Advanced Research in English Series

5

UTOPIA X SATIRE IN ENGLISH LITERATURE

BERNADETE PASOLD

Pós-Graduação em Inglês
Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina

ADVANCED RESEARCH IN ENGLISH SERIES

ARES

ARES
Advanced Research in English Series
Pós-Graduação em Inglês
Departamento de Língua e Literatura Estrangeiras
Universidade de Santa Catarina
1997

Projeto gráfico e arte final: Ane Girondi

C145n Pasold, Bernadete
UtopiaXSatire in English Literature/
Bernadete Pasold - Florianópolis : Pós-Graduação em Inglês / UFSC, 1999.122 p. - (Advanced Research in English Series ; 5)

ISBN 85-86593-01-X

1. Literatura Inglesa. 2. Sátira. I. Título

CDU: 801

Endereço para correspondência/Address for correspondence:
ARES
Pós-Graduação em Inglês - CCE - UFSC
Campus Universitário - Trindade
88040-900 Florianopolis - SC - Brasil
Tel 048/331-9455 Fax 048/331-9819
e-mail: ares@cce.ufsc.br

BERNADETE PASOLD

UTOPIA X SATIRE IN ENGLISH LITERATURE

ADVANCED RESEARCH IN ENGLISH SERIES
PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM INGLÊS

For “the” aunts, Lúcia and Laci,
with love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"I cannot speak well enough to be unintelligible".
Jane Austen. *Northanger Abbey*

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the present work is to determine how English writers, especially the satirists, have dealt with utopia, a literary mode which has been present in English literature for more than four centuries, at least, since the publication of More's *Utopia*, in 1516.

In order to study the English satirical interpretations of utopia some steps are necessary: the analysis of some utopian models, the study of some theory of satire, and the analysis of some English satires connected with utopia in order to verify how, through the use of satirical devices, the utopian models were deflated and/or derided.

It goes without saying that a process of selection has been necessary, for the number of utopias as well as the number of satires of utopia is huge. We have selected those utopias currently viewed as representative of the mode[1] and some satires which seem meaningful in their treatment of the model, revealing subtleties and nuances that soon made a division of the work into topics inevitable.

The work is divided into two main sections. The first section deals with utopia as such; the second section, with satire in its relationship with utopia. The second section is longer than the first one, for there the diverse treatments given to the subject are focused upon, first in a descriptive way, then in an analytical way.

We have devised four main branches in the satirical utopia, and selected two fictional pieces for each, in an attempt at classification, having observed that terms such as *dystopia, utopian satire, negative utopia* and the like may be quite misleading.

There has been no attempt to exhaust the subject, and it ought to be pointed out that a lot has been deliberately excluded, like the feminist utopias, for example, which would constitute a research topic by themselves.

We are well aware that each of the texts analysed in this work would admit a more thorough scrutiny than the one presented, but we have tried to restrict ours to our main interest, i.e., the satirical treatment of utopia. Nevertheless, care has been taken to provide the reader with a truthful description of the texts so as to allow him his own interpretation. Evidently a work dealing with so many texts loses in depth what it gains in scope, or at least so we hope!

It ought to be said that quotations have mostly been kept in the language in which the texts were read, mainly to avoid a second translation which might take us too far from the original texts.

We have quoted frequently from the texts under analysis, confident that what has been well said by the writer will not be improved by paraphrasing. Another reason for doing this was the intention to provide readers with a taste of the writers' style.

Note

1 According to Paul Turner, in the Introduction to Thomas More's *Utopia*; Mark R. Hillegas, in the Introduction to H.G.Wells' *A Modern Utopia*; Vsevolod Revitch, in "Algum Dia, o Paraíso...", in *O Correio da UNESCO*, pp. 24-28; Fernando Ainsa, in "As Utopias Morreram, Viva a Utopia!", in *O Correio da UNESCO*; Aldo Maffey, in "Utopia", in Norberto Bobbio's *Dicionário de Política*.

I- TRADITIONAL OR CLASSICAL UTOPIA

A. Some Theoretical Aspects

According to Paul Turner in the Introduction to More's *Utopia*, "the germ of Utopian fiction is probably to be found in ancient descriptions of Paradise."[1] More's *Utopia* gave its name to a literary genre, of which well over a hundred specimens have been published. In *The Epic of Gilgamesh* the Sumerian equivalent of Noah is discovered in a place where there was no death, no sickness, no old age, no lamentation; in the *Odyssey* the description of the Elysian Fields stresses the superb weather-conditions. To this vein of pure wishful thinking, Turner says, Plato adds the element of serious political theory, working out the idea of a perfect state in *The Republic*. In the *Timaeus* he gives his notion a local habitation and a name, *Atlantis*, the island which supposedly sank beneath the sea about nine thousand years before; and in the *Critias* the island is described in detail.

According to Aldo Maffey, "The attempt to define utopia is complicated by the multiplicity of possible approaches to it, " since it can be approached by the historian, the literary scholar, the philosopher, the sociologist, etc., each emphasizing specific aspects related to their main concerns. The bibliography on Utopia collected by A. Neussüs in 1968 presented 695 titles, and in recent years, studies may have increased that number to more than a thousand.[2]

The term *utopia* has three entries in the dictionary: first, "an imaginary and indefinitely remote place"; secondly, "a place of ideal

perfection in... social conditions[...]"; and finally, "an impractical scheme for social improvement."[3]

Holman and Harmon define Utopia as "a fiction describing an imaginary world. The term comes from Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*, written in Latin in 1516, describing a perfect political state. The word *utopia* is a pun on the Greek *outopia*, meaning 'no place', and *eutopia*, meaning 'good place'."[4]

A great debate has arisen out of the possible meanings More had in view when creating the neologism. What did he have in mind, "no place" or "happy place", or both? According to Maffey, in the Latin subtitle to the book —"*Libellus vere aureus, nec minus salutaris quam festivus de optimo republicae statu deque nova Insula Utopia*" —Morus "especificava que o objeto do *libellus* seria a busca de um "ótimo Estado" e, na sextilha de Anemólio, este levará adiante a dialética dos contrasensos, unindo o significado de inexistente e de feliz: "*Utopia prixis dicta [...], Eutopia merito sum vocanda nomine.*" Thus, according to him, More had both meanings in view, and this can also be seen in the name of the traveller who tells More about his voyage, Raphael Hythlodaeus, since Raphael in its biblical origin means "the angel that cures", whereas Hythlodaeus, in its Greek neologism means "the liar". The idea of non-existence would also be conveyed through the other names found in Utopia, since the name of the river means 'no water', and its capital is called 'Aircastle'.

Without revealing a source for his statement, Jean Servier thinks that More had no idea of a "eu-topos", but of a "ou-topos", that is, "*un pays de nulle part, car il jugeait bien improbable l'existence d'un État, selon lui, si parfait."*[5]

The dispute about the possible intentions of More when creating the word *utopia* leads us to another aspect of Utopia, its objective. According to Fernando Ainsa, "contrariamente a uma idéia bastante difundida, a utopia não é um gênero de literatura escapista, mas a obra de autores profundamente comprometidos com a realidade

política, social e econômica de seu tempo. A maioria das utopias estimula a reflexão crítica sobre uma determinada época: seu projeto imaginário, seu ideal, é sempre concebido em função de valores dominantes na sociedade do autor."[6] Citing Karl Mannheim (*Ideologia e Utopia*, 1929), he continues saying that Utopia is an attempt to create the future, and this is what distinguishes it from ideology. Maffey, in his turn, says that Utopia is not only thinking, it is not fantasy or daydreaming, it is ideology put into action by a social group.[7]

Contrary to the visionary ideals foreseen by Mannheim and Ainsa, Jean Servier believes that the utopian writers are men outside their time, who dream of a return to an idealized better past. And he justifies his assertion with historical explanations: Plato's Republic, he says, was quite far from the Athens of his time, eager to recover its prosperity and waiting for an Alexander, much more than for the philosopher-prince; when More wrote his utopia England was ready to conquer the seas, with its navy, its merchants and its pirates, stimulated by the discovery of America; furthermore, the Tudors had taken some measures to mitigate the poor living conditions of the population, such as a weekly allowance to be paid by the parish to its destitute old people, the obligation of keeping a certain amount of land around the cottages so as to ensure a minimum of vegetable growing and cattle breeding and thus avoid hunger. In the 18th century, with the beginning of the effects of the Industrial Revolution, utopian writers praised the merits of country and village life. In the 19th, when old institutions like the parish and the village were disappearing due to the exodus to the cities and towns, utopian writers project "*des collectivités, des phalanstères, au rebours du désir des migrants qui était de fuir les anciennes tutelles et se noyer dans l'anonymat des villes."*[8]

As we have seen, the question whether the utopian writer is an advanced visionary who rejects the present and plans the future, or a conservative who cannot accept the changes of his own time

remains to be answered through the analysis of utopias themselves, since they are not all alike.

The same polemic about the meaning, the aims and the character of utopian writers exists concerning the effects of utopian writing. For Fernando Ainsa, "a história suscita as utopias, mas algumas utopias fazem, por sua vez, a história. Para Thomas Morus—que escreve sob o impacto do descobrimento da América—aquilo que já não é possível no Velho Mundo o será no Novo. Sua obra influencia diretamente os modelos de "colonização alternativa" propostos ao longo do século XVI na América Latina...". Despite the danger of totalitarianism inherent in utopia, as testified by Karl Popper, Ainsa believes that the fascination of the impossible "appears as one of the motors of the history of mankind, " and he quotes the Italian essayist Ignazio Silone and the American theologian Paul Tillich, both of whom emphasize the stimulating effect of utopia.[9]

Cioran, though recognizing in Utopia the natural human search for happiness, considers it responsible for many evil historical events[10] , and Alain Frontier says that "Toda a infelicidade do mundo não provém das utopias, mas daqueles que são suficientemente loucos para confundi-las com programas de ação política," because they are only methods to search for and understand the truth, guidings of thought.[11] And Servier says that the utopian experiments in America, those of the Hutterites and the Amish, reveal themselves quite closed to the outside world, far from constituting the paradigm capable of changing the world, as proclaimed by Mannheim.[12]

Despite the controversial views concerning Utopia, one has to recognize the vitality of the genre, evident, as Maffey says, in the movements which demand social solutions, such as the ecological and the feminist, whose utopias imply a view of the world completely different from the current one.

For our purposes, *Utopia is to be considered that literary piece which describes a perfectly organized and happy world from the point of view of the author, in an imaginary place and/*

or time. For, as Maffey well observes, "o utopista transforma e desnatura o homem. A sociedade que ele cria é contestável somente do exterior: uma vez dentro, aceitas as regras do jogo, permanece prisioneiro, feliz e satisfeito com seu próprio estado."[13]

B. Some important classic utopias and their main features

1. Plato's *Republic* [14]

We cannot be certain of its exact date, but probably it was written around 375 B.C., soon after the founding of the Academy. *The Republic* is in dialogue form and its style is conversational. The dialogue form was used by some of Plato's contemporaries and by Plato himself, and many have used it since his day. Plato reproduces in his dialogues the conversational atmosphere of his time. The Athenians loved an argument, their political life was one of constant discussion in Assembly and law court, and they spent most of their spare time in the public places of Athens gossiping, debating, discussing, or listening to others. The activity of Socrates fitted naturally into this context and he was a conversationalist, not a lecturer. In *The Republic* he talks with Glaucon and Adeimantus, sole respondents in the dialogue after Book I, elder brothers of Plato, but several other men watch their conversation like Polemarchus, in whose house the dialogue takes place, Cephalua, Polemarchus's father and brothers, Niceratus, etc. The dramatic date of the dialogue is commonly supposed to be just before 420 B.C., when Socrates would be about fifty.[15]

In the dialogue that takes place between Socrates and the others, Socrates formulates the organization of an ideal state with the following basic characteristics:

1. A strong belief in the power of education to transform society; the aim of the Republic is to develop the philosopher-ruler;

2. Society is divided into three classes, which are not so much three but two. The first class is composed by the Rulers, the second by their Auxiliaries, and they correspond roughly to Government and Army-Executive-Police. These two top classes are really subdivisions of a single class. They share the same way of life, and are put through the same elaborate system of training and promotion. There are a number of promotion bars to be passed, quite enough to grade the Auxiliaries for their various functions, while leaving a small homogeneous Ruler class to emerge at the top; but all start with equal opportunities.

The function of the Rulers is to govern, i.e., to make all the decisions of policy concerning the country. The Auxiliaries' function is to assist the Rulers in the execution of their decisions and to enforce the decisions of the Rulers. Thus they combine the functions of civil service, military, and police, implementing the government decisions.

The third class, of which Plato does not tell us much, comprises all those engaged in economic activities—farmers, manufacturers, traders, rich or poor (for they are allowed to own property). Their function is to provide for the material and economic needs of the community. They are not a proletariat in the usual sense. Their virtue is obedience and it is pretty clear that they will be under the Guardians' strict control, who will see that there is no excessive wealth or poverty among them: "One produces luxury and idleness and a desire for novelty, the other meanness and bad workmanship and the desire for revolution as well."[16]

Plato constantly emphasizes that the Rulers have the interests of the third class at heart and should govern with the willing consent of the governed. Promotion from the third class is possible as well as demotion from the two upper classes, though it is hard to see how the scheme is to work, as Aristotle observed; but the real point is that Plato visualized an aristocracy of talent, based on personal merit. He never recovered from the disappointment in democracy after Socrates' condemnation.[17]

3. Abolition of the family as well as abolition of private property for the two upper classes. Plato believed that the pursuit of riches corrupted government and disrupted society. His reasons for abolishing the family are more complex: he believed that private interests and private affections distracted a man from his duties to the community; but a second reason lies in his belief in the equality of the sexes. According to him, women should follow the same careers, share the same education and have the same opportunities as men. It follows logically that in order to behave and be respected as men women should be exempted as far as possible from family responsibilities. Thus, the family is replaced with a system of state nurseries which relieves women's traditional duties and makes possible the breeding of Guardians on scientific lines.

4. Sexual intercourse is strictly regulated and confined to certain "marriage festivals" when suitable partners will be mated, with a view to produce the best type of Guardian, just as one breeds horses or dogs. The production of children is a matter of such vital importance to the state that it is undesirable to leave it to the unregulated operation of private enterprise and individual affection, argues Plato.

5. The Philosopher-Ruler is the central theme of the Republic and it is the aim of its whole educational curriculum to produce him. The philosopher-rulers are those who have survived all tests and mastered the whole curriculum, and are put at the disposal of the state. They do not serve the state because they want to but because they have a duty to their fellow-men. They are a dedicated minority ruling in the interests of all.

6. Plato was the first one to formulate what one would call today a university course. He divided education in three stages: the earliest stage, of learning to read and write, implies the equivalent of our primary education; the second stage, which corresponds to our secondary school, involves literary and humanistic studies (including

history); this stage would be finished about the age of twenty, and we suppose it would be common to the three classes. At the third stage, our university level, Plato's Guardians transferred their attention to Mathematics, science and philosophy. The whole curriculum was aimed at training the character of the pupils, i.e., moral as much as intellectual and physical training.

7. Education is exclusively provided by the state on the grounds that anything of such crucial importance cannot be left to private initiative. The curriculum is controlled and defined by the state. Strict control is applied not only to text-books but to all art and literature.

8. There is to be no expression of opinion other than what the State allows.

9. The arts must be subservient to what the social order requires. Plato rejects drama, poetry and painting, art in general because, according to him, art deals with a low element of the mind instead of dealing with reason, and thus it encourages the unreasoning part of the mind (emotions, feelings, instincts), besides creating images far removed from the truth. Poetry, he says, "has a terrible power to corrupt even the best characters, with very few exceptions [...]. But you will know that the only poetry that should be allowed in a state is hymns to the gods and paens in praise of good men." [18]

10. Religion is kept, and the last part of the Republic is titled "The Immortality of the Soul and the Rewards of Goodness", and it ends with a myth, the Myth of Er, which explains the doctrine of transmigration.

2. Thomas More's *Utopia*

Written in 1516, More's *Utopia* is in the form of a report. Raphael Hythlodaeus is a student of philosophy who tries to open his listeners' eyes (More and a friend) to the causes of social evils, and the sources of prosperity. More is just a listener and everything

is done to give the impression of reality. More apparently just publishes their conversation, and to make it more realistic there is even a letter from More to his publisher, Peter Gilles, explaining that he had decided to publish Raphael's tale and asking his advice about the faithfulness of his tale. He even asks Gilles to ask Raphael's permission to publish it. Of course at that time one had to be careful with what one said, even with what one did not say. As the translator says, "Raphael Nonsenso is the only person who says anything unorthodox: More's own contributions to the conversation are usually quite conventional. The sole indication that Nonsenso may act as More's mouthpiece is the fact that in Utopian he means I."[19] And he adds: "The form of *Utopia* was designed not only to entertain but also to create a context in which More could say what he liked, without laying himself open to too much criticism. It enabled him, in an age when rash expressions of opinion were apt to land one in the Tower, to disclaim responsibility for any view that might be considered subversive."[20] Besides presenting the image of an ideal state, Utopia also presents harsh criticism on the English society of More's time, both directly, by Raphael in Book I, and indirectly, by contrast, in Book II.

At the beginning, More presents the Utopian alphabet, a specimen of Utopian poetry, the same transliterated, and a word-for-word translation. Most of the proper nouns in *Utopia* are of Greek origin, especially invented for the purpose and designed to be immediately intelligible. Thus, *Hythlodaeus*, as already seen, means "dispenser of nonsense" or Nonsenso; *Anydrus* (the name of a river) means "not water", and *Ademus*, the title of a chief magistrate, means "not people".

According to Raphael, Utopia is an island in the New World where Raphael lived for five years. It had been a peninsula inhabited by savages. It was conquered by Utopos who gave it its name. The people there are probably of Greek origin, but their language is more like Persian. They are naturally protected from contact with

other countries: "Only the Utopians know where the safe channels are, so without a Utopian pilot it's practically impossible for a foreign ship to enter the harbour."[21]

An interesting feature concerning the utopia created by More is the amount of minute details. Probably nothing was left out in his design, every aspect of daily life being scrutinized.

Let us now see the main features of *Utopia*:

1. Abolition of private property.

2. Equal distribution of goods among the inhabitants.

3. Abolition of money.

4. The family is kept, but life is communal; even the meals are taken in communal dining-halls.

5. There are state nurseries for children under five.

6. Regular hours for everything: work, leisure and sleep.

7. Everything is done bearing in mind the welfare of the community.

8. Activity seems to be the basis of the social system. Idleness is not allowed, and though they work only six hours a day they have to busy themselves with something useful during their spare time.

9. Agriculture is very important, and done in groups, in alternation: two years for each person, unless he wishes to have a farm life; during the harvest people are sent from the towns to help, and the harvest is done in twenty-four hours, if the weather is fine.

10. They constitute a republic with a parliament about which the author does not say much. What seems clear is that the towns are divided into districts and each district has its own administration. Stywards are elected by each district, and they elect the Council of Bencheaters and the Major. All officials, except the Major who is elected for life, stay only for one year. So, there is no possibility of personal dictatorship.

11. There is a ruling class which is called the "intelligentsia", composed by the most educated people. To this class belong the Major and the Bencheaters, but not the Stywards, who are direcly voted by the population.

12. Only very gifted children become full-time students. The others have a primary education and learn a special trade. But people have access to culture in their spare time, if they wish.

13. Religion is important and the priests, elected by secret ballot, are in charge of the education of children and adolescents.

14. There is religious tolerance, but they have to believe in a Supreme Being and in the immortality of the soul. The belief in a life hereafter has also a practical purpose: if you believe that the dead are watching you, you behave well even in private.

15. They have slaves who are either convicts or foreign volunteers. The slaves do the hard and rough work. Sometimes they are condemned criminals from other countries.

16. There is the death penalty for recalcitrant convicts and for persistent adulterers.

17. Their major penalty if slavery. Once recovered, the person becomes free again. They have only a few laws that everybody can understand. Councils decide on the penalty, and the accused person pleads his own case, without a lawyer.

18. Uniformity in clothes; no fashion, no jewels.

19. Euthanasia is accepted when voluntary and in cases of incurable and painful diseases.

20. Priests may marry, and elderly widows may become priestesses.

21. Divorce is allowed when there is adultery or incompatibility between husband and wife. The adulterer is severely punished and may not marry again.

22. Sexual intercourse before marriage is severely punished and the couple will never be allowed to marry, due to the assumption that nobody would marry if they could have sex outside marriage.

23. They do not value gold and money, but keep them for emergencies, mainly war, when they prefer to hire and pay foreign soldiers than risk their own lives. The humblest household items, like chamber-pots, are made of gold, so that nobody values them and is not sorry to part with them when necessary; besides, they are secure.

24. In order to travel people must obtain a permit. They only travel in groups and the passport says when they must come back. After twenty-four hours in any place the person is expected to work as usual, otherwise he does not eat.

