

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF MOHAMED BOUDIAF - M'SILA

FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

N°:.....



DOMAIN: FOREIGN LANGUAGES

STREAM: ENGLISH LANGUAGE

OPTION: LITERATURE & CIVILIZATION

**The Invalidity of the Institution of Marriage as
Predicted in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*
and George Orwell's *1984***

**Thesis Submitted to the Department of English in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Master's Degree in English Literature and
Civilization**

By: Miss. ABDALLAOUI Djihad and Miss. HADJI Ikhlas

Publically defended before the following jury:

Mr. Mohammed GOUFFI	University of M'sila	Chairperson
Mrs. Nassima AMIROUCHE	University of M'sila	Supervisor
Mrs. Karima LAOUIDJI	University of M'sila	Examiner

2016 /2017

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF MOHAMED BOUDIAF - M'SILA

FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
N° :.....



DOMAIN: FOREIGN LANGUAGES
STREAM: ENGLISH LANGUAGE
OPTION: LITERATURE & CIVILIZATION

**The Invalidity of the Institution of Marriage as
Predicted in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* and
George Orwell's *1984***

**Thesis Submitted to the Department of English in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Master's Degree in English Literature and
Civilization**

By:

Miss. ABDALLAOUI Djihad

and

Miss. HADJI Ikhlas

2016 / 2017

Declaration

We hereby declare that except where due acknowledgement is made, this thesis is the result of our own work and has not been submitted previously.

Acknowledgment

Undertaking this research has been a truly life-changing experience for us, for it has enriched our understanding in matters of love, gender roles, and relationships between men and women. Despite the challenges we faced in terms of the limited time we had to finish this research, we were able to accomplish the aims we set forth earlier for this study.

First and foremost, we would like to express our deepest gratitude to our dear supervisor Mrs. Amirouche Nassima for her having been patient, devoted, and caring. For us, she has always been an incarnation of literature as such. She has always been there for us with her encouragement and the enlightening insights she has provided throughout the course of conducting this study. We greatly appreciate her unwavering belief in us.

Second, we gratefully acknowledge the valuable advice we received from Mr. Senoussi; we are particularly indebted to him for his mindful guidance to us on times of pressure. Also, Mr. Touati has earned our endless love and respect for the support he has bestowed upon us since our very first years here in the English Department at the University of M'sila.

We would like to extend our expression of gratitude and appreciation to the panel of examiners Mr. Gouffi Mohammed and Mrs. Laouidji Karima for their knowledgeable remarks.

And last but not least, we owe our dearest friends and colleagues an infinite gratitude for having marched this past five-year journey alongside us; our journey would not have been as enjoyable or valuable as it was if it were not for their company.

Dedication

“If life is not about the destination, but the journey, then the journey is not just about the road, but the people along that road”

This thesis is dedicated to all the good people I have encountered, and indeed they are so many.

Djihad

Dedication

To the ones that I am indebted to for eternity: my dear father, mother, Toka, Maruoa, Sondous and little Ghaya.

To my friends, teachers, and to the dark shadow of the old days.

Ikhlas

ABSTRACT

In spite of the extensive research on the development of the social institution of marriage and family life through the ages, little is known with certainty about the future of marriage and whether it will remain an institution in decline till it eventually ceases to exist. In their futuristic novels *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Aldous Huxley and George Orwell went beyond merely reflecting contemporary social happenings, to predicting the future of humanity, social life, and social institutions. The plethora of literature dealing with *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* often overlooked the representations of marriage and the family in the two novels, which is the area this study delves into. With the aid of the two English writers, this present study aims at analyzing the two future worlds presented in the novels and the way they relate to the real world, with particular focus on relationships between the sexes, and identifying the reasons for the two societies to break with the institution of marriage and family life as related mainly to the state regulations, the use of technology and the abolition of the traditional gender roles. This research, thus, employs a sociological approach with emphasis on Marxist and Feminist theories from which the findings of this study will be drawn.

Key Words: The Institution of Marriage, Family Life, Gender Roles, Disestablishment of Marriage and Family, George Orwell, Aldous Huxley, *1984*, *Brave New World*.

