

# Trust in the World State

A Study of Trust in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*

Kristian August Skagen Eskedal



UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

ENG4790 – Master's Thesis in English, Secondary Teacher Training

Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages

Supervisor: Eleanor McCausland

Spring 2019



**Trust in the World State**  
**A Study of Trust in Aldous Huxley's *Brave***  
***New World***

© Kristian August Skagen Eskedal

2019

Trust in the World State

Kristian August Skagen Eskedal

<https://www.duo.uio.no>

Trykk: Reprosentralen, Universitetet I Oslo



# Abstract

This thesis offers a new sociological reading of *Brave New World* through trust theory. Trust theory is a facet of sociology that has amassed increasing scholarly interest across academic fields such as business, health and political science for the last few decades but is still in its infancy as it pertains to literary analysis. This account applies trust theory along with adjacent issues related to trust and risk to Huxley's dystopian nightmare, *Brave New World*, first published in 1932. The thesis analyzes the World State citizens' trusting relationships both interpersonally and institutionally in order to identify the opaque authoritarian techniques of the World State and why many have found Huxley's vision so prophetic. It specifically argues that the World State itself functions as mother in the absence of biological mothers and thus manages to establish a robust trusting relationship with its citizens. The World State consequently abuses the trusting relationship it establishes as mother in order to achieve its ambition of "Community, Identity, Stability". Moreover, living in a highly authoritarian technocratic society with technological and scientific progress as moral imperatives, citizens are forced to trust abstract capacities and a series of expert systems of which they have limited knowledge. This leads to a less psychologically rewarding existence where what people put their trust in cannot answer back in any substantial form, which in turn has implications for the interpersonal trusting relationships the citizens are capable of establishing. Finally, it argues, citizens have unconditional trust in their government due in large part to the government also functioning as their mother. This is a reversal of typical (dis)trust in liberal democratic governments, where an element of distrust is part of its architectural design. By using trust theory as a theoretical framework, this thesis investigates what dystopian authors, and *Brave New World* specifically, have found and continue to find so frightening in the advancement of technology.



# Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Elly McCausland, for her continuous guidance, encouragement and feedback. Her academic insight and shrewd observations have been greatly appreciated throughout the process of writing this thesis. A heartfelt thank you also goes out to all my friends at the University of Oslo who have provided me with countless laughs and moments of joy during my time at Blindern. I am extremely proud to call you my friends and may our friendship long continue. Although getting a degree is great, it is worthless compared to you. Most importantly, thank you to my amazing parents and sister for always believing in me. Who would have thought that I, a white cisgender male with a great socio-economic starting point coming from a stable middle-class household in Southeastern Norway, would end up getting a master's degree (fingers crossed)? Everyone, and here I am!





# Table of contents

<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>2. Textual analysis and discussion</b> .....	10
2.1 Trust and ontological security: soma, the World State as mother and family structure.....	10
2.2 Trust in machines: expert systems and reduction of social complexity.....	22
2.3 Trust in government: inverted liberal democratic distrust.....	36
<b>4. Conclusion</b> .....	43
<b>5. Bibliography</b> .....	46

# 1. Introduction

A doorbell is ringing in John the Savage's apartment. He anticipates that it is Helmholtz Watson – a likeable alpha who shares Bernard Marx's distaste for the World State, and has become John's closest ally both intellectually and emotionally since John's arrival from the Savage Reservation. He is anxious to discuss his feelings for Lenina Crowne with Helmholtz - feelings upon which he does not know how to act. From the time John arrived in London and up to this point in the novel, there has been a budding romance between John and Lenina. John wants to prove his chivalric worth to Lenina, which Lenina finds ridiculous and unnecessary. This sets up a potentially romantic encounter between John and Lenina which succinctly illustrates their different world views. Lenina brushes off John's attempt at earning her trust, but John is persistent, and does not want to engage in sexual activity with Lenina until he has proven that he is worthy. He brings up his homeland of Malpais, which functions as an emotional barrier between Lenina and John and underscores their different understandings and emotional investments regarding romance, sex and trust. John says that in Malpais, 'you had to bring her the skin of a mountain lion – I mean, when you wanted to marry someone. Or else a wolf', to which Lenina replies 'there aren't any lions in England' (Huxley, 1958, p. 156), completely missing the point. When John tries to gain Lenina's trust, she claims that it is not necessary. John says 'no, of course it isn't *necessary*. But some kinds of baseness are nobly undergone. I'd like to undergo something nobly. Don't you see?' (Huxley, 1958, p. 156). Lenina and John have very different understandings of not only romance, but also how to negotiate interpersonal trust, exemplified in this passage, where their cultural upbringing makes the negotiation of trust collapse quickly. Lenina repeatedly asks 'why', to which John replies 'Why? But for you, for *you*. Just to show that I... To show how much... How much I love you, Lenina' (Huxley, 1958, pp. 156-57). Lenina is only able to regurgitate indoctrinated community phrases. 'Hug me till you drug me, honey' and 'kiss me till I'm in a coma. Hug me, honey, snuggly...' (Huxley, 1958, p. 159), she says, while frantically trying to seduce John the only way she knows how. The scene culminates in John's raw display of emotional frustration and anger, to which Lenina replies only with fear and confusion. John misinterprets Lenina's conditioned sexual advances as nefarious adultery and shouts 'damned whore!' (Huxley, 1958, p. 160), before violently pushing her away.

Lenina's behavior is emblematic of how, in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* written in 1931 and first published in 1932, World State citizens' notions of trust and

trustworthiness in general are heavily affected by their government's ideology and the social conditioning to which they are subjected. The 'scène à faire' and 'erotic collision of [...] two worlds' (Adorno, 1967/1983, p. 105) above functions as a segue into a number of issues related to trust apparent in *Brave New World* both interpersonally and institutionally. Issues of trust and risk permeate Huxley's novel and raise a multitude of topics that are currently at the forefront of trust theory. Trust theory is a facet of sociology that has been researched with a recent growing interest in areas such as politics, health and business, but also has the scope to shed light on dystopian fiction in a way traditional literary analysis cannot. With *Brave New World*, Huxley's aim 'is not to so much to foresee what will happen to machines as to foresee what will happen to man' (Firchow, 1975, p. 302), and the interplay between machine and man and its consequences, so anxiously anticipated by dystopian authors, can be better understood through trust theory. The dystopian genre is a 'vehicle for literary technology criticism' (Kádár & Tóth, 2013, p. 53) and the aim of this thesis is to analyze individual and institutional trust relationships in *Brave New World* to offer a new sociological perspective on the novel through trust theory. By doing so, we can identify why scholars have found Huxley's vision so prescient, and trust theory can help unpack some of the warning signs many dystopian authors identify in the advancement of technology. Trust is an essential part of life as well as literature, but its role is often assumed – it is "just there" and as such quickly forgotten. Its function in literature, and dystopian literature specifically, deserves scrutiny and this thesis proposes trust theory as a compelling addition to traditional literary analysis. This thesis can contribute to spur on more research in the field of trust theory as it pertains to literary analysis and help further nuance the dystopian genre.

Posner (2000) argues that 'what makes *Brave New World* still a good "read" today is mainly the fact that so many of its predictions of futuristic technology and morality have come or are rapidly coming to pass' (p. 23). In typical fashion, he points to the prophetic vision of Huxley and his ability to foresee the effects of technology and mass-consumption on the individual to an impressive degree. This is of course a valid point, and through *Brave New World*, Huxley emphatically demonstrates that he had an almost unprecedented ability to identify what hazardous ideas in his social and political environment could potentially produce. I argue, however, that what makes *Brave New World* a good "read" today, and why we have found Huxley's vision so prophetic, is how the effects of being forced to trust cold and inhuman principles – be it trust in machines, abstract capacities, or government – leads to a less psychologically rewarding existence where what people put their trust in cannot answer

back in any meaningful form. This is alarmingly prevalent in the World State and becomes increasingly closer to our reality with the “juggernaut of modernity” (Giddens, 1990). Consequently, modernity demands trust in inanimate principles because social phenomena are becoming increasingly opaque. The fictional dystopian society of the World State shares many ominous similarities with contemporary modern societies, more so than ever with the advent of late modernity reaching its peak. This account highlights some of those unfortunate harmonies through trust theory, which offers a new vocabulary and theoretical framework to identify how the World State achieves its ambition of ‘Community, Identity, Stability’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 1).

*Brave New World* reflects a multitude of our present-day societal issues, both individually and structurally, and there are valuable insights to be found in Huxley’s nightmarish dystopia. Smith (2011) poignantly points out that ‘Huxley’s dystopia is uncomfortably familiar in its unfamiliarity’ (p. 349), and such familiar unfamiliarities suggest that we now find ourselves in a time where Huxley’s dystopian society invites us to ponder questions which can no longer be considered inconceivable. These individual and structural issues, and their implications, can be better understood through a sociological analysis with trust as its main focus. Giving a sociological account of trust in *Brave New World* will help us understand the key issues of the novel such as the function of motherhood, social conditioning, family structure, technology and romance from new angles and give a fresh perspective to a beloved and universally read work of fiction. The novel has been analyzed extensively and thoroughly since its publication in 1932, and its social relevance seems only to increase with every passing decade.

As Pedersen & Liisberg state, (2015) ‘there is a significant and increasing interest in studying trust [...] ranging from trust in political institutions, over trust in the economy, to trust in other individuals’ (p. 2). Niklas Luhmann, Anthony Giddens and Russell Hardin are prominent authors on conceptual trust from a sociological perspective whose theories and interpretations of trust, along with other scholars with an interest in trust theory, will be used to analyze *Brave New World*. Trust from a sociological perspective has become especially relevant in relation to ongoing debates about modernity and rapid societal changes, and applying these theories to dystopian literature can help unpack works of fiction from perspectives which have been previously overlooked in the field of dystopian literature. This account will shed new light on dystopian literature generally and *Brave New World* specifically in the age of modernity, where connotations of trust are becoming increasingly

nuanced and complex and technology is becoming increasingly pervasive in our everyday lives. There are generally two primary focal points of trust from a sociological perspective: a macro level account which takes social systems into consideration, and a micro view considering individual actors within said social systems. Hardin (2002), for example, establishes that we can discuss ‘trust as an individual-level problem’ and then ‘as an individual-institution-problem, as in my trust or distrust of our government’ (p. x). Piotr Sztompka (2006) calls this distinction “horizontal trust” and “vertical trust” – the former meaning trust between common people or peers and the latter meaning trust in institutions, authorities, government and so on (p. 906). Both accounts will be considered to provide an extensive insight of trust both on a macro and micro level in the World State – the wholly unified totalitarian society of *Brave New World* spanning the globe - in order to investigate the subtleties of how the two are interconnected and how vertical trust can affect horizontal trust.

In *Trust: A Sociological Theory*, Sztompka (1999) gives a comprehensive theoretical account of trust that will establish the groundwork for what this thesis will discuss, and how it can contribute to the existing literature on Huxley’s novel. There is no shortage of literature comparing and contrasting *Brave New World* to modern day societies, and how the advent of modernity shares many similarities with the World State and its social fabric, but through trust theory we can explore currently neglected angles in criticism of the novel, such as trust in institutions and trust in systems, and provide additional nuance to the already existing literature. Sztompka (1999) says,

for the last decade or so the problem of trust has come to the fore of sociological attention. Seemingly marginal and idiosyncratic concerns of some individual scholars at the beginning of the eighties – Niklas Luhmann in 1979, Bernard Barber in 1983 – have turned into rich intellectual enterprise with a large and constantly growing number of contributions. (p. ix)

Sztompka lays out a number of distinct features of contemporary societies which underscore the importance and prominence of the problematics of trust. Most of these features, if not all, also underscore the salience of trust in *Brave New World*. First, he points towards how humans now more than ever look inward to their own agency in order to shape the future via election ballots, social movements, voluntary associations and innovations *et cetera*. To be able to shape the future in a productive manner, trust must be deployed in for instance

politicians, educators, innovators and big corporation CEOs. (Sztompka, 1999, p. 11-12). This is manifested in the World State by the citizens' complete trust in institutions. Secondly, he points to the interdependency of the world in the age of globalization which demands an increasing trust in the reliability of multilateral international collaboration. Moreover, the unintended side-effects of the advancement of technology, such as climate issues and industrial catastrophes, make human-made innovations turn on ourselves. This introduces considerable amounts of risk (Sztompka, 1999, p. 13). According to Luhmann, 'trust should be understood specifically in relation to risk, a term which only comes into being in the modern period' (in Giddens, 1990, p. 30). To live in a "world risk society" (Beck, 2007/2009) requires enormous amounts of trust. This need for transnational cooperation has been met in *Brave New World* by turning the world and its nations into a unified whole. Furthermore, modern societies find themselves in a world of incredible amounts of options and choices in every aspect of life. With the sheer number of options available comes uncertainty and unpredictability, and trust is indispensable in order to reduce complexity in everyday life. This uncertainty and unpredictability in everyday life is diminished in the World State through for example social conditioning techniques such as hypnopaedia which in turn reduces complexity, creating a stable community of obedient and commodified individuals. Furthermore, the opaqueness of large segments of modern societies demands trust from people in order for them to grapple with their social environment in everyday life. Trust ensures that we are able to act, as opposed to being paralyzed by the anxieties related to the complexity of institutions, technological systems and professional experts. Without trust in the social and political environment, which they have in abundance, World State citizens would not function.