25. Everybody is everyone else's watcher.

26. They have good hospitals, and a good notion of hygiene. Lunatics and sick people are well treated, and elders, highly respected.

27. The only art mentioned is music, but they know Greek and read the classics.

28. Their philosophy of life is happiness. They believe in a kind God who created man to be happy, and happiness for them is pleasure. Yet, they believe that pleasure must not bring pain, and pain will inevitably come if the pleasure is immoral.

Raphael concludes his report with the remark that it is pride that prevents us from creating a Utopia in every country.

3. Tommaso Campanella's *Civitas Solis*, or *The City of the Sun*

Written in 1602 by the Italian priest Tommaso Campanella, *The City of the Sun* is also in the form of a report: the narrator, an

admiral, tells his experience to the head of a religious order, and the two establish a dialogue. At his host's request, the admiral tells what happened during one of his trips. Near Ceylon he had to disembark and, afraid of the native inhabitants, went into the jungle and reached a huge plain under the line of the Equator. He met a group of men and women, well armed, and they took him to the City of the Sun. The City is situated on a high hill which is in the middle of a plain. It is divided into seven circles named after the planets. Each circle communicates with the next by four doors, each in the direction of one of the four cardinal points. Each circle is a kind of fortress, with towers, ditches, walls and "war machines". There is a long interval of land between one circle and the next, and within each circle are beautiful palaces, galleries, and cloisters.

After finishing the dialogue, the author presents three other sections in which he refutes possible arguments against his republic, which he recognizes as imaginary but as "um exemplo que deve ser imitado tanto quanto possível."[22]

The main features of *The City of the Sun* are as follows:

1. The supreme authority of the City is a priest named Hoh who rules over material and spiritual matters. (The narrator calls him Metaphysical). He is assisted by three "ministers"—*Pon, Sin and Mor*—whose equivalent names are *Potency, Wisdom and Love*. *Potency* is in charge of war and peace. *Wisdom* is in charge of the liberal and mechanical arts and all sciences and the "schools of instruction". *Love* is concerned with procreation, nutrition and clothes and he has several people under his supervision.

Apparently the four authorities are elected, but Campanella does not explain the system. In any case, Hoh and his three assistants select the other officials of the City, but those involved in the same functions of the candidates also participate in their selection or election. Candidates must be suggested by their companions.

2. They have an Assembly in which the problems of the City are discussed. Everyone older than twenty participates in it and the

authorities must execute the decisions of the Assembly. Yet, the Assembly has no power to overthrow Hoh and his ministers, who eventually abdicate if they find it convenient.

3. Hoh is recognized a long time before his election. He distinguishes himself by his wisdom and knowledge, and it is his immense wisdom that, according to the narrator, will guarantee to the people that he will not become a tyrant.

4. The family is abolished as well as private property, based on the same arguments as Plato's.

5. Everyone receives whatever is needed and no private favours are allowed.

6. Men and women dress alike. The only difference is that women have their knees covered and men do not.

7. Men and women receive the same kind of education and training in all the crafts. Sports are practised by everybody and swimming is obligatory.

8. Women fight in war with the men.

9. Men and women exercise the same functions but those which demand more physical effort are reserved for men. On the other hand, only women and children are allowed to learn music and to play an instrument.

10. Every workshop is directed by an old man and an old woman who observe the talents and tendencies of the children, and register them accordingly so that they will be useful when the children have to choose their professions, in a later stage.

11. After childbirth, the woman has fifteen days of rest. She will feed her child till the age of two, caring for it in common rooms. After this period the child is taken to a "boarding school" where professional teachers will be in charge of its education.

12. Education includes natural and mechanical sciences and foreign languages. Practical training in a certain job is also obligatory.

13. Children who are slow learners are sent to the country, but they may come back to the city if they reveal progress.

14. Procreation is considered a religious act, and its aim is the benefit of the City and not of individuals. It is a public right, not a private one. People are coupled according to their physique, aiming at a healthy offspring. The hour of copulation is determined by the doctor and the astronomer.

15. If a woman is not fertilized by the men assigned to her and proves, therefore, to be sterile, she becomes the common property of men.

16. If a man and a woman fall in love with each other, courtship is allowed as long as there is no danger of deformity for their offspring.

17. There are no slaves in the City.

18. They only work four hours a day, and the rest of the day is dedicated to reading, scientific discussion, conversation, sports, etc. No games that demand sitting are allowed.

19. They have commerce with several countries, exchanging goods instead of using money.

20. In order to avoid the corrupting influence of foreigners all the commerce is practised at the ports, and prisoners of war are either sold or sent to the country to perform strenuous tasks.

21. Foreigners may become citizens after succeeding in the tasks assigned to them.

22. They own ships, know the art of sailing and travel abroad in order to acquire scientific knowledge.

23. They do not value gold or silver.

24. Agriculture is very important and everybody participates in it.

25. They follow Brahmanism and believe in the immortality of the soul.

26. They have a few rules, succinct and clear, and exposed between the columns of their temple.

27. The usual punishment for crimes committed by men is being forbidden to have women for the time set by the judge. Whipping and exile are also adopted, and the death penalty is applied to brutal criminals.

4. Francis Bacon's *The New Atlantis*

Written in the last years of Bacon's life, left unfinished and published posthumously, in 1627, *The New Atlantis* [23] is also written in the form of an account. The narrator tells his own experience in the New Atlantis where he arrived by chance and was miraculously rescued from death with his crew. They had left Peru and were going to Japan and China, but the winds simply did not help them after a certain time and they thought they would die of starvation. Yet, they saw an island, after a certain time were rescued (and Bacon creates a certain suspense here for they did not know how they would be received) and found themselves on an island, Bensalem, which the narrator considers to be the new Atlantis, in a clear allusion to Plato. Thus, it is situated in the Pacific, probably in the South Seas.

Bensalem is a kingdom unknown to the world. They have laws against contact with foreigners, except in cases of humanity, which were established 1990 years before, by their wise king Solamona, to avoid a mixture of habits. So they restricted the travels of the population, but foreigners who arrived by accident were well received, as was the case of the narrator and his crew. Such

foreigners could stay as long as they wished, and the majority preferred to stay for ever.

Nevertheless, the inhabitants of the New Atlantis did not want to stay behind in the progress of the world. Every two years two ships were sent abroad, with a foreign flag, with a crew of three members of Solomon's House. These people stayed abroad until a new ship came to fetch them, and their mission was to acquire knowledge on science, arts, manufacturing and inventions of the world, and bring books, instruments and models of every type.

Main features of *The New Atlantis*:

1. Honesty, chastity and the family are strong pillars of this society, which has an established religion too and whose priests present the same splendor and authority of the Roman Catholic Church or the Anglican Church.

2. They have a monarchy.

3. Parental authority is highly respected, and nobody may marry without parental consent and those who do have their children punished since they inherit only one third of their parents' wealth.

4. They have no vices, and there is no prostitution or dissolution in their society.

5. They have private property.

6. As José Aluysio Reis de Andrade says in the Preface to the Brazilian edition, the secret of the success of this society lies in the existence of an institution called Solomon's House which, due to its work and good results, allows a fair organization of the economic and social structure. Bacon's idea is that human harmony and welfare depend on the scientific control of nature and on its resulting perfecting of life. Solomon's House guides and directs the life of the citizens towards happiness and progress. Science, for Bacon, is not an individual task, but it demands an army of researchers who investigate

empirically and thus lengthen the duration of life, cure diseases, make machines of every kind, even airplanes and submarines.

7. The reader is not told how the members of Solomon's House are selected, or how the law is applied and punishments inflicted, and one has the impression that everybody obeys the laws so that there is no need for courts and punishments. It is evident that they have a clean, honest, productive state, with plenty and without disputes and so, with happiness.

8. The members of Solomon's House are divided as follows: 12 are "merchants of light", and they travel; 3 are "depredators", and they collect the experiments found in books; 3 are "mystery-men", and they collect the experiments of the mechanical arts and other practices; 3 are "pioneers or miners", and they attempt new experiments considered useful; 3 are "compilers", and they unite the experiments of the four preceding groups, organizing them into titles and tables, to reach deductions and axioms from their observation; 3 are "dowry men or benefactors", and they examine the experiments of their companions searching a way of finding a practical application to human life and science; 3 are "lamps", and they evaluate, with the other members, the works and collections and guide and direct new experiments based on the existing ones; 3 are "inoculators", and they execute the experiments as oriented and keep the guiders informed; 3 are "interpreters of nature", and they synthesize the preceding discoveries into observations, axioms and aphorisms of greater generality.

Besides these, there are apprentices and servants, both male and female.

9. The members of Solomon's House seem to be priests too, and they hold consultations to decide which inventions and experiments may be made public and which may not. They all keep a vow of secrecy concerning everything they find convenient, and they do not reveal everything to the state authorities for they are

independent of the state. Periodically they make visits to the main towns of the kingdom, revealing the inventions they find convenient to reveal, and they also predict sickness, plagues, earthquakes, floods, tempests, and give advice to prepare the people to react to them accordingly.

The narrator "finishes" his report saying that he received this account from a priest of Solomon's House who allowed him to publish it "for the benefit of the other nations."[24]

5. H.G.Wells's *A Modern Utopia* (1905)

At the very beginning, the narrator states that what follows is a utopia, it is imaginative, it takes place in someone's mind, for it is "the Utopia of a modern dreamer."[25] He also makes references to previous utopias, generally pointing out the differences between them and his Modern Utopia which, he says, "must not be static but kinetic, must shape not as a permanent state but as a hopeful stage, leading to a long ascent of stages."[26]

In this imaginary journey to a world state which is on a planet exactly like ours, the narrator has the company of a botanist who keeps remembering and deploring a past love affair. It is this botanist who, at the end, will make "the bubble burst", breaking the spell of the dream so that the narrator finds himself back in London, the London of his time.

In the narrator's own words, his book is a mixture of essay and drama, and differs from all previous utopias because it takes for granted the diversity of human beings and the duty of the State to comply with it.

The language of Wells's utopia is a synthesis of all existing languages, and he foresees some future events such as the use of fast trains and airplanes, a unified Europe and a tunnel linking England to the continent.

Let us now see some of the main features of *A Modern Utopia*:

1. A world state, without boundaries, and a migratory population which speaks the same language.

2. Interchange of employees and exchange of scientific knowledge.

3. Natural resources belong to the state.

4. Private business or enterprise is stimulated.

5. The state will stand behind the economic struggle as the reserve employer of labour.

6. Maps of job vacancies will be available at post-offices and the state will pay for the locomotion and initial lodging of the worker.

7. Children and aged people will be under the care of the state.

8. Strict birth control; the state will not pay for the nourishment and education of children born outside marriage.

9. Marriage and family are kept, but people will be encouraged to live in hotels and inns so that housework will almost disappear.

10. Concern with eugenics: deformed or diseased new-born babies will be immediately killed.

11. People will work five hours a day.

12. Leisure is allowed, granted that one can pay for it.

13. Private property is allowed, as well as legacy.

14. Motherhood is a service to the state, so mothers will receive a salary from the state to rear their children, who must keep up to the minimum standard of health and physical and mental development.

15. There will be no state interference in private morality unless children are born or the youth corrupted.

16. Divorce is possible, either at the husband's or the wife's request, but made difficult if the couple has small children who demand care.

17. There is no official state religion and religious tolerance is widespread as long as original sin is not accepted.

18. Although it is agreed that every human being is unique, they have classified people according to temperaments, for political and social purposes. Thus, they have devised four classes of mind: a) the *Poietic*—They constitute the imaginative, creative group, either artistic, or scientific, of philosophic; b) the *Kinetic*—They are very clever and capable people but do not go beyond the known, the experienced and accepted. They are more moral and trustworthy than the Poietic type; c) the *Dull*—They are incompetent and stupid and never rise on the social and financial scale; d) the *Base*—They may be either Poietic, Kinetic or Dull, though they are generally Dull. They are more selfish than is common, have great powers of concealment and have an inclination towards cruelty. In brief, they have no moral sense.

19. There is an "élite" of people, the *Samurai*, voluntary noblemen who belong to a great organization which governs the state.

20. The Samurai have to follow the Rule which "was planned to exclude the Dull, to be unattractive to the Base, and to direct and coordinate all sound citizens of good intent."[27]

21. The Samurai organization is open to both sexes, provided they follow the Rule, a very ascetic set of rules of conduct, some of which quite in the Jesuitic tradition: cold baths, reading of the Book of the Samurai, spiritual retirements, sexual intercourse with their spouses every five days, and the like.

22. They have a general Assembly in which at least one-tenth and at most 50% of the members are not Samurai.

23. Every three years there is an election which decides whether officials must stay in their positions or not.

24. Education is compulsory and free till the age of 14, but most people go to college until 18 or 20. Adult life begins near the age of 30.

25. The land belongs to the state, and groups of people or individuals may lease it for a maximum of fifty years.

26. Agriculture is undertaken by groups.

27. Infractors of the law, criminals, lunatics, drunkards, are sent to prison-islands where they run their own affairs.

An interesting feature of Wells's Utopia is that it distinguishes between quality and quantity. Thus, people may drink but they must not get drunk; money is necessary but the state rules make it difficult for anyone to accumulate wealth; property is allowed but one has to pay for extra privacy.

6. Aldous Huxley's *Island* (1962)

Unlike the previous utopias mentioned, Huxley's *Island*[28] has a plot and characters. It is what one might call an essay-novel, or an essay disguised as a novel. As Anthony Burgess has observed, "it is less concerned with telling a story than with presenting an attitude to life, it is weak on character but strong on talk, crammed with ideas and uncompromisingly intellectual."[29]

William Asquith Farnaby is a journalist who survives a shipwreck in the Pala Strait and arrives at an imaginary island in the tropics, Pala. There he meets a different civilization, established a hundred years before by a Raja and a British doctor. They still have a constitutional monarchy, and the first Raja's grandson, Murugan, will be the new Raja when he comes of age. The government consists of the Cabinet, the House of Representatives and the Privy Council, which represents the Raja. Pala is pacifist, but the neighbouring island, Rendang Lobo, ruled by a dictator, colonel Dipa, covets its oil.

Colonel Dipa counts upon the sympathy of Pala's future Raja, Murugan, and his mother.

At the end of the book, colonel Dipa attacks Pala, and Murunga proclaims the union of the throne of his father and the throne of his mother's ancestors since the queen-mother came from Rendang Lobo. Expectedly, there was an international oil company behind Colonel Dipa's plot, and William Farnaby was aware of it. He had told Pala's authorities about it but nothing could be done since they refused to have an army. Their civilisation is, thus, destroyed.

Let us see some of the main features of *Island*:

1. Their economy and technology are adapted to human beings, not the opposite. They have a part-time system of work for those who prefer it. People may change jobs if they wish, since the purpose of work is not to get the biggest possible output in the shortest possible time but human satisfaction.

2. They have no tension, no anxiety, and as a result, no addicts, no neurotics or psychotics.

3. Medicine is mainly prophilactic—exercise and healthy food —and they use herbs and hypnotism as a cure.

4. They use the system of cooperatives for agriculture, industry, commerce, and banking.

5. For money, they use silver, gold and copper. They pay their imports with gold, abundant on the island, so that they can buy sophisticated equipment, like transmission lines and generators.

6. They have a newspaper with a board of editors representing a dozen different parties and interests, so that the reader is in a position to compare their arguments and make up his mind.

7. They do not overconsume and do not spend on weapons, and adopt birth control. Therefore, there is plenty for everybody.

8. A sampling of all kinds of work is part of everybody's education. People learn an enormous amount about skills and crafts. They must be fully aware of what they do in order to have pleasure in what they do. It is what they call "the yoga of work".

9. They have judges and policemen, but in a small number. They have few crimes thanks to preventive medicine and preventive education. Criminals are dealt with by an MAC, a therapy group within a community that assumes group responsibility for the delinquent. In difficult cases the group therapy is supplemented by medical treatment.

10. They detect future problems in childhood through blood tests, psychological tests and X rays. They have detected two basic types of anomaly: the *Peter Pan type*, of which Hitler would be the prototype, and the *Muscle type*, of which Stalin would be the prototype.

They treat the Peter Pans with chemistry and a tolerable environment, and the Muscle types are offered opportunities of exercising their strength and desire for leadership by performing rough and difficult tasks and sports.

11. Their general religion is Buddhism.

12. They have developed the "yoga of love" or "Maithuma", which seems to be the application of Freud's axiom of diffused sexuality. It is a special technique of making love without conception, but contraceptives are distributed free by the government.

13. Their philosophy of life excludes Christianity and Marxism.

14. They have a kind of Bible, a book written by the old Raja named *Notes on What's What*.

15. They have a natural drug, *Moksha-medicine*, which is taken in group in a kind of religious ritual, from time to time. Its effects are

the same as meditation, but immediately felt. It is also occasionally administered as medicine to people with psychological problems.

16. Education is extremely important for their organization. It comprises not only academic training but especially internal training. Thus, they learn how to face danger, illness and death; they are also taught about love and responsibility from when they are babies in arms. Their first business in elementary school is to learn to accept and admire the diversity of human beings.

17. Psychology is applied in teaching, as well as analogy and practical experience.

18. Their primary emphasis is on the sciences of life — psychology, biology, ecology.

19. Part of the advanced sociology course is to take the teenagers to Rendang Lobo to see what the outside world is like.

Some of them follow courses in Europe to acquire some specific knowledge useful to the island. They all come back relieved.

20. Marriage is kept but the family is radically changed. "Father" and "Mother" designate functions which, once fulfilled, have an end.

21. Every child has about twenty homes on average, for they have mutual adoption clubs. The child is not only allowed but encouraged to migrate to some other home whenever he/she wishes. In every home the child has duties to perform. Through the adoption clubs the aged feel useful and loved too.

22. They practise artificial insemination and have deep freezing of the semen of very talented men.

23. They have all the arts but one notices that their literature is poor. The old Raja says in his book that literature is incompatible with human integrity, individual sanity and a decent social system.

24. They speak English and Palanese.

C. Some Remarks upon the Previous Description

From the previous description, one notices that in fact Wells is the only one who encourages travelling, but his is a world state, without boundaries, with a common language and common features. Although he emphasizes the individuality of human beings, his assertion remains an axiom, it is not shown, for there are no characters in his book, and no private or social intercourse is shown the reader. All the other utopian writers focused on in this work either prohibit or restrict locomotion, and their worlds are either set on islands or in unknown, distant places. In Plato's *Republic*, by the way, locomotion is not even mentioned. Servier's satiric words apply literally to Huxley's *Island*: "*Car, dans toutes les utopies et reconnues sans discussion comme telles—nous parlons des utopies écrites - les hommes sont si heureux qu'il ne peut venir à aucun d'eux le désir d'aller courir le monde."*[30] In the other utopias, the government takes measures to avoid such a wish.

Another point that calls our attention is their system of government. Only *Island* has a constitutional monarchy with a democracy. In all the other utopias, even if there is not a dictatorship, the power of an oligarchy is present. In Plato's and Wells's there is an aristocracy of talent, represented by the Rulers and Guardians, and by the Samurai; in More's there is an "intelligentsia", in Bacon's a scientific-concerned group is in charge of government and in Campanella's, a group of four gifted people. According to these utopian writers, all these rules are extremely wise and tolerant.

The society in these utopias seems to be quite stratified. There is a division of social classes in Plato's, More's, Bacon's and even in Wells's. Such a division is not mentioned by Campanella and seems inexistent in *Island*. In the latter book, the similarity of the people seems to be rooted in their education.

Private property and the family seem to be closely linked, not unnaturally. Thus, both are abolished in Plato's and in Campanella's; property is abolished in More's but the family is preserved;

nevertheless family life disappears in his utopia so that property becomes unnecessary. Both property and the family are kept in Bacon's utopia since science and the well-being it brings seem to be the basis of its stability. Both are also kept in Wells; and also in Huxley, but in the latter the family is radically transformed. Thus it seems that Huxley keeps private property in his world either because he considered it an inherent necessity of human beings or because of a practical reason which is marriage.

Gilles Lapouge makes some interesting remarks on the abolition of the family undertaken by utopian writers. According to him, utopian writers fear the family because the family is the "organic"which they wish to replace with the "organized": "Essa família será o grande dilema, o martírio e o naufrágio dos utopistas. Nela fervilham o visceral, o primitivo, o obscuro, o orgânico. Certamente o estado poderia negociar com a família, ou, melhor ainda, atá-la a regras estritas, impor-lhe a camisa-de-força. Isso mais tarde é feito por muitos estados despóticos, que, entretanto, sempre terminam por se render ante a resistência da família. Platão, mais astuto, escolhe a solução radical: consciente de que a família colocará perpetuamente em xeque o Estado absoluto, prefere aniquilá-la [...] Essa imolação da família é ao mesmo tempo lógica e insensata. Lógica, porque a sociedade matemática não pode efetivamente tolerar a desordem, o calor humano, a intimidade e as trevas da família. Insensata, porque a família é irredutível e resistirá eternamente a qualquer ofensiva do Estado."[31] It seems that Huxley, aware of this, decided not to abolish the family but to transform it in such a way that family life does not exist anymore. In a more sophisticated way, he did the same as More.