Table of Contents

General Introduction 1

CHAPTER ONE: Socio-Historical Context

Introduction 6

Section One: The Institution of Marriage from a Socio-Historical Perspective

1. Definitions of Marriage 7

2. A Brief Review of the Development of Marriage in Ancient History

 2.1. The Institution of Marriage in Primitive Society 10

 2.2. The Institution of Marriage in Ancient Greece 12

 2.3. The Institution of Marriage In Ancient Rome 14

3. Marriage and Family in Medieval Europe 16

4. The Institution of Marriage in Modern Era

 4.1. Marriage Reforms 17

 4.2. Cohabitation, Love and Intimacy in Modern Society

 4.2.1. Cohabitation vs. Marriage 18

 4.2.2. Love and Intimacy 19

Section Two: A General Background of the Novels

1. The Novels and their Historical Context 20

 1.1. The Hedonistic Totalitarian vs. the Oppressive Totalitarian 22

 1.1.1. *Brave New World* 22

 1.1.2. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* 24

 1.2. Early Twentieth Century Europe 27

 1.2.1. A Revolution Leading to Turmoil 28

 1.2.2. Eugenics and Reproduction 29

Conclusion	30
------------------	----

**CHAPTER TWO: The Future of the Institution of Marriage in Orwell's
Oceania and Huxley's *World State***

Introduction	32
1. The Government Replacing Parenthood	32
1.1. The Hatchery and Conditioning Centers	35
1.2. Mass Surveillance	37
1.3. Marriage and Family in <i>Brave New World</i> and <i>Nineteen Eighty- Four</i>	38
2. The Disestablishment of the Gender roles	41
2.1. Ectogenesis Takes-Over	42
2.2. Disestablishing Parenthood	45
3. Male-Dominated Society Preserved	
3.1. Second-Class Citizens	48
3.2. Sexual Objectification	53
4. Love and Intimacy	55
4.1. Sexual Promiscuity in <i>Brave New World</i>	57
4.2. The Prohibition of Sexual Promiscuity in <i>Nineteen Eighty- Four</i>	59
Conclusion	60
General Conclusion	62
Bibliography	65

General Introduction

At the dawn of the twentieth century, Europe was swept by revolutionary trends, both new and old refined ones, that changed the way society was conducted. These trends fashioned new ways of life based on the initiative technologies and ideologies of the era. However, setting these trends as the basis for social function, required the abolition of the basic foundations on which the social institutions and values were found, and, consequently, damaging the equilibrium of the traditional set of institutes.

Of the social institutions that were affected by the revolutionary trends of the early twentieth century in Europe, is that of marriage and the family. Marriage and family predominantly define the relationship between a man, a woman, and their offspring through establishing a ritual union which the religious and social conventions deem sacred. Throughout history, this institution constituted the bedrock for the organization of social communities. However, the question of whether or not marriage is as fundamental as it was in the past is becoming controversial. The importance given to marriage varied considerably over the course of history; this is mainly due to the ideological and scientific trends affecting social, political, and economic norms. The new norms emerging in contemporary western societies, in turn, had altered people's perception of marriage.

As representatives of their societies, authors usually adhere to the fact that they are responsible for illustrating the status quo of their communities. As a result, their literary production serves as a reliable source that reflects the progression of the societies during particular eras. During the twentieth century, the social consensus, on which institutions and ritual practices were constructed, became greatly subject to decomposition resulting from the introduction of new ideologies and social norms which spanned the West at that time. The literature affected by the scientific revolution, sequentially, triggered writers to

address these serious social issues in their works. This associated them more with the dystopian tradition in terms of the pessimism they offered through their literature. Following the two world wars, the conversion of the social values restricted the men of letters no longer to the mere depiction of reality; they started, then, questioning the conclusions their societies would reach if certain status persisted.

In this respect, Aldous Huxley and George Orwell brought into focus the idea that a fundamental change was striking the traditional concepts of marriage and family institutions. Based on the context of their time, Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) reflect the issue of the recession in importance of familial and marital relationships. These two novels do not only illustrate facts surrounding marriage, but they also go further to anticipate the developments that could be underlying this institution if certain circumstances were to surround it.

The totalitarian state in the two novels seeks to invade every aspect of citizens lives, hence affecting human and social relationships as well. In Huxley's novel this dominance is achieved through hypnopaedia¹ and conditioning, while Orwell's functions on the basis of coercion, persistent surveillance and sanctioning. This interference affects the functioning traditional social institutions. Once the social institutions are reshaped accordingly with the state's policy, it ceases to function the traditional way. Marriage and family, thus, being one of the most crucial social institutions lose their meaning and become tools to serve the states.

This research tackles a facet of the two novels on which little research has been conducted. The literature dealing with the gender roles and the states' totalitarianism in the chosen works of Huxley and Orwell is expanding. Several studies were conducted to explain the ideas presented by these two novels which envision a future devoid of social

¹ Sleep teaching

values and human relations. However, little has been said on the relationship between this totalitarianism and the abolished gender roles and the change that the institution of marriage and the family has been subject to in these literary works.