Additionally, the impersonality, anonymity and lack of transparency of those upon which our well-being depends - be it producers of food, government officials, pilots or social media CEOs - gives us no other option than to resort to trust in order to bridge the gap of anonymity and impersonality. Mustapha Mond, resident world controller of Western Europe and 'the *raisonneur* and devil's advocate of the book' (Adorno, 1967/1986, p. 111), is an elusive figure who most inhabitants have no connection to other than viewing him with an inflated, God-like admiration. The excitement from a group of students upon seeing him reveals this: 'His Fordship Mustapha Mond! The eyes of saluting students almost popped out of their heads. Mustapha Mond! [...] he was going to stay, to stay, yes, and actually talk to them. [...] Straight from the mouth of Ford himself' (Huxley, 1958, p 26). This can bear

resemblance to people in positions of power in the real world, especially within states with authoritarian tendencies who ordinarily have charismatic leaders creating a cult of personality through mass media propaganda around themselves. A lack of transparency is an issue both in *Brave New World* and modern-day societies. Finally, he argues, is the increasing number of unfamiliar faces in our daily environment due to for example migration, tourism and travel. This, again, demands trust (Sztompka, 1999, p. 13-14), and John the Savage's arrival in the World State symbolizes how new faces in new environments can intervene with the status quo. Most of the aforementioned features are distinctly noticeable in *Brave New World*. By exploring them, in addition to adjacent and auxiliary trust-related issues, we can re-interpret the novel to further reflect our real-life modern societies.

The World State citizens are generally happy, and experience feelings of security in relation to their place in the world and in their everyday lives. They feel as though they are part of something larger than themselves and are at peace with the roles they have been assigned from birth for the betterment of the community. Traditionally, the sense of security and happiness in *Brave New World* is read as the successful implementation of authoritarian conformity through a numbness from casual entertainment, promiscuity and unconditional trust in scientific principles. I argue, however, that this "ontological security" (Giddens, 1990, 1991), which is deeply rooted in trust, is achieved from the World State's role as mother, in combination with "soma" - the governmental-provided drug without side effects. Soma offers an "emotional inoculation" (Giddens, 1990, 1991) essential to basic trust from infancy and creates a robust trusting relationships between itself and its subjects. The World State's role as mother is crucial to understanding citizens' trust relationships both horizontally and vertically. The World State as mother will be explored in detail in 2.1 and further addressed in 2.2 and 2.3 in relation to trust in systems and trust in government.

Moreover, Lenina being brought to life on a conveyor belt means that she is literally a product of a disembedding mechanism. Disembedding mechanisms are understood as 'the "lifting out" of social relations from local contexts of interaction and their restructuring across indefinite spans of time-space' (Giddens, 1990, p. 21), and is, according to Giddens, (1990) one of three dominant sources of the dynamism of modernity (p. 54). In addition, the World State is entangled in an enormous web of expert systems, which are particular types of disembedding mechanisms (Giddens, 1990, p. 27). John's traditionalist homeland of Malpais relies on radically fewer expert systems in everyday life - although they are by no means non-existent in the Savage Reservations either. Such extreme dependency on expert systems has repercussions for trust and causes what Luhmann (1973/2017) calls reduction of social



complexity. Hypnopaedia is an example of an expert system which greatly reduces social complexity and affects both interpersonal and institutional trust. The consequences of trusting expert systems and abstract capacities, and the role technology plays in the pervasiveness of said systems, will be explored in detail in 2.2. Furthermore, Lenina trusts her government unconditionally in an inverted form of how populations typically have trust (or distrust) in their governments (Luhman, 1973/2017; Hardin, 2002). This can be understood through the automatization of trust which must be viewed in relation to a reliance on expert systems, especially within a World State context where expert systems are ubiquitous, and will be explored further in 2.3.

Finally, the question of whether to call *Brave New World* a dystopian or a utopian work of fiction is not a straightforward one. I have already labelled it a nightmarish dystopia, and I intend to treat it as a dystopia for the purpose of this thesis. Booker & Thomas (2009) state that ‘a utopia is an imaginary ideal society that dreams of a world in which the social, political, and economic problems of the real present have been solved’ whereas ‘a dystopia is an imagined world in which the dream has become a nightmare. Also known as anti-utopias, dystopias are often designed to critique the potential negative implications of certain forms of utopian thought’ (p. 65). The latter definition corresponds with Huxley’s critique of Western capitalist thought, and his celebrated novel functions as an extreme warning of the tendencies he identified in his contemporary political and social milieu. Moreover, Booker & Thomas (2009) claim that there are strong satirical elements in dystopian literature designed to warn and frighten readers of potential outcomes and consequences (p. 65). To call the World State a dystopian or a utopian society essentially rests upon whether *Brave New World* is presenting a good or a bad world. On one hand, it is a highly productive, technologically innovative, healthy, wealthy and stable community, but on the other it is an enslaved community ruled by a strictly totalitarian, oppressive and manipulative government. There is a myriad of ironic and satirical jabs in the novel which help reveal Huxley’s own attitude towards what he is depicting, and Congdon (2011) argues that ‘a close reading of *Brave New World* reveals too many sites of satire simply to claim that Aldous was endorsing the specific scientific society he depicted’ (p. 3). Huxley himself wrote in a foreword to a *Brave New World* edition published in 1958 that ‘...it looks as though Utopia were far closer to us than anyone, only fifteen years ago, could have imagined. Then, I projected it six hundred years into the future. To-day it seems quite possible that the horror may be upon us within a single century’ (Huxley, 1958, p. xv). The use of “Utopia” seems intentionally ironic, and by following up

with “the horror may be upon us within a single century”, it becomes evident that Huxley himself, at least, considered the fictional universe he created a nightmarish dystopia.

Furthermore, Jodlowska (2012) states that ‘authorial intent has already become part of the standard methodology for differentiating between utopian and dystopian texts’ (p. 69), and Huxley’s intent indicates that *Brave New World* is a dystopia. Posner (2000) points out that *Brave New World* also contains satirical elements, which are indicative of the dystopian genre, because it invites the reader to reflect on problems in their own society. We find two primary satirist characters in the novel who denounce the flaws of said society: the aforementioned John who is an outsider, and Bernard Marx, an insider and a ‘classic satiric misfit’ (p. 9). Moreover, Aeschliman (2015) crowns Huxley with the title of ‘the most important English-language satirist since Swift’ (p. 36), implying that his most famous work of fiction is indeed a dystopia.

Although ‘Huxley does not unequivocally endorse the Savage’s position’ (Clayton, 2016, p. 887), John the Savage can in many ways be claimed to represent Huxley’s ethos, and as such can help more firmly define *Brave New World* as a dystopian novel. Claeys (2010) claims that critics have painted Huxley as anti-American in light of *Brave New World*, but that Huxley is in fact ‘a critic of modernity as such, and America is only a leading instance of its definitive characteristics (p. 116), which is a fitting description of Huxley’s ethos to my understanding. Varricchio (1999), however, points out that Huxley, in an essay titled *The Outlook for American Culture, Some Reflections in a Machine Age* published in 1927, writes that ‘one of the most ominous portents of the American Way of Life is that it embraces a large class of the people who do not want to be cultured, are not interested in the higher life’ and that ‘given food, drink, and the company of their fellows, sexual enjoyment, and plenty of noisy distractions from without, they are happy’ (p. 98). This description is similar to the ethos of the World State, and is also the root cause of John’s apprehension about the brave new world. In particular, the disillusionment from seeing that people are not interested in the higher life permeates John’s character, and as such can be claimed to represent Huxley’s own ethos in some respects. It does not seem, however, that Huxley was categorically anti-American. Rather, Huxley identified characteristics in the American lifestyle which corresponded with what he regarded as problematic of modernity. America is simply ‘the butt of parody’ (Adorno, 1967/1983, p. 99).

Moreover, during Mustapha Mond and John the Savage’s ideological sparring near the end of the novel, Mond tells John that in the World State, there are no mosquitos that can sting you. John replies,

you got rid of them. Yes, that's just like you. Getting rid of everything unpleasant instead of learning to put up with it. Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune, or to take arms against a sea of trouble and by opposing end them... But you don't do either. Neither suffer nor oppose. You just abolish the slings and arrows. It's too easy. (Huxley, 1958, p. 196)

John goes on to claim that 'what you need is something *with* tears for a change. Nothing costs enough here' (Huxley, 1958, p. 196). Their ideological disagreement largely boils down to happiness through material wealth and stability versus happiness through human emotional investment, art and religion. Happiness, of course, is an elusive term and it is difficult to categorize on both a general and individual level, and I do not intend to go into a detailed discussion about the philosophy of happiness and its many meanings and connotations in this thesis. However, it can hardly be argued that material over-consumption and being completely out of touch with one's emotional life will lead to any form of substantial happiness. Diken (2011) argues that in *Brave New World*, 'this "happiness" is one reduced to sheer consumerism, just as "politics" in the brave new world is degraded to conformism' (p. 1). Through *Brave New World*, Huxley offers commentary on the human condition and it is evident that he aligns himself ideologically more with John the Savage than with Mustapha Mond. In *Brave New World Revisited*, Huxley's critique of his own novel thirty years later, he offers propositions as to how democracies can prevent themselves from ending up like the World State, which clearly indicates that he had no wish for humanity to decay into a World State-like authoritarian blissfully ignorant nightmare (Huxley, 1984). Claves (2010) uses the term dystopia to include 'feasible negative visions of social and political development, cast principally in fictional form' (p. 109) – a categorization into which *Brave New World* fits nicely. Ultimately, a reading of *Brave New World* from a sociological perspective on trust will help more firmly categorize Huxley's novel as a dystopia, and will nuance how authoritarian dystopian rulers can abuse technology and trusting relationships to their benefit. There is a lack of trust perspectives in the vast array of literature not only on Huxley's dystopia, but on the dystopian genre in general. Discussions about theories of trust and risk are ongoing and relevant in the field of sociology and this account will provide additional nuance to the already existing literature by adding new sociological trust perspectives on interpersonal and institutional trust in *Brave New World*.

## 2. Textual analysis and discussion

### 2.1. Trust and ontological security: soma, the World State as mother and family structure

From the Social Predestination Room the escalators went rumbling down into the basement, and there, in the crimson darkness, stewingly warm on their cushion of peritoneum and gorged with blood- surrogate and hormones, the foetuses grew and grew or, poisoned, languished into a stunted Epsilonhood. With a faint hum and rattle the moving racks crawled imperceptibly through the weeks and the recapitulated aeons to where, in the Decnating Room, the newly-unbottled babes uttered their first yell of horror and amazement. (Huxley, 1958, p. 120)

In *Brave New World*, people have everything in common but they are simultaneously separated deliberately through the caste system. Biological birth is prohibited; instead babies are born in test-tubes on assembly lines. The process of bringing human life into existence has been removed from its local context, making even the most intimate human experience impersonal. Infants are predestined to fit into a caste based on preconditioned physical and intellectual capabilities. Early on in the novel, Mustapha Mond proclaims ‘stability. No civilization without social stability. No social stability without individual stability. Stability. The primal and the ultimate need. Stability. Hence all this’ (Huxley, 1958, pp. 33-34). This pinpoints the World State’s ideology and serves as a justification for their authoritarian techniques. Mond explains that they have made the choice ‘between happiness and what people used to call high art. We’ve sacrificed the high art (Huxley, 1958, pp. 180-81), claiming the two are incompatible and that Helmholtz is paying for happiness ‘because you happen to be too much interested in beauty’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 187). There are five castes: Alphas, Betas, Gammas, Deltas and Epsilons. Alphas, like Bernard and Helmholtz, are highly intelligent people whereas Epsilons are only capable of performing basic tasks which require minimal intellectual effort. The conditioning continues after the infants have been born – most prominently through the sleep-teaching technique hypnopaedia which teaches children about class distinctions and love for the community, science and Ford – the World State deity based on the business magnate and assembly line innovator Henry Ford.

This almost exclusively leads to a strong sense of one's place as a piece of the puzzle in a larger societal picture, and creates high levels of what Anthony Giddens (1990) calls ontological security. Ontological security can be described as the state of feeling secure about one's place in the world, or simply security of "being". Giddens explains that 'a sense of the reliability of persons and things, so central to the notion of trust, is basic to feelings of ontological security; hence the two are psychologically related' (p. 92), which can give some explanation as to why World State citizens generally have high levels of ontological security. They live in a socially and materially predictable and stable community which generally produces high levels of ontological security. This feeling is often enforced by the continuing routine of day-to-day life, as opposed to a sense of chaos and anxiety and a loss of a sense of reality. Bernard Marx, the novel's protagonist, and John the Savage are arguably the least ontologically secure characters in the novel and there is a sense of dissatisfaction with what they regard as a chaotic feeling in relation to the order of things. Bernard's trajectory in the book 'follows three stages: discontent, reconciliation and exclusion' (Diken, 2011, p. 170), invoking notions of an inverted *bildungsroman* character trajectory, and his ontological security adjusts accordingly. From the outset, he feels disconnected and lonely in the community he lives in and has low ontological security. Next, he finds popularity by parading John the Savage and his mother Linda as curiosities in London and feels reinvigorated, and his ontological security increases dramatically. Finally, when John refuses to partake in his quest for popularity, Bernard is exposed as a hypocrite and again his ontological security is low as a consequence. Lenina has high ontological security because she lives in a highly regulated, but socially stable community, and in contrast to Bernard is ready to accept this, whether consciously or not, instead of questioning it. Malpais, compared to the World State, is a much more socially unpredictable community and this is partly why John feels less ontologically secure than Lenina. The stability of the World State, however, is highly artificial, fabricated and tightly institutionally controlled, but that does not negate the fact that its citizens' experience of the World State community generally produces high levels of ontological security among its inhabitants.