It is somewhat puzzling that marriage is not necessarily banished with family life. Thus, More and Huxley keep it, perhaps to avoid poligamy and an undesirable increase of the population, at least in More's utopia. On the other hand, marriage does not seem to represent the menace posed by the family. Plato and Campanella

abolish it altogether due also to a preoccupation with eugenics. Such a preoccupation is absent from More's and Bacon's, but present in Wells's and Huxley's, as seen above.

Work is present in all the utopias under consideration. Yet, the number of hours dedicated to it seems quite small if compared to our current standards. According to Wells, "if toil is a blessing, never was blessing so effectually disguised."[32] He is the only one, nevertheless, to encourage leisure on the grounds that good ideas and artistic achievements are produced during spare time. Plato does not mention leisure and one has the impression that his Rulers and Guardians don't even sleep!

All of the six utopias present a religion, official or not official. Wells and More present religious tolerance but under certain conditions. Huxley does the same. Did they believe religion to be an innate urge, or did they consider it a factor of stability?

Education is compulsory and free till a certain age in all of them. In Plato's and Huxley's the moral training is as or more important than academic training. Education is the pillar of their systems.

They all have laws and punishments, with the exception of Huxley's, in which criminals are treated in childhood, in general, and in Bacon's punishment seems unnecessary for they all behave well.

Science is a predominant concern in *The New Atlantis*, and important for practical reasons in Huxley and Wells: it provides people with welfare, and welfare is a source of happiness. It is barely mentioned by Campanella, and not emphasized by Plato or More. Thus, one verifies that Servier's assertion about the dislocation of the Utopian writer does not apply to Bacon, Wells and Huxley, who recognized the importance of the development of science for human life. Huxley goes even further in his utopia, using psychology and drugs to treat people. In *Island* they also have artificial insemination and deep freezing of the semen considered convenient. Thus, Huxley's utopia could exemplify Maffey's statement: "No nosso século se prevê a realização de utopias através de transformações

determinadas por saltos biológicos (naturais ou impostos) ou de condicionamentos comportamentais. A alquimia da evolução espontânea ou imposta substitui a magia da revolução na fé do utopista."[33]

In what concerns the position of woman in the six utopias, we notice that very little changed from Plato to Huxley. The quasi-misogyny of More, and Bacon's and Campanella's prejudice are absent from the *Republic* and quite attenuated in Wells' world. The latter seems to recognize and value biological and physiological feminine characteristics. Plato seems to have exaggerated in his feminism, completely disregarding female physical characteristics and psychological needs.

Summing up, it seems evident that the worlds created by Plato, Campanella, More, Bacon, Wells and Huxley have stability. This stability means peace but also uniformity. Even in Huxley, who seems to have been the only one to have thought first about the human being and his necessities and later of how to satisfy them, thus following the reverse route from that taken by the others, even Huxley's system lacks creativity and freedom. As happens with the others, arts and literature disappear, or almost, and to all of them we could apply the remark submitted by Maffey: "Estes homens regenerados considerar-se-ão felizes, sem saber que foram obrigados a ser felizes, de uma felicidade imutável, porque ter-se-á perdido todo o impulso e toda a capacidade crítica."[34]

Gilles Lapouge's assertion seems a fitting way to finish this section and pose further questions: "Algumas vezes já se observou, com surpresa, que os mamíferos são incapazes de constituir sociedades racionais... A nulidade política do mamífero se explica pela resistência que a família, que o vínculo do marido com a mulher ou da mãe com os filhos opõe a toda espécie de violência do Estado.

Nisso reside o gênio dos insetos sociais: nas colméias ou nos formigueiros, o Estado se apropria dos recém-nascidos, de modo que nenhum apego sentimental, nenhuma ternura pode ligar os pais

a seus descendentes [...] o formigueiro concretiza o sonho irracional da razão absoluta. Esse foi o erro de Platão e de todos os utopistas que seguiram seus passos: o animal político não é o homem mas a formiga. Platão é um filósofo para abelhas e cupins."[35]

Nevertheless, the fictional mode—utopia—is still alive, and man's search for happiness will probably never die. Fortunately, should we say?

Notes

1 In Thomas More. *Utopia*, translated with an Introduction by Paul Turner, England: Penguin Books, 1981, pp.7-23.

2 In Norberto Bobbio et alii, *Dicionário de Política*, tradução de Luis Guerreiro Pinto Cacais et alii, Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília, 1986, pp. 1284-1290 (Utopia).

3 *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*, 1977.

4 C.Hugh Holman and William Harmon. *A Handbook to Literature*, sixth edition, New York: Macmillan 1992, p.491.

5 Jean Servier. *L'Utopie*, Paris: P.U.F., Collection Que sais-Je, 1979, p.3.

6 Fernando Ainsa. "As Utopias Morreram, Viva a Utopia!", tradução de Clóvis Alberto Mendes de Moraes, *O Correio da UNESCO*, abril 1991, ano 19, no. 4, Brasil (número intitulado "As Utopias ou a Busca do Impossível"), pp. 7-10.

7 In Norberto Bobbio, op.cit.

8 Jean Servier, op.cit., p.12.

9 Fernando Ainsa, op.cit.

10 As mentioned by Fernando Ainsa, op.cit.

11 Alain Frontier. "Uma Parábola de Platão", tradução de Clóvis Alberto Mendes de Moraes, *O Correio da UNESCO*, op.cit., pp.14-15.

12 Jean Servier, op.cit., p.8.

13 In Norberto Bobbio, op.cit.

14 Plato. *The Republic*, translated with an Introduction by Desmond Lee, second edition (revised), England: Penguin Books, 1982.

15 According to Desmond Lee, in the Introduction to Plato. *The Republic*, op.cit., pp.11-58.

16 Plato, op.cit., p. 188.

17 According to Desmond Lee, op.cit.

18 Plato, op.cit., pp. 436-437.

19 Paul Turner, in Thomas More, op.cit.

20 Ibidem.

21 Thomas More, op.cit., p. 69.

22 Tommaso Campanella. *A Cidade do Sol*, tradução de Aristides Lobo e Introdução de Alceu Amoroso Lima, Rio: Ed.Tecnoprint, s.d., p.92.

23 Francis Bacon. *Novum Organum ou Verdadeiras Indicações acerca da Interpretação da Natureza* & *Nova Atlântida*, tradução e notas de José Aluysio Reis de Andrade, São Paulo: Abril Cultural, coleção Os Pensadores, 1979, 2a. edição.

24 Francis Bacon. op.cit., p.272, my translation.

25 H.G.Wells. *A Modern Utopia*, Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1967, p.5.

26 Ibidem.

27 H.G.Wells, op.cit., p.279.

28 Aldous Huxley. *Island*, Toronto: Bantam Books, 1968.

29 Anthony Burgess. *The Novel Now***.** A Guide to Contemporary Fiction, New York: Pegasus, 1970, p. 42.

30 Jean Servier, op.cit., p. 9.

31 Gilles Lapouge, "O Ideal do Formigueiro", tradução de Clóvis Alberto Mendes de Moraes, *O Correio da UNESCO*, op.cit., pp.10-14.

32 H.G.Wells, op.cit., p.101.

33 In Norberto Bobbio, op.cit.

34 In Norberto Bobbio, op.cit.

35 Gilles Lapouge, op.cit.

II- UTOPIA AND SATIRE

A. Some Theoretical Aspects Concerning Satire

There are other ways of criticizing or questioning Utopia than the critical essay, and the most efficient and creative of these is probably the "negative utopia", or "utopian satire", or "satirical utopia", or "dystopia", or "anti-utopia". These terms do not designate the same kind of fiction necessarily, but they all seem to question the utopian idea as presented in utopian literature, through different means and in differing degrees of attack. With them we plunge into the realm of satire, and therefore some theoretical aspects concerning satire ought to be described.

According to Northrop Frye, "the word satire is said to come from satura, or hash, and a kind of parody of form seems to run all through its tradition, from the mixture of prose and verse in early satire to the jerky cinematic changes of scene in Rabelais."[1]

Aristotle, in the *Poetics*, says that the earliest division of poetry occurred when the graver spirits reproduced noble actions and praises of heroes. In contrast, spirits of a more trivial sort, who reproduced the actions of meaner persons, composed satires in order to criticize them. The first ones, who were Epic poets, became writers of tragedy and the other ones, the lampooners, became writers of comedy.[2] So, according to Aristotle, old comedy derived from the satiric improvisations uttered by the leaders of the phallic songs which were "ritual performances devoted to increasing the fertility of the land, the herds, and the people."[3]

Elliott points out that "in its early manifestations in Greece, Arabia and Ireland satire is intimately connected with magic and the satirist hardly distinguishable from the magician." [4]

In his course "Modern Literary Satire", Dr. John Reagan defined satire as "any literary form which has as its main purpose to attack a problem, situation, or people in order to change the reader's perception of the reality that surrounds him."[5]

Kernan affirms that criticism has traditionally distinguished only two main types of satire: formal verse satire and Menippean satire. According to Kernan, the term "Menippean", which originally referred to those satires written in a mixture of verse and prose, has gradually come to include any satiric work written under cover of a fable. Formal verse satire, on the other hand, has been used to identify those satires written in verse, with no continuous narrative and where the author appears to speak in his own person. According to the same author, another difference between Menippean and formal verse satire lies in their focus. In the Menippean type the scene is stressed to a point that it absorbs the satirist whereas in formal verse satire the satirist dominates the scene. He may be identified as *I* or may be even given the author's name but his main characteristic lies in his emerging from anonymity, providing the reader with hints of his character and origins. He is generally agrarian, presenting the countryside as the ideal life in contrast with the scenery of his satire which is always urban.[6] Thus, in what concerns the scene of satire, it is generally urban, crowded, and disorderly, and the countryside, if presented, is indicated as the ideal life in contrast with the city.

According to Frye, the essence of satire is *wit or humour*, founded on fantasy or a sense of the grotesque or absurd, and *attack*, behind which there is an implicit moral standard. [7]

An inherent pessimism seems to permeate satire. This pessimism is reflected in absence of plot, in the sense that there is no real change. "We seem at the conclusion of satire to be always very nearly the same point where we began [...] the scenery and faces

may have changed outwardly, but fundamentally we are looking at the same world, and the same fools, and the same satirist we met at the opening of the work."[8] And Dr. Reagan adds: "Whenever there is a solution it is a particular one, while the general problem remains."

The pessimism inherent to satire is also detected in the disappearance of the heroic. As Frye points out, effective action and heroism are absent or foredoomed to defeat; anarchy and confusion reign over the world.[9]

Another quality of satire is the absence of true characters, with caricatures that lack psychological depth.

Kernan presents further important qualities of satire, besides those already mentioned, such as: a) portrayal of the grotesque and distorted, with concentration to an obsessive degree on the flesh, excrements and orifices; [10] b) the character who delivers the attack on vice must appear the moral opposite of the world he condemns; "he must be fervent, he must be horrified at what he sees, and he must be able to distinguish between vice and virtue without any philosophical shilly-shallying about 'what is right and what is wrong?'"[11] c) "Satire has traditionally made most pretense of being realistic... [the satirist] fills his work with references to contemporary customs, places, names. He will proudly call attention to the absence from his writing of the usual ornaments of poetry."[12] Yet, as Elliott points out, "what starts as local attack ends up by calling the whole institution into question."[13] For in order to last satire ought to deal with human nature, its ultimate main target of attack (Reagan).

Another quality of satire is *bathos*, "the effect resulting from an unsuccessful effort to achieve dignity or pathos or elevation of style, an anticlimax, dropping from the sublime to the ridiculous."[14]

According to Kernan, "the satirist must be regarded as but one poetic device, used by the author to express his satiric vision, a device which can be dispensed with or varied to suit his purpose."[15] Though there are significant exceptions, the satirist is generally a conservative, operating within the established framework of society,

accepting its norms, appealing to reason, or to what his society accepts as rational, as the standard against which to judge the folly he sees. "He is the preserver of tradition—the true tradition from which there has been grievous falling away."[16] Thus, he is also a moralist.[17] Yet he does not present any clear solution; his aim is to change the readers' views, not to solve problems. Often, nevertheless, he establishes norms of conduct (Reagan).

The satirist has an enormous supply of rhetorical tools at his disposal, "which he uses in rapid succession to belabor his victims."[18] Let us examine some of them:

a) *Irony* — It can be situational or of inversion. In situational (or dramatic) irony the reader sees a character in a position which the character him/herself is not aware of. According to Worcester, "the hero, through egoism or a false sense of security overlooks it; the audience, seeing it sees through it to the oncoming catastrophe."[19]

"Irony of inversion ordinarily compels the reader to convert apparent praise into blame [...] Occasionally contempt and insult are to be understood as praise."[20] When irony attains vituperation, carrying its sting exposed, we have what is called sarcasm.

b) *Juxtaposition* — Two situations or two characters are presented to the reader who must be able to see their similarities and/or differences.

c) *Allusion* — It presumes a certain knowledge of the reader since it is not clearly specified. Generally it is used to indicate some optative norm which could be the solution the author believes in, but it may also be used as in indirect parallel.

d) *Allegory* — "Fables, parables, and allegories are forms of imaginative literature or spoken utterance constructed in such a way that their readers or listeners are encouraged to look for meanings hidden beneath the literal surface of the fiction. A story is told or perhaps enacted, whose details — when interpreted — are found to correspond to the details of some other system of relations (its hidden, allegorical sense) [...] Many forms of literature elicit this

kind of searching interpretation, and the generic term for the cluster is allegory; under it may be grouped fables, parables, and other symbolic shapings." [21]

e) *Burlesque* — It may be defined as the comic imitation of a serious literary form — epic or tragic — relying on an extravagant incongruity between a subject and its treatment. The burlesque, together with bathos, is the essential quality of a literary form called either mock-epic or mock-heroic, for as the most elevated of literary forms the epic "offers scope for the distortions of satire, either by direct deflation or by oblique mock-exaltation." [22] A trivial subject is treated in the "grand style" and the epic formulae are used to make a trivial subject ridiculous by ludicrously overstating it.

Pollard distinguishes two types of burlesque: "low burlesque in which, as Boileau put it, 'Dido and Aeneas are made to speak like fishwives and ruffians', the second, high burlesque or mock-epic in which, conceivably, fishwives and ruffians would speak (and act) like Dido and Aeneas."[23] Thus, *Don Quixote* is a burlesque of chivalric romance, whereas Byron's *Don Juan* is a mock-epic of the myth of Donjuanism.

f) *Parody* — It is the burlesque applied to a certain author, poem or other work. Presently the term parody is also used for the satirical or comic imitation of traditional rituals, symbols, etc. According to Worcester, "we do not find a parody printed side by side with its original. It is the reader's part to supply knowledge of the model. He must hold up the model, and the author will furnish him with a distorted reflection of it. Herein lies the strength of burlesque, and its weakness [...] burlesque withers away when the knowledge that supports it is forgotten."[24] As we may notice, the terms *burlesque* and *parody* are often used interchangeably, and one sometimes finds the term *parody-burlesque* which encompasses both.

After this brief panorama we may enter the main topic of our work which, for the time being, we shall name "the upside-down

utopia", for want of a better term to encompass such diverse treatments of the subject. These diverse treatments we shall classify tentatively in four main types: the *dystopia* or *reversed utopia*; the *ambiguous utopia*; the *frustrated utopia*; and the *utopian derision*.

B. Dystopia or the Reversed Utopia

A term first used by Joseph Hall in his *Mundus Alter et Idem* (1600) (loosely translatable as "another world and yet the same") , *dystopia* may be defined as a term to be applied "to accounts of imaginary worlds, usually in the future, in which present tendencies are carried out to their intensely unpleasant culminations."[25] The definition may be aptly applied to Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* and George Orwell's *1984.*

1. *Brave New World*

Written in 1932, by Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*[26] is a Menippean satire, for it presents a coherent and well-developed plot which culminates in the suicide of the protagonist, John, the Savage. The fictional time is 600 years ahead of our time and the scene is urban, but far from disordered. The world has been divided into ten sections, each under the supervision of a controller. Savage reservations are still kept for those who could not cope with "civilization" and are also the places of exile for the infractors to the system. John comes from one of these reservations, and as he arrives he is so enthusiastic about this new world that he resorts to Shakespeare to express his wonder: "O brave new world that has such people in't" (*The Tempest*, act 5, scene 1). As he comes into contact with this new world his disappointment increases, and the allusions to Shakespeare acquire a bitter irony. It is an extremely clean and ordered world, without families, without love, with plenty, and everybody looks happy. Babies are decanted in bottles,

fertilization occurs on a scientific basis so that the embryoes receive the exact amount of oxygen according to the intelligence the State wishes them to have; people are divided into castes — *Alphas, Betas*, *Gammas*, *Deltas* and *Epsilons* — according to their future tasks; *hypnopaedia* makes them accept and enjoy their future lives, so that, in the words of Mustapha Mond, one of the ten world-controllers, one does not wish for what one may not have, and one has everything that one wishes. John falls in love with Lenina but she cannot understand what love is and wishes only to have sex with him. Forbidden to go back to the reservation and unable to accept this world in which morality has been completely inverted, John commits suicide.

Brave New World presents the essence of satire, as well as many of its qualities and devices: one example of wit, out of many, is the name of the characters, in a clear allusion to historical figures — Lenina, Bernard Marx, our Ford, the Malthusian belt; humour based on the grotesque or absurd can be seen in the song, "an old favourite" of the public:

> "Bottle of mine, it's you I've always wanted!
> Bottle of mine, why was I ever decanted?"

for, since parents have been abolished, people can only miss their "bottles". The same can be applied to certain scenes, as the one in which John kneels before his father, the director of the hatchery, and, quite moved, calls him "father", an insult in that world. Yet one has to acknowledge the fact that the humour found in it sounds bitter, and dark, and even uncomfortable.

The targets of attack are multiple: not so much science but the use of science, since it can smash freedom and individuality. On the other hand, the countryside is not idealized, quite the contrary: it is ugly, filthy, full of diseases and superstition, so, it is not the solution either. Thus, ultimately, the main target of attack seems to be human nature itself, as if Huxley were asking: "Can't we do anything better? Do we have to pay such a high price in order to have peace and

stability?"[27] It seems clear that material progress means nothing if it does not bring spiritual progress with it. Thus, Huxley's novel is a warning against a use of technology that may annihilate man's intrinsic characteristics, thus awakening the reader's perception about the present, as a way of avoiding a future like the one in which John the Savage is caught.

Pessimism is also evident in the book, since John's suicide may be an extreme solution for his problem but does not affect the situation as a whole. All his heroic attempts to dissuade the people there from taking *soma*, for example (the drug distributed by the government to make people feel happy and passive) are defeated, as well as his attempt to make Helmholtz understand Shakespeare: he just laughs, unable to understand suffering and passion.

The grotesque permeates the whole novel, in its inverted morality: father and mother are "bad" words; everybody belongs to everybody so that they are really promiscuous; also grotesque is the reservation, and the collective delirium of the mob watching the Savage whipping himself and the scene ending in an orgy.

Bathos can be seen more than once; a very good example is the love scene between the Savage and Lenina, in which he behaves like a chivalric Shakespearean knight and Lenina reacts with pure lust, so that he ends by calling her "whore, strumpet", and she locks herself in the bathroom for fear of his aggression. This scene is also a good example of situational irony, for none of them are aware of their real positions. The same can be said concerning the Savage's situation when he arrives in this world. It takes him some time to realize it is not the "brave new world" of his dreams.

Irony of inversion is also an important satirical device, since inversion is a key word to describe this world: marriage is obscene and children learn about sexual intercourse at a very early age, through sexual games; death is seen as something very normal and the nurses are afraid that the Savage's weeping at his mother's deathbed will undo all their death-conditioning, "as though death were something

terrible, as though anyone mattered as much as all that!"[28]

Juxtaposition is another expedient used by Huxley, apparently for purposes of contrast, but also to show the hopelessness of mankind, human beings being what they are. To the cleanliness, health, organization, youth, plenty and uniformity of the Brave New World he juxtaposes the dirt, illness, old age and shortage of the Reservation, so that hope is not to be found in either of the two.