Two of the investigations done on the question of relationships in Huxley's *Brave New World* and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are Tomislav Mišić's *The Question of Intimacy in the novels Brave New World by Aldous Huxley and 1984 by George Orwell* (2016), and Cass R. Sunstein's essay *Huxley and George Orwell's Contrasting Views of Love and Sex* (2011). The thesis of Mišić focuses on the ways in which totalitarian states in the two novels deprive people of intimacy and deny them the fostering of any close relationships with fellow citizens, in order to prevent any kind of disorder and achieve total control over the people. Sunstein, on the other hand, touched on the issue of gender relations as depicted in the two futuristic novels. Sunstein concluded that the totalitarian regime in Huxley's *Brave New World* seeks to take advantage of people's eagerness for happiness to promote promiscuity as a way of control over the people. Distinctively, in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* the government represses intimate relations between males and females to maintain stability and avoid political rebellion. According to Sunstein, these different attitudes of the states in the two novels led to major changes underlying social values.

Overlooking the transformation surrounding the social organization of marriage, and the way the changing gender roles and state interventionism affected it in Huxley's *Brave New World* and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, is one essential point that has been missed by the previously mentioned works. The works give more importance to the influence of gender roles and state dominance on intimacy and sex in the two novels, as dissociated from the issue of marriage and family as a declining norm and the reasons leading to its decline.

In the two works in hand, the authors present a conception of the future of the institution of marriage and the family amidst turmoil and social transformation. The present study aims at defining the reasons which resulted in the decline of the marriage-family institution. This problem relates itself with two major questions. While one of them concerns the relationship between the recession of the institution under investigation and the state's regulations to it, the other one deals with the future anticipated for the development underlying the institution of marriage and the family in the two novels and reasons leading to this future. The study will also touch on the controversy resulting from the claim that by disestablishing the gender roles, egalitarianism will be the mood prevailing in the relationships between the sexes in the societies of the novels. This will help explain the visions Huxley and Orwell tried to communicate for the future of marriage.

Studying marriage and family decline in relation to gender roles and the states in the two novels will require approaching them using Feminist and Marxist perspectives. The Feminist gender role theories of Simone de Beauvoir and Nancy Julia Chodorow will provide the basis for the analysis of the gender roles and gender relations in relation to the institution of marriage and the family. Furthermore, the Marxist theory will aid in studying the role of the state in rejecting the institution by means of the family disestablishment theories of a Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

This study will be presented in two chapters. In the first chapter the historical background of the study is outlined. The first section will provide a general historical background of the development of marriage, followed by a section that introduces *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and their literary and historical contexts. The second chapter entitled “*The Invalidation of the Institution of Marriage in Orwell’s Oceania and Huxley’s World State,*” consists of four sections. The first section discusses the challenges

which the institution faces in order to maintain its existence in the two worlds. The second presents an analysis of the role of the state in disestablishing marriage and the family and taking over their role. The third section discusses how the disestablishment of certain familial gender roles of females affects the institution under discussion. The following section presents how disestablishing the gender roles does not make of the societies less sexist, while last presents how love and intimacy are abolished by the states.

CHAPTER ONE: Socio-Historical Context

Introduction

Over the past few decades, the marriage-family institution has become a fascinating field of study for researchers of various disciplines. The contemporary debates about the future of the institution of marriage, family life, and gender roles stem from the evolving nature of marital practices and relationships between sexes. In fact, the meaning of marriage itself is still a subject of passionate debate. Even prior to the emergence of same-sex marriage debates, both anthropologists and sociologists were yet to agree on one sufficient definition (Coontz 24). As a universal social phenomenon, marriage was orchestrated through many cultural trends throughout history. Therefore, analyzing the multiple historical trends of marriage may help in envisioning its future evolution, or at least predict the results of its decline in contemporary society.

In literature, Aldous Huxley and George Orwell, two renowned English writers, attempted to put family and marriage under scrutiny through predicting their future in their novels *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. In these novels, the two writers rely heavily on the implications provided by the modern social changes. Of these changes, the technological advancement, totalitarianism, and the collapse of social norms may be drawn out from the two works as the basis upon which the predictions of the authors were laid.

This chapter will deal with how marriage has changed and evolved through time leading to its disfavor by contemporary Western societies, and demonstrate the way it was celebrated by both ancient and modern social groups with reference to anthropological and sociological studies. In the second section, this chapter will introduce *Brave New World*, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and their writers, and elucidate the historical context of the

aforementioned works. Furthermore, the historical context of Europe at the dawn of the 20th Century will be furnished.

Section One: The Institution of Marriage from a Socio-Historical Perspective

1. Definitions of Marriage

Marriage is popular because it combines the maximum
of temptation with the maximum of opportunity

-Henri Philippe Petain

The Institution of marriage, which represents one of the most ancient social institutions, has undergone certain stages of development throughout history. Thus, the newly emerging forms of marital and family relationships and the lately discovered practices of marriage in early times, approved either by “custom or law” (Westermarck 03), have prompted sociologists to continually refine the boundaries of the meaning of marriage. However, a universally accepted definition of the term cannot be sufficiently and satisfactorily provided due to the rapid changes in “relationships between the sexes” (1). It would be of much aid, then, to state a variety of definitions, which were set forth by some notable researchers in the field, in order to reach the most fitting conceptualization of the word marriage.