Giddens (1990) asks 'why is everyone not always in a state of high ontological insecurity given the enormity of such potential existential troubles?' (p. 94). The answer, he argues, is that

“normal” individuals [...] receive a basic “dosage” of trust in early life that deadens or blunts these existential susceptibilities. Or, to alter the metaphor slightly, they receive an emotional inoculation which protects against the ontological anxieties to which all human beings are potentially subject. The agent of this inoculation is the primary caretaking figure of infancy: for the vast majority of individuals, the mother. (p. 94)

In response to Giddens’ question and answer, we might ask, then, why inhabitants of the World State are feeling ontologically secure and safe at all times without having a mother to provide the emotional inoculation Giddens deems necessary for ontological security. It is reasonable to suggest that the World State itself has filled the void of the mother to fulfill the needs required for a feeling of ontological security. ‘Everyone belongs to everyone else’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 31), the World State mantra, has connotations of family relations and the World State itself functions as the tribe’s, as it were, mother and provider of ontological security. But the World State is not capable of providing the intimate dosage of trust the physical presence of a mother could, as Giddens describes it.

However, the World State can instead offer soma as emotional inoculation to reduce or lessen feelings of ontological insecurity. Infantile schizophrenia, for example, can give evidence of what can occur if the child is not given sufficient amounts of basic trust from its provider and Giddens (1990) argues that ‘the infant develops little sense of the “reality” of things or of other people, because the regular nourishment of affection and caring is lacking’ (p. 95). One would think that cases similar to infantile schizophrenia would be a likely outcome for most newborn World State infants. However, in the World State the caretaker’s love is provided by the institution of the World State, not from a mother, and soma functions as a replacement for the emotional inoculation a mother would normally provide to protect her baby from ontological insecurity. Moreover, according to Giddens (1990), the baby must get used to the caretaker being absent, which is part of the process of building up trust, and claims that ‘...a fundamental feature of the early formation of trust is trust in the caretaker’s return’ (Giddens, 1990, p. 97). If we do recognize the World State as a functional substitution for the mother, it could not provide ontological security the way Giddens describes it because the World State never leaves, it is never absent, and it is impossible to expect a return from something omnipresent. Thus, trust and ontological security could not occur. However, the World State citizens must get used to being away from soma, and we can read the World State

only in combination with the emotional inoculation of soma as a parental figure which covers the basic dosage of trust in early childhood, while also having the capacity to be absent.

Representations of motherhood are common in dystopian literature, as in for example Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* (1985) and Marge Piercy's *Woman on the Edge of Time* (1976), dystopias notorious for their portrayals of motherhood. *Brave New World*, however, antithetically depicts motherhood, and mothers and fathers have been substituted by the World State itself as the primary caretaker and the one who has the citizens' fundamental interests at heart. Kohn (2008) suggests that 'trust may be unconditional too – but rarely so outside the special relationship between parents and young children' (p. 9), and it is fair to suggest that similar to how a child trusts their parents unconditionally, the citizens trust the World State unconditionally. The World State, much like a biological parent, is the citizens' primary caretaker, supplier of goods and services and provider of ontological security. By providing these essential necessities, it becomes easier for the World State to gain the trust of the citizens.

Diken (2011) explains that in control societies, such as the World State, nothing is ever finished, including childhood (p. 154). The notion that childhood is never finished in the World State imprisons the citizens in a permanent need for soma as the emotional inoculation, as well as reaffirming the World State's role as mother. Soma also represents nihilistic consumption and it is never finished - and neither is the populace's dependence on it. Thus, the people never truly evolve from the stage of childhood. Furthermore, 'as children of society, in a literal sense' (Adorno, 1983, pp. 100) citizens are institutionally expected to be infantile, as made clear by the Director when he is reprimanding Bernard for spending too much time with Lenina. The Director says,

Alphas are so conditioned that they do not *have* to be infantile in their emotional behavior. But that is all the more reason for their making a special effort to conform. It is their duty to be infantile, even against their inclination. (Huxley, 1958, pp. 80-81)

Soma, in addition to hypnopaedic and biological conditioning, is the primary tool to achieve this perpetual state of childhood. Moreover, Diken (2011) argues that this lifelong dependence on the recreational drug in addition to permanent infantile behavior shows that '*Brave New World* is an allegory of regressive evolution', where childhood and playtime is everlasting (p. 154). The never-ending supply of soma, the continued state of childhood and the demand for infantile behavior creates an environment where the World State firmly establishes its role as

the mother of its citizens. As (Diken, 2011) states, ‘...the conduct of the nursery becomes generalized throughout the society. So the governmental imperatives in the brave new world are the same as those of the nursery: play, learning, stability and happiness’ (p. 154) while also engulfing the citizens in a permanent state of an infantile unconditional trusting relationship comparable to the unconditional trust a child has in their parents.

Bernard Marx, however, perhaps the least ontologically secure character in the novel, does not take soma regularly and voices his dislike for it on several occasions. In a scene where Bernard brings Lenina to watch the ocean and moon, he brings up feelings of angst. A sense of lack of freedom and happiness in a world where what constitutes happiness is decided by other people makes him uneasy about his place in the World State. Lenina bluntly replies that ‘I don’t understand anything’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 75), underscoring their conflicting world views and how Alphas have a higher capability of cognition than Lenina’s caste – Lenina’s caste is never explicitly stated, but she is most likely a Beta. Lenina then offers Bernard soma and says ‘when you have these dreadful ideas of yours. You’d forget all about them. And instead of feeling miserable, you’d be jolly. *So jolly*’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 76). When the couple return to Bernard’s room, Bernard nevertheless ‘swallowed four tablets of soma at a gulp’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 76), illustrating how his ideology is at odds with the hedonistic community he is forced to partake in, and the outwardly hedonistic character he is to become once the circumstances allow it. When Bernard experiences a newfound popularity after bringing John to the World State, he aligns himself more and more with the doctrine of the World State and starts taking soma regularly. He becomes at peace with his place in the world because he finally manages to fit in and as a consequence feels a higher level of ontological security. This exemplifies both Bernard’s unprincipled and deceitful nature and how the combination of soma and the World State work in tandem to create high levels of ontological security among its citizens. The World State citizens have a lifelong dependency on the emotional inoculation soma provides, instead of only needing it to establish basic trust during infancy. Consequently, this results in the citizens’ lifelong dependency on the World State.

There is a plethora of negative maternal and traditional family related imagery in *Brave New World* which further suggests that the World State itself has taken the role of mother. Natural reproduction is destroyed, and “decanting” has taken its place. The word mother itself is a profanity; Mustapha Mond asks students at the Hatchery and Conditioning Centre to ponder what it would be like to have a mother, before thinking ‘that smutty word again’ (Huxley, 1958, pp. 27-28) to himself. The home itself has likewise become a representation of something obscene, and the World State’s ambition of deconstructing



traditional family structure makes itself clear in the following passage, where Mond recalls the horrors of traditional family life to students at the Hatchery and Conditioning Centre:

home was as squalid psychically as physically. Psychically, it was a rabbit hole, a midden, hot with the frictions of tightly packed life, reeking with emotion. What suffocating intimacies, what dangerous, insane, obscene relationships between the members of the family group! Manically, the mother brooded over her children (*her* children) ... brooded over them like a cat over its kittens; but a cat that could talk, a cat that could say, "My baby, my baby, over and over again. "My baby, and oh, oh, at my breast, the little hands, the hunger, and that unspeakable agonizing pleasure!" (Huxley, 1958, p. 29)

Mond finishes off with 'yes, you may well shudder' (Huxley, 1958, p. 29), suggesting that their current society is clearly superior. If we recognize the World State itself as the mother, the World State citizens can consequently be considered siblings brought to life by a common mother, reinforced by the community phrase 'everyone belongs to everyone else' (Huxley, 1958, p. 31).

The overtly sexualized society of the World State viewed in the context of the World State as a remodeled family structure naturally calls to Freud and his idea of the Oedipus complex. Holmes (1970) says that 'throughout his life Huxley rejected Freud, though the tone and intensity of his rejection varied. Given Freud's emphasis on sex and Huxley's near-obsession with it, the rejection implies unconscious resistance incompletely understood' (p. 147), and Freud can be found in *Brave New World* both overtly and covertly. We can better understand the Oedipus complex and its implications in the World State through trust theory and the World State itself as mother. Ford, as Mond explains, even called himself Freud 'whenever he spoke of psychological matters – our Freud had been the first to reveal the appalling dangers of family life' (Huxley, 1958, p. 30). The positive Oedipus complex states that all children view their opposite-sex parents as sex-objects and their same-sex parents as rivals (Auchincloss, 2012, p. 180). However, the World State as mother is not a physical being, and Buchanan (2002) argues that in *Brave New World*, '... the Oedipus complex is deemed such a dangerous and powerful force that it (along with the family structure that produces it) has been eliminated from civilized life, as far as possible' (p. 76). What happens instead is that those sexual desires are directed towards other members of the community, which they are allowed, and expected, to act upon freely.

This ties in with the larger argument of the interpersonal trust relationship between World State citizens, and as Buchanan (2002) points out, ‘Huxley’s imaginary state has taken over the role of parent and robbed the child of his or her Oedipal potentialities’ (p. 76). Moreover, Buchanan (2002) claims that ‘it could be argued that the active suppression of the Oedipus complex is the principal tool of social stability practiced in this future’ (p. 76), with which I agree to an extent. However, I argue that the Oedipus complex is not actively suppressed, but rather directed towards other members of the perverse family structure because of the absence of a physical mother, whereas people do have physical siblings within the World State family structure. This redirection of sexual desire between children of the same mother instead of towards the mother herself is epitomized in the organized communal gatherings known as Solidarity Service. Bernard has Solidarity Service every other Thursday where he and 11 others sit in a circle ‘ready to be made one, waiting to come together, to be fused, to lose their twelve separate identities in a larger being’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 66). During this cult-like ritual the participants sing hymns, take soma, shout praise for the “Greater Being”, dance and have intercourse. The last line of the last stanza in their song, ‘orgy-porgy gives release’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 70), is the manifestation of the positive Oedipus complex being redirected towards brothers and sisters and thus releasing sexual desire.

Moreover, John the Savage, a reversal of the classical utopian traveler (Vieira, 2010, p. 7), has not been subjected to World State eugenics and hypnopaedic conditioning, and does contrarily have a biological mother. The positive Oedipus complex is clearly manifested in John’s enormous jealousy of Popé, the man who sleeps with his mother. Linda, a Beta originally born inside the World State and accustomed to its cultural codes, says that John ‘tried to kill poor Waihusiwa – or was it Popé? - just because I used to have them sometimes’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 100). John confirms his mother’s suspicion. ‘He hated Popé. He hated them all – all the men who came to see Linda’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 103) and ‘a man can smile and smile and be a villain’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 108), John says, referencing *Hamlet*. One day John comes home and sees Linda and Popé sleeping on the bed - Popé with his arms around Linda ‘like a snake trying to strangle her’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 109). John cannot contain his hatred for the man challenging him for his mother’s love. ‘I’ll kill him, I’ll kill him, I’ll kill him’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 109) he keeps repeating to himself, before picking up a knife and stabbing Popé, without managing to kill him. John’s mind has not been colonized by World State ideology, and for him the Oedipus complex manifests itself like Freud describes it. For World State citizens however, the absence of a physical mother means that there is no competition

for their mother's affection, and the positive Oedipus complex manifests itself in the shape of sexual desire toward their siblings.

“Bokanovsky's Process” reinforces the perverse family structure of the World State and the idea that World State citizens can be considered siblings – the bokanovskified twins biologically are. ‘One egg, one embryo, one adult – normality. But a bokanovskified egg will bud, will proliferate, will divide [...] making ninety-six human beings grow where only one grew before’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 3), the Director of Hatcheries explains, before proclaiming ‘ninety-six identical twins working ninety-six identical machines!’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 6). The Director chooses the word “twin”, reaffirming the World State's ambition to create a perverse family structure in order to secure unconditional trust from the citizens. In addition, ‘the two thousand million inhabitants of the planet had only ten thousand names between them’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 28), meaning that it is likely for citizens to share surnames, as Lenina and Fanny Crowne do. The World State and its inhabitants constituting an enormous extended family does not mean, however, that trust can be evenly distributed from each individual to every other family member, as would be the case in traditional familial trusting relationships which are obviously much smaller than that of the World State. Fukuyama (1995) conceptualizes a “radius of trust” and states that ‘the narrowest radius covers trust in the members of our family, pervaded with strongest intimacy and closeness’ (as cited in Stzompka, 1999, p. 42). With the “radius of trust” in mind, we may do as Hardin (2002) requests and ‘consider the limits on how many individuals one can trust’ (p. 175). Typically, we have the capacity to substantially trust our close family and a handful of close friends and immerse ourselves in what Hardin (2002) calls “rich relationships” with a limited number of people. The extended family of the World State have in each other “generalized trust” which is ‘unspecific trust in generalized others’ (Hardin, 2002, p. 176). Moreover, as I will argue in more detail in 2.3, there is an element of distrust in the relationships between World State citizens due to social policing and a strict requirement of adhering to social norms. This aligns itself with the World State's goal of creating social stability by reserving the citizens' trust exclusively for itself as the motherly matriarch.

