1993, p.43-44). This is almost identical to the situation between the Director of Hatcheries and the students. In Fairclough's text the Doctor controls the student in the following ways: 1) interrupts the student to control the contributions; 2) announces what is happening; 3) makes explicit instructions; 4) evaluates contributions; 5) puts the student on the spot. The interaction in *Brave New World* is more dominative. It is immediately clear who is in control as the students 'followed nervously, rather abjectly, at the Director's heels', equipped with notebooks, 'desperately' scribbling (Huxley 2007, p.2). The Director loves the sound of his own voice, so rather than interrupting students, he lectures almost non-stop. He announces 'smiling at them with a menacing geniality', 'you will be settling down to serious work. You won't have time for generalities' his menacing smiles showing his obscene pleasure in controlling what is going on, making explicit instructions (Huxley 2007, p.2). This is the 'obscene enjoyment' of Žižek, the enjoyment of the pathological 'want to rule' (Žižek 2009, p.89). He evaluates students contributions, patronizing, 'My good boy! [...] Can't you see? Can't you see?', insulting, 'Ass!', and condescending, 'Hasn't it occurred to you [...]?', when students ask questions and make statements putting students on the spot (Huxley 2007, p.4-7). The negative form of these questions along with the sneering and derisive tone in which they are posed suggests the student 'ought to know' and his contributions are 'silly' (Fairclough 1993, p.46). The obscene enjoyment at the core of the technocratic ideology can be experienced subjectively through the manifest content of the objective violence in the form of the Director talking all the time, telling everyone what to do, menacing, condescending, insulting, sneering,

deriding, and being negative. Power's form here is the violent use of language within discourse to impose a regime of truth. The Director's speech is mechanical and cyclical like the Fordian production line he is describing. The cloned humans are products of this production line, in the standardized form of Alphas, Betas, Deltas, Epsilons, and Gammas.

### **Discourse/Regimes of Truth**

As illustrated, symbolic violence in the form of language and signs offers a subjective experience which symbolises a rationalistic desire and will-to-order/power over the natural universe, which is a form of 'obscene enjoyment' when physically imposed by the leaders. This symbolic violence points to systemic violence as the non-violent zero level, which is the embodied form of the shared ideological fantasy of stability. This shared ideological fantasy is imposed and enjoyed through the violent use of language in discourse. Face-to-face spoken interactions in discourse, such as the Director's speech to the students on the operations of the Conditioning Centre, represent the larger discourses/regimes of truth, which make up the larger ideological frameworks for *Brave New World*. These regimes of truth have a kernel of obscene enjoyment in application, evidenced by the rationale in which they are imposed. Three main Regimes of Truth are used by the World State Controllers to provide a foundation for 'stability'. These are the ideas of Henry Ford, Sigmund Freud, and J. B. Watson. The Resident Controller for Western Europe, Mustapha Mond, describes the regimes which dominate the function of desire, ideology and power in *Brave New World* in Chapters 3 and 16/17. In Chapter 3 Mond talks of the abolition of the family which allows for more efficient control of the individual consumer. In *Brave New World* Ford and Freud's theories become merged in an overarching regime of truth. Foucault states that regimes of truth are societies' 'discourse(s)' which it

accepts and makes function as true [...] mechanisms [...] to distinguish true and false statements [...] [and] [...] the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true' (Foucault in Rabinow 1991, p.73). In *Brave New World* Fordism and Freudianism are combined in one ultimate regime of truth, their systems of ideas becoming the means by which true and false statements are judged, inscribing higher statuses to those with more knowledge of them. Mond states in *Brave New World*, 'Our Ford-or Our Freud, as [...] he chose to call himself whenever he spoke of psychological matters [...] had been the first to reveal the appalling dangers of family life (Huxley 2007, p.33). Merging Fordism and Freudianism effectively merges capitalism and psychology to harness humanity in a hive-collective of 'desiring machines', where the family is destroyed to integrate individuals directly into the consuming collective, both consuming and producing the larger desiring machine that is society itself (Deleuze & Guattari 2013, p.11). Clearly then, Žižek's focus on the 'ideological privileging of the fetish object' allows collective action to be more fully undermined than with Adorno's aesthetic individuation (Day 2004, p.13). The behaviourist theories of J.B. Watson explain the disciplinary use of conditioning by the technocrats in this process. Ideology and power then become the means and ends of desiring (re)production through the use of Ford/Freud and Watson, where desire is inextricably linked to ideology as obscene enjoyment in commodity consumption and omnipresent promiscuity, with power becoming the eternal justification of the ideological manifestation of enjoyment. Mond, as a scientist, was capable of rebelling against the World State, however chose power and status instead. Mond embodies the technocratic agent desiring power and controlling regimes of truth for obscene enjoyment, as evidenced when he says 'we believe in happiness and stability' (Huxley 2007, p.195), the 'we' being the technocrats, 'happiness' being desire

fulfillment, 'stability' facilitating power/control, the translation being: *the technocrats desire fulfillment through power and control*. He later states 'we don't want... change', meaning that what society should be is what the technocrats *want* (Huxley 2007, p.198), this *want* necessarily being the 'want to rule', obscene just like fascism, 'in so far as it perceives directly the ideological form as its own end, as an end in itself', *ergo* the ideological form of enjoyment (Žižek 2009, p.89).