Marriage, as defined in Westermarck’s thorough research *The History of Human Marriage*, is “nothing else than a more or less durable connection between male and female, lasting beyond the mere act of propagation till after the birth of the offspring” (19). He emphasizes the effect of our biological nature on how the practices of matrimony developed, and how Darwin’s natural selection shaped our desires for marital union and family life. In the hitherto given definition, Westermarck attempts to exclude all the “loose

connections” which, according to him, cannot be “honored with the name of marriage” (20). However, in his later book, Westermarck admits that his earlier definition, which has received much criticism, includes certain sexual practices that one would not consider as marriage; and excludes other forms of relationships which one would give the name of marriage, such as child-free married couples. Given that Westermarck’s first definition does not account for all forms of matrimony and family life, another suitable definition, therefore, can be found in his later book, in which he defines marriage as “a relation of one or more men to one or more women that is recognized by custom or law, and involves certain rights and duties both in the case of the parties entering the union and in the case of the children born of it.” (03). This definition is wide enough to include most, if not all, sexual practices which were, during one time or another, considered as legal marriages such as monogamous, polyandrous, polygynous, and group-marriages.

According to Edward Westermarck, thusly, the desire for establishing family life, which all human groups and social categories manifest according to their own marital rituals, is biological, and we can trace back its history to early primitive humans. Human nature and its craving for family and long-term mating behaviors, however, must be distinguished from the “elaborate rules about whom one should, must, or cannot marry” (Coontz 25). This means that humans, apart from their biological making, have established social norms and rules to regulate sexual activities as they saw fit. These social conventions and rules, which are the natural consequences of the social communities established by humans, prevailed over marriage and family systems throughout history. It should be noted, however, that the rules, upon which the ritual union of marriage was built, have varied from one social group to another, but the sanctity attributed to marriage amongst all social groups is a feature of “the seeming universality of marriage” (26).

In 1949, George Peter Murdock, an acclaimed anthropologist, defined marriage as a “universal institution” made-up of a man and a woman whose relationship is built upon three main elements: common residence, economic cooperation, and socially accepted sexual relationship. Murdock’s definition was, nevertheless, criticized by Stephanie Coontz, a leading historian, in her 2005 book *Marriage, a History*. In this book, Coontz explains that there are many exceptions which may be drawn from Murdock’s definition and thereupon used in arguing against him. She exemplifies her point with the Ashanti people of Ghana and the Minangkabau of Indonesia. In these two tribes, husbands and wives live remotely from each other and men, in particular, live with their mothers and sisters (26). In 1951, the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain published a different definition from that of Murdock; stating that marriage is “a union between a man and a woman such that children born to the woman are the recognized legitimate offspring of both partners.” Like Murdock’s definition, the institute’s definition ruled out other forms of matrimony.

Marriage in modern times presents, in turn, other concepts related to family and marital life. The reasons why people nowadays enter into wedlock are unconventional to their ancestors. Certain elements, such as love and intimacy, are highly considered by modern men and women when choosing their significant other (Coontz 307). Such ideas must be presented whenever an attempt to define the institution of marriage is made. Hence, Renata Grossi argues, in *Looking for Love in the Legal Discourse of Marriage*, that:

Over time, marriage has been understood in many different ways. It has been considered central to sexual expression and the procreation of children, the formation of community and of social and political alliances. It has been considered as an important way to regulate property, citizenship and the giving and receiving of care. While many of these functions are not denied by a contemporary understanding of the institution, a significant argument now exists that marriage in contemporary society is, and should be understood primarily as an institution that gives expression to love (17).

Therefore, on the basis of the information which was put forward by the aforementioned scholars, it may be said that marriage is a sanctioned union between a man and a woman engaging in a sexual activity; and this relationship, however, may or may not result in offspring. Understanding the meaning of marriage, thus, may facilitate the forthcoming discussion of its future.

2. A Brief Review of the Development of Marriage in Ancient History

2.1. Marriage and Family in Primitive Society

Understanding the advancement of human societies depends, to a large extent, on the amount of valuable information we may obtain from studying the early human history. In fact, a better comprehension of social phenomena, regarding how humans constitute social rules and establish social institutions, would be attained from the body of knowledge about ancient human history. Therefore, in order to understand marriage in contemporary society and, consequently, anticipate its future course, we need to have a glimpse at its early manifestations. Marriage, either as a sacred social practice or simply as a common social activity, is by no means the invention of the civilized man. Of course, we may derive different connotations for the institution of marriage throughout times according to how people behaved towards it and how it was celebrated by each separate social group.