Furthermore, the actions of the World State lay-people are perceived locally as personally determined, but in reality, they have minimal control over their day-to-day actions, and only on a superficial level, which makes the interpersonal trust they are able to negotiate fragile. To be able to consolidate interpersonal trust, according to Luhmann (1973/2017),

it is a necessary precondition that the situation permits selective steps, meaning behavioral choices, and that behavior is not already determined either institutionally or historically. Thus the first basic prerequisite for building up personal trust is that human actions are perceived in general as personally determined. (p. 45)

World State inhabitants' behavior is determined institutionally by eugenics, which significantly reduces their ability to negotiate interpersonal trust. There is a severe lack of long lasting and meaningful personal relationships in the World State, dictated by the idea enforced institutionally that relationships should be short lived and plentiful, instead of long lasting and few. At one point, Fanny asks Lenina who she's going out with for the evening. 'Henry Foster', Lenina says, to which Fanny answers: 'again? Do you mean to tell me you're *still* going out with Henry Foster?' (Huxley, 1958, p. 31), emphasizing that being with one person for an extended period of time is socially frowned upon. The trust that would normally be distributed and built up to a network of meaningful relationships is instead reserved for and directed toward the World State itself, which has taken the role of mother. This perverse notion of familial trust is all-encompassing within the World State, and can be viewed in relation to the World State being able to successfully provide its citizens with ontological security. Through an illusion of community, stability and identity, the authorities have created a social sphere where a traditional family hierarchy has been replaced with a family structure with the World State itself as its mother.

This invites a brief comparison to Big Brother and the "Party" in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* – another dystopian classic and a contemporary of *Brave New World* - to further underscore the World State's role as mother. Big Brother functions as the patriarch in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, but he (whether "he" actually physically exists will not be discussed here) is more reminiscent of an omnipotent God-like figure who demands worship and praise and is a symbol of unity – like Henry Ford in *Brave New World* he is a deity. Citizens are under constant surveillance from Big Brother, as the community slogan "Big Brother is watching you" proudly displays on an endless number of posters. However, neither he nor the "Party" itself is a figure of motherhood in the way the World State is. The "Party" and Big Brother are more similar to a traditional authoritarian political apparatus than the World State because they do not artificially create their citizen's themselves - like the World State does. Rather, the "Party" rule through fear, and the World State's approach creates a tighter and more robust trusting relationship between the World State and its subjects than it does between the "Party" and its subjects. Natural birth still exists in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and the

emotional inoculation essential to ontological security is provided through infancy by biological mothers and fathers the way Giddens describes it. Traditional family structure is more or less intact in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, exemplified by Parsons and his family who live next to Winston Smith. In *Brave New World* however, the abolition of traditional family structure allows the World State itself to fill the vacuum of mother and thus ensure the unconditional trust of its citizens, and in a perverse way its children. As Claeys (2010) points out, ‘consent [in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* ] rests upon punishment and fear rather than the manipulation of pleasure. Conformity is instilled by routine practice rather than eugenic conditioning’ (p. 118). From a sociological perspective on trust, at least, conformity through eugenic conditioning creates a more potent trusting relationship between government and subject because of the overtones of familiarity it creates.

The successful formation of the World State’s perverse family structure is achieved partly through the suppression of *procreativity*, but creativity is also actively curbed in *Brave New World*. Conformity is traditionally used as a means for authoritarian governments to stifle creativity, and the dystopian genre is in many ways synonymous with the suppression of creativity. As Claeys (2010) points out, dystopias are typically ‘demanding and normally exacting complete obedience from its citizens...’ (p. 109), leaving minimal room for individual creativity. However, creativity and common interests are a source of forming strong interpersonal trusting relationships. Lenina and John have very little in common and trust is therefore less likely to develop. Simply having things in common strengthens the trust a person has in another person’s behavior and makes it more predictable (Kohn, 2008, p. 34), and in the scene discussed in the introduction, it is clear that John and Lenina do not have aligning personalities. Lenina represents the normality of the World State: shallow, promiscuous and materialistic and ‘is at one with convention down to her very core’ (Adorno, 1967/1983, p. 105). John represents the opposite, and has a passion for poetry, exploring human emotion and natural beauty. John and Helmholtz, on the other hand, discuss various issues like poetry and love, and it is clear that their common interests allow trust to flourish easily between them.

Moreover, John and Helmholtz are creative individuals, which can help consolidate trusting relationships and is related to basic notions of trust. Guilford (1959) points to divergent thinking - including fluency of thinking as in the ability to produce many ideas and originality as in being capable of giving unconventional but right answers - as a marker of individual creativity (as cited in Rubinstein, 2003, p. 696). Both John and Helmholtz possess

such qualities. John is an avid reader of Shakespeare whereas Helmholtz loves to write, although his creative output is severely limited due to the cultural environment he was raised and lives in. John unintentionally mocks Helmholtz, who unbeknownst to John works as an “Emotional Engineer” writing community propaganda, when he proclaims that the “Feelies” are ‘told by an idiot’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 180), but Helmholtz agrees. Helmholtz’s justification is that it is idiotic ‘writing when there’s nothing to say’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 181) underscoring that he is aware that his writing is uninspired, but he finds himself in creative captivity. Both John and Helmholtz find that their creative inclinations are suppressed in the World State, and Giddens (1991) argues that ‘a creative involvement with others and with the object-world is almost certainly a fundamental component of psychological satisfaction and the discovery of “moral meaning” (p. 41). This can be viewed as a root cause to their ontological insecurity inside the World State, because neither of them can find a creative outlet. John’s creative involvement is time and time again mocked after he arrives in the World State - even Helmholtz laughs at him when John reads him Shakespeare poems, and Lenina finds him ridiculous when he wants to show her that he is noble. This also reveals some of Helmholtz’s creative frustration and ignorance. He knows he wants to write, he knows the job he does writing community slogans and phrases is not creatively stimulating, but psychological chains of a lifetime in a society of indoctrination are preventing him from doing otherwise.

When Helmholtz is first introduced in the novel, he voices this frustration to Bernard, without fully being able to comprehend what his frustration is. ‘Did you ever feel as though you had something inside you that was only waiting for you to give it a chance to come out?’, he asks before adding ‘some sort of extra power that you aren’t using – you know, like all the water that goes down the falls instead of through the turbines?’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 57). In reply, Bernard asks him if he is talking about tapping into emotions of the idea of another world, where things are different. ‘Not quite’ he answers, and says that he has 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’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 58). This illustrates how creativity is quashed in the World State, which is common not only in *Brave New World* but in dystopian literature in general because of the inherent restriction on individual freedom symbolic of the dystopian genre. As noted earlier, creativity is one possible route to moral meaning and ontological security, and it is also a key component to trust on a basic level. Giddens (1991) writes,

creativity, which means the capability to act or think innovatively in relation to pre-established modes of activity, is closely tied to basic trust. Trust itself, by its very nature, is in a certain sense creative, because it entails a commitment that is a “leap into the unknown”. (p. 41)

As has already been established, the large majority of people in the World State are ontologically secure while at the same time having no vehicles for creative output. But Helmholtz and John are abnormalities and therefore creativity for them can possibly help instill a higher sense of ontological security. Lenina has shown that she is incapable of taking such a creative leap into the unknown because pre-established modes of activity are so tightly ingrained into her nature. This is one of the reasons why she is unable to build any meaningful trust with John, who contrarily has dived head first into a world of creative wonders. Helmholtz, on the other hand, is just scratching the surface of creative output, but is restricted heavily by his culture and explains why John and Helmholtz instantly take a liking to each other. It also gives an idea as to why their trust ultimately breaks down. Pedersen (2015) notes that ‘...trust relationships are socially and culturally embedded in the sense that their development is a result of the social cooperation between two or more agents in a concrete social reality’ (p. 106). The cultural gap between John and Helmholtz is too severe to overcome, even though Helmholtz wishes to engage creatively with John – and they do to some extent. Helmholtz’s attempt at verbalizing his creative frustration to Bernard reveals that he knows that he does not know, which is a rarity among World State inhabitants.

Although Helmholtz is unable to verbalize fully the risks inherent in suppressed creativity, he nonetheless acknowledges that the risks exist, and that creativity is essential to notions of trust. The fact that Helmholtz knows that something is wrong and that something is being suppressed inside him but cannot articulate how or why is a powerful image, and is central to the notion of trust in *Brave New World*, and how the World State has been able to seize control of their citizens’ trust and made it nearly unconditional. As stated earlier, a marker of individual creativity is divergent thinking, but the World State instills convergent thinking, ‘a logical inference aiming at one right answer’ (Rubinstein, 2003, p. 696), into the very nature of its machine-like inhabitants. Consequently, the catharsis Helmholtz yearns for will most likely never be achieved in the brave new world because of the World State’s successful colonization of the citizens’ minds. Ultimately, the suppression of creativity is only one of many weapons in the World State’s arsenal used to prevent rich interpersonal

relationships from emerging, and trust theory illustrates how significant creativity is to the formation of strong interpersonal trust relationships.

## **2.2 Trust in machines: expert systems and reduction of social complexity**

“And this”, said the Director opening the door, “is the Fertilizing Room.” Bent over their instruments, three hundred Fertilizers were plunged, as the Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning entered the room, in the scarcely breathing silence, and the absent-minded. (Huxley, 1958, p. 1)

Consider the indoctrinated phrases Lenina hurls at John in the scene examined in the introduction to this thesis. That John’s passionate display of emotion only elicits indoctrinated drivel from Lenina is a vivid example of how social complexity has been reduced in *Brave New World*. Lenina has a habit of responding with community phrases in social settings due to her indoctrination through the caste system, hypnopaedia and other technological innovations created to instill conformity in the masses. Instead of replying to John with original or heartfelt sentiments, she can only reply the way the pervasive power of the World State demands of her. Peter Firchow (1975) asserts that Huxley’s ‘most powerful rendering of the effects of science and technology [...] is unquestionably *Brave New World*’ and that ‘the mere mention of it evokes a whole complex of hostile attitudes toward science’ (p. 301). Huxley, who himself came from a rich scientific and intellectual background being the grandson of “Darwin’s bulldog” T. H. Huxley, undoubtedly evokes hostility toward science through his most famous novel. This bitterness can best be grappled with through trust theory which provides a vocabulary that can help decipher how mechanisms like expert systems and the reduction of social complexity interact with human relationships. Expert systems are ‘systems of technical accomplishment or professional expertise that organize large areas of the material and social environments in which we live today’ (Giddens, 1990, p. 27), and such systems are all-encompassing within the social fabric of the World State. ‘Scion of a distinguished scientific family’ (Aeschliman, 2015, p. 37), Huxley came to question the Enlightenment principles of scientific modern progress and rationalization of industrial growth through *Brave New World*. The novel can thus be read as a critique of excessive trust in Enlightenment principles through the medium of World State citizens’ trust in abstract



capacities because ‘a common principle around which modern "abstract systems" are based, is the supremacy of reason and science’ (McDermott, 2003, p. 58).

Gorman Beauchamp (1986) argues that ‘technological determinism is the dominant philosophy of history found in the dystopian novel and [...] dystopists are generally technophobic’ (p. 55), to which *Brave New World* is no different. But what exactly is it about technology that continues to frighten dystopian writers and readers alike? Chrostowska (2013) offers an answer and says that ‘the Huxleyian fantasy of a posthumanist tomorrow is the offspring of present disenchantment, the industrial-scale standardizing of consciousness, deindividualization, the production of petrified sameness’ (p. 103). The industrialization of the human and resulting loss of individuality in *Brave New World* reflects real world disenchantment with the incredible speed of societal change related to modernity. Ultimately, most of the dystopian fear of technology boils down to losing control of what makes us human and this fear is fanatically manifested in John the Savage. The fear of losing control is ushered by the premise that we are unable to predict with any real confidence what the final price of the fetishization of scientific progress will be, and trust theory applied to *Brave New World* can help verbalize some of these fears.

Analyzing a myriad of dystopian novels - such as *Brave New World*, Ayn Rand’s *Anthem*, E. M. Forster’s *The Machine Stops*, D. F. Jones’s *Colossus* and Zamyatin’s *We* - Beauchamp (1986) suggests that

the greatest threat posed by technology, these dystopists suggest, is not that man's mechanical creations will come to rule over him like some alien power but rather that he will so completely introject the ethos of technology that his highest aspiration will be to become a machine himself. Then the machine, like Hell for Milton's Satan, will be inside him. (p. 62)

Being forced to trust inanimate principles and trusting a series of expert systems over which one has limited control, as is the case in *Brave New World*, can be a springboard to the fears Beauchamp describes, and it is how Huxley’s fear of man turning into machine manifests itself in *Brave New World*. It is the technological and material success of the World State that has caused what John and Bernard view as such horror on its inhabitants, not its failures. This is akin to what Beck (2007/2009) lays out in his theory of “world risk society”, where the success of industrialization and modernity has brought with it unaccountable risks and side-

effects which must in turn be responded to. Risk society is a type of “reflexive modernity” (Giddens, 1990; Beck, 2007/2009), where the unprecedented speed of new information itself produces new risks and side-effects. The reflexivity of modernity allows individuals to view themselves and their surroundings from a distance, as it were, and be conscious about past and future actions through reflexively applied information. The World State are effective at slowing down the immense speed of new information through censorship and a monopoly on information which in order to succeed requires a durable trusting relationships between citizens and systems. This ensures that citizens never get the chance to reflexively interpret themselves and their surroundings in light of new information, because the flow of information is severely halted. This is reflected in the World State’s ideology channeled through Lenina, who in her blissful ignorance states that ‘when the individual feels, the community reels’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 77), demonstrating that opportunities to construct personalities through acquired knowledge is detrimental to the greater good.