Parody also abounds in Huxley's novel, and it refers to several aspects of life:

a) *religion* — Instead of *Our Lord,* they say, *Our Ford*; the sign of the cross is replaced with the sign of the T; they also have a *Ford's Day Celebration*, in which soma tablets are taken and "the loving cup of strawberry ice-cream soma was passed from hand to hand,"[29] and it ends with an orgy as they sing the liturgical refrain:

> Orgy-porgy, Ford and fun,
> Kiss the girls and make them one.
> Boys at one with girls at peace,
> Orgy-porgy gives release. (BNW, p.74)

b) *children's rhymes and traditional sayings*:

> Streptocock-Gee
> To Banbury - T
> To see a fine bathroom
> And W.C.

parodies

> Ride-a-cock-horse
> To Banbury Cross,
> To see a fine lady
> Upon a white horse
> With rings on her fingers
> And bells on her toes
> She shall have music
> Wherever she goes. [30]

The sayings "The more stitches the less riches" and "Ending is better than mending" are inversions of the popular "The more the

stitches the more riches" and "Mending is better than ending."[31]

c) *books — Three Weeks in an Helicopter* reminds one of *Five Weeks in a Balloon*, by Jules Verne.

d) *mottoes* — "*Community, Identity, Stability*", the state motto, reminds one of "*Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité"*.

e) *names of places — Charing T,* instead of *Charing Cross*; *Big Henry*, instead of *Big Ben*; as well as people's names: Helmholtz Watson, Benito Hoover, Foster, Bernard Marx, etc.

The several references to Shakespeare (around eleven works are alluded to) are generally used either to clarify John's character or for purposes of contrast, for Shakespeare has no place in that world.

In what concerns the satirist, we see that the Savage is the moral opposite of the world he condemns: he is conservative, pure, and is sure of what is right or wrong. The outside narrator, nevertheless, seems to be sure of what is not right, but does not propose a solution which, after all, is typical of satire.

2. *1984*

Written in 1949, by George Orwell, *1984* is also a Menippean satire, with a well-developed plot and a protagonist, Winston. The fictional time is 1984, and the world has been divided into three super-states: Oceania, Eurasia and Eastasia, apparently always making war one against the other. Oceania, the scene of the novel, has people divided as such: *Big Brother*, the head of the Party which controls everything; 2% of the population belong to the *Inner Party*, 13% belong to the *Outer Party*, and 85% constitute the *Proles*.

The Party has ministries which serve to maintain the power: the *Ministry of Truth*, which deals with historical adulteration; the *Ministry of Peace*, concerned with War, the *Ministry of Love,* concerned with law and punishment; the *Ministry of Plenty*, concerned with shortages.

Those who belong to the Inner Party have more advantages and rights than those who belong to the Outer Party who, on the

other hand, have better conditions of living than the proles, who are in charge of menial tasks, live miserably and are ill fed.

The official language of Oceania is Newspeak, and the purpose of it is to make thinking impossible. They also have "*doublethink*" which "means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them."[32]

Besides the ministries, the Party has other means to control everybody and prevent any upheaval: a *telescreen,* which can never be turned off; the *Thought Police,* which eliminates all the dangerous elements; *torture; the adulteration of history; overwork,* since everybody works about twelve hours a day; the *family*, which has become an extension of the Thought Police since the children are systematically turned against their parents and taught to spy on them and report their deviations (the only aim of marriage is to provide the Party with children). A *continuous state of warfare* distracts people's minds from any reflection upon their miserable condition, and apart from that *an imaginary common enemy* created by the Party, Emmanuel Goldstein, keeps them absorbed.

Winston, the protagonist, has a certain awareness of the manipulation of their minds and lives by the Party and on meeting Julia and falling in love with her, he becomes a kind of rebel. Their love affair is a political act, for love and sex are prohibited, unless for procreation. Ironically, Winston trusts O'Brien, a member of the Inner Party, is tortured, receives a brainwashing treatment and finally yields to the Party, betraying Julia and agreeing with O'Brien that 2 plus 2 make 5, if that is the Party's wish.

The setting of *1984* is urban, a large metropolis resembling London, crowded and, despite the fanatical attempts to impose order from above, rather disorderly, certainly uncomfortable, pathetic and inhuman.

Though there is a sense of the grotesque and absurd underlying the novel, it lacks humour. The picture depicted and the plot events are too dark to admit humour. On the other hand, attack is persistent

and efficient. Its main target does not seem to be human nature in itself but totalitarian governments. The Party in the novel has reached a stage of perfection in the totalitarian ideal, able to control even thought. There is a suggestion of the USSR's totalitarian state, of course, but Orwell was careful to place the action in "Oceania", and Russian communism is specifically mentioned as being incomplete, as it had not mastered the techniques of complete control. What seems to be attacked is the kind of state that the USSR was in danger of becoming, under Stalin, and, by extension, socialist countries in general. Within totalitarianism, Orwell presents some specific targets of attack: state control over the lives and even minds of human beings; the debasement of language; the suppression of the individual and individuality in the service of the "public good"; all culture turned into political propaganda; inefficiency and corruption in ordinary services; shortage; want; mindless or alienating work; unnecessary war; puritanism; a cynical disregard of the poor; torture; the falsification of the past, etc.

Pessimism is almost total in the novel and unrelieved. The author seems to be saying that the world could be moving toward a situation such as the one portrayed and offers no solution, not even a private solution, for Winston is finally subjugated instead of dying, as he wished. Thus, Winston's heroic challenge to the state control is completely defeated.

The satirist, the third-person narrator, is clearly horrified at what he sees and surely intent on changing the reader's view, thus, he has a moral intention.

The *grotesque* is also a satiric quality found in *1984.* It can be seen in the public hangings of prisoners the children like to watch, the vomiting and defecation scenes in the cell, the torture Winston is submitted to. In this scene there is also an example of bathos, since he tries to keep his reason and not to betray Julia, but finally surrenders.

Besides these qualities, *1984* presents other satirical devices, such as: a) *irony of inversion*, evident in the names of the ministries,

in the absurd inversions of the Party slogans (*War is Peace, Freedom is Slavery*), etc; b) *situational irony* is most striking in the fact that Winston trusts the very man he should fear most, O'Brien; also in the fact that the Party has replaced the hated capitalists as the privileged class, and the proles, for whom the Revolution had been presumably fought, remain the degraded class (the betrayal of socialism so meaningful for Orwell himself); c) *allusion* can be detected in the figure of Big Brother who is similar to Stalin; also the shortage seems to be an allusion to the conditions of life in London after the Second World War, when the book was written; Goldstein may also be an allusion to Trotsky; d) *juxtaposition* can be detected in the comparison between Oceania and Winston's dream place, Golden Country, which represents the bucolic past, the harmony of man in contact with nature. By picturing the beauty of Golden Country Orwell is stressing the shabbiness of Oceania. Also the proles make "a world within a world"; despite its poverty its freedom is also a contrast to Oceania, and Winston even believes that if there is any hope, it lies in the proles; e) *parody*, especially of religious rituals and beings, is also quite evident in the novel: the Book, a parody of the Bible; Goldstein is presented like Lucifer, the primal traitor; the Communion Service seems to be parodied when O'Brien gives Winston and Julia wine to drink and hands them a white tablet to be placed on the tongue. In the same occasion, O'Brien's questioning seems a parody of the ceremony called "*renewal of Baptism vows*". And "You are prepared to give your lives?"[33] echoes "Are you prepared to give your lives for Christ?" Big Brother can also be viewed as a parody of God, since he is all-powerful and omnipresent but nobody has ever seen him.

3. Some Reflections on *Brave New World* and *1984*

First of all one must remark that both Huxley and Orwell had an illustrious predecessor in the Russian Eugene Zamiatin who, in 1920, wrote *We*, published in English in 1924. In *We,* as in the

English dystopia first depicted, freedom is equated with unhappiness because freedom brings instability. In *We* people have numbers, and the political police uses tubes to watch the numbers that live in glass houses. In *1984* this becomes unnecessary due to the two-way telescreen (perhaps the result of Orwell's suspicion of the newly invented television set), and in *Brave New World* the conditioning is so perfect that spying has become irrelevant. There is also a love affair in *We*, followed by its discovery, a "cure" and the reintegration of the man in the group. In *We* the official newspaper says that "if they will not understand that we are bringing them a mathematically faultless happiness, our duty will be to force them to be happy."[34] Isn't that what is done in *Brave New World*?

Whatever ideas Huxley and Orwell borrowed from Zamiatin, they were able to give their novels a different shape from their model, as Leonida Campestrini Kretzer has observed.[35] Huxley's world is a more sophisticated world than the one presented in *We*, and Orwell included in *1984* some concerns that had been haunting his mind for many years.

If we compare *Brave New World* to *1984,* we notice that they share some characteristics: in both States there is no freedom, no individuality, but stability; in both states all cultural manifestation is put at the service of the state, and both use slogans and propaganda to restate the marvels of their world. Yet, their way of achieving stability is quite different. Quite fortunately for his purposes, Huxley projected his world into a future further than Orwell's, into an age of extreme scientific development. Thus, many of the features found in Orwell become unnecessary in Huxley, his world being an extremely sophisticated one. Instead of torture, thought police, brainwashing and fear, he presents genetic manipulation, hypnopaedia and soma. Thus, the basis of Huxley's stability is happiness, artificial but generally successful since just a few people seem dissatisfied. The motto of Brave New World — "Identity, Stability, Community" — really reflects the situation of that state. It is as if in Huxley the world

had already passed through the stages of *1984* and *We*. Thus, though apparently contradictory, it seems to me, *Brave New World* offers a darker perspective than *1984* because it is more stable and unshakeable. Throughout history no dictatorship has lasted for ever, but a society in which people are conditioned to be happy, only desire what they can have and always have what they desire looks almost eternal, unless an unforeseen accident happens, something like AIDS, for example.

If we compare the two English dystopias to the traditional utopias we saw in Part I, we will notice some interesting points. First of all, the stability foreseen by the utopian writers also exists in the dystopias, yet "the wise and benevolent monarch of the classical utopia gives place to the tyrant who, in the name of order and of the security of the state, mocks the rights of man and even violates the conscience and hinders all private life, all form of individual existence."[36] The fact is that the whole concept of utopia presupposes an underlying optimism regarding human nature, a belief that human beings are potentially capable of voluntarily choosing to sacrifice their personal interests and pleasures for the common good, and that suitable education can bring about this nobility of character which will, in turn, make possible a stable, happy and harmonious state. This optimism seems to be mocked by Huxley and Orwell who present, in a more or less subtle way, a quite negative view of human nature. Thus, their stability seems more concrete, more feasible, especially Huxley's. Both the latter and Orwell took care to preserve a parody of religion, recognizing in it a natural impulse, as utopian writers did; both feared the influence of the family, as Plato and Campanella and More did, and Huxley not only kept but encouraged sexual intercourse as a form of satisfying another natural impulse and of avoiding affectionate links. The problem of birth control found in More, Plato, Wells and Campanella seems to be solved in *Brave New World* through the fertilization in vitro and the Malthusian belt, so that sexual repression and chastity become

obsolete. The same can be said concerning the preoccupation found in classic utopia with eugenics.

The identity desired by Plato and More is fully achieved in *Brave New World* within each caste, through genetics. In this way, the long years of education and training seen in Plato and More are replaced with genetic control, conditioning and hypnopaedia. Even laws and punishment become unnecessary due to the efficacy of their methods.

Taking a look at Bacon's *New Atlantis* and its emphasis on science and technology one has the impression that Huxley is saying: "Look at the results of your Solomon's House!" And in *Island* he was careful to replace hypnopaedia with yoga and a conscious conditioning which suggests, despite his optimism, a kind of brainwashing. He also replaces *soma* with *moksha medicine*, thus attenuating the devices of *Brave New World*.

In the utopias as well as in the two dystopias the state takes precedence, so that the individual must be shaped to adapt to a preplanned ideal. In both types of fiction the state has complete control over educational materials, art and literature which are practically abolished. In both, there are no individuals but citizens, and those who do not conform to this fact are duly corrected .

It is interesting to notice that the enthusiasm of Raphael Hythlodaeus concerning Utopia is in sharp contrast with John the Savage's reaction, but the latter has Shakespeare as a model, so how could he accept "a transparent society of citizens without passion, without memory, without imagination — a somber collection of 'men without quality'?"[37]

Briefly, utopia and dystopia seem to differ mainly in tone, dystopia being a negative development of what is presented in utopias. The tone changes completely, from one to the other type, and dystopias seem to be the utopists' dream viewed from inside, put into execution. To this dreary view contribute the plot, the characters who live the experience and the satirical features. What Aldo Maffei

said about utopia has a frightening resonance if applied to either *1984* or *Brave New World*: "[...] Utopia is definitive, it is a door that is closed never to be opened again, because 'afterwards' everything will be just the same".[38] The literal meaning of dystopia — "*bad place*"[39] — applies perfectly to both *Brave New World* and *1984,* for the latter is the portrayal of a gloomy world, with unhappy people, and the former is the picture of a world of automata which leads the protagonist to suicide.

C. The Ambiguous Utopia

The following works to be discussed are definitely satires, as we shall see, but their relationship with utopia remains dubious, therefore we shall call them "ambiguous", for want of a better term.

1. Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, Books I, II and III

First published in 1726, *Gulliver's Travels*, according to Miriam Kosh Starkman, "supports the themes of travel fiction (of the extraordinary, imaginary, philosophic, cosmic, and fantastic voyages) and of the Utopia."[40] Divided into four books, it tells the adventures of Lemuel Gulliver, a surgeon and captain. Similarly to More, Swift aims at verisimilitude and presents, at the very beginning, a letter from Captain Gulliver to his cousin Sympson, the publisher of his manuscript, and a letter from Sympson to the reader in which he tells about Gulliver's personality and life. Then the adventures are presented, in the first person, in the form of an account.

Part I tells Gulliver's voyage to Lilliput; *Part II* is named "A Voyage to Brobdingnag"; *Part III*, "A Voyage to Laputa, Balnibarbi, Glubbdubdrib, Luggnagg, and Japan"; Part IV, "A Voyage to the Country of the 'Houyhnhnms'".

1.a. Part I: "A Voyage to Lilliput"

In Part I, Gulliver tells the reader about his family, his apprenticeship as surgeon and his studies in navigation. After a few trips as a ship's doctor, he stayed in London for a few years. Facing financial difficulties, he decided to take another trip, this time to the South Sea. The ship was wrecked near the East Indies and Gulliver arrived on a shore and slept. He woke up to find himself surrounded by extremely little people, about six inches high.[41] He was in Lilliput[42] and was attacked with small arrows which pricked him like needles. Realizing that Gulliver was of a peaceful disposition, the Lilliputians finally received him well and even housed him in an abandoned temple. Suits were sewn for him, attendants were put at his service, food was to be given him by the population, instructors were designed to teach him their language which he learned fast and was soon able to talk to the emperor.

Gulliver, the Great Man-Mountain, soon gained the good will of the emperor and his court. People also came to see him and he had them in his hand in order to be able to establish a conversation. He soon discovers that Lilliput has two great problems: a violent faction between two opposing parties — the high heels and the low heels, and the danger of an invasion by a potent enemy from abroad, the island of Blefuscu, which they believe to be the only other important empire in the world.

The enmity between Lilliput and Blefuscu dated from the present emperor's grandfather who, on cutting a finger when breaking an egg at the large end, published an edict commanding all his subjects, under great penalties, to break the smaller end of their eggs. There were rebellions because of such a law, which were encouraged by the monarchs of Blefuscu who sustained that the edict offended a fundamental doctrine of their people which said that "All true believers shall break their eggs at the convenient end", and the convenient end for them was the long end. Because of such controversies the Lilliputians had lost forty ships and several smaller

vessels besides thirty thousand seamen. Thus, they expect Gulliver will help them and so he does. He goes to Blefuscu and brings to Lilliput a whole fleet and three weeks later a solemn embassy from Blefuscu comes with humble offers of peace which was soon concluded with advantages to Lilliput and its emperor. The emperor, however, was not satisfied with Gulliver because he refused to help him destroy the Blefuscu empire and reduce it to a province of Lilliput. Noticing that a certain animosity against him was increasing — one man in court was jealous of Gulliver with his wife, another thought he brought too many expenses to the country because he ate too much, and so on — Gulliver goes to Blefuscu, finds an abandoned boat on the sea, repairs it and leaves for England where he arrives safely and remains there for two months.

Let us examine now some social, economic, and political aspects of Lilliput.

It seems a mixture of Asian and European countries, according to the description of the people's clothes. The political system is a hereditary monarchy, and the court lives in the same pomp and idleness as any European court of the time. There is intrigue, jealousy, and bribery at court. High state offices are distributed according to amazing criteria, like the ability to dance on a rope — " whoever jumps the highest without falling succeeds in the office."[43] There are two rival parties in the kingdom, and the animosity between them is such that they will not eat, or drink, or talk with each other. They distinguish themselves by the use of high or low heels on their shoes.

All crimes against the state are severely punished, but if the person accused proves innocent the accuser is killed and the accused one is recompensed with the land and goods of the accuser.

They consider fraud a greater crime than theft for, "they allege, that care and vigilance, with a very common understanding, may preserve a man's goods from thieves, but honesty hath no fence against superior cunning."[44]

Reward and punishment are the two hinges upon which the government turns: "Whoever can there bring sufficient proof that he hath strictly observed the laws of his country for seventy-three moons, hath a claim to certain privileges, according to his quality and condition of life, with a proportionable sum of money out of a fund appropriate for that use."[45]

"In choosing persons for all employments they have more regard to good morals than to great abilities[...] But they thought the want of moral virtues was so far from being supplied by superior endowments of the minds, that employments could never be put into such dangerous hands as those of persons so qualified; and at least, that the mistakes committed by ignorance in a virtuous disposition would never be of such fatal consequence to the public weal, as the practices of a man whose inclinations led him to be corrupt, and had great abilities to manage, to multiply, and defend his corruptions."[46]

Ingratitude is among them a capital crime, though they are not grateful to Gulliver.

The belief in a divine Providence is a must since kings avow themselves to be deputies of Providence; therefore, "nothing can be more absurd than for a prince to employ such men as disown the authority under which he acts."[47]

The family is abolished or, at least, the children are not brought up by their parents who are believed to be the last to be trusted with the education of their children. According to them, people shouldn't bring anyone into this world full of miseries, so that human life is far from a benefit, being the natural result of concupiescence only. There are public nurseries where children of both sexes are reared, and where they receive the occasional visit from their parents — twice a year, for one hour each time. Parents pay the state for their children's education, each according to their own possibilities, "for the Lilliputians think nothing can be more unjust, than that people, in

subservience to their own appetites, should bring children into the world, and leave the burden of supporting them on the public."[48]

The aged and diseased are supported by the state, in hospitals, and begging is unknown in the country.

Though educated separately from the boys, the girls receive a certain amount of education besides being trained in the domestic duties, for the Lilliputians think that "a wife should be always a reasonable and agreeable companion, because she cannot always be young."[49]

If we observe *Gulliver's Travels*, *Part I* as a satire, we notice that it seems to be a mixed type, neither strictly formal verse satire nor strictly Menippean, since the scene dominates but the author speaks in his own voice, and it is not written in verse.

The scene is urban and the countryside is not even presented.

In this part of the book the essential qualities of satire are evident for *humour*, based on fantasy or a sense of the grotesque or absurd, abounds, as well as *attack*. Concerning *humour*, we may mention, out of the many possibilities, the scene in which Gulliver urinates over the queen's palace in order to extinguish a fire. The *attack* is mainly on aristocracy and authorities, but also on human nature. Thus, Gulliver attacks the monarch's ingratitude and vanity, and the lack of kindness typical of humans in general since one of his "friends" suggests that he be punished with blindness instead of death!

Pessimism is also evident in the absence of plot — nothing will change in Lilliput and Gulliver's stay will leave no traces, and also in the fact that Gulliver's heroic deeds are soon forgotten.

Besides having no characters but human types, mainly the aristocrat, we find many examples of the *grotesque* with concentration on the human body and its functions: descriptions of defecation, urination and excrements.[50]

Gulliver pretends to be realistic, with his careful description of the journey, the shipwreck. According to the editor, "the political allegory in *Gulliver's Travels* is inescapable and extensive, if not

always consistent or even decipherable. Generally speaking, Book I is satirical of events in England from 1708-1715, the end of the reign of Queen Anne and the beginning of the reign of George I, particularly of the period when Oxford and Bolingbroke between them led the Tory government, and to both of whom Swift, as spokesman of the Tories, was loyal both personally and politically. Thus Gulliver is sometimes Oxford, sometimes Bolingbroke".[51] The whole description of the contention between Lilliput and Blefuscu about the convenient end for breaking eggs seems to be an allusion to the contention between Catholics and Protestants in Britain; or "they also suggest England and Rome in the reign of King Henry VIII; the controversy between the two also suggests the Civil Wars in England in the 1640s when Charles I was beheaded and Charles II exiled."[52]

Irony of situation is also present, basically in the fact that the Lilliputians made Gulliver their prisoner, apparently unaware that he could set himself free whenever he wished; also in the fact that they consider Lilliput and Blefuscu the only important kingdoms of the world.

Irony of inversion is mainly conveyed by the narrator's commentaries, such as "And this was the first time I began to conceive some imperfect idea of courts and ministers."[53] Also in the fact that Lilliputians and Lilliputian laws say one thing and people's behaviour contradicts them.