When attempting to study the development of a certain social practice chronologically, a suitable system of periodization would be needed in order to facilitate the study and analysis of that social phenomenon. On that account, the historical system, which categorizes past events and time periods beginning with the first written records, seems the most appropriate and fitting for the study of human marriage. Before delving into the task of reviewing marriage in Ancient History, starting off with prior knowledge about marriage in pre-historic epochs would be of great benefit.

In his *Studies in Ancient History: Primitive Marriage*, J. F. McLennan, ventures into the research world of ancient social phenomena. His book stands out as an unprecedented rigorous study of primitive marriage and marriage ceremonies. In regard to primitive marriage, McLennan explains that for the features of primitive marriage to be well demonstrated, “we must look, not to tribes of the Kirghiz type, but to those of Central Africa, the wilds of America, the hills of India, and the islands of the Pacific” (03). Because, according to him, we may find in these societies new marriage laws or, by contrast, we may realize that what we label today as “marriage law” was unknown to them during that time. Dr. McLennan adds farther, that “Marriage laws, agnatic relationship, and kingly government, belong, in the order of development, to recent times” (03). In fact, the family system or family relationships were not yet developed as we may observe in recent times; even patrilineality was far from being the norm to them. In the Seneca tribe, for instance, “decent was reckoned in the female line” (McGee 373). One might wonder about the use of a North American tribe to exemplify the spread of matrilineality in pre-historic periods; hence, it must be noted that” in the sciences of law and society, old means not old in chronology but in structure” (McLennan 03).

In 1877, Lewis H. Morgan, an American anthropologist, classified the history of human progress into three main epochs; from savagery to barbarism then to civilization (Engels 39). Thus, in order to investigate the beginning of family structures and marital values, we need to examine the first two epochs which represent the time of the pre-historic man. Group marriage was the most common form of marriage in pre-historic times. The mating behavior of the social groups practicing them, also known as the consanguine family, is arranged according to generations that is to say, “all the grandfathers and grandmothers within the limits of the family are all mutual husbands and wives, the same being the case with their children, the fathers and mothers, whose children will again form a third circle

of common mates, their children... in turn, forming a fourth circle” (Engels 51). All adult members of one group or family, who are usually blood-related siblings, may be sexual partners. In *The Origin of the Family*, Engels argues, however, that the so far explained connotation of group marriages and the consanguine family, in particular, has now become extinct. Moreover, the assumption that blood-related group marriage represents the first stage of family development came from the system of consanguinity observed in Hawaii, in which certain degrees of consanguinity are performed and therefore can only be the result of such a form of the family (52).

2.2. The Institution of Marriage in Ancient Greece

The family system in Ancient Greece and Rome, along with the concepts surrounding marriage and its inner workings, bears some resemblance to the systems established in modern times. During that period of time, the institution of marriage became the basic unit of society unlike in prehistoric times, in which marriage was manifested in various forms and by no means obligatory. In ancient Greek and Roman worlds, men and women were obliged to enter into wedlock in order to belong to society and achieve a high social status. In fact, men were not considered as full men unless they married and established a family. These ancient beliefs, therefore, have established the foundations upon which modern family systems were built.

A deep examination of marriage as practiced by the ancient Romans and the Greeks, however, shows that the concept of matrimony was far from being the same for the two civilizations. In ancient Greece, “the arranged marriage was the norm” (Glazebrook & Olson 69). Through marriage, which was a transaction between the father of the bride and the groom, men could attain social value and status, social networks, and legitimate heirs. Whereas women, who had no say in the marriage process, could acquire social value, privilege, and a sexual partner through matrimony. Moreover, monogamy, as one might

expect, was the only authorized form of marriage for the Greeks. However, men, unlike women, were allowed to have other sexual partners beside their one legitimate wife (70).

Perhaps the most significant characteristics that substantially distinguish marriage in ancient Greece from Roman marital relationships are age disparity and gender roles in the family. In Classical Athens, the typical age for the woman was fifteen years old, whereas men were expected to marry once they reach their thirties. This age disparity was socially sanctioned in order to ensure the husband's authority over his wife (Glazebrook & Olsen 70). In regard to Greek women's marital and social life, women were discriminated against, could not own property, or decide autonomously in matters regarding their own lives. They were also expected to be sexually virtuous and inexperienced. If this trait is possessed, they would receive much praise because producing legitimate heirs was the primary purpose of marriage in their society (69). When the husband and wife failed in their intended task of producing offspring, the husband could divorce his wife and return only half of the dowry given by her family. Marriage, however, was only a ceremony witnessed by the family and the local community; that is to say, no legal or state registration was required (Patterson 60).