Moreover, Niklas Luhmann (1973/2017) argues that trust can be ‘thoughtless, careless and routinized, and thus [...] require no unnecessary expenditure of consciousness especially if expectation approaches certainty’ (pp. 27-28). This routinization of trust as a consequence of heavy reliance on expert systems causes what Luhmann (1973/2017) calls a reduction of social complexity. Being entangled in a network of expert systems inevitably causes a reduction of social complexity, because there are simply fewer choices and fewer courses of action the lay-people have the capacity to take.

Consider short impersonal everyday trust relationships within small interaction systems with few participants, as Luhmann (1973/2017) does when describing the risk and trust involved in a taxi ride. The amount of time and background knowledge required, and the incredible tediousness, of having to build up a trusting relationship with the driver every time you get in a taxi would make such systems quickly collapse. Instead, we ‘depend on highly standardized “tests” of the normality of the situation – and on a sufficiently normalized environment which make the risk, although serious, appear unlikely’ (Luhmann, 1973/2017, p. 50). This is heightened to extreme levels in *Brave New World*, and the World State is effective in reducing social complexity through expert systems and social control where courses of action are streamlined by the World State for its citizens to perpetuate mass conformity.

Social complexity has been greatly reduced in the World State because of the robust trusting relationship the World State has been able to establish between itself and its subjects.

Luhmann (1973/2017) states that ‘trust reduces social complexity, that is, simplifies life by the taking of a risk’ (p. 79) and that ‘trust increases the “tolerance of ambiguity”’ (p. 17). Luhmann refers to the risk of contingency and the unpredictable nature of future events, which are uncountable and near infinite. Taking such a risk is essentially unavoidable because it is practically impossible for a person to predict every contingency in a given social environment, and this is taken to extreme levels in *Brave New World*. The rapid progression of science necessarily means a growing need for trust, as individuals are forced to give up control over what they can and cannot grasp in their everyday lives. When traditional societal morals and values of family, individual success and love is replaced with technological and industrial growth as moral imperatives, trust takes on increased societal importance. Giddens (1990) says that ‘all disembedding mechanisms, both symbolic tokens [like money] and expert systems, depend upon trust’ and that ‘trust here is vested, not in individuals, but in abstract capacities’ (p. 26). Trust in abstract capacities encompasses for instance trust in social order, the regime, the functionality of the economic structure and the overall competence of the social system (Sztompka, 1999, p. 45) and is the default setting of trust among World State citizens. People have limited incentives to trust others, because the World State ensures the conformity of all people and thus complexity is reduced. The people themselves do not have to actively consider who to trust, the World State does it for them. After Bernard gets deported, Mond says that he is being sent to ‘a place where he’ll meet the most interesting set of men and women to be found anywhere in the world. All the people who, for one reason or another, have got too self-consciously individual to fit into community life’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 186), underscoring that active choices of trust become redundant by conforming. Trusting abstract capacities, like trusting the idea of the World State and its advancement, reduces complexity.

Corresponding to how complexity is reduced in the World State is Henry Ford’s (the real life historical figure, not the World State deity) design of assembly line production. Huxley obviously drew heavily on Henry Ford when constructing the World State’s industrial ethos, and Ford himself states in his 1926 biography that the result of the application of his assembly principles is ‘the reduction of the necessity for thought on the part of the worker and the reduction of his movements to a minimum’ (as cited in Sexton, 1986, p. 426). Ford illustrates a prime example of reducing complexity where the goal itself is to reduce the necessary expenditure of thought to a minimum. This turns man into machine where efficiency and productivity are the only objectives. Ford fails, however, to acknowledge what

the worker has to trade away to achieve this reduction of thought in the workplace, but this is by contrast carefully calibrated in the World State. The Director of Hatcheries describes bokanovskified siblings as ‘identical machines!’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 6), proudly illustrating that the line between human and machine in the World State is extremely blurred. That the industrial success of the World State has brought with it unaccountable risks resonate with readers from the late modern period because the relative success of the modern project also brings with it unforeseen risks which must be met. *Brave New World*, then, highlights the importance of urgency when facing the problematics of modernity as it pertains to the commodification of individuals.

The process of reducing social complexity begins even before life begins in the World State through the eugenic caste system. ‘We also predestine and condition. We decant our babies as socialized human beings, as Alphas or Epsilons, as future sewage workers or future Director of Hatcheries’ (Huxley, 1958, pp. 9-10), illustrating that in the World State, people are born to serve a specific purpose which in turn decreases complexity by severely reducing the amount of options people have in their lives. Reducing social complexity is in many ways the equivalent of making everyday life easier and more convenient, but it requires trust. Luhmann (1973/2017) states that ‘the amount of societal complexity which exists is overwhelmingly large. The individual can therefore make use of [truth] only if it is presented to him in an already reduced, simplified, prearranged form’ (p. 57). The World State has solved the issues inherent in the overwhelming amounts of social complexity by forcing their ideological “truths” on the inhabitants from before they are born and throughout their living days. In *Brave New World*, this necessarily means trust in technology and science. At the same time, even technological progress cannot be fully unleashed within the World State. Mustapha Mond points out to John, Helmholtz and Bernard that ‘I’m interested in truth, I like science. But truth’s a menace, science is a public danger. As dangerous as it’s been beneficent’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 186) because it has the potential to endanger stability. ‘Universal happiness keeps the wheels steadily turning; truth and beauty can’t’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 187), Mond says, underscoring that their “truths” are consciously biased in order to pay the price for public happiness. As Posner (2000) points out, ‘technological innovations can interact with each other or with the social structure to produce unforeseeable long-run consequences that may be good or bad’ (p. 4), but the effects of the World States technological innovations have been carefully calibrated to create a well-oiled welfare state, while still steering the technological progress enough to never compromise social stability.

The love of Ford, technological progress and innovation is merely a tool to camouflage the World State's actual ambition: social stability and conformity. As Mond says, they want to 'shift the emphasis from truth and beauty to comfort and happiness' (Huxley, 1958, p. 187), in which they have succeeded.

Posner (2000) identifies three main categories of technological innovations present in the World State. Firstly, reproductive technology involving safe contraception and ova mixed with sperm in a laboratory to perfect eugenic breeding. Secondly, technology to alter mind and body such as hypnopaedia, soma, sophisticated cosmetic surgery methods and 'gonadal hormones' and 'transfusion of young blood' (Huxley, 1958, p. 46) to halt aging. Thirdly, entertainment technology to induce happiness such as synthetic music, the "Feelies" and, if you are lucky enough to be an Alpha, personal helicopter rides (p. 10). These industrial innovations have helped produce an intellectually and politically passive public mass and entangle the very social fabric of the World State in a network of expert systems.

In relation to technological innovations that produce a passive public mass, Giddens (1990) argues that 'the prime condition of requirements for trust is not lack of power but lack of full information. If you fully understand something or what someone does [...] trust is not needed' (p. 33). This stipulates that trust is not a goal in itself, but it is a necessary device to be able to cope without complete knowledge in everyday life. It is unquestionable that World State citizens do not have the luxury of full disclosure on information about the society in which they partake. The distribution of knowledge is scattered through the caste system and as such reinforces the strong hierarchical class structure of the World State, ensuring that no single caste is able obtain any form of eclectic worldview which could potentially threaten the World State's legitimacy. This lack of information and transparency must be viewed in relation to expert systems in *Brave New World*, because an overwhelming load of expert systems makes a lack of information and transparency inevitable. In the real world, this does not necessarily mean that the information is deliberately held back from public discourse (although this is the case in *Brave New World*, where knowledge is both deliberately held back and also distributed unevenly among the different castes), but it is inevitable nonetheless because no person has the capability to navigate themselves through the immense landscape of information that exists and make practical sense of it. The combination of all-encompassing expert systems and a severe lack of information gives the lay-people no other option than to trust the World State. Beck (2007/2009) states that 'only a strong, competent public sphere "armed" with scientific arguments is capable of separating the scientific wheat

from the chaff (Beck, 2007/2009, p. 44), but this is unthinkable in the World State and therefore the public have no choice but to trust abstract capacities and heavily rely on externally processed information. Being forced to trust expert systems is extremely convenient in everyday life, but produces a less informed public not only in the World State, but also in our modern reality.

According to Beuchamp (1986), technology in dystopias is commonly ‘not a neutral tool misused by totalitarian rulers but [...] intrinsically totalitarian in itself, a futuristic Frankenstein's monster (p. 55), which is true in *Brave New World*. Mustapha Mond proclaiming that the World State cannot risk letting science and technology run loose (Huxley, 1958, p. 186) in a *laissez-faire* style capacity indicates that he and the World State Controllers are aware of the harmful potential technology has if it is not governmentally controlled. Congdon (2011) offers an antagonistic assessment to Beuchamp and argues that *Brave New World* ‘offers a sophisticated critique of how scientific knowledge emerges from and in turn serves the social, political, and economic agendas of those in power’ (Congdon, 2011, p. 3). *Brave New World* seems to indicate that technology is intrinsically totalitarian, but in line with Congdon’s assessment, the World State manages to control it through drastic measures of surveillance and control to serve their purpose.

John and Lenina, in reference to the scene examined in the introduction, being in John’s apartment and trusting that the structure will not collapse or that some other unforeseen disaster will occur is an instance of trust in expert systems that reduces complexity. This requires trust in expert systems because the durability and relative safety of the structure which stabilizes the building of John’s apartment is practically out of their control. Of course, some experts possess knowledge that can increase the relative safety of the structure, but ultimately one can only have sophisticated expertise in a limited number of areas because of the incredible amount of societal complexity that exists. People who do not possess such knowledge must therefore trust both experts who do and the systems they encapsulate in order to maintain ontological security and a sense of ontological security in everyday life. Lenina is culturally, socially and materially heavily reliant on expert systems in her everyday life, which John has not been throughout his life. Merely by being in John’s apartment and enjoying the material advantages of the World State, John and Lenina are involved in an expert system, or rather a series of expert systems, where expertise outside of their control must be relied on and trusted. When Lenina rings the doorbell, she nor John possess sophisticated knowledge about the underlying mechanisms of the ringing of the

doorbell or how the sound is produced by pushing the button, but both of them trust it to work – they practically have no other choice. Trust, then, as Luhmann (1973/2017) states, ‘is the generalized expectation that the other will handle his freedom’ (p. 43). It is a bet on others, both persons and things, and for World State citizens like Lenina this gamble entails the loss of individuality because she is given no other outlet for trust than in systems of frigid and unresponsive nature.

This type of trust in systems is also closely related to ontological security. To reiterate, Giddens (1990) states that ontological security ‘refers to the confidence that most human beings have [...] in the constancy of the surrounding social and material environments of action’ (p. 92) which is basic to notions of trust. If one were to always be afraid of the structure of a building collapsing, one would not feel ontologically secure. Trust, in a way, dismisses unpredictability by the taking of a risk. Furthermore, Giddens (1990) argues that with an ever-increasing amount of expert systems and development of trust in abstract capacities, ‘trust in impersonal principles as well as in anonymous others becomes indispensable to social existence’ (p. 120). The lay-people of the World State are forced to trust impersonal principles, which cannot stimulate the psyche the way trust in persons can. To the World State, ‘the worker’s emotional state is simply a function of his productive capacity’ (Sexton, 1986, p. 427), and thus trusting impersonal systems and principles is thrown back on to the individual to grapple with. Adorno (1967/1983) states that in *Brave New World*, ‘[Huxley] pursues in succession various unanalyzed surface phenomena, such as the conflict between men and machine’ (p. 113), and Adorno’s assertion that this conflict *per se* is not necessarily of great importance is valid. Nevertheless, it is an important conflict to examine in order to understand what the truly significant conflict is, namely that between men and men as a consequence of man’s conflict with machine. Trust theory allows us to confront the conflict between humans as a result of the conflict between men and machine in the World State through for example trust in expert systems and abstract capacities which predominantly creates shallower human relationships because trust, of which one only has a limited amount to meaningfully distribute, must be channeled toward machines instead of humans.

It can be argued that the trust the lay-people of the World State have in expert systems is confidence, not trust, which according to Giddens (1990) ‘presupposes awareness of circumstances of risk’ (p. 31). It is reasonable to suppose that World State inhabitants are not consciously aware of risk, but unconsciously they are. Bernard is cognizant of certain risks, but he is an outlier. He has to trust expert systems that he cannot influence, which in turn is a

source of frustration for him and causes low ontological security. For non-conformists like Bernard, who acknowledges and is aware of certain risks, it becomes an impossible situation when the information needed will likely never be disclosed to him. But ironically, this awareness of not being able to know is an opening for self-knowledge for Bernard.