The letter published at the beginning can be considered a kind of informal *Apologia*, typical of the formal verse satire.

1.b. Part II: "A Voyage to Brobdingnag"

Launching himself on another trip, Gulliver has another shipwreck and arrives at an unknown island where the people, contrary to Lilliput, are giants, i.e., twelve times bigger than the usual men. Their properties, animals, mountains, are also as big; accordingly, the country is called Brobdingnag, a name which "has

been decoded England, with overtones of grand and big."[54] He is rescued by a farmer who makes a lot of money by showing him in public fairs, as a curiosity. Fortunately, the farmer's daughter, Glumdalclitch, who is nine years old, becomes very fond of him and so takes good care of him. After many excursions around the country and many presentations, Gulliver feels weak and sick. Noticing the fact and suspecting that he will soon die, the farmer sells him to the Queen. Then he begins to live in the Queen's palace, with his little mistress, the farmer's daughter. He is treated by everybody as a pet or a little child. The girls change clothes in front of him and even hold him to their breasts. The queen's dwarf becomes very aggressive towards him out of jealousy and has to be sent away.

Sometimes Gulliver is placed in dangerous or difficult situations due to his small size: rats crawl over him, a monkey takes him to the roof of the palace, wasps afflict him with enormous stings, he tries to jump over some cow-dung but jumps short and falls into it. He himself behaves like a child sometimes, looking for approval, as when he knocks down a linnet, seizes him by the neck with both hands and runs with him in triumph to his nurse.

One day Gulliver is taken to the seaside in a wooden house which is put on a rock. An eagle takes it away, is persecuted by other eagles and drops it into the sea. Gulliver is rescued by a ship and taken to England.

Let us now examine some social, economic, and political aspects concerning Brobdingnag. It is true that this time there are not many details about the organization of the country which, on the whole, seems much better than Lilliput or England. The emphasis here seems to be on Gulliver's funny situation and on England as the main target of attack. The king asks Gulliver about England and criticizes its political system, with apparently sound arguments.

It is clear that Brobdingnag is a monarchy with a courtly life as futile as any other court, of which the best example is the dwarf kept

like a pet for the court's amusement. But the king and queen seem quite reasonable and kind.

Perhaps in an allusion to More, Brobdingnag is set on a peninsula of difficult access due to a range of volcanic mountains and rough sea. The country is well inhabited, and it contains 51 cities, nearly 100 walled towns and a great number of villages. They have adopted the death penalty (guillotine) and beggars are a common sight.

Their education is inadequate, and it consists in morality, history, poetry and mathematics, the latter wholly applied to what may be useful in life, "to the improvement of agriculture and all mechanical arts, so that among us it would be little esteemed. And as to ideas, entities, abstractions and transcendentals, I could never drive the least conception into their heads."[55]

They do not like verbosity, and their laws are put in few words, in the most plain and simple terms, so that everybody understands them, "and to write a comment upon any law is a capital crime."[56] Their libraries are also small, though they do know the art of printing, and their style in writing is objective and without ornaments.

The king could not understand what Gulliver meant by "secrets of state" when an enemy was not involved. Government, for him, is based on common sense and reason, justice and efficiency.

They do not have an army in the usual sense, since it is not permanent and not paid, and only summoned when there are internal conflicts, since they have no contact with foreign countries.

Looking for satirical characteristics in "*A Voyage to Brobdingnag*" we realize that, like the first book, it is a mixed type of satire — both formal and Menippean — and its scenery is first agrarian, though not idealized, and later, urban.

Wit or *humour* founded on fantasy or a sense of the grotesque also abounds, since Gulliver's absurd position as a pigmy among giants who treat him as a pet is both ridiculous and funny. Several scenes would fit here: Gulliver and the rats on his bed; Gulliver taken by the monkey; Gulliver taking a bird and showing it to his mistress

with pride; Gulliver rowing a boat in a basin for the joy of the court, and many others, the most hilarious of them being his behaviour on arriving home, and treating his wife and child as if they were pigmies: "My wife ran out to embrace me, but I stooped lower than her knees, thinking she could otherwise never be able to reach my mouth. My daughter kneeled to ask me blessing, but I could not see her till she arose, having been so long used to stand with my head and my eyes erect to above sixty foot; and then I went to take her up with one hand, by the waist. I looked down upon the servants and one or two friends who were in the house, as if they had been pigmies, and I a giant. I told my wife she had been too thrifty, for I found she had starved herself and her daughter to nothing. In short, I behaved myself so unaccountably, that they were all of the captain's opinion when he first saw me and concluded I had lost my wits."[57]

The *attack* is both direct, when he criticizes human traits — "For I apprehended every moment that he would dash me against the ground, as we usually do any little hateful animal which we have a mind to destroy"[58] — and indirect, through the king's words, and in this case the target of attack is England or the English — "I cannot but conclude the bulk of your natives to be the most pernicious race of little odious vermin that nature ever suffered to crawl upon the surface of the earth."[59]

Pessimism can be perceived in Gulliver's lack of heroism due to his ridiculous position. There is no plot and probably no need of one, since Brobdingnag, though not perfect, seems better than England, at least in terms of government. The inhabitants, on the other hand, present the same faults common to human beings: meanness, lust (especially the women), jealousy, etc.

References to *grotesque* situations abound, as we have already mentioned, but a concentration on flesh and body is seen in the descriptions of a repugnant woman's breast, excretion, the queen's voracious appetite, urination, the people's strong smell, etc.[60]

Allusions to England and the English also abound, such as the reference to the microscope, recently invented; to Gresham College, the original name of the Royal Society; to English children in their evil behaviour toward animals and to the English women's fright at animals; also his account to the king of the political affairs in England during the century, to which the king reacts "protesting it was only an heap of conspiracies, rebellions, murders, massacres, revolutions, banishments, the very worst effects that avarice, faction, hypocrisy, perfidiousness, cruelty, rage, madness, hatred, envy, lust, malice, and ambition could produce."[61]

Irony of situation is evident in Gulliver's absurd situation among giants, and also in his behaviour back home, treating normal human beings as if they were pigmies. *Irony of inversion* is conveyed through the king's questions, as when he asks Gulliver on the qualities and training of English aristocrats, attributing to them qualities of intelligence and labour which they never possessed. It is also present in the fact that it is the king who conveys the attacks, Swift clearly taking advantage of him to convey criticism of his own country and institutions.

Thus, the satirist in this second part seems to be double: on the one hand, Gulliver, when he criticizes the Brobdingnagians; on the other hand, the king of Brobdingnag, who criticizes the English. Gulliver, the apparent satirist, wears the mask of the moralist and the plain man, asking the reader's forgiveness for his lack of ornaments and his subject: "I hope the gentle reader will excuse me for dwelling on these and the like particulars,[...] wherein I have been chiefly studious of truth, without affecting any ornaments of learning or of style,"[62] in what is at the same time an informal a*pologia* and a pretense at realism.

1.c. Part III: "A Voyage to Laputa, Balnibarbi, Gubbdubdrib, Luggnagg, and Japan"

Gulliver says that he was invited to be surgeon on a ship leaving for the East Indies, and again there was a shipwreck. He was caught by fierce pirates who put him in a canoe with provisions for eight days. He went from one rocky island to another and was finally rescued by a floating island, Laputa.

The Laputians know only music and mathematics, and nothing objective or useful. They are so absent-minded that they keep flappers to flap their mouths and ears and so make them listen to someone or give an answer. Their food is cut in geometrical figures, and their garments are adorned with the figures of suns, moons and stars, interwoven with those of fiddles, flutes, harps, trumpets, guitars and the like.

The Laputians consider themselves very smart and have no curiosity about other places. The island functions through magnetism, and so it rises and falls, and moves from one place to the other, as they wish, but not beyond the extent of the dominions below, nor higher than four miles.

Laputa is the name of the floating island and Balnibarbi is the continent below it, the capital of which is Lagado. The king keeps control over Balnibarbi easily, for "if any town should engage in rebellion or mutiny, fall into violent factions, or refuse to pay the usual tribute, the King hath two methods of reducing them to obedience. The first and the mildest course is by keeping the island hovering over such a town and the lands about it, whereby he can deprive them of the benefit of the sun and the rain, and consequently afflict the inhabitants with death and diseases. And if the crime deserve it, they are at the same time pelted from above with great stones, against which they have no defence but by creeping into cellars or caves, while the roofs of their houses are beaten to pieces. But if they still continue obstinate, or offer to raise insurrections, he proceeds

to the last remedy, by letting the island drop directly upon their heads, which makes a universal destruction both of houses and men."[63]

Nonetheless, Gulliver heard of an incident which had happened three years before his arrival, in which the mutinous town built four towers, one at every corner, and put a strong pointed rock in the middle of it. On the top of the towers and the rock they fixed a great loadstone which attracted the bottom of Laputa irresistibly. The Laputians noticed they would fall over the towers and rock and be destroyed and the king was, thus, forced to grant the town their own conditions.

Gulliver soon got weary of Laputa and its obsessions and got permission to leave and go to Lagado, the capital of Balnibarbi. Although he was well received, by a great lord, he did not like what he saw: people wearing rags, buildings inclined, people busy but no production. The lord his friend explained that everything in Lagado was under the direction of an academy of Projectors which made projects and proposals which still lacked perfection, and meanwhile people lived miserably, without food or clothes or decent houses. Instead of being discouraged, the members of the academy got "fifty times more violently bent upon prosecuting their schemes, driven equally on by hope and despair."[64]

Gulliver visits the Grand Academy of Lagado and gets acquainted with its absurd and useless projects. Seeing no reason to stay there he decides to go back home. But first he would like to visit Japan, and in order to do so he goes to Maldonada in order to take a ship to Luggnagg, and from there go to Japan. Since he would have to wait a month for a ship to Luggnagg, he goes to visit Glubbdubdrib — the island of sorcerers and magicians — where the governor and his family are attended by the ghosts of dead people. Gulliver meets the ghosts of famous people, like Alexander, the Great, Hannibal, Brutus, Caesar, Descartes, and is surprised to find so much corruption in the Roman empire as a result of luxury. By comparing the dead to the living he notices a degeneration in the

physique of the people. He goes back to Maldonada and gets a boat to Luggnagg.

Gulliver stays in Luggnagg for three months, and there he meets the Struldbruggs, those who never die. He soon realizes that death is a necessity, for the appearance of the Struldbruggs is atrocious: "They were the most mortifying sight I ever beheld and the women more horrible than the men. Besides the usual deformities in extreme old age, they acquired an additional ghastliness in proportion to their number of years, which is not to be described, and among half a dozen I soon distinguished which was the eldest, although there was not above a century or two between them."[65] The immortals lost their memory, their senses, and the capacity to talk since the language changed continually and they did not follow its flux.

From Luggnagg Gulliver sails to Japan where he stays a short time, unable to understand a word of their language and under the guidance of an interpreter. He takes a Dutch ship, and from Amsterdam he goes to England, arriving safely home after an absence of five and a half years.

Gulliver provides the reader with no further information about the social, political, or economic aspects of the places he visits in this third part, other than those already mentioned. So, let us examine its satirical components.

This third part follows the same type of report as the preceding parts, though with less involvement of the protagonist, who is basically an observer. Thus, the Menippean aspect of satire is emphasized, in the predominance of the setting which is basically urban, and there is no attempt to contrast it to the countryside.

Wit or humour is fundamentally founded on the absurd, for one cannot imagine the existence of a floating island, but sometimes it is also founded on the grotesque, as in the scene with the ghosts. Thus, the grotesque and the absurd are combined to provoke smiling, not the hearty laughter of the second part.

The targets of *attack* are various: man's wish for immortality, through the description of the Struldbruggs; scientists who dedicate themselves to useless theories, as well as their absent-mindedness; intellectuals without objectivity, and the like.[66]

Allusion plays an important role in this part, for "Swift's flying island is a combination of satire on voyages to the moon (here reversed to a voyage from the moon to the earth), and of flying machines. The mathematical figures assume significance when collated with William Gilbert's figures in his *De Magnete*. Swift's flying island is satirical of the exploitations of Ireland by England in all its punitive and controlling measures."[67] Also the Academy of Lagado is a clear allusion to the Royal Society and its projects, considered absurd by Swift. And many others, annotated by the editor.

The *grotesque* is mainly present through the descriptions Gulliver gives of the people he met: the Laputians. "Their heads were all reclined either to the right or to the left; one of their eyes turned inward, and the other directly up to the zenith";[68] the Struldbruggs also. Some of the experiments at the Grand Academy of Lagado are quite grotesque, like the one which aimed at reverting human excrement to its original food, described in detail, and that which aimed at curing colic diseases, or that which asserted the possibility of detecting plots against the king by the colour of the suspect's ordure.

Gulliver often juxtaposes what he observes in those strange places to England or Europe in general, mainly for purposes of stressing similarities and thus, of attack. An example can be seen when he talks about the interest in politics demonstrated by mathematicians, which occurs both in Lagado and in Europe, though he could never discover the analogy between the two sciences, he says.[69]

Irony of situation may be visualized in Gulliver's discovery that what he had supposed to be court style was a real fact in Luggnagg, when he sends the king a message saying he should like

to have the honour to "lick the dust before his footstool" and on arriving he was commanded to crawl upon his belly and lick the floor as he was advancing — "[...] but on account of my being a stranger, care was taken to have it so clean that the dust was not offensive,"[70] and here we have also *irony of inversion* for it stands to reason that licking anyone's floor is offensive. *Irony of inversion* is also present in the narrator's *apology*: [...] "(for I hope the reader need not be told that I do not in the least intend my own country in what I say upon this occasion)."

According to the editor of this edition, the description of the flying island seems to be "a direct parody of the language of the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society.*"[71]

A rampant *pessimism* pervades this third part, not only due to the absence of heroism or the lack of plot, but mostly for the several varieties of folly and absurdity Gulliver encounters, human qualities that are extended into the past, through the ghosts he meets, and into the future, through the immortals with whom he gets acquainted.

2. *Erewhon* and *Erewhon Revisited*

Samuel Butler's *Erewhon, or Over the Range* appeared in 1872, and its sequel, *Erewhon Revisited*, almost thirty years later, in 1901. Despite the interval between the two, the second, though more elaborate in terms of action and characters' relationships, is obviously a continuation of the first, and in it Butler basically deepens certain features of *Erewhon.* They will, therefore, be analysed together.

Both fictions are in the form of a report written in the first person, the first by the protagonist, the second, by his son. Each tells his adventures in Erewhon, (the name being an anagram of *no-where*) a place unknown to everybody, its location remaining a mystery in the first book because the narrator suspects he has found the lost tribes of Israel and wishes to be the first one to announce it. In the second book, there are symptoms of a possible wish on the

Erewhonians' part for establishing contact with the outside world, so that the narrator finds it unnecessary to reveal its location.

The first narrator, Higgs, whose name we are only told in the second book, goes to a farm in an exotic place, and from there he goes through a mountain range and arrives at a beautiful place where people have dark skin and great beauty. He goes there in search of adventure and riches. Chowbock, a native of the farm, a kind of Indian, had taken him to the direction of Erewhon but disappeared in the middle of the excursion thus leaving Higgs alone.

In the new place, Higgs is well received at the beginning, but later is put into gaol after the Erewhonians discover he has a watch, which is confiscated and put into a museum. In gaol he is well treated by the gaoler's beautiful daughter, Yram. Through her we come to know that "illness of any sort was considered in Erewhon to be highly criminal and immoral, and that [he] was liable, even for catching a cold, to be held before the magistrates and imprisoned for a considerable period — an announcement which struck [him] dumb with astonishment."[72] In prison he is taught their language and soon after is set free, being taken to the capital, since the king and queen wished to meet him, and a rich merchant offered to be his host for as long as he wished.

Mr. Nosnibor, the merchant, and his wife were very kind to him. They had two daughters and Higgs fell in love with the younger one, Arowhena. Later, he realizes her parents would not agree to their marriage unless their elder daughter got married first. Worse of all, he discovers that they intended him to marry Zulora, the elder daughter. Since he and Arowhena were deeply in love, he decides to escape from Erewhon with her. The problem is how, but he soon has an idea. He persuades the queen to allow him to build a balloon and help him in this task because he wanted to ascend to talk to the Air God and ask him personally to send them rain, of which they were desperately in need after a long drought. The queen agrees to his plan and a huge balloon is built. Arowhena hides in the bottom of

its car and the two escape from Erewhon in front of a crowd. After a long flight they fall into the sea, are rescued by a ship and taken to England.

Erewhon Revisited Twenty Years Later begins with Higgs's son telling the reader about his father's book. We are informed that Chowbock, the Indian, had also gone to England and had accused Higgs of lying about Erewhon. As a result, his father got no money from the publication. Yet, an uncle of his who lived in Australia left him a huge legacy, and he became rich, being able to send his son to Oxford. Arowhena died early, for she could never adapt herself to the new country. After her death Higgs decided to visit Erewhon again. He went, found it changed and, to his surprise, realized that he had been transformed into a god, the Sunchild. Fortunately he had darkened his skin and only Yram the gaoler's daughter, who was married to the town major, recognized him. The fact was that after he and Arowhena disappeared in the balloon a strong rain had fallen over the country for several days almost causing a flood, and people believed it was his doing.

Higgs also finds out that he has a son in Erewhon, George, Yram's first born. The boy is fair like his father and it was not easy for Yran to make people believe he was her husband's son. Higgs meets George, Yram and Major who, by the way, knew everything about their past and accepted George as his son.

Higgs, the Sunchild, leaves Erewhon and promises George to come back within a year. He dies, nevertheless, and his son goes to the meeting in his place. The two brothers meet and talk, John gives George the gifts he had brought to Yram, the Major, and his brothers and sisters, and also gives him the gold their father had assigned to him. Back in England he receives a letter from George in which he tells him the news of Erewhon, the best being that the old railway had been reconstructed and was operating well.

Let us now examine some social, political, and economic aspects related to *Erewhon*. First of all, it becomes clear that Erewhon has

a monarchy and magistrates. Very soon the reader finds out, together with Higgs, that the Erewhonians have equated morality with health and beauty, and crime with illness. What is commonly considered a crime in our society is considered a disease by them and the offender is taken to a hospital and carefully tended at public expense, or, if he is rich, a straightener, a kind of moral doctor, comes to visit him to prescribe a cure, which may consist in a diet of bread and water for a few months, or a weekly flogging, and sometimes a fine, to be paid not to the offended person, but to the state. Ill luck or ill treatment at the hands of others is considered an offence against society, for it makes people feel uncomfortable on hearing of it. Loss of fortune is also punished.

They do not marry into families of unhealthy people, and it is impolite to ask someone if he is well. Disease is considered a crime because they do not want doctors who are liable to acquire too much power within the households and consequently, within society.

They have families and the man is the head of the household.

They accept death with ease and cremate their dead. They used to have statues of themselves made while they were still alive, but the amount of statues was such that it became a nuisance, so they acquired the habit of paying a sculptor for not making a statue. When someone dies the friends of the relatives send them little boxes filled with artificial tears, the number varying according to their degree of intimacy.

Childbirth "is looked upon as a painful subject on which it is kinder not to touch; the illness of the mother is carefully concealed until the necessity for signing the birth-formula [...] renders further secrecy impossible."[73] The ladies are scolded by their husbands when they get pregnant and try to hide it for as long as possible. The *birth-formula* is a formula printed on common paper where the recently born baby testifies that he came into this world of his own volition, on purpose to disturb the life of two people who were perfectly happy without him, that his parents will have nothing to do

with his physical blemishes and deficiencies, that they have the right to kill him if they wish, but if they do not he promises to be their humble servant for the whole of his life. This formula is read in the presence of the friends and of the family straightener and the baby is asked whether he agrees to sign it, and a friend answers yes in his place and signs it for him. When the child is fourteen he is induced to sign it himself, thus taking all responsibility for being alive.

They have peculiar institutions called Musical Banks where all mercantile transactions are accompanied with music, "though the music was hideous to a European ear".[74] The money issued by the Musical Banks has no practical value but it is a question of etiquette to have some of it in one's purse. In fact, "they have two distinct currencies, each under the control of its own banks and mercantile codes."[75] The Musical Banks are generally empty, very beautiful and clean; "they never allowed interest on deposit [...], paid little or no dividend, but divided their profits by way of bonus on the original shares once in every thirty thousand years, and as it was now only two thousand years since there had been one of these distributions, people felt that they could not hope for another in their own time and preferred investments where they got some more tangible return [...]"[76].

They believe in pre-existence and "that it is of their own free act and deed in a previous state that they come to be born into this world at all [...]. If this were not so [...], it would be a monstrous freedom for one man to take with another,[...] to say that he should undergo the chances and changes of this mortal life without any option in the matter."[77]

They also believe that only the stupid souls wish to incarnate, and that explains the stupidity of human beings.