Despite the fact that family in ancient Greece was primarily patriarchal, the marriage system differed geographically and from one time period to another (Glazebrook & Olson 80). In ancient Sparta, for instance, the bride was older and the groom was younger than thirty years old (Pomeroy 44). In contrast to the archaic and classical Greece, men and women in Hellenistic times as well showed an unprecedented interest in finding a partner with whom they could share romantic love with and eventually marry (Glazebrook & Olson 75). This, therefore, represents the emergence of new concepts such as love and intimacy which would be associated with the institution of marriage and family for the first time in history. The emergence of these new elements as foundations of marriage does not

mean, nonetheless, that feelings of love and infatuation never occurred between men and women in earlier times. In regard to this, Stephanie Coontz argues, in her article on the origins of modern divorce, that “romantic love was not unknown in the past, but it was not closely linked to marriage” (8). She explains furthermore that people in the past married in order to accumulate wealth, gain social status and alliances, and produce offspring (8).

In the ancient Greek world, especially in archaic and classical Greece, women were regarded as second class citizens and their role was limited to child-rearing and taking care of the household (Cartwright 2016). Many Greek authors, such as Aristotle, describe women as “unproductive, wasteful, lacking in self-control, and thus untrustworthy” (Glazebrook & Olsen 69). Moreover, in his article “Women in Ancient Greece”, Cartwright explains that women were put under the authority of their husbands or guardians because men in the Greek society believed that women were incapable of making reasonable decisions. He adds farther that relationships between the sexes in ancient history differed from one city-state to another, and that information regarding the Greek family is still lacking (2016).

In Hellenistic times, Greek people were introduced to new cultures and cultural groups due to Alexander the Great’s campaigns. This, as a result, brought major changes to the ancient Greek world, the institution of marriage, and particularly to gender roles. Egyptian marriage contracts, for example, were adopted by Hellenistic Greeks which provided women with more rights, such as economic rights and divorce proceedings (Glazebrook & Olsen 75). One may easily notice, therefore, the major development of the institution of marriage from a matriarchal institution in prehistory to a patriarchal one in ancient Greece.

2.3. The Institution of Marriage in Ancient Rome

The Roman Empire, which enforced a republican form of government, succeeded the Greek Empire in 168 B.C. Despite the fact that the two entities were separate empires,

scholars prefer to use the term “Greco-Roman culture” when they refer to the prevailing way of life in ancient history (Maxwell 1). Relating to the family system and the institution of marriage, Glazebrook and Olsen put forward the claim that there are certain variations and differences between the Roman and Greek worlds, as well as many similarities (80). Furthermore, C. Mervyn Maxwell states, in his article *Women in the Greco-Roman World*, that “Greek and Roman cultures had been blending around the Mediterranean basin for over 200 years” (1). This shows that other Mediterranean cultures exerted their influence on the two empires and were, in turn, influenced and enriched by the Greco-Roman culture.

Thus, in the ancient Roman Republic, marriage maintained its value as one of the pillars of society and, just like marriage in ancient Greece, monogamous and arranged marriage remained the most common form of marriage among Roman people. Regarding marital age and gender roles, women were expected to marry before they reach their twenty years of age, while men tended to marry in their twenties. Women were brought up to be virtuous and obedient wives but, unlike women in ancient Greece, they could own property, divorce their husbands, and their consent to the marriage contract was required (Glazebrook & Olsen 75).

Marriage in the ancient Roman Republic was still a customary institution with little state interference. According to Wasson, “the state played little or no part in a marriage. Most were simple and private affairs while others were far more elaborate and expensive. Basically, a couple was married if they claimed to be and divorced if they said so” (2016). However, Treggiari argues that authorization to contract a legal marriage was not obtained by all in Roman society; slaves and soldiers could not marry until Emperor Severus succeeded to the throne (qtd. in Glazebrook & Olsen 77.).

Women in Rome, just like their counterparts in ancient Greece, were under the control of their fathers (pater familias) or their husbands. Despite being considered as citizens, they were denied the right to vote and they could not hold official positions (Wasson). This, in fact, had its impacts on the family system and matrimony. Marriage in ancient times was deeply rooted in patriarchy and gender inequality. The husband, for instance, could prosecute his adulterous wife, while women had no right to do the same (Glazebrook & Olsen 79). So, in ancient history, marriage was a transaction between men, people entered into wedlock seeking status, privilege, and legitimate children.

3. Marriage and Family in Medieval Europe

Before the Catholic Church became the dominant institution in Mediaeval Europe, marriage was a transaction between two parties with little interference from the state or the church (Glazebrook & Olson 08). However, when the church asserted its authority during the Middle Ages, marriages and weddings could only be conducted under the supervision of the priest (qtd. in Titshaw 218). The church took the responsibility of setting certain rules and laws that people had to abide by in order to regulate relationships in society. In *Marriage, a History*, Stephanie Coontz sheds light on the laws that were prescribed by the church in Medieval Europe and states that “for a marriage to be valid, the council stated, three things were necessary: the bride had to have a dowry, which effectively undercut the independence of a young woman from her parents; banns had to be published beforehand; and the wedding had to take place in a church” (106-107). Reading the banns was an important pre-wedding step. People were notified of the imminent marriage so that they could object to the marriage if they knew any reasons why the two could not marry (107).