Establishing that people are aware of risks, however, is important for the validity of applying trust theory to *Brave New World*. Luhmann (1988), in unison with Giddens, states that trust is a solution for a specific problem and ‘presupposes a situation of risk’ (p. 97), implying that without risk there can be no trust. Akin to Bernard, Henry Foster’s case suggests that some citizens actively choose what others are not capable of choosing and thus acknowledge risk. Henry Foster is an archetypical Alpha male who is popular, tall and handsome – everything Bernard wishes he himself was. What is peculiar about Henry Foster is that he is conscious of being a product of social conditioning, but he does not seem to mind it. When Lenina wonders aloud whether or not Epsilons mind being Epsilons, Henry Foster replies ‘of course they don’t. How can they? They don’t know what it’s like being anything else. We’d mind, of course. But then we’ve been differently conditioned. Besides, we start with a different heredity’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 62). Moreover, Lenina claims that she is happy that she is not an Epsilon, to which Henry Foster replies ‘and if you were an Epsilon your conditioning would have made you no less thankful that you weren’t a Beta or an Alpha’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 62). It is obvious that Henry Foster has sophisticated knowledge about hypnopaedia and its effects and he is the only character in the novel, apart from Mustapha Mond and Bernard, who explicitly displays insight to this degree. This seems to be what is missing from Helmholtz’s cognitive ability, but the key difference is that he would probably be sent away whereas Henry Foster displaying this level of understanding does not pose any threat to social stability because he aligns himself with the World State’s ideology.

Bernard Marx and Henry Foster’s cases make it clear that the populace, at least some higher caste members of society, do have a choice to rebel, which means that the trust lay-people have in the World State is not meaningless or carries no value. If the possibility of choice is non-existent, trust cannot meaningfully exist. Exactly where the line is drawn between which castes has the capacity to rebel the way Bernard and Henry Foster are seemingly capable of is unclear, but the fact that at least some citizens are capable of challenging the status quo means that choice is present and the trust the citizens have in the World State carries meaning. Giddens (1991) argues from the premise that ‘to be a human being is to know, virtually all of the time, in terms of some description or another, both what one is doing and why one is doing it’ (p. 35). Even Lenina can give some novel explanation as



to why she does what she does, but agency in *Brave New World* must be treated as a continuum where Bernard and Henry Foster have a higher capability of actively reflecting on the choices they make than for example Lenina. Lenina's trust in the World State and its all-encompassing expert and abstract systems nonetheless presupposes risk, but for Lenina and other lower caste members, risk is not consciously acknowledged, contrary to Bernard and Henry Foster.

Moreover, reading a paper named "A New Term of Biology", Mond categorizes it as 'not to be published' for its 'heretical and, so far as the present social order is concerned, dangerous and potentially subversive' (Huxley, 1958, p. 145) content. The paper is written by an unnamed higher caste member of the World State and includes content that could 'easily decondition the more unsettled minds among the higher castes – make them lose their faith in happiness as the Sovereign Good...' (Huxley, 1958, p. 145). This again suggests that higher caste members do have the cognitive capacity to rebel, and that the societal indoctrination is not completely bulletproof. From this it can be deduced that the trust the lay-people have in their government and in the abstract systems to which they are subjected carries meaning as there does exist awareness of risk. At no point is it suggested that lower castes than Alphas are capable of acknowledging such risks, but the point that it is possible still stands. That Bernard is sent to an island consisting of people who have questioned the World State's approach also reflects that a decent amount of people have previously been consciously aware of the risks the World State's authoritarian, pervasive techniques pose to humanity.

All relationships in *Brave New World* are intrinsically insubstantial, crystallized by the community phrase 'everyone belongs to everyone else' (Huxley, 1958, p. 31), particularly sexual relationships between male and female. Inherent in this slogan is the idea that people should not feel entitled to spend too much time with one single person, as would be the case in traditional societies such as in John's homeland of Malpais. Instead, short-lived relationships are expected. To most, if not all, scholars on trust, such societies would have a severe disadvantage in building interpersonal trust, which stipulates that meaningful trusting relationships can barely occur inside the World State. Hardin, (2002) argues that 'trust is relational. If we have no or only a passing relationship, we are not in a trusting relationship' (p. 3) and even if the citizens are discouraged from being alone, they rarely get the chance to build up substantial interpersonal trust which could potentially threaten the World State's monopoly on authority. It is clear, however, that people are directly and indirectly in contact with each other over extended periods of time – the circulating rumor that Bernard got alcohol

in his blood-surrogate, for example, reveals this. Such rumors could not gain traction if the same people did not have regular interactions with each other. However, the notion of everyone belonging to everyone only reinforces the interchangeability of people in the World State, and ‘extinguishes man as an individual being, liquidates as mythology his claim to exist for his own sake, and defines him as existing merely for the sake of others and thus [...] as worthless’ (Adorno, 1967/1983, p. 105). Excessively trusting expert systems and abstract capacities with no alternative outlet for interpersonal trust pigeonholes people into an existence where they are not living as individual agents but as dispensable items that can be easily replaced. Fordism has created an environment where this is the function of individual humans, and *Brave New World* suggests that unbridled trust in technological and material progress can produce a similar existence in our own world.

If we view interpersonal trust as the belief that someone will behave “appropriately” within a given cultural context, there is interpersonal trust in the World State as a consequence of trust in systems because ‘trust in impersonal systems depends on a foundation of shared meaning and some degree of trust in the individuals associated with those systems, i.e. some degree of personal trust’ (McDermott, 2003, p. 61). This implies that there are elements of personal trust in the World State between citizens because they must collectively agree on what constitutes appropriate behavior and agree on some sort of shared value system. However, interpersonal trust spawned from trust in impersonal systems merely feeds into the cold, inanimate principles of trusting expert and abstract systems itself because it leads to social policing as a strategy to ensure that cultural norms are upheld.

Social policing is common inside the World State to ensure that citizens do not spend too much time with one single person. When Lenina reveals that she has only been with Henry Foster for the last four months, Fanny replies with disturbance and says ‘I really think you ought to be careful. It’s such horribly bad form to go on and on like this with one man. And you know how strongly the D.H.C. objects to anything intense or long-drawn’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 32). Fanny’s reply reveals that it is in the World State’s interest to discourage the formation of interpersonal trusting bonds, and instead promote trust in abstract capacities to maintain social stability. It is ironic that people are conditioned to ‘hate solitude’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 193) but passing and short-lived relationships are the social norm in the World State. The fear, of course, is that solitude can produce wayward thoughts, exemplified through Bernard who prefers being alone. ‘There was horror in Fanny’s voice’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 36) when she has reminded Lenina of Bernard’s atypical preference, underscoring the dominant

societal preference of hating solitude. Mond later explains that in the brave new world, there is ‘no leisure from pleasure, not a moment to sit down and think’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 47) and such institutional dissuasion of forming strong interpersonal bonds by never having time away from hedonistic pleasure in turn makes the citizens trust expert and abstract systems as well as the World State itself, instead of each other. Giddens (1990) explains that

with the development of abstract systems, trust in impersonal principles as well as in anonymous others, becomes indispensable to social existence [...]. There is a strong psychological need to find others to trust but institutionally organized personal connections are lacking, relative to pre-modern social situations. (p. 120)

It is paradoxical that there is a plethora of institutionally organized events that can create personal connections in the brave new world, like the Solidarity Service, but it does not equate to strong interpersonal trust. The social policing and institutionally instilled distrust among citizens, as will be discussed further in 2.3, creates only a decadent social sphere where all trust is reserved for the World State itself. The real-life fear of losing ownership over our humanity through the pervasive intrusiveness of technology is succinctly highlighted by Huxley in *Brave New World*. Some critics, such as Adorno (1967/1983), have argued that the World State inhabitants cannot even be considered human; they are merely commodified cogs in the wheel of mass consumption. Social policing serves as fuel for the degradation and deindividualization of humanity as a by-product of excessive trust in non-sentient objects. As Lenina states, ‘when the individual feels, the community reels’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 77) and the nonsentience has consequently become internalized to the extent that people police each other to crumble any remaining fragments of human emotion.

While expert systems are extremely convenient in everyday life, a heavy reliance on such systems has implications for romantic intimacy as well as trust. Giddens (1990) argues that ‘trust in abstract systems provides for the security of day-to-day reliability, but by its very nature cannot supply the mutuality or intimacy which personal trust relations offer’ (p. 114). This can explain how most of the World State citizens have high levels of ontological security but lack the capability of forming strong interpersonal bonds – both platonic and sexual. Lenina has consistently put trust in expert systems, and trust of this nature ‘is not psychologically rewarding in the way in which trust in persons is’ (Giddens, 1990, p. 113), which, to some degree, can explain why John prioritizes symbolic gestures in romance

whereas Lenina finds this unnecessary. John needs to put a personal touch, as it were, on intimacy, but Lenina does not, and he wants what in sociological terms is often referred to as a ‘pure relationship’ (Giddens, 1991, p. 6).

In societies where trusting abstract capacities and inhuman principles is inevitable, a climate develops where the formation of pure relationships typically becomes sought after. Trusting abstract capacities is pragmatically inevitable in both the World State society and our late modern reality. Giddens (1991) argues that “pure relationships” have emerged in modern societies as a response to new spheres of social life due to globalization. The World State is a highly globalized society where national borders are broken down and a unified single state has emerged in the aftermath of the “Nine Year’s War”. Only a selection of “Savage Reservations” remain untouched to which Bernard ‘as an Alpha-Plus psychologist [...] was one of the few men [...] entitled to a permit’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 72). A pure relationship ‘is one in which external criteria have become dissolved: the relationship exists solely for whatever rewards that relationships as such can deliver’ and that ‘trust [...] can by definition no longer be anchored in criteria outside the relationship itself – such as criteria of kinship, social duty or traditional obligation’ (Giddens, 1991, p. 6). Citizens are strongly discouraged from engaging in anything reminiscent of pure relationships, and would likely be extradited if they were to do so. Pure relationships do not exist within the closed sexual system of the World State, and Diken (2011) points out that ‘as erotic drives are institutionalized, the body is captured by the system and functions as an instrument of regulation and domination’ (p. 167). Thus, no relationships within the World State can exist purely for whatever reason said relationship can deliver because all relationships in the World State are ultimately captured by and fed into the system in which they partake. Fanny Crowne, for instance, tells Lenina that she ‘ought to be a little more promiscuous’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 34), urging her to abide by criteria of social duty in relation to her sexual relationships. Again, in the shape of the non-existence of pure relationship, we see an example of what excessively trusting expert systems and abstract capacities can amount to. *Brave New World* argues that pure relationships and excessive trust in abstract capacities cannot peacefully coexist.

John, and arguably Bernard, want to establish a pure relationship with Lenina, the reason being that ‘absorption within pure relationships certainly may often be a mode of defence against an enveloping outside world’ (Giddens, 1991, p. 7). For both John and Bernard, their relationship with Lenina is an attempt at distancing and protecting themselves from an outside world of which they cannot make sense. After a date with Lenina, Bernard

says that he does not want to go to bed with her, at least not on the first day, before proclaiming: 'I want to know what passion is. I want to feel something strongly' (p. 77). That Bernard "wants to feel something strongly" seems to indicate that he wants a relationship with Lenina for selfish reasons. He wants to use Lenina as a means for self-knowing, and thus the reward he seeks from the relationship is anchored in his own interests because he merely wants to use Lenina as a medium in order to "feel". He does not encapsulate Lenina's interest into his own interest, which Hardin (2002) deems crucial to any attempt at forming strong interpersonal trusting relationships in his account of 'trust as encapsulated interest' (p. 3). Reading Bernard's initial relationship with Lenina *not* as an attempt at forming a pure relationship becomes more plausible in the context of post-Savage Reservation Bernard where his fickle and selfish nature is revealed.

John, contrary to Bernard, wants from the relationship with Lenina only what the relationship as such can offer. Like Bernard, John attempts to distance himself from the World State through a relationship with Lenina. However, John does not have ulterior motives and says that he wants to please Lenina only 'for you, for you. Just to show that I... to show much... how much I love you, Lenina' (Huxley, 1958, p. 156-57), ignoring external criteria. Where Bernard points to what he selfishly aspires to achieve from the relationship, John encapsulates Lenina's interests into his own in order to gain her trust. This, of course, is doomed to fail from the outset, as are all attempts at pure relationships within the World State because of the institutionalization of sexuality. Horan (2007) states that 'lust threatens the establishment because every dystopian world is built on cold, methodical logic, and lust is fundamentally illogical' (p. 318). John's primal lust for Lenina is potentially dangerous for the World State because they recognize that monogamy leads to traditional family structures which competes for loyalty (Horan, 2007, p. 320) and consequently competes with the World State for citizens' trust. The World State idea of romance must ultimately be viewed as a product of trust in abstract systems, which Giddens (1990) says can provide 'for the security of day-to-day reliability, but by its very nature cannot supply either the mutuality or intimacy which personal trust relations offer' (p. 114). This manifests itself in *Brave New World* both in platonic and sexual relationships where excessive trust in inanimate systems generally produces materialistically comfortable lives, but creates a vacuum of substantial intimate relationships and meaningful camaraderie.