After a long civil war between mechanists and anti-mechanists, the latter won, and almost all appliances and machines were destroyed and forbidden, on the ground that they would finally acquire a degree of consciousness, as man did, and prevail over human

beings. If man had evolved from an ape, machines could also evolve and dominate the country: "But who can say that the vapor engine has not a kind of consciousness? Where does consciousness begin, and where end? Who can draw the line? Who can draw any line?"[78] Besides, the machine has advantages over man: it is never tired or inefficient, it needs no food or sleep. All the arguments in favour of machines were carefully counterclaimed and it had been agreed that all inventions with less than 271 years of existence would be destroyed. This number was dictated by the age of a certain mangle much in use among washerwomen. After a long discussion, they had decided to exclude it.

Vegetarianism had been obligatory for a time, but everybody ate meat somehow and finally, on the ground that vegetables and fruit are also alive, meat was reestablished in their diet.

Their gods are personifications of human qualities, as justice, strength, hope, fear, love, etc. They inhabit a region beyond the clouds and are believed to be like men and women both in body and passion, except that they are comelier and more powerful than human beings, and invisible to the human eye. They have erected temples for their gods, and they also have priests. They believe that their gods are benevolent and helpful, and that they do not regard motives but only deeds. Still, there is some religious controversy among them as to an existence hereafter.

In what concerns education, they have "*colleges of unreason*" where the straighteners are trained. "The student for the profession of straightener is required to set apart certain seasons for the practice of each vice in turn, as a religious duty. These seasons are called 'fasts', and are continued by the student until he finds that he really can subdue all the more usual vices in his own person, and hence can advise his patients from the results of his own experience[...]. Some students have been obliged to continue their exercises during their whole lives, and some devoted men have actually died as martyrs to the drink, or gluttony, or whatever branch of vice they may have chosen for their especial study."[79]

They also have "*schools of unreason*" where children are taught useless things, and their major subject is the 'hypothetical language', a dead language. The young people are required to provide intelligent answers to the questions arising from a set of strange and impossible contingencies. *Inconsistency* and *Evasion* are also important subjects, since they believe that unreason develops those qualities that are necessary for conducting affairs. Reason and unreason complement each other, but the first is a natural tendency of human beings so that its teaching is unnecessary.

No originality of thought is allowed, and to be too far ahead of one's neighbours is an insult to them. Therefore, they are against progress because progress demands competition, and competition breeds discord. Briefly, their educational system aims at suppressing rather than encouraging mental growth.

As happens with disease, misfortune is also considered a crime, more or less criminal, and according to a judge "it stands to reason that no man should be allowed to be unlucky to more than a very moderate extent" and "luck is the only fit object of human veneration." [80]

On his return, Higgs finds out that science is being reintroduced into Erewhon and its king intends to establish commercial relations with other nations. They have adopted the European calendar and clothes, and the Musical Banks and the college professors are united against the king's wish for modernization.

In what concerns satire, both *Erewhon* and *Erewhon Revisited* seem to be a mixture of the two basic types, since there is a tale and a plot, but the narration is in the first person and the emphasis is on setting, which is mainly urban. The narrator-satirist frequently interrupts the narrative with his own ideas and interpretations, such as the following: "I do not suppose that even my host, on having swindled a confiding widow out of the whole of her property, was put to more actual suffering than a man will readily undergo at the hands of an English doctor."[81] Nevertheless, his digressions are often organized in topics, as "The Book of the Machines" and "The World of the Unborn".

Humour is persistent, based on absurdity rather than the grotesque, and examples abound, generally connected with the inversion of common sense: "Mrs. Nosnibor, who had been keeping an ear on all that I had been saying, praised me when the lady had gone. Nothing, she said, could have been more polite according to Erewhonian etiquette. She then explained that to have stolen a pair of socks, or 'to have the socks' (in more colloquial language) was a recognized way of saying that the person in question was slightly indisposed."[82] Certain incidents are also humorous, like the suicide among cattle and sheep, the only possibility people had of eating meat during the period of its prohibition: "Suicidal mania, again, which had hitherto been confined exclusively to donkies, became alarmingly prevalent even among such for the most part self-respecting creatures as sheep and cattle."[83]

The targets of *attack* are innnumerable, and we will mention just a few: social conventions, such as asking people how they are, or wearing mourning clothes; conversion; established religions; virtue or virtuous people — "The straighteners say that the most that can be truly said for virtue is that there is a considerable balance in its favor, and that it is on the whole a good deal better to be on its side than against it; but they urge that there is much pseudo-virtue going about, which is apt to let people in very badly before they find it out. Those men, they say, are best who are not remarkable either for vice or virtue";[84] social institutions like property, the law and marriage, "For property is robbery, but then, we are all robbers or would-be robbers together, and have found it essential to organize our thieving, as we have found it necessary to organize our lust [marriage] and our revenge [the law]. Property, marriage, the law";[85] man's greed; female vanity; the way parents treat their children, through the shame it is to have a child and the birth-formula strategy; religious disputes about life here and life hereafter; Platonism, through "the World of the Unborn" — "They are believed to be extremely numerous, far

more so than mankind. They arrive from unknown planets, full grown, in large batches at a time; but they can only leave the unborn world by taking the steps necessary for their arrival here — which is, in fact, by suicide";[86] parents and children who may forget that they have to accept one another in the dark, since the children do not choose their parents, and the parents do not choose the character of their children; life, which is so miserable that death becomes a relief; man's free will, which constitutes a burden; work, the opium of man — "If any faint remembrance, as of a dream, flit in some puzzled moment across your brain, and you shall feel that the potion which is to be given you shall not have done its work, and the memory of this existence which you are leaving [the world of the unborn] endeavors vainly to return;[...] fly-fly — if you can remember the advice — to the haven of your present and immediate duty, taking shelter incessantly in the work which you have in hand";[87] useless objects of study, like dead languages and philosophy (he is perhaps criticizing the English educational curriculum); scholars and universities — "for whereas the Athenians spent their lives in nothing save to see and to hear some new thing, there were some here who seemed to devote themselves to the avoidance of every opinion with which they were not perfectly familiar, and regarded their own brains as a sort of sanctuary, to which if an opinion had once resorted, none other was to attack it";[88] prophets and fanatics.

Pessimism can be detected in the targets of attack, in the view of man as a fool, and also in the almost total absence of plot, for very little happens after Higgs arrives in Erewhon and the reader has little hope that things will improve. It is true that on his return, there are more people aware of the absurdities of the country, but fanaticism has become suffocating and many people profit from it. Thus, at the end of *Erewhon Revisited* we meet the same satirist, the same fools and the world we look at is fundamentally the same. Yet, there is some hope evinced in the changes that have already

taken place, though we may not be sure whether these changes will be necessarily for the better.

In what concerns characters, even the protagonist, Higgs, receives only a few traits. The people presented have no psychological depth, and, with the exception of the two professors — Hanky and Panky — who appear in the second book, are not caricatures either. They seem as formless as More's people.

Although in the second book the author stresses the attack on religion and scholars, the ultimate main target is definitely human nature, with its pride, its beliefs, its lack of kindness and tolerance, its absurdity.

We did not detect either the grotesque or examples of bathos, but several allusions to England, the feminist movement and English journalism, for example, most of them indirect and not so easily understood by the contemporary reader. "*The Book of the Machines*" seems to be an ironic allusion to Darwin, though the author rejects it in the Preface to the second edition of *Erewhon.*

The satirist's attitude is not clear: sometimes he is horrified at what he sees, especially in the second book; other times he seems to convey a somewhat ironic acceptance of things.

We could mention several examples of *irony of situation*, since the Erewhonian world is, in many respects, an inversion of traditional mores and beliefs. A most striking example is Higgs's being scolded by Yran for being sick, when he had anticipated sympathy; another one is the trial of the boy who had been stolen by his guardian and is severely admonished by the judge for no one should be so stupid as that.

Irony of inversion is evident in the names of the institutions — "colleges of unreason", "deformatory" — and in their bizarre morality, by which an honest child is punished and a dishonest one is praised.

Parody abounds in both books: the boy's trial, for example; though the procedure is the same of a European court, the victim is punished and not his dishonest guardian; the Musical Banks,

which seem to be a parody of religious institutions and rites, with their promises of heaven after death; the "colleges of unreason" seem parodies of the usual university colleges, as the straighteners seem to be the parody of moralists or preachers. In the second book, religious parodies are paramount: they have the *Sunchild's Book* [the bible] with the imaginary teachings of the Sunchild; also, the *Sunchild's Prayer*, a parody of the *Lord's Prayer* which says "Forgive us our trespasses, but do not forgive them that trespass against us";[89] the service performed at the temple, in which Hanky preaches, is also a parody of a religious service, as well as a reliquary of glass with fossil excrements, a parody of the Eucharist.

Situational irony is, in fact, an extremely important device in the second book since the Sunchild is back in Erewhon and the people do not recognize him, talking to him about himself and attributing to him words he never uttered.

3. Some Reflections on *Gulliver's Travels* — Books I, II and III, and *Erewhon* and *Erewhon Revisited*

After the previous description, we may establish a parallel between Swift's and Butler's books in order to extend our analysis to the dystopias analysed in the previous section.

First, we may point out that both Swift and Butler adopted the frame of a report of adventures, written in the first person by those who experienced them. In both authors the setting is stressed and their works seem to constitute a mixed type of satire, neither strictly formal nor strictly Menippean. Both authors present a criticism of their society, with more or less subtle allusions to England.

The world depicted by the two authors presents absurd features, and the grotesque is an important satirical device in Swift, almost absent in Butler. And here lies a slight difference in tone between the two: Swift's is darker than Butler's; the latter seems to keep a bigger emotional distance from his work than Swift.

In both works human folly and absurdity are portrayed by means of fantastic places, people, their habits and beliefs.

Now, if we compare Swift and Butler to *Brave New World* and *1984* some important differences strike our attention: whereas *Brave New World* and *1984* are Menippean satires, Butler's and Swift's are of a mixed type. This fact shows clearly that the two dystopias present a view from inside which allows them an approximation to tragedy, something we do not have in Swift and Butler since in both the protagonist arrives safely home, and is capable of writing the account of his adventures.

Furthermore, the worlds portrayed by Swift and Butler are not dark projections into the future, they are not so pessimistic or immutable as the two dystopias; they do not constitute a warning against future dangerous paths, but are simply ironic, humorous evidences of human nature's frailties, which are immutable.

Thus, *Gulliver's Travels*, *books I, II and III* and *Erewhon* and *Erewhon Revisited* do not constitute dystopias; instead they are satires which seem to mock at the utopian writers' belief in human nature's capacity and intrinsic goodness, not only through the depiction of human vices and stupidity but also by the parodic use of traditional utopian features, as the shipwreck and the unknown place discovered.

D. The Frustrated Utopia

1. Orwell's *Animal Farm*

Published in 1946, *Animal Farm* is a satirical allegory of revolutions which end in dictatorships. It is written in the form of a beast fable, a very ancient satiric technique which "is basically the dramatic realization of metaphor; in a realistic work a man might be called a pig, but in the beast fable he is presented as an actual pig. Satirists have always found this translation of metaphor to dramatic fact an extremely effective way of portraying the true nature of vice and folly."[90]

Mr. Jones owns a farm, Manor Farm, where the animals are ill fed and badly treated, for he often forgets about their existence. Old Major, the eldest pig on the farm, has a strange dream which leads him to reflection. In this dream the world was rid of men and ruled by animals, and Old Major foresees an animal revolution. He talks to the other animals of the farm about his dream and incites them to rebellion, for man is the only animal who consumes without producing, he says. And he warns them against the dangers implicit in such a revolution: "And remember also that in fighting against Man, we must not come to resemble him. Even when you have conquered him, do not adopt his vices. No animal must ever live in a house, or sleep in a bed, or wear clothes, or drink alcohol, or smoke tobacco, or touch money, or engage in trade. All the habits of Man are evil. And, above all, no animal must ever tyrannise over his own kind. Weak or strong, clever or simple, we are all brothers. No animal must ever kill any other animal. All animals are equal."[91]

After Old Major's death the animals at Manor Farm really rebel against Jones and succeed in expelling him. The animals begin to rule the farm, under the leadership of the pigs Napoleon and Snowball, smarter than all the other animals. They learn to read and write and develop "Animalism", a complete system of thought based on Old Major's speech, condensed into seven commandments which, in their turn, are condensed into one sentence, easier for the more stupid animals to memorize: "Four legs good, two legs bad". Among the animals, besides the pigs, only Muriel, the goat, and Benjamin, the donkey, are able to read; Boxer, the big horse, just learns the first four letters of the alphabet, and Clover, a motherly mare, reads with extreme difficulty apparently because she is shortsighted.

Napoleon is a large boar, not talkative but "with a reputation for getting his own way."[92] Snowball is a more vivacious boar than Napoleon, quicker in speech and more inventive, but not considered as highly as Napoleon. Squealer, another pig, is a small, fat pig, a

brilliant talker, capable of turning black into white, and he becomes the spokesman of the ruling pigs.

Snowball is an idealist. He creates committees for the several tasks to be accomplished, which do not succeed, and foresees a happy future for them all, through the use of technology. He plans the construction of a windmill, with which the animals would work less and through which they would get a lot of comfort, such as hot water, heated stalls, and the like. Napoleon rejects the idea of the windmill as foolish and unfeasible, and expels Snowball with the aid of his dogs, some huge puppies he has reared in private. The dogs become his private guards and with them, propaganda, and Squealer always ready to convince the animals that Napoleon is right, the latter holds absolute and indisputable power. The sheep constitute another element of Napoleon's strategy, for whenever there is an argument they begin bleating "Four legs good, two legs bad" for a long time so that everybody forgets the subject of the argument. As time goes on, no argument ever appears for Napoleon cancels the Sunday assembly on the ground that it is unnecessary. He also uses Jones and the possibility of his coming back as a way of keeping the animals obedient, for they fear nothing more than the farmer's return.

Napoleon decides they must build the windmill, and even convinces the animals, through Squealer, that the idea of the windmill was his, that Snowball had stolen its plans because he was an ally of Jones. Since they keep no records, historical facts are easily adulterated or denied, and after some time the animals deny their own memories and accept Napoleon's arguments.

The construction of the windmill demands hard work, for they have to break the rocks, sometimes in rough weather, and without the ability of men. The windmill falls to pieces more than once, and Napoleon orders the reconstruction. It is also costly, so that the animals' rations are reduced. Sometimes they work sixty hours a week, but happily because they think of the benefits they will enjoy when the windmill is ready. When it is ready, it does not bring them

any comfort: "But the luxuries of which Snowball had once taught the animals to dream, the stalls with electric light and hot and cold water, and the three-day week, are no longer talked about. Napoleon had denounced such ideas as contrary to the spirit of Animalism. The truest happiness, he said, lay in working hard and living frugally."[93]

One by one the seven commandments are abolished: they engage in trade with the neighbouring farms in order to buy what they need for the windmill; the pigs go to live in the farmhouse, and sleep in beds; Napoleon extracts false confessions of rebellion followed by executions, and several animals die; the revolutionary hymn "Beasts of England" is prohibited; the pigs dress like men, smoke tobacco, and drink alcohol. The commandments painted on the wall are duly changed, in case some of the animals remember the old ones. Thus, to the commandment that "no animal shall sleep in beds" they add "with sheets"; to the commandment that said "no animal shall drink alcohol", they add "to excess", and so on. And at the end, the pigs walk on their hind legs and the maxim "four legs good, two legs bad" is replaced by "four legs good, two legs better", and the seven commandments are erased and replaced by just one sentence: "All animals are equal. But some are more equal than others."[94] The name Animal Farm is replaced with the old one, Manor Farm.

In terms of satire, *Animal Farm* fits the Menippean type, for it is a fable which warns against the dangers of revolutions. The targets of *attack* may be embodied in one word, dictatorship, or tyranny, with all its implications: a powerful privileged oligarchy, extermination of enemies, exploration of the people, state propaganda, and the like.

The setting is agrarian, but with little importance for the purpose of the tale. It had to be agrarian because it dealt with animals, and the farm stands for a country or a state.

The absurd and the grotesque do not give rise to humour, for the atmosphere is dark and gloomy. Pigs walking on their hind legs

and behaving like humans constitute an absurd scene, but not necessarily humorous.

Pessimism pervades the tale and is mostly evident in the fact that although there is change, the change is not for the better. At the end of the story, the farm has the same name as at the beginning and the animals instead of being ruled by a man, are ruled by a pig and his comrades, and their despotism is even worse than man's, but the animals are unaware of it. Nothing could better convey the total frustration of the animal revolution than the story's last sentence: "The creatures outside looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again; but already it was impossible to say which was which."[95] Morally, their situation is worse, for now they are ruled autocratically by someone of their own species.

As is usual in satire, *Animal Farm* has no real characters, but types: Snowball, the idealist; Napoleon, the tyrant; Squealer, the opportunist, etc.

Though there is the presence of the grotesque, there is no concentration on the flesh, for the author is dealing with animals. Yet, the pigs' fatness and their attempt to behave like humans are grotesque.

The satirist is the outside narrator, who interferes very little in the narrative, only when an explanation is deemed necessary, and his interferences are always to the point, closely connected with the story at hand. He does not present solutions, but he implies norms of conduct, related to ethics, humanism and human respect.

Bathos is carefully constructed, from the beginning of the animal revolution to its sequel, its end being the opposite of what Old Major had dreamed of.

Irony of situation plays an important role in this satire, for it conveys the idea of eternal dictatorship. The animals do not realize that their position is not better under the pigs' authority, and still feel proud of not having a human master.

Irony of inversion can be seen in Squealer's speeches, always pointing out Napoleon's and the other pigs' altruism, and in sentences

such as "the pigs did not actually work, but directed and supervised the others. With their superior knowledge it was natural that they should assume the leadership".[96] So, elections were not necessary!

We can also detect the *juxtaposition* of animals to humans, at the beginning for purposes of contrast, at the end, for purposes of similarity.

Allusion may be considered an important device, and many readers have glimpsed in Napoleon, Snowball and the other animals an allusion to the leaders of the Soviet Revolution, like Stalin, Lenin, Trotski, etc and seen the animal revolution as an allusion to the same revolution. Nevertheless, the fable may be appreciated without taking such allusions into consideration. Social revolutions are a current historical fact, and human ambition, especially political ambition, is an intrinsic component of such revolutions.

As happened in *1984*, the ultimate main target of attack in *Animal Farm* is not necessarily human nature, for some of its characters are good, but human pride, tyranny, and the naïveté of the good ones.

2. William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*

Published in 1954, *Lord of the Flies* tells the story of a group of boys (the reader is not told exactly how many) who suddenly find themselves alone on a tropical desert island in the Pacific. They were on a plane and the pilot was able to leave them there but not to land, and the plane probably exploded soon after.

There are no adults on the island which is rich in fruit trees, good water, birds, flies and butterflies. The air is very hot and the island has no wild beasts, only pigs.

The main characters, whose ages vary from six to twelve, are Ralph, a fair, handsome boy of twelve, Piggy, a fat, short, intelligent boy, Jack, the head of a choir, and its members; two identical twins, Sam and Eric, who are always together and referred to as

"Samneric", and Simon, a sensitive, strange boy who has fits in which he loses his senses.

The boys are scattered over the island and reunite because Ralph blows into a big shell, thus making a big noise, at Piggy's suggestion. They assemble around Ralph and Piggy and decide to organize themselves and do something to attract the attention of a probable passing ship. They had heard the pilot say that a bomb had destroyed the airport so that nobody knows where they are.

The boys elect Ralph their leader, to Jack's disguised disappointment. Nevertheless, Piggy seems a more adult-like boy and that probably explains why he is rejected by the majority.

At the beginning the boys take everything as an exciting adventure, for the island is good and there are no adults. Then Ralph begins to get tired of it and to wish to be rescued. At his suggestion, they make a fire on the top of a mountain so that a passing ship can see the smoke. It is agreed that the fire should be permanently kept. They also build cabins on the shore, to sleep in. Quarrels arise because some of the boys lack responsibility, so that the fire sometimes dies out, the cabins fall to pieces and some of them refuse to cooperate.

Jack decides to hunt so that they can eat meat, and he succeeds in killing a pig. From then on he thinks of nothing else and he and Ralph quarrel because of the fire. Ralph is exasperated because the boys, with the exception of the twins, Piggy and Simon, do not realize the seriousness of their situation.

Jack refuses to accept Ralph's leadership any longer and leaves the group. All the big ones (Piggy, Samneric and Simon excluded) follow him. They spend their time in hunting, first covering their bodies and faces with paint. After the hunting, they dance around the roasting pig. Ralph and his friends come once to watch but the dance is contagious and they also participate. Simon comes from the mountain, on this occasion, to tell them what he had found: there was not any beast in the mountain, as they had feared, only the corpse of a man,

fastened to a parachute. Yet, inebriated by the painting and the savage dance the boys do not listen to him, and kill him as if he were a pig.