Since the Roman Catholic Church controlled the way marriage and wedding rituals were conducted, the dissolution of the marriage bond was also according to its strict teachings. In fact, there were only few grounds for a marriage to be dissolved as “a

husband or wife could get a judicial separation for only three reasons: adultery, a partner's heresy, described as "spiritual fornication"; and extreme cruelty, although the cruelty had to be very extreme for a woman to initiate a separation" (Coontz 108). Medieval gender roles did not differ significantly from gender roles in ancient times. Women were still expected and required to be obedient, chaste and submissive to their husbands (Coontz 120). The sanctity of marriage and family relationships, therefore, grew stronger during the Middle Ages but the change in gender roles, marital relationships, and marriage norms was following a slow pace.

4. The Institution of Marriage in the Modern Era

4.1. Marriage Reforms

As early as the 11th and the 12th centuries, Europeans started a number of social reformation movements which aimed at refashioning the marriage and family code. Due to the dominance of the Roman Catholic Church and its strict rules for marriage, it was not until the 16th century however that people started to enjoy the fruits of the reforms brought by the Protestant reformation² because marriage, to the reformers, was what "stabilized individuals and society as a whole", and family was "the cradle of citizenship" (qtd. in <http://issues.cune.edu/>). Martin Luther, furthermore, insisted on the important of marriage and family for all, even for priests and nuns, by arguing that "all creatures are divided into male and female; even trees marry; likewise budding plants; there is also marriage between rocks and stones" (qtd. in Coontz 134). Notwithstanding the growing importance of marriage to Europeans by the 17th century, they were still far from embracing love, intimacy and equality as essential elements for long-lasting marriages (Coontz 135).

² The Reformation "also referred to as the Protestant Reformation and the European Reformation, was a schism from the Roman Catholic Church initiated by Martin Luther" (en.wikipedia.org)

As industrialization spread around the world during the 18th century, many profound changes were brought to Western Europe societies. Those changes were so far-reaching that they even influenced the social structure and the family systems. Arranged marriages, for instance, were overthrown by marriage for love (Coontz 145-146). Furthermore, Stephanie Coontz explains:

The spread of wage labor made young people less dependent on their parents for a start in life. A man did not have to delay marriage until he inherited land or took over a business from his father. A woman could more readily own her own dowry... young people were no longer obliged to live in a master's house for several years. They could marry as soon as they could earn sufficient wages. (146)

Gender stereotyping in the family was addressed by some notable thinkers and philosophers in 18th century Europe. Mary Wollstonecraft, a philosopher and an advocate of women's rights, stood against men's authority over women and called for equality in marriage (Coontz 149). This was, thus, the dawn of feminism leading to a series of demands for reforms in marital and familial relationships.

4.2. Cohabitation, love and Intimacy in Modern Society

4.2.1. Cohabitation Vs. Marriage

According to the International Encyclopedia of Marriage and Family, cohabitation is a "consensual union or [a] de facto marriage, [which] refers to unmarried heterosexual couples living together in an intimate relationship" (315). Cohabitation arrangements, in their modern meaning, were extremely rare before the 1970s and were even considered a taboo before that date (315). As more and more unmarried couples choose to cohabit, many scholars tend to set this new pattern of partnership as a major factor leading to a sharp decline in marriage rates. In fact, it is due to a number of reasons that cohabitation became a common social practice. Women, for instance, and by the end of the 1970s, were given the possibility to access employment, education, birth control, and more civil rights

(Coontz 261). As a consequence, living with a male partner without having to tie the knot, while obtaining almost the same benefits of a legal marriage, seemed a better option for women who feared for their freedom from a dominating husband.

Cohabitation, as a social phenomenon, goes through four main stages of development which may be drawn from the experience of people in Sweden and Denmark. In the first stage, cohabitation begins as a rare phenomenon practiced by a few people in a social community while the majority of people, on the other hand, choose to enter into wedlock without pre-marital experiences. In the second stage, however, cohabitation becomes a preparatory phase for people prior to a marital contract. The third stage represents an important phase in which cohabitation gains social approval and becomes an alternative to marriage. Lastly, in the fourth stage, marriage and cohabitation become synonymous with the same childbearing rights (Kiernan 5).