## Conclusion

The protagonists, Bernard Marx and Lenina Crowne, are constituted by the ideologies and powers which pervade the World State. Their bodies are bound up in a 'political investment' which is 'in accordance... with its economic use' and they are only useful because their bodies support the function of stability in *Brave New World*, i.e. the shared ideological fantasy which equals desire consumption/(re)production (Foucault in Rabinow 1991, p.173). They accept and enjoy servitude. John, not conditioned, does not enjoy nor accept, and ideologically finds no other route than self-destruction as a final act of will-to-power. *Brave New World's* domination is so complete that not one character transcends it. Even Mustapha Mond is fully integrated into the network of desire; he desires power over individuality. Whilst Huxley's examinations of ideology and power shared the Frankfurt School's concerns and his project was sophisticated enough to anticipate Žižekian, Foucauldian, and Deleuzian thought, his utopian project fails due to his apparent inability to reconcile materialism with spirituality. Re-appropriating my method of examining Huxley's satirical account of post-WWI materialism to a re-examination of his entire *oeuvre* would shed more light on obscene enjoyment within Huxley and potentially more light on our present-day dystopian global capitalism. However, focusing on isomorphic-methodological correspondences

between poetic literature and critical theory, in literature, which is more successful in reconciling materialism with spirituality, may prove to be more valuable. Philip K. Dick, William Gibson and Philip Jose Farmer blend materialism and spirituality in a more sophisticated way than Huxley did. Deep examination of these authors should tell us a lot more about omnitemporal utopian consciousness than Huxley.

## Bibliography

- Baker, Robert S. 1990. *Brave New World: History, Science, and Dystopia*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Baker, Robert S. 2001. Science and Modernity in Huxley. In C.C. Barfoot (ed.), *Aldous Huxley Between East and West*. 35–58. New York: Editions Rodopi B.V.
- Curtis, William M. 2011. Rorty's Liberal Utopia and Island. *Philosophy and Literature* 35. 91–103.
- Day, Benjamin. 2004. From Frankfurt to Ljubljana: Critical Theory from Adorno to Žižek. *Studies in Social and Political Thought* 9, 1–20.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Félix. 2004. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Continuum.
- Dick, Maria-Daniella & McLaughlan, Robbie. 2013. The Desire Network. *CTheory*. <http://www.ctheory.net/articles.aspx?id=727> (15<sup>th</sup> May 2014).
- Fairclough, Norman. 1993. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Foucault, Michel. 1976. *The History of Sexuality*. Paris: Editions Gallimard.
- Foucault, Michel. 1991. In Paul Rabinow (ed.), *The Foucault Reader*. London: Penguin.
- Huxley, Aldous. 1954. *The Doors of Perception*. London: Chatto & Windus.



- Huxley, Aldous. 1958. *Brave New World Revisited*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Huxley, Aldous. 1969. In Rover Smith (ed.), *Letters of Aldous Huxley*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Huxley, Aldous. 2007. *Brave New World*. London: Vintage.
- Huxley, Aldous. 2012. *Ends and Means: An Inquiry Into the Nature of Ideals and Into the Methods Employed for Their Realization*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Maes-Jelinek, Hena. 2013. Criticism of Society in the English Novel Between the Wars.  
<http://www.books.openedition.org/pulg/880> (9<sup>th</sup> October 2013)
- Russell, Bertrand. 1962. *The Scientific Outlook*. New York: The Norton Library.
- Valentić, Tonči. 2008. Symbolic Violence and Global Capitalism. *International Journal of Žižek Studies* 2, (1–5).  
[www.zizekstudies.org/index.php/ijzs/article/view/140/214](http://www.zizekstudies.org/index.php/ijzs/article/view/140/214) (15<sup>th</sup> May 2014)
- Vighi, Feldner & Heiko Feldner. 2007. Ideology Critique or Discourse Analysis?:  
Žižek against Foucault. *European Journal of Political Theory* 6. 141–159.
- Žižek, Slavoj. 1997. Psychoanalysis and Society: The Big Other Doesn't Exist. *Journal of European Psychoanalysis* 5.  
[www.psychomedia.it/jep/number5/zizek.htm](http://www.psychomedia.it/jep/number5/zizek.htm) (19<sup>th</sup> November 2013)
- Žižek, Slavoj. 2009. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso Books.