The next day Ralph is horrified at what had happened: "I'm frightened. Of us. I want to go home."[97] At night Jack and two accomplices invade Ralph's cabin and steal Piggy's glasses. They needed the glasses in order to build a fire, for the glasses work as a mirror. The problem was that Piggy could not see an inch without his glasses. So, the next morning Ralph and his friends decide to face Jack and his gang who were living in a cavern which they named 'the castle'. There are guardians in front of the cavern who do not allow them to enter. They are armed with wooden spears, and so are Ralph and his friends. Jack refuses to give the glasses back and fights with Ralph. Another boy, Roger, throws a huge stone from above over Piggy who falls twelve meters, on the rocks, and dies. Ralph has to escape and the twins are made prisoners. They are obliged to become members of Jack's gang, but they do tell Ralph that the next day he will be searched for and killed.

Ralph hides in the forest, where he finds the boar skull Simon had alluded to and which he had named "Lord of the Flies".

Since the boys cannot find Ralph they set fire to the forest. The fire spreads rapidly and Ralph and his persecutors rush to the shore where a navy officer has just arrived. He and his crew have seen the smoke and come to investigate. He seems to be disappointed at the boys' appearance, and he notices that something has gone wrong. Ralph says that at the beginning it was all right, but later... And "Ralph wept, for the end of innocence, the darkness of man's heart, and the fall through the air of the true, wise friend called Piggy."[98]

In what concerns satire, *Lord of the Flies* is clearly a Menippean type, with a unified plot and characters. As is usual in satire, the characters have no psychological depth, but are rather types: Ralph, the kind, gentle, dreaming boy; Jack, the tyrant; Piggy, the reasonable, boring intellectual.

The setting is rural, but far from idealized. Ralph and Piggy, the best characters, represent civilization, common sense. They understand what is happening to the others and refuse to yield to savagery. This consciousness is clearly expressed: "But they'll be painted! You know how it is. The others nodded. They understood only too well the liberation into savagery that the concealing paint brought."[99] The paint seems to work for them as the drums work for Kurtz in *Heart of Darkness*. Thus civilization is presented as the better alternative, since it restrains man's natural tendency to violence and savagery, the satirist seems to say, in a moralizing way.

The novel has no humour. The most the reader can do in this respect is to smile. The grotesque is quite mild in terms of description, Piggy's fatness, for example, but there is grotesque behaviour, as in the scene in which the boys dance like savages around a pig. The attack is conveyed through the evil characters — Jack and Roger — and its ultimate main target is human nature itself which seems to reveal its worst facets when far from the restrictions imposed by civilization. What Margaret Drabble says about Golding's fiction in general seems to apply perfectly to *Lord of the Flies*: "[...] the intrinsic cruelty of man is at the heart of many of Golding's novels."[100] And the cruelty here is even more poignant because it is hidden in children.

The novel is pessimistic in its message and also in other aspects, such as the heroism which is not acknowledged, Ralph's endeavours to keep them peaceful are not successful, and the solution presented — their rescue — is a private solution, it does not eliminate the basic problem, human cruelty. Anarchy and confusion reign on the island after some time, but Ralph can be seen as a suggestion of a humane ideal. Not all the boys are naturally evil; they seem, rather, to be easily induced into evil, what attenuates the atmosphere of gloom visualised at first sight.

Bathos is also present, at least on two occasions: Ralph attacks a boar with his spear and is scolded by Jack for not killing it, when

he expected praise; also, when Ralph calls for a meeting and admonishes the boys, emphasizing the necessity of keeping the fire burning, and they interrupt him with other subjects, paying no attention to what he says.

Irony of inversion is seldom used in this novel, for the characters are children. Yet, *situational irony* plays an important role in it: the boys believe that living by themselves on a paradisiacal island will be a fantastic experience. Only later some of them begin to feel the necessity of adults and the security that they provide. Simon is the only one aware of this irony at the very beginning. He knows that a wild beast inhabits their hearts, not the island.

We can distinguish *juxtaposition* in the contrast between the characters of Ralph and Jack, and also in the boys' situation at the beginning of their experience and at the end.

We could detect some *allusions* for parodic effects, for parody may be seen in the boys' behaviour, especially Jack's and Piggy's. The first seems to be the parody of the adult, male tyrant, the second, a parody of an old man, with his mannerisms and his asthma. Also Jack's rise to power and the others' reaction to it seem to mirror adult revolutions and 'coups d'état'. If we take these features as parodic we may consider *Lord of the Flies* an allegory of revolution, the boys standing for men. Margaret Drabble says that "Golding often presents isolated individuals or small groups in extreme situations dealing with man in his basic condition stripped of trappings, creating a quality of a fable."[101] The fact that the characters are children makes the intention clearer. Besides these allusions, there is a clear mockery of works such as *The Coral Island* (1857) or *Treasure Island* (1883).[102]

3. Some Reflections on *Animal Farm* and *Lord of the Flies*

Although *Animal Farm* presents a more elaborate development of a situation, with the many steps that lead the farm from an initially

good situation to a tyranny, than Golding does in *Lord of the Flies*, (and the longer fictional time of the first one is to a large extent responsible for this), the two fictions have striking similarities. Both seem to acknowledge sadly the impossibility of establishing a utopia due to man's inherent evil, or to some men's inherent tendency to tyranny. Both rely on parody: the animals and the boys seem to parody adults' behaviour and vices. The parodic allusion to utopia itself is clearer in *Lord of the Flies:* the desert, unknown island is the favorite location of traditional utopia, as we have seen, and the boys' arrival there, a plane crash instead of the traditional shipwreck, was also used by James Hilton in *Lost Horizon*. In both fictions, the starting situation is optimistic, leading to the hope that everything will turn out well. Man is expelled in *Animal Farm* and the animals are free to rule the farm; in *Lord of the Flies* the island is nice, without danger, and there are no adults to interfere in the boys' affairs. In both, what started well ends badly, with a dictatorship of the strongest. In both, a good leader — Snowball, Ralph — is expelled and a tyrant holds the power — Napoleon and Jack. Thus, through different frames, Orwell and Golding build allegories of the establishment of dictatorships, in which animals and/or boys stand for grown-ups. In both, the ultimate main target of attack seems to be human nature, in its inherent cruelty and thirst for power, which leads to tyranny.

It is left to say that neither *Animal Farm* nor *Lord of the Flies* seems to conform to the idea of dystopia. They are not projections into the future and they do not present an organized state as the one portrayed in *Brave New World* and *1984*. They lack the sophisticated political organization of *1984* (mainly *Lord of the Flies*), or the social sophistication of *Brave New World*, and most important of all, they are circumscribed to a certain space, they are not world states, and so, seem less menacing than dystopia.

E. The Derision of Utopia

1. Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, Book IV

After five months at home, Gulliver received and accepted the offer to be captain of a ship, and go to the South Sea to trade with the Indians and make discoveries. Unfortunately, some of the men he hired as his crew were pirates. They conspired against him, took hold of the ship, made Gulliver a prisoner and finally left him on an unknown shore. As he advanced inland he met some strange animals, quite wild and dirty, full of hair, whom he found out to be human beings. He was delivered from their attack by a horse who revealed himself to be quite civilized. He was taken to the horse's house and to his surprise found a civilization of horses who had their own language and laws, a perfect utopia which had one sole problem, the perpetual menace of the Yahoos, the human beings who were like brutes, completely uncivilized.

As the time passes, Gulliver learns the language of the Houyhnhnms, the horses, which is quite nasal, and is very happy among them. They suspect he is a Yahoo but are not sure because he lacks hair. In fact, his clothes cover his hair and as they get too worn out he cannot deny his human characteristics and the horses notice he is a man.

Although Gulliver behaves very well, his horse master tells him to go away because their assembly has exhorted him to leave. So he builds a boat, leaves the island and arrives safely home.

Let us now examine some social, economic, political and moral aspects of the country of the Houyhnhnms. Their language, according to Gulliver, "expressed the passions very well, and the words might with little pains be resolved into an alphabet more easily than the Chinese."[103] It is also better than German, and here is an irony towards German: "In speaking, they pronounce through the nose and throat, and their language approaches nearest to the High Dutch or German, of any I know in Europe, but it is much more graceful and significant. The emperor Charles V made almost the same

observation, when he said, that if he were to speak to his horse, it should be in High Dutch."[104]

The word *Houyhnhnm,* in their tongue, signifies *horse*, and in its etymology, 'the perfection of nature'. Nevertheless, they do not know how to read or write.

As Gulliver excuses himself for wearing clothes out of decency, his master horse replies that he could not understand "why nature should teach us to conceal what nature had given. That neither himself nor family were ashamed of any parts of their bodies, but however I might do as I pleased."[105]

The horses do not understand the word 'lying', and only use the expression 'the thing which was not'.

They know nothing concerning our common vices, such as lust, intemperance, malice, and envy, and have no terms for them: "He was wholly at a loss to know what could be the use or necessity of practising those vices. To clear up which I endeavoured to give him some ideas of the desire of power and riches, of the terrible effects of lust, intemperance, malice and envy. All this I was forced to define and describe by putting of cases, and making suppositions. After which, like one whose imagination was struck with something never seen or heard of before, he would lift up his eyes with amazement and indignation. Power, government, war, law, punishment, and a thousand other things had no terms wherein that language could express them, which made the difficulty almost insuperable to give my master any conception of what I meant."[106]

The Houyhnhnms are divided into classes, according to the perfection of their bodies and minds, but each has a certain dignity which is respected: "He made me observe, that among the Houyhnhnms, the white, the sorrel, and the iron-grey, were not so exactly shaped as the bay, the dapple-grey, and the black; nor born with equal talents of the mind, or a capacity to improve them; and therefore continued always in the condition of servants, without ever

aspiring to match out of their own race, which in that country would be reckoned monstrous and unnatural."[107]

Reason is the main value of the Houyhnhnms, and friendship and benevolence their two principal virtues: "[...] they will have it that Nature teaches them to love the whole species, and it is reason only that maketh a distinction of persons, where there is a superior degree of virtue."[108]

In what concerns marriage, couples are mated so as not to cause any degeneration in the race, and marriage is everlasting. They have, thus, a concern with eugenics and adopt birth control, so as not to overpopulate their country. "The young couple meet and are joined, merely because it is the determination of their parents and friends; it is what they see done every day, and they look upon it as one of the necessary actions in a reasonable being. But the violation of marriage, or any other unchastity, was never heard of, and the married pair pass their lives with the same friendship and mutual benevolence that they bear to all others of the same species who come in their way; without jealousy, fondness, quarrelling, or discontent."[109]

The Houyhnhnms are brought up with discipline and temperance, and are only given oats and milk on special occasions. They are trained to strength, speed, and hardiness, and they have athletic competitions four times a year, mainly in running and leaping. Male and female horses receive the same kind of education, only the females also receive some lessons in domestic management.

In what concerns government, the Houyhnhnms have a representative council of the whole nation which meets in a grand assembly every fourth year, for five or six days: "Here they inquire into the state and condition of the several districts; whether they abound or be deficient in hay or oats, or cows or Yahoos. And whenever there is any want (which is but seldom) it is immediately supplied by unanimous consent and contribution. Here likewise the regulation of children is settled: as for instance, if a Houyhnhnm hath

two males, he changeth one of them with another who hath two females; and when a child hath been lost by any casualty, where the mother is past breeding, it is determined what family in the district shall breed another to supply the loss."[110]

The Houyhnhnms are very healthy and do not need physicians. Their medicines are made of herbs, and only used for accidental bruises and cuts. They generally die of old age, at 70 or 75, and accept death very naturally, without joy or grief.

In terms of culture, though they do not know how to read or write, they are acquainted with the motion of the sun and the moon and "calculate the year by the revolution of the sun and the moon, but use no subdivisions into weeks."[111] They have good oral poetry, their buildings are plain but convenient, protecting them from cold and heat; they have instruments similar to axes and hammers, made of flint. They use their forefeet as we do our hands, milking cows, reaping oats, cutting hay, etc. They also make vessels of wood and clay.

They have no word to express anything that is evil, "except what they borrow from the deformities or ill qualities of the Yahoos. Thus they denote the folly of a servant, an omission of a child, a stone that cuts their feet, [...] and the like, by adding to each the epithet Yahoo."[112]

In what concerns satire, the fourth book of *Gulliver's Travels* has the same frame of its predecessors: it is a mixed type of satire, a report in the first person in which are mixed the objective descriptions and the narrator's digressions and interpretations.

Wit or humour founded on fantasy or a sense of the grotesque is quite evident, mainly because of the inversion of positions: the human beings behave like wild beasts and perform the tasks usually assigned to horses, whereas the horses behave like civilized people. The whole situation, in which Gulliver tries to pretend not to be human, is quite funny too. The same can be said about his reaction to his family when he arrives back home. Since he cannot stand

their smell or touch, he buys two horses — "which I keep in a good stable, and next to them the groom is my greatest favourite; for I feel my spirits revived by the smell he contracts in the stables"[113] — and talks to his horses at least four hours a day.

The main target of *attack* is obviously human nature, but there are also some specific targets, namely human institutions and social conventions, lawyers, doctors, the avarice and lust of the upper classes as well as their idleness and the exploration of the poor; politicians, the aristocracy, women (lusty and frivolous), the psychological diseases to which the Yahoos are subject (spleen), imperialism, human pride, and the like.

The *grotesque* with a concentration on the flesh abounds in the descriptions of the Yahoos: "Several of this cursed brood getting hold of the branches behind leaped up into the tree, from whence they began to discharge their excrements on my head; however, I escaped pretty well, by sticking close to the stem of the tree, but was almost stifled with the filth, which fell about me on every side."[114]

Gulliver, the satirist, appears to abhor the Yahoo world, with its filth and vices. He even would like to stay with the horses for good, since they are the moral opposites of the Yahoos.

Irony of inversion plays an important role in this section, as well as *irony of situation* since the Yahoos are not aware of the fact that in 'civilized' world they would be the masters and the horses, their servants. The inversion is total, as we can see in the following quotation: "[...] I took a second leave of my master: but as I was going to prostrate myself to kiss his hoof, he did me the honour to raise it gently to my mouth. I am not ignorant how much I have been censured for mentioning this last particular. Detractors are pleased to think it improbable, that so illustrious a person should descend to give so great a mark of distinction to a creature so inferior as I."[115] Thus, not only does the horse behave like a benevolent master but Gulliver thinks no one will believe it due to his own insignificance.

There are many *allusions* to the English, some indirect, as seen in the targets of attack, some quite direct, as the following: "Difference in opinions hath cost many millions of lives: for instance, whether flesh be bread, or bread be flesh: whether the juice of a certain berry be blood or wine; whether whistling be a vice or a virtue; whether it be better to kiss a post, or throw it into the fire; what is the best colour for a coat, whether black, white, red, or grey; and whether it should be long or short, narrow or wide, dirty or clean, with many more, "[116] which the editor of the edition adopted explains as such: "In the seventeenth century Anglican was split from Puritan and later High Church was split from Low Church, on four basic practices: the controversy over the Eucharist, the place of music in the church service, the veneration of the crucifix, and the appropriateness of certain ecclesiastical vestments."[117]

In a last attempt at verisimilitude, Swift ends the book with a chapter which is a kind of a*pologia*, in which he addresses the reader protesting the faithfulness of his report: "Thus, gentle reader, I have given thee a faithful history of my travels for sixteen years, [...] I could perhaps like others have astonished thee with strange improbable tales; but I rather chose to relate plain matter of fact in the simplest manner and style, because my principal design was to inform, and not to amuse thee."[118]

2. Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange*

Published in 1962, *A Clockwork Orange* is a novel in which Alex, a youth of eighteen, tells his own story since he was fifteen. He uses the teenage-argot of a not distant future, perhaps, not always easy to decipher.

Alex is a delinquent, fond of violence, the leader of a gang who go out at night in order to attack people, steal and break private property. And he gives no reason for his behaviour except his liking what he does: "But what I do I do because I like to do."[119]

He tells us that he is an only son, refers to his mother as "my poor old mother", misses school and we are told that he has gone to reformatories.

In one of his violent night excursions, Alex kills an old lady, is judged and condemned. In prison he kills a cell mate, for once he starts a violent act he loses control of himself, feeling pleasure in inflicting pain. He loves classical music, especially Beethoven, but hearing it also incites him to violence.

In prison Alex accepts being the guinea-pig in an experiment that aims at eliminating the instinct of violence. The treatment, called 'reclamation', is planned for a fortnight, and after it Alex will be set free. It consists in receiving a drug injection daily and being obliged to watch violent films, films of torture. After some days Alex develops a biological reaction to violence: he becomes dizzy and sea-sick at the sight or even the mental image of violence. Thus, he is considered cured and set free. Nevertheless, he has not only become docile but also defenseless, and people take advantage of his passivity. An ex-member of his gang has become a policeman and hits him cruelly. His parents are surprised at his return and cannot put him up for, as they only expected him back within six or seven years, they have a lodger occupying his room.

He takes refuge in a certain F. Alexander's house, and soon remembers who the man is. He and his gang had attacked him and his wife and killed her. F. Alexander's friends come to see him and try to use him for political purposes, showing him in the papers as a victim of the government. Trying to escape from them, Alex jumps out of the window and gets seriously hurt. The government pays for his treatment and gives him a good job to avoid the publicity of his case. At the hospital he is cured not only of his bruises but also of his exaggerated tolerance. His parents take him home and he resumes his old style of life, with a new gang. Nevertheless, after a time he gets tired of his life and realises he has grown up. So, at the age of eighteen he feels like an adult. And he wishes to have a home, a wife

and a son. The book ends with his decision to find a wife who will give him a son.

As a satire, *A Clockwork Orange* may be labeled Menippean for it has a unified plot, and at the end the protagonist is changed, though his change does not seem the direct result of his experiences, but of aging. The main target of *attack* does not seem to be violence but the negative view we have of violence and the usual handling of it. The 'cure' to which Alex submits is clearly attacked through the plot events but violence as such is taken for granted as a component of existence, almost as part of the divine will, as Alex puts it: "More, badness is of the self, the one, the you or me on our oddy knockies, and that self is made by old Bog or God and is his great pride and radosty. But the not-self cannot have the bad, meaning they of the government and the judges and the schools cannot allow the bad because they cannot allow the self."[120] At the end, he just gets tired of evil, and thus, regenerates.

Besides attack the novel also presents *humour*, especially wit, through Alex's peculiar language and the way he refers to 'respectable' people.

The setting of the satire is urban, crowded, disorderly and violent.

Pessimism is not so evident, due to the dubious position of the satirist. Alex's problems are solved, but the problem of violence, especially teenagers' cruelty is not solved and the satirist seems to say that aging will bring common sense, and the lady who was murdered, and the woman who was raped and killed are not mentioned any longer. In other words, the satirist just shows how *not* to deal with young gangsters, but the right way is not proposed. Chemicals and psychiatrists and prisons are discarded, and the reader wonders whether Burgess is not saying that a certain dose of aggression or violence is necessary not only for survival, but for life, for violence is a form of energy, and its total elimination would lead to apathy, and death.[121]

The *grotesque* can be seen in the description of violent scenes, especially because of their gratuitousness. The youths' violent acts are just a pastime.

The effect of the treatment is pure *bathos*, and comicality, especially the scene of the demonstration before the authorities, for Alex seems a 'clockwork orange', acting in an absurd way, and his being set free does not mean the exhilaration he had foreseen. His acting like an automaton despite himself reminds one of Bergson's emphasis on automation as a source of comicality.[122]

There are no references to contemporary scenes; instead all the names seem imaginary, and the place could be any big violent city.

Irony of situation is an important satiric device, for through it Alex's treatment is attacked. He is put in an undignified position, offering to please the man who had attacked him, accepting aggression without revolting, in fact, unable to offer any reaction to it. This irony can also be seen in the way F. Alexander treats Alex, without being aware of his real identity. Once he gets the information, he wants to kill him. *Irony of inversion* also occurs, especially in what the doctors and nurses tell Alex during the treatment, that he is becoming normal, as if reacting to aggression were abnormal.

Juxtaposition is another efficient satiric weapon, for we see Alex before and after the cure, and though his outward behaviour has changed, the change is purely artificial, pavlovian since inwardly he remains the same.

There are *allusions* to classic composers, especially Handel, Mozart, Mendelson and Beethoven, and to Arthur Rimbaud. Their function seems to be to help delineate the protagonist who, though well characterized, remains a kind of prototype, the bullying, violent teenager found in big cities.

3. Some Remarks on *Gulliver's Travels*, Book IV and *A Clockwork Orange*

It may seem strange to place *Gulliver's Travels*, Book IV and *A Clockwork Orange* under the same heading, since they are obviously so different, in content, in frame, in targets of attack. Yet, after a careful examination one realises that both fictions mock utopia, though from different angles.