The conclusion becomes that individual humans are essentially unnecessary and lasting emotional attachment is non-existent. Consider how the Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning responds to an earthquake in Japan, for example. Instead of mourning the loss of

fellow humans, he is simply frustrated that a selection of Hatchery workers will have to work overtime to produce new ones (Huxley, 1958, p. 7). Thus, the commodification and relative obsolescence of individuals has become institutionalized and the loss of individuals solely means more production. Death itself, in a sense, feeds into the system of mass-production and keeps the wheels of production and consumption steadily afloat. Adorno (1967/1983) indignantly points out that ‘one day it will be readily apparent that men do not need the trash provided them by the culture industry’ (p. 109). By continuously trusting expert systems and abstract capacities that produces “trash” and having no alternative outlets for forming strong interpersonal trusting relationships - sexual and platonic - the Fordians will only know shallow and fragile experiences and emotions. Huxley postulates this as a crucial warning to the reader through *Brave New World*, and trust theory allows us to discern how close, in many respects, the “juggernaut of modernity” has come to Huxley’s ominous predictions.

### **2.3. Trust in government: inverted liberal democratic distrust**

‘There was something called liberalism [...] there was something called democracy (Huxley, 1958, pp. 37-38)’, says Mustapha Mond, establishing that in the World State we find ourselves in a post-democratic authoritarian world without any form of public democratic representation. Nonetheless, the World State enjoys the privilege of unconditional trust from its citizens. Inherent in the idea of liberal democracies, contrary to the World State regime, is distrust. Kohn (2008) states,

much of the attention devoted to trust in public discourse revolves around the public’s suspension of belief in political theatre. This may, however, be a problem for politicians rather than for democracy, whose structural foundations are actually based on mistrust. Liberal states take as a given that those with power will be tempted to abuse it, so the powers of the state are separated into divisions intended to check and balance their exercise. (p. 7)

Barber, however, (1983) explains that ‘this folklore does not seem to exist in other modern societies, at least not nearly to the same extent’ (p. 71). I argue, contrarily, from the premise that there is an element of distrust inherent in liberal democracies worldwide toward

government, while also acknowledging that this feature is most conspicuous within the United States' political climate.

There is nevertheless a fine line between healthy distrust and detrimental trust in government. Excessive trust in government can lead to authoritarian abuse of power, as is the case with the World State and also a feature of some modern nations such as North Korea, Saudi-Arabia and China, to name a few, where infringements of civil rights are customary, elections are rarely fair nor free and mass-censorship is typical. Excessive distrust, on the other hand, might cause dissociation and apathy from political life among the public, as has, following Barber's point, arguably been the case in the United States. Distrust is institutionalized in democracies and built into its very architecture in the shape of various checks and balances to ensure that no faction is able to disproportionately exercise power over the nation. In the World State, however, trust is institutionalized and trust theory can help pinpoint how liberal democratic distrust is flipped on its head to establish what we might call authoritarian non-democratic unconditional trust. Through *Brave New World*, Huxley does not only address the pitfalls of unbridled technological progress. He also criticizes the perils of an ill-informed public mass content with non-democratic authoritarianism. In the World State, 'people are happy; they get what they want, and they never want what they can't get' (Huxley, 1958, p 180), and they are prepared to surrender freedom of the self, freedom of thought, social justice, equality before the law and every other inalienable right as long as their hedonistic needs are satisfied. This is a democratic slippery slope and trust theory can conceptualize how *Brave New World* embodies the fatal consequence of such reasoning.

There is no division of power in the World State, only a complete centralization where authorities can freely abuse authority without the risk of being checked. The political structure in *Brave New World* is not founded on distrust, as is the case in liberal democracies, but on unconditional trust. Therefore, there exists an inverted form of trust in liberal democratic institutions in the World State, or as Smith (2011) dubs it: 'an ironical reversal of government by the people to a people by the government' (p. 348). The lay-people of the World State have unconditional trust in their government because they lay-people essentially regard their government as their mother. However, Cook, Hardin & Levi (2005) states that 'when great power differences exist between parties, it is rare that trust relations provide proper protection for the interests of the less powerful or adequate safeguards against exploitation' (p. 188). Thus, even if the lay-people trust the government, the colossal power difference indicates that their trust is not any more likely to be rewarded by the World State.

Trust in government, however, makes it exponentially easier to create, in Foucauldian terms, “docile bodies” (see Foucault, 1975/1977, pp. 135-169). Trusting a system or an institution, such as government, is very dissimilar to trusting a person and this is a crucial point in *Brave New World*. Sztompka (2006) defines institutions as things in which one can trust ‘that enable, constrain and guide action and are durable and committing’ (p. 55) but this trust is not analogous to trust in another person because it cannot answer back or reward the trust given to it. Although the vast majority, give or take a few Alpha misfits, trust the government unconditionally, this does not in any meaningful way mean that the government is likely to reward that trust and largely only produces mass conformity and only reinforces the strict hierarchical power structure without social mobility. The World State rewards citizens’ trust insofar as they provide them with life essentials (and then some), but the tradeoff is an unequivocal loss of individuality, social justice and freedom and no meaningful protection from exploitation. Moreover, ‘poverty can lead to distrust’ (Inglehart, 1999, p. 88), and by providing inhabitants with an overabundance of material goods, distrust toward government becomes less likely. A healthy dose of political distrust among the public mass, however, is a necessary ingredient to prevent authoritarianism, and *Brave New World* demonstrates what unconditional trust in government can produce. Barber (1983) lays out the ideal distrust a public mass can have in government and says that

a democratic polity requires legitimate criticism based on democratic allegiance; some distrust, in this sense, is essential for a viable democratic order. With a better educated, more knowledgeable, and generally more competent public, American [and every other] democracy is likely to get just this kind of distrust. (p. 81)

The exact opposite, however, is happening in the World State which is built on a poorly educated public who are deliberately denied information and democratic participation and nonetheless still unconditionally trust government.

Hardin (2002), in line with many other scholars on trust (Barber, 1983; Warren, 1999; Sztompka, 1999; Luhmann, 1973/2017) argues that ‘a claim to trust government is typically implausible if it is supposed to be analogous to a claim to trust in another person’ (Hardin, 2002, p. 151), but in *Brave New World* the trust citizens have in government is arguably analogous to interpersonal trust because of the vacuum of motherhood the World State has filled. The government itself spearheads the perverse family structure of mothers, brothers



and sisters which in this case allows the trust being distributed to the government to align itself with trust in persons. As Sztompka (1999) points out, a ‘social resource relevant for trust is a robust family’ and that ‘the family [is] seen as central for the emergence of trusting impulses, or basic trustfulness’ (p. 130), echoing Giddens’s argument that parental caretakers provide infants with basic notions of trust through an emotional inoculation during infancy. By providing a perverse family structure and the emotional inoculation necessary for basic trust and creating a habitat where trust can be nourished, the World State secures the citizens’ trust in government.

Moreover, Hardin (2002) argues that trust in government is ‘short of trust as we experience it in interpersonal relations. This is confidence, or what we might call quasi trust’ (p. 152). Trust in expert systems and trust in government are comparable because neither can answer back or respond the way one would expect from an interpersonal trusting relationship. Governments, at least, can respond in the form of a representative figure or other government officials, but it is highly implausible to build up and maintain interpersonal trust with individual government authorities due to the large scale of modern societies and institutions. Generally, trust in government is quasi-trust and more analogous to confidence or faith. However, the citizens of the World State’s relationship with their government can be classified as trust, and the citizens have a sturdier and more secure trusting relationship with the government than they do between themselves interpersonally. The vertical trust outweighs the horizontal trust because of the robust trusting relationship the citizens have with their government functioning as their mother and because citizens are institutionally encouraged to police each other.

This suggests that not only has distrust in government been essentially eliminated, but distrust has been rechanneled toward what Hardin (2002) describes as “thick relationships” (p. 21). Thick relationships are complex, overlapping interactions which typically include interactions within a close community of family, friends, colleagues and others one interacts with on a consistent basis. Lenina, Bernard, Fanny Crowne, Helmholtz and later John the Savage can be claimed to partake in a thick community of trust with each other, interacting on a consistent basis and thus run the risk of losing ‘reputation and the possibility of shunning by others’ (Hardin, 2002, p. 21) by acting untrustworthy within the thick community. In *Brave New World*, typical distrust in government is non-existent and instead we find distrust within thick relationships. ‘Do you mean to tell me you’re *still* going out with Henry Foster?’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 31), Fanny asks Lenina, illustrating that seeds of social policing and distrust

has been planted by the World State and grown to become a reflex among citizens. 'I really do think you ought to be careful' (Huxley, 1958, p. 32) Fanny continues, alluding to the consequences that would befall Lenina were she not to be careful. This awareness of consequences produces distrust within the thick community, and also suggests an awareness of risk which, to Giddens's (1990) point laid out earlier, is a presupposition of trust.

Barber (1983) points out that 'the political system is one of the most important social mechanisms for the creation and maintenance of public expectations of a stable moral social order' (p. 68). The World State is painstakingly aware of this and utilizes the citizens' trust to create a misconstrued social reality where stability is paramount. John, from his position as an outsider, detects this and claims that 'I don't want comfort. I want God, I want poetry, I want real danger, I want freedom, I want goodness, I want sin'. Mond replies coldly, and says: 'you're claiming the right to be unhappy' (Huxley, 1958, p. 197). John, however, is untouched by social and eugenic conditioning – such privileges do not exist for the lay-people of the World State and they do not have the possibility of claiming unhappiness. There are certain expectations about totalitarian governments in dystopian literature. Violence and fear, suspicion and skepticism and disillusionment and resentment are familiar keywords attached to totalitarian governments in dystopian fiction. To illustrate this, we may once again turn to Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and the Party government, who according to Booker & Thomas (2009) 'seek only to perpetuate its own power' (p. 68) and are consciously working toward a dystopian world. The World State, however, rules oppositely and 'not through the overt exercise of power [...] but through the more subtle manipulations that are typical of modern bourgeois society in the West' (Booker & Thomas, 2009, p. 67). This would not be achievable without substantial trust from the lay-people. Dystopian governments chiefly rule through fear and violence analogous to how a slave owner would rule over his subjects, but not the World State. 'Do you like being slaves' (Huxley, 1958, p. 174) John shouts at Bernard, Helmholtz and a group of Deltas at the hospital, which introduces a new topic of interest for the trusting relationship World State citizens have with their government. It can hardly be argued that John is wrong in his assessment calling World State inhabitants slaves. However, most lay-people are not consciously aware of this, crystallized by Lenina. Bernard asks: 'don't you wish you were free, Lenina?' (Huxley, 1958, p. 75), implying that he already knows that he is not free, and functions as an invitation to Lenina to admit her captivity. Instead, Lenina replies: 'I don't know what you mean. I am free. Free to have the most wonderful time. Everybody's happy nowadays' (Huxley, 1958, p. 75). As Jodlowska (2012)

states, 'it is obvious Lenina is not free in any objective sense – she simply feels free' (p. 68), but the feeling of freedom and actual freedom is not necessarily awfully different, and Lenina cannot be criticized for her illusion of freedom. Foster, however, would claim that he is free while also acknowledging the World State's authoritarian techniques, but to an objective observer both he and Lenina are World State captives.

Moreover, Lenina is not only a World State captive but also a captive of her own mind, and the trusting relationship between government and subject in *Brave New World* can be explored more thoroughly by comparing it to the trusting relationship between a slave owner in the Americas and his slave. 'A slave-owner in the Americas', Kohn (2008) states, 'might have been completely confident that his slaves would act in his interests, but that confidence would be based on control' (p. 14). The World Controllers are similarly confident that the citizens will act in their interest, which is also based on control, but citizens act in a way the World State expects due to a complete colonization of their minds. Not only has the World State succeeded in a complete planetary colonization, apart from a few Savage Reservations, but most crucially it has colonized its citizens mind, making them genuinely believe that the World State is a doer of good. The American slave owner did not have such luxuries and had to rely on means of violence to control his slaves. The Fordians are not only slaves to the World State, but slaves to their own minds. This can be viewed as a perverse form of trust as encapsulated interest (Hardin, 2002), where the World State citizens encapsulates the interest of the World State into their own. Normally, trust as encapsulated interest is reserved for an interpersonal trusting relationship 'that is grounded in the value of maintaining the relationship into the future' (Hardin, 2002, p. 3), but in the case of the World State and subject, encapsulated interest of trust from citizens to government is both possible and plausible because of their familial relationship and successful social indoctrination.

Kohn (2008) states that for many authors writing on trust, a central component of its meaning is the position of vulnerability the trustor places themselves in if the trustee does not act as the trustor expects (pp. 14-15). The World State are essentially invulnerable to this disappointment because, as with the slave-owner, they have effective ways to ensure that the trusted party are complicit through means of social control and, if necessary, violence. Thus, when the World State functions as the trustor and the lay-people function as the trustee, there is essentially no risk involved. Conversely, however, when the lay-people function as the trustor of the World State, they become incredibly vulnerable because the consequences are enormous if the trustee decides to act differently than as expected by the trustor. A strictly hierarchical power structure such as the relationship between the World State and the

populace cannot be said to be based on trust when only one half of the equation has to accept vulnerability and risk great suffering. In a liberal democracy, the government is always at risk of public uproar or rebellion if the citizen's do not sufficiently feel that the government is catering to their interest, or acting in a way that the populace, the trustor, would expect them to act. This is not the case in *Brave New World*, and the trust relation between lay-people and government becomes an inversion of what we expect it to be in a liberal democracy, where an integral part of the trust relation consists of distrust toward authorities. This can be explained by the World State successfully and sufficiently colonizing the minds of the lay-people in order to create a trust relation where only the lay-people have to accept meaningful risk.