In *Gulliver's Travels*, Books I, II and III we are presented with absurd and fantastic situations, but the human beings, either giants or pigmies, in a peninsula or on a floating island, are endowed with the same basic faults, the same happening with their societies which, after all, do not seem better or worse than the world we live in. But in the fourth book, we are faced with a real utopia, a perfect, organized, peaceful civilization. It even has some of the traditional features of utopia: a council of representatives, like in More; chastity, like in More and Plato; birth control with a concern for eugenics, as in almost all the utopias described in this work; a certain dynamism in the family structure, like in More, and Huxley's *Island*; a concern with education, like in all utopias; a division into social classes, with people happy with their position, like in Plato, More, Campanella, and Bacon, and the like. Nonetheless, this fantastic utopia (from the point of view of the satirist) is a utopia of horses! And in it, human beings are wild beasts, under the control of the horses. Thus, by portraying a utopia of horses Swift is not only attacking human beings, but also satirizing the belief in utopia, as if saying to utopian writers: "A utopia with human beings? It is easier to achieve it with animals". Thus, to the utopian writers' optimism concerning human beings, Swift juxtaposes bitter pessimism, and I cannot imagine a more devastating satire on the utopian ideal than his.

Although Swift mocks the feasibility of utopia he does not seem to question its values, structure and aims, since he keeps them as desirable in his 'utopia' (book IV). Anthony Burgess, on the contrary, seems to challenge the desirability of utopia, seems to question the

value and necessity of such key features of utopia as stability and peace. He seems to accept human nature as it is, and violence as a necessary component of it because equated with energy and vitality.

Thus, Swift and Burgess seem to hold very different outlooks on human beings, the first a very pessimistic one, the second a very tolerant one. Yet, in their very different views and means, they both seem to reject utopia. Swift seems to give it up as impossible but desirable, Burgess seems to reject the utopian ideal as traditionally conveyed. This way, Swift mocks the dreaming, whereas Burgess mocks the dream.

Notes

1 Northrop Frye. *Anatomy of Criticism*, New York: Atheneum, 1970, pp.233-234.

2 Aristotle. *Poetics*, translated with an Introduction by Gerald F. Else, Ann Arbor: The Univ. of Michigan Press, 1986, pp. 21-22.

3 Robert C.Elliott. "The Satirist and Society", in Alvin B.Kernan (ed.), *Modern Satire*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1962, pp. 148-154.

4 Ibidem.

5 Notes from the course "Modern Literary Satire", Georgetown University, May-June 1973, henceforth referred to as "Reagan".

6 Here I am quoting from my M.A. dissertation titled "Molière's Dom Juan and Byron's Don Juan: two different approaches to the same theme", UFSC, 1979, p. 86, where I alluded to Alvin B. Kernan's essay "A Theory of Satire", in *Modern Satire*, op.cit., pp. 164-179.

7 Northrop Frye, op.cit, p.224.

8 Alvin B.Kernan, "A Theory of Satire", op.cit, pp. 176-177.

9 Northrop Frye, op.cit., p. 192.

10 We notice that although Mikhail Bakhtin, in *Rabelais and his World*, also mentions such characteristics, he does so with a positive connotation, in a view of satire, mainly that of the Middle Ages, quite disputable and different from Kernan's and other traditional scholars on the subject.

11 Alvin Kernan, op.cit., p. 173.

12 Ibidem, p. 165.

13 Robert C.Elliott, op.cit., p. 153.

14 Holman, op.cit., p.47.

15 Alvin B. Kernan, op.cit., p. 170.

16 Robert C. Elliot, op.cit., p. 153.

17 Northrop Frye, op.cit., p. 225.

18 Alvin B. Kernan, op.cit., p. 166

19 David Worcester, Selections from "The Art of Satire", in Alvin B. Kernan (ed.). *Modern Satire*, op.cit., p. 186.

20 Ibidem, p. 185.

21 *Encyclopaedia Britannic*. Macropaedia, vol. 7, p. 132, entry: Allegory.

22 Arthur Pollard. *Satire*, *The Critical Idiom*, London: Methuen & Co, Ltd., 1977, p. 41.

23 Arthur Pollard, op.cit., p. 41.

24 David Worcester, op.cit., p. 183.

25 C. Hugh Holman, op.cit., p. 156.

26 Aldous Huxley. *Brave New World*, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1969.

27 Antony Burgess, in *The Novel Now*, op.cit., suggests that the question raised by Huxley in this novel is "Is happiness enough? "

28 Aldous Huxley. *Brave New World*, op.cit., p.163.

29 Ibidem, p. 71.

30 Leonida Campestrini Kretzer, "Brave New World X 1984: a comparison", M.A. dissertation, UFSC, 1985, pp. 89-90.

31 Ibidem, p. 90.

32 George Orwell. *1984*, USA: New American Library, 1961, p. 264.

33 George Orwell, op.cit., p. 142.

34 Eugene Zamiatin. *We*, translated by Gregory Zilborg, New York: E.P. Dulton, 1952, p.3.

35 Leonida C. Kretzer, op.cit., pp. 23,62.

36 Fernando Ainsa, op.cit.

37 Gilles Lapouge, op.cit.

38 In Norberto Bobbio, op.cit.

39 C.Hugh Holman , op.cit.

40 Miriam Kosh Starkman, in the Introduction to *Gulliver's Travels and Other Writings by Jonathan Swift.*, Toronto: Bantam Books, 1986.

41 It is interesting to observe that Swift's scale in Lilliput is consistently 1 to 12; in Brobdingnag, 12 to 1, according to the editor, Miriam Kosh Starkman, in a note on page 38.

42 Probably Lilliput is a combination of "lilli"-little and "put" connoting vice, as in the Spanish "puta"or Italian "putta", according to the editor's note on page 35.

43 Jonathan Swift. *Gulliver's Travels***,** op.cit., p.54.

44 Jonathan Swift, op.cit., p. 71.

45 Ibidem

46 Ibidem, p.72.

47 Ibidem.

48 Jonathan Swift, op.cit., p. 82.

49 Ibidem, p. 83.

50 As seen on pp. 45, 68 and 69, respectively, Jonathan Swift, op.cit.

51 Miriam K. Starkman, note, op.cit., p. 46.

52 Ibidem, p. 63.

53 Jonathan Swift, op.cit., p.67.

54 Miriam K. Starkman, note, op.cit., p.119.

55 Jonathan Swift, op.cit., p. 137.

56 Ibidem, p. 138.

57 Jonathan Swift, op.cit,p. 149-50.

58 Ibidem, p. 96.

59 Ibidem, p. 134.

60 As seen on pp. 99, 102, 112, 123, 122, respectively, Jonathan Swift, op.cit.

61 As seen on p. 134, Jonathan Swift, op.cit.

62 Jonathan Swift, op.cit., p. 102.

63 Jonathan Swift, op.cit, pp.168-169.

64 Ibidem, p. 176.

65 Jonathan Swift, op.cit., p. 207.

66 Bernardina da Silveira Pinheiro in her lecture at the seminar "Utopias do

Novo Mundo", UFRJ, Rio, August 24-28 1992, devised an interesting link between Orwell's Newspeak in 1984 and the project of the Academy of Lagado which aimed at reducing language to a minimum and even suppressing it. As she rightly observed, Orwell was probably indebted to Swift in this aspect for in both cases the result of the procedure would be the elimination of thought. Thus, both Swift and Orwell attack the misuse of science.

67 Miriam K. Starkman, note, op.cit., p. 164.

68 Jonathan Swift, op.cit., p. 157.

69 Ibidem, p. 162.

70 Jonathan Swift, op.cit., p. 199.

71 Miriam K. Starkman, note, op.cit., p. 164.

72 Samuel Butler. *Erewhon* and *Erewhon Revisited*, Introduction by Lewis Mumford, New York: The Modern Library, n.d., p. 71.

73 Samuel Butler, op.cit., p. 130.

74 Ibidem, p. 137.

75 Ibidem, p. 138.

76 Ibidem, p. 143.

77 Samuel Butler, op.cit., p. 173.

78 Ibidem, p. 224.

79 Samuel Butler, op.cit., pp. 100-101.

80 Ibidem, p. 103.

81 Samuel Butler, op.cit., p. 114.

82 Ibidem, p. 94.

83 Ibidem, p. 266.

84 Ibidem, p. 101.

85 Ibidem, p. 114.

86 Samuel Butler, op.cit.,p. 182.

87 Ibidem, p. 188.

88 Ibidem, pp. 216-217.

89 Samuel Butler, op.cit., p. 362.

90 Alvin B. Kernan, op.cit., p. 106.

91 George Orwell. *Animal Farm*, in Alvin B.Kernan (ed.). *Modern Satire*, op.cit., p. 109.

92 George Orwell. *Animal Farm*, op.cit., p. 110.

93 George Orwell. *Animal Farm*, op.cit., p. 141.

94 Ibidem, p. 143.

95 George Orwell. *Animal Farm*, op.cit., p. 145.

96 George Orwell. *Animal Farm*, op.cit., p. 113.

97 William Golding. *Lord of the Flies*, London: Faber and Faber, 1970, p. 173.

98 William Golding, op.cit., p. 223.

99 Ibidem, p. 191.

100 Margaret Drabble (ed.). *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, London: Guild Publishing, 1987, p. 400.

101 Margaret Drabble, op.cit., p. 401.

102 According to Mark Kinkead-Weekes and Ian Gregor, in *William Golding. A Critical Study*, London: Faber and Faber, 1970, p. 21, "Golding reoccupies R.M.Ballantyne's *The Coral Island* (1857) and declares its portrayal of the idealized British boys, Jack, Ralph and Peterkin in their tropical paradise, to be a fake.

103 Jonathan Swift, op.cit., p. 218.

104 Ibidem, p. 224.

105 Ibidem, p. 226.

106 Ibidem, p. 232.

107 Jonathan Swift, op.cit., p. 243.

108 Ibidem, p. 253.

109 Ibidem, p.254.

110 Ibidem, p. 254-255.

111 Jonathan Swift, op.cit., p. 257.

112 Ibidem, p. 259.

113 Ibidem, pp. 271-272.

114 Jonathan Swift, op.cit., p. 216.

115 Ibidem, p. 265.

116 Ibidem, p. 234.

117 Miriam K. Starkman, note, op.cit., p. 234.

118 Jonathan Swift, op.cit., p. 272.

119 Anthony Burgess. *A Clockwork Orange*, England: Penguin Books, 1982, p.34.

120 Anthony Burgess, op.cit., p. 34.

121 This reminds one of Blake's "The Tyger", in which violence seems to equal energy and vitality.

122 Henri Bergson. *Le Rire*. Essai sur la Signification du Comique, Paris: P.U.F., 1975.

CONCLUSION

From the preceding description and analysis one may observe that British literature, and especially British satirists, have dealt with utopia in a number of different ways. Hence, to a quite optimistic view of man which allowed utopian writers like More, Bacon, Wells and even Huxley to devise ideal states in which stability and a reasonable organization promote not only general welfare but also happiness, some satirists have counterpointed a pessimistic view of man which shakes the utopian hope.

Huxley's *Brave New World* and Orwell's *1984* show the reverse of utopia since in these novels utopian features such as the division into social classes, stability and uniformity, and oligarchical power are turned into instruments of dictatorship and de-humanization. To them we may aptly apply the term *dystopia*. In being dark projections into the future they constitute a warning against the power of the State over the individual. The fact that they are focused on from inside approximates them to tragedy and eradicates any possibility of real humour. If it were not for this lack of humour they could probably be labelled the burlesque of utopia. They constitute peculiar samples of satire in the sense that they lack one of its basic elements — comicality — and preserve only attack.

Swift, in *Gulliver's Travels*, Books I,II and III, and Samuel Butler in *Erewhon* and *Erewhon Revisited*, on the other hand, do not present gloomy projections into the future, or negative utopias as Huxley and Orwell did. By using utopian devices, such as the shipwreck, the discovery of unknown places, and the traveller's

report, Swift and Butler seem to laugh at the utopian writers' belief in an ideal state. The worlds they visit are different from ours but they still reveal human follies and absurdities. Furthermore, the two narrators use their adventures to criticize their own country's society and institutions, so that besides criticizing human beings as such they take the opportunity to satirize England and the English. The fact that they are outside observers allows them a detachment which makes humour possible and probably inevitable. Thus, their tone is much lighter than the tone we find in dystopia.

Orwell's *Animal Farm* and Golding's *Lord of the Flies* were qualified as "frustrated utopias" because the utopian ideals of stability and community, added to equality, of the initial situation are shattered into pieces and give place to a dictatorship of the strongest. Both fictions seem to be a sad acknowledgement of the impossibility of utopia due to some people's evil and tendency to tyranny. The ideal is still desirable but acknowledged as unattainable due to man's character.

Animal Farm and *Lord of the Flies* approximate dystopia in the sense that they seem to depict its germ. This fact, added to *bathos*, seems to explain the absence of humour in them. Nevertheless, their being circumscribed to a certain space, and time (in Golding's) and their allegorical content which removes them from realism seem to attenuate their dreary tone.

Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, Book IV, in its turn mocks acidly the belief in utopia, men being what they are. Probably never has man been viewed as pessimistically as in this book, in which men are the beasts and horses are what men should probably be. Utopia does exist, and Swift portrays it in the horses' civilization and praises it, but it is beyond man's grasp.

Anthony Burgess, contrary to the other satirists analysed, seems to doubt the value of traditionally accepted utopian features such as stability and lack of criminality. He displays a mild and benevolent view of man as he is and seems to wonder at the desirability of

utopian values. If violence is equated with vitality and individuality, as his text suggests, its disappearance would mean death in life, and life, then, would not be worthwhile.

Thus, we see that both Swift and Burgess laugh at utopia, but the first laughs at its attempt whereas the second laughs at its content.

Finally, we realise that through the use of different satirical devices, and with a lighter or darker tone, Orwell, Swift, Huxley, Butler and Golding ultimately attack human nature itself, its frailties, folly, and cruelty. Thus they testify to Dr. Reagan's assumption that the ultimate main target of attack in satire is human nature itself. The same cannot be said about Burgess in *A Clockwork Orange*. His outlook on man seems rather tolerant especially when contrasted to the other satirists'. He seems to attack not a human trait but a conventional standard of behaviour which rejects violence. And if violence is accepted in the name of freedom and individuality then a traditional utopian feature is being dismissed.

We may assume that Burgess believed the party's axiom in *We* which said that "the way to rid man of criminality is to rid him of freedom"[1] and decided for freedom, thus accepting man's inherent violence.

Nevertheless, we might venture a second possibility in terms of interpretation if we dislocated the emphasis of Burgess's attack from the absence of violence to its treatment, since the author's attitude is quite ambiguous. In this case, Burgess's target would be the traditional handling of violence. Thus, he would not conform to satire in its ultimate main target of attack which, in *A Clockwork Orange*, is not human nature itself but either the absence of violence or the conventional view of it. In the latter case, he would still conform to satire in one basic characteristic, namely, the absence of a solution. Psychiatry, chemicals and punishment are discarded by him as inefficient and unacceptable to human dignity, but the solution for teenagers' criminality is not presented. It is left to say that if we adhere to this second possibility of interpretation which focuses on

the handling of violence instead of its rejection then the link between this book and utopia becomes extremely tenuous, if at all existent.

Burgess's ambiguity, though puzzling to the reader and contrary to the satiric mode, may perhaps be attributed to a possible sympathy with Laurence Sterne's narrator when he says in *Tristram Shandy*: "Writing, when properly managed (as you may be sure I think mine is), is but a different name for conversation. As no one who knows what he is about in good company would venture to talk all — so no author who understands the just boundaries of decorum and good breeding would presume to think all: the truest respect which you can pay to the reader's understanding is to halve this matter amicably, and leave him something to imagine, in his turn, as well as yourself."[2]

Notes

1 Eugene Zamiatin, op.cit., p.34.

2 Laurence Sterne. *Tristram Shandy***,** New York: New American Library, 1980. With an Afterword by Gerald Weales, vol. II, p. 90.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AINSA, Fernando. "As Utopias Morreram, Viva a Utopia", trad. de Clóvis Alberto Mendes de Moraes. *O Correio da UNESCO*, abril, 1991, ano 19, n.4, Brasil, pp. 7-10 (número intitulado "As Utopias ou a Busca do Impossível").

ARISTOTLE. *Poetics*. Translated with an Introduction by Gerald F. Else. Ann Arbor: The Univ. of Michigan Press, 1986,

BACON, Francis. *Novum Organum ou Verdadeiras Indicações acerca da Interpretação da Natureza & Nova Atlântida*. Trad. e notas de José Aluysio Reis de Andrade. 2 ed. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, Os Pensadores, 1979.

BAKHTIN, Mikhail. *Rabelais and his World*. Translated by Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

BERGSON, Henri. *Le Rire*. Essai sur la Signification du Comique.Paris: P.U.F., 1975.

BOBBIO, Norberto et alii. *Dicionário de Política*. Tradução de Luís Guerreiro Pinto Cacais et alii. Brasília: Editora Univ. de Brasília, 1986.

BURGESS, Anthony. *The Novel Now*. A Guide to Contemporary Fiction. New York: Pegasus, 1970.

_____. *A Clockwork Orange*. England: Penguin Books, 1982.

BUTLER, Samuel. *Erewhon and Erewhon Revisited*. Introduction by Lewis Mumford. New York: The Modern Library, n.d.

CAMPANELLA, Tommaso. *A Cidade do Sol*. Tradução de Aristides Lobo e Introdução de Alceu Amoroso Lima. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Tecnoprint, s.d.

DRABBLE, Margaret (ed.). *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*. London: Guild Publishing, 1987.

ELLIOTT, Robert C. "The Satirist and Society". In: Alvin B. Kernan (ed.). *Modern Satire.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1962, pp. 148-154.

FRONTIER, Alain. "Uma Parábola de Platão". Tradução de Clóvis Alberto Mendes de Moraes. *O Correio da UNESCO*, op.cit, pp. 14-15.

FRYE, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. New York: Atheneum, 1970.

GOLDING, William. *Lord of the Flies*. London: Faber and Faber, 1970.

HODGART, Matthew. *Satire.* London: World University Press, 1969.

HOLMAN, C.Hugh & HARMON, William. *A Handbook to Literature*. 6th ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1992.

HUXLEY, Aldous. *Brave New World*. New York: Harper & Row, Publisher, Inc., 1969.

_____. *Island.* Toronto: Bantam Books, 1968.

KERNAN, Alvin B. "A Theory of Satire". In: KERNAN, Alvin B (ed.). *Modern Satire*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1962. pp. 164-179.

KINKEAD-WEEKES, Mark and GREGOR, Ian. William Golding .A Critical Study. London: Faber and Faber, 1970.

KRETZER, Leonida Campestrini. *Brave New World X 1984: a Comparison*. M.A.Dissertation, UFSC, 1985.

LAPOUGE, Gilles. "O Ideal do Formigueiro". Tradução de Clóvis Alberto Mendes de Moraes. *O Correio da UNESCO*, op.cit, pp. 10-14.

MORE, Thomas. *Utopia*. Translated with an Introduction by Paul Turner. England: Penguin Books, 1981.

ORWELL, George. *1984*. USA: New American Library, 1961.

_____. *Animal Farm*. In: KERNAN, Alvin B. (ed.). *Modern Satire*, op.cit., pp. 105-145.

PASOLD, Bernadete. *Molière's Dom Juan and Byron's Don Juan: two different approaches to the same theme*. M.A. Dissertation, UFSC, 1979.

PLATO. *The Republic*. Translated with an Introduction by Desmond Lee. 2 ed. (Revised), England: Penguin Books, 1982.

POLLARD, Arthur. *Satire*. The Critical Idiom. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1977.

SERVIER, Jean. *L'Utopie*. Paris: P.U.F., Colléction Que Sais-Je, 1979.

STARKMAN, Miriam Kosh (ed.). *Gulliver's Travels and Other Writings by Jonathan Swift.* Toronto: Bantam Books, 1986.

STERNE, Laurence. *Tristram Shandy*. New York: New American Library, 1980. With an Afterword by Gerald Weales.

SUTHERLAND, James. *English Satire*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967.

THE NEW ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA, 15th. Edition, Macropaedia, vol 7 p. 132.

WEBSTER'S NEW COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY, Massachusetts: G & C, Merriam Company, 1973.

WELLS, H.G. *A Modern Utopia*. Lincoln and London: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1967.

WORCESTER, David. Selections from *The Art of Satir*". In: KERNAN, Alvin B. (ed.). *Modern Satire*, op.cit, pp. 179-186.

ZAMIATIN, Eugene. *We.* Translated by Gregory Zilborg. New York: E.P. Dulton, 1952.

Bernadete Pasold was Professor of English Literature at Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina from 1975 to 1996, when she retired. She is still a guest faculty member with the Graduate Program in English at UFSC. She holds a Doctorate in English and American Literature from Universidade de São Paulo and has carried out post-doctoral research at the University of Essex, UK, on the reception of Christopher Hampton's *Savages*. After a five-year research on British satire, she has dedicated herself to the study of modern tragedy..