Violence is a rare, almost non-existent, occurrence in the novel. The lay-people do not fear violence from the authorities, contrary to the slave and slave-owner trust relation. Of course, the World State has the power to discipline its citizens through means of violence if the situation requires it, but the successful colonization of minds makes this a largely unnecessary course of action. To get this point, however, the pre-World State government relied heavily on warfare and violence in response to the "Nine Year's War" and the "Great Economic Collapse", and there is no question they would resort to violence and brutality again if needed. Mustapha Mond at one point says that ruling is an 'affair of sitting, not hitting. You rule with the brains and the buttocks, never with the fists' (Huxley, 1958, p. 40), which the World State does to a large extent but in the context of its history must be read with skepticism. However, in the present-day World State which is presented to the reader, citizens do not fear violence. The World State has achieved this feat by functioning as the mother of the citizens, as well as indoctrinating them both before and after they are brought to life and successfully colonizing their minds to imprint the World State's belief system into the citizens making them slaves both of the World State and themselves.

As Kádár & Tóth (2013) point out, 'technological advance is one of the most dominant motives of the utopian works from the dawn of the modern age, and also of dystopias that became an independent literary genre from the beginning of the twentieth century' (p. 53). The difference in modes of ruling between a slaver-owner in the Americas and that of the World State can be traced back to the difference in technology they have at their disposal, and this difference also applies to the World State as opposed to many other totalitarian dystopian regimes. It utilizes sophisticated technology, which even Mustapha Mond acknowledges cannot be fully controlled, to produce a trusting, obedient and conforming mass of useful idiots. The traditional slave-owner could not take advantage of this level of sophisticated technology and consequently had to rule through violence and fear. But

technology, as seen in the World State, has the power to create docile bodies who blissfully abandon their individual agency without being cognizant of what they are abandoning, and as such technology becomes the Swiss Army knife of the World State's achieved goal of social stability. Swer (2014) stresses that 'in recent years, philosophers and cultural critics have characterized technology in a far more problematic fashion, as an authoritarian power with the ability to bring about far-reaching cultural, political and ecological effects' (p. 201), and through *Brave New World* Huxley demonstrates his keen ability to foresee the potential effects of authoritarian technology. The disparity between technology in the World State and technology in the age of late capitalism is that in the World State it is tightly regulated because the World Controllers spearheaded by Mustapha Mond acutely acknowledge its authoritarian power. The manner in which citizens unconditionally trust the World State emphatically demonstrates the power of technology, and trusting government becomes synonymous with trusting technology.

### **3. Conclusion**

Investigating institutional and interpersonal trust, along with adjacent topics of interest related to trust, in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* provides a new perspective on the novel and uncovers some of the mechanisms behind the fear of technology that scholars have associated with the novel since it was first published 1932. Issues of trust are still somewhat arcane, as shown with the increase of scholarly interest it has received over the last couple of decades. This must be treated as an exciting opportunity, however, and trust theory deserves more attention in relation to literary analysis because it can offer explanations as to why *Brave New World* and dystopian literature in general continues to resonate so strongly with readers.

The World State has managed to establish a robust trusting relation with its citizens mainly due to its ability to provide ontological security through its role as mother, in combination with the emotional inoculation of soma, on which citizens maintain a dependence throughout their lives. This creates an environment where citizens have unconditional trust in the World State due to the construction of a perverse family structure which the state itself solely administer. Furthermore, the pervasiveness of expert and abstract systems within the World State as a result of their audacious trust in the progression of technology - be it soma, the "Feelies", community orgies, hypnopaedia or the philosophy of everyone belonging to everyone else - leads to an everyday existence where citizens lose

control over their surrounding environment which critically reduces social complexity. This reduction of social complexity through excessive trust in expert systems leads to a submissive and easily manipulated public mass. The World State orchestrates this and abuses authority to perpetuate their agenda of ‘Community, Identity, Stability’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 1). Finally, the World State functions both as a totalitarian government and as mother. It utilizes the trust its position as mother grants as a gateway to the unconditional trust of citizens in government. Their abuse of authority with minimal public dissent is only possible due to the unconditional trust the lay-people have in their government. The World State has created a community where liberal democratic distrust has been turned into authoritarian non-democratic unconditional trust due in large part to the robust trusting relationship the World State has with its citizens because of the perverse family structure they have constructed.

Huxley’s dystopia is not the logical conclusion of the “juggernaut of modernity” and I echo Clayton’s (2016) somewhat histrionic statement that ‘by invoking *Brave New World* as if its message were simple and unambiguous, commentators either show their ignorance of literary satire or rely on their audience’s inability to see through a devil’s bargain’ (p. 892). Theodor Adorno, a prominent neo-Marxist thinker of the Frankfurt school, disagrees and criticizes the liberal Huxley (Diken, 2011, p. 167) and *Brave New World* for providing humanity only with a binary option. Adorno (1967/1983) states that ‘man’s choice is not between individualism and a totalitarian world-state’ (p. 117), and there is merit to his criticism insofar as there seems to be little room for compromise in Huxley’s vision of the future of humanity.

However, it is ultimately an ambiguous work of art, and both the World State and the traditional society of Malpais are targets of critique. What the novel purposefully does is to invite readers to look inward to their own societies and contemplate issues both ethically and morally, and from a technology-captivated late modern vantage point Huxley’s vision reverberates strongly. *Brave New World* ‘does not envision the downfall of capitalism, but its ultimate dehumanizing triumph’ (Clayes, 2010, p. 67) through covert abuse of power in a society mindlessly craving instant gratification and entertainment intended to divert the public from critical societal issues, and to perpetuate the commodification of their labor. Mustapha Mond states that ‘the machine turns, turns, and must keep on turning – forever. It is death if it stands still’ (Huxley, 1958, p. 33) and this certainly strikes a chord with twentieth and twenty-first century readers alike. Our modern quest for casual entertainment and instant gratification through technology is uncannily familiar to that of Huxley’s imagined society. Trust theory applied to *Brave New World* identifies how trust, especially in systems, is a necessary tool in

everyday life but also consequently alters human interaction and intimacy. With the advent of modernity, local human interaction and intimacy has been modified in a fashion unique to any other point in history and according to Aeschliman (2015), *Brave New World* 'is in fact a profound, vehement philosophical-literary attack on the "sacred cows" or "golden calves" of modern "progressive" thinking' (p 37). Although I do not believe such a vehement judgement can be passed on Huxley's authorial intent, *Brave New World* does invite questioning of established moral imperatives of science and progress. Trust theory offers ideas and a vocabulary that can help decode these questions in relation to human interaction on both a personal and an institutional level by identifying in what and how we must trust. Perhaps the most basic lesson to be learned from *Brave New World* through trust theory is encapsulated by a proverb from *Hávamál*, an Old Norse poem from the *Poetic Edda*. It declares that 'maðr er manns gaman' (in Evans, 1986, p. 48), which literally translates to "man is man's joy", and the fear of technology *Brave New World* highlights through excessive trust in inanimate objects is that this may one day be forgotten.

## References

- Adorno, T. (1983). *Prisms* (S. & S. Weber, Trans). Massachusetts: The MIT Press. (Original work published 1967).
- Aeschliman, M. D. (2015). A Dark Angel and His Masterpiece: Aldous Huxley and *Brave New World*. *L'Analisi Linguistica e Letteraria* 23(1), 35-46. Retrieved from <http://www.analisilinguisticaeletteraria.eu/?s=A+dark+angel+and+his+masterpiece>
- Auchincloss, E. & Samberg, E. (2012). *Psychoanalytic Terms and Concepts*. New York: American Psychoanalytic Association.
- Barber, B. (1983). *The Logic and Limits of Trust*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Beck, U. (2009). *World at Risk* (C. Cronin, Trans). United Kingdom: Polity Press. (Original work published 2007).
- Beuchamp, G. (1986). Technology in the Dystopian Novel. *MFS Modern Fiction Studies* 32(1), 53- 63. DOI: 10.1353/mfs.0.1315
- Booker, K. M. & Thomas, A. M. (2009). *The Science Fiction Handbook*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.
- Buchanan, B. (2002). Oedipus in Dystopia: Freud and Lawrence in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. *Journal of Modern Literature* 25(3), 75-89. DOI: 10.1353/jml.2003.0016
- Carey, J. (1992). *The Intellectuals and the Masses: Pride and Prejudice Among the Literary Intelligentsia 1880-1939*. London: Faber.
- Chrostowska, S. D. (2013). Thought Woken by Memory: Adorno's Circuitous Path to Utopia. *New German Critique* 118(Special Issue on Adorno), 93-117. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.uio.no/stable/23357081>
- Claeys, G. (Ed.). (2010). *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clayton, J. (2016). The Modern Synthesis: Genetics and Dystopia in the Huxley Circle.



- Modernism/Modernity* 23(4), 875-896. DOI: 10.1353/mod.2016.0078
- Congdon, B. (2011). "Community, Identity, Stability": The Scientific Society and the Future of Religion in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. *ESC: English Studies in Canada* 37(3), 83-105. DOI: 10.1353/esc.2011.004
- Cook, K., Hardin, R. & Levi, M. (2005). *Cooperation Without Trust?* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Diken, B. (2011). Huxley's *Brave New World* – and Ours. *Journal for Cultural Research* 15(2), 153-172. DOI: 10.1080/14797585.2011.574056
- Evans, D. A. H. (Ed.) (1986). *Hávamál*. London: Viking Society for Northern Research
- Firchow, P. (1975). Science and Conscience in Huxley's *Brave New World*. *Contemporary Literature* 16(3), 301-316. DOI: 10.2307/1207404
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans). London: Penguin Books, Ltd. (Original work published 1975).
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. United Kingdom: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hardin, R. (2002). *Trust and Trustworthiness*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Holmes, C. (1970). *Aldous Huxley and the Way to Reality*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Horan, T. (2007). Revolutions from the Waist Downwards: Desire as Rebellion In Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*, George Orwell's *1984*, and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. *Extrapolation* 48(2), 313-339. DOI: 10.3828/extr.2007.48.2.8
- Huxley, A. (1958). *Brave New World*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Huxley, A. (1984). *Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Inglehart, R. (1995). Trust, Well-being and Democracy. In Warren, M. (Ed.) *Democracy and*

- Trust* (pp. 88-121). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jodlowska, J. (2012). B.F. Skinner's *Walden Two* versus Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*: what-topia? *Anglica – An International Journal of English Studies* 1, 61-74. Retrieved from <https://www-ceeol-com.ezproxy.uio.no/search/article-detail?id=202857>
- Kádár, Z. & Tóth, J. (2013). The Critique of Technology in 20<sup>th</sup> Century Philosophy and Dystopias. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 71(1), 53-60. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.008
- Kohn, M. (2008). *Trust. Self-Interest and the Common Good*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Liisberg, S., Pedersen, E. O. & Dalsgård, A. L. (2015). *Anthropology & Philosophy: Dialogues on Trust and Hope*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Luhmann, N. (1988). Familiarity, Confidence, Trust: Problems and Alternatives. In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust. Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations* (pp. 94-109). Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Luhmann, N. (2017). *Trust and Power* (H. Davis, J. Raffan & K. Rooney, original Trans. C. Morgner & M. King, revised Trans). Cambridge: Polity Press. (Original work published 1973).
- McDermott, C. (2003). *Personal Trust and Trust in Abstract Systems: A Study of Forest Stewardship Council-Accredited Certification in British Columbia* (Doctoral dissertation). British Columbia: The University of British Columbia.
- Posner, R. (2000). Orwell Versus Huxley: Economics, Technology, Privacy and Satire. *Philosophy and Literature* 24(1), 1-33. DOI: 10.1353/phl.2000.0015
- Rubinstein, G. (2003). Authoritarianism and Its Relation to Creativity: A Comparative Study Among Students of Design, Behavioral Sciences and Law. *Personality and Individual Differences* 34(4), 695-705. DOI: 10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00055-7

- Sexton, J. (1986). Brave New World and the Rationalization of Industry. *ESC: English Studies in Canada* 12(4), 424-439. DOI: 10.1353/esc.1986.0041
- Smith, B. (2011). *Haec Fabula Docet: Anti-Essentialism and Freedom in Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*. *Philosophy and Literature* 35(2), 348-359. DOI: 10.1353/phl.2011.0017
- Sztompka, P. (1999). *Trust: A Sociological Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sztompka, P. (2006) Review: New Perspectives on Trust. *American Journal of Sociology* 112(3), 905-919. DOI: 10.1086/510993
- Varricchio, M. (1999). Power of Images/Images of Power in *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. *Utopian Studies* 10(1), 98-114. Retrieved from <https://www-jstor-org.ezproxy.uio.no/stable/20718011>
- Vieira, F. (2010). The Concept of Utopia. In G. Claeys (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature* (pp. 3-28). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Warren, M. (Ed.). (1999). *Democracy and Trust*. New York: Cambridge University Press.