4.2.2. Love and Intimacy

The idea of love and intimacy as an essential element in the family code was not recently developed. Renata Grozzi, in this respect, informs that romantic love between genders dates back to the classical times, but the term love was not used until the 19th century (10). However, Francesca M. Cancian, a renowned sociologist, argues that “marital intimacy, in the modern sense of emotional expression and verbal disclosure of personal, was probably rare” (17). Perhaps the fact that marriage shifted from being an economic transaction conducted by men paved the way for young people to seek emotional connection with their future partners. Stephanie Coontz, on the other hand, classifies love and intimacy among the major factors leading to the decline in marriage rates (Journal of Marriage and Family 978). She explains that dictating that marrieds should provide emotional energy for each other and for their nuclear family breeds stress and instability in the family life (978). Feminists, also, hold a negative perspective on romantic love in

marriage. According to Feminists, love is a patriarchal tool used by husbands to maintain their wives devotion; and after entering into matrimony, women become the sole providers of emotional support and love (Grozzi 108).

Section Two: A General Background of *Brave New World* and *1984*

1. The Novels in their Context

Utopian literature does generally envision a content human life and set an idealistic picture of the future society. Starting with Plato's utopian *Republic*, the body of utopian literature experimented with the new ideologies of their own times, set up the blueprints for the organization of all the aspects of society, and schemed the future of humanity (Ferns 32-34). However, the delighted sketches of the utopian future were often disturbed with bleak ones at the wake of the twentieth century (105). The anti-utopias, or dystopias as they are often called, depict the grim aspects of civilizations as a way to denounce their defects, provide hideous envisioning of the future, and warn against what could lead to such a future.

In his book *Narrating Utopia*, Chris Ferns notes that the utopian and dystopian writings are usually driven by the existing conditions of the milieu of their authors; and thus were those of the twentieth century (105-106). During the twentieth century, the developments in technology and advancement of both new and old refined ideologies and libertarian thoughts created a variety of responses on the part of writers. Some writers perceived the unrest of the century as the door opened toward a more sophisticated world and embraced it as a redeemer of mankind; the English novelist Herbert George Wells is the most memorable of those writers. On the other hand, opponents of the negative aspects that the

unrest brought about, took a position to condemn this unrest and warn against the potential future that would devastate humanity and the planet.

Tony Burns in his book *Science, Politics, and Utopia in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four*, denotes that critics disagree on whether H.G. Wells is considered a writer of utopian or dystopian literature (20), but what came to be known as the Wellsian tradition, bound to his optimistic writings, created an atmosphere of general optimism at the wake of the twentieth century in the British society (Lichtheim 44-45). The Progress of society and science are closely related in Wells's utopia. Wells was convinced that society owed its development to science and that scientific progress was the salvation for humanity (Reiff 61). Thanks to this contribution of his to the body of utopian literature, as well as other writers', technology and the new philosophies were zealously welcomed. The positivist attitude toward the evolution of the era, however, was struck by the outcomes of the evolution itself (Kohlmann 1-2); a growing sense of skepticism and fear dominated Europe following the two wars breaking the optimistic anticipations of Wells and his positivist counterparts (Lichtheim 45). Despite the fact that there still existed an air of cheerfulness, thinkers of the time worried that science and new ideologies were bringing humanity and human institutions to their end; and this idea was discussed in a number of eminent literary works of the century.

Driven by the conditions in which Europe stumbled in the first half of the twentieth century, novelists of dystopia set their fictional states in worlds that resembled Europe and the West at that time. They further anticipated what the world could be like if adherence to modern science and ideology diverted away from its intended objective, that is, serving humanity. The two novels this study focuses on, George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932), were among those works. They were intended to serve the purpose of warning against the plight of societies both run by

the state, and in which human society institutions and human values are demolished as a result of complete adherence to new ways of thinking.

The states in the two novels dominate every aspect of their citizens' lives; thus interfering with human relations and the social institutions related to them. The institution of marriage and family is one of those institutions affected by the state's control. In the two novels the relationship between men and women is restrained, and family ties are not as important as they were in the past. The ideological totalitarian attitude in *Brave New World* toward the institution, and the coercive one in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, both cause the tethers of the relationships within the institution to loosen and fade gradually.

Despite the fact that Huxley denied any intentions of penning his novel as a prophecy (Bloom 13), and so did Orwell in a letter of his (CEJL 502), Huxley admitted that his novel was becoming reality by the 1950s, while Orwell said at the same instance in which he denied the prophetic aspect to his novel that he expects something similar to arrive, which was the case with Stalinism. The changes spanning the West over the twentieth century established them both as two prominent anticipatory tales.

1.1. The Hedonistic Totalitarian vs. the Oppressive Totalitarian:

1.1.1. *Brave New World*:

Aldous Huxley's scientific and literary heritage provided the background for his literary production. The literary lineage of his parents Leonard and Julia Arnold Huxley, and the scientific background of his grandfather, Thomas Henry Huxley, replenished the material for his writings (Bloom 12). Huxley's father was an editor of an outstanding literary journal; his mother had a sister novelist, Mary Humphrey Ward, and a poet uncle, Matthew Arnold; while his grandfather was a proponent of Charles Darwin and his own disciple. Aldous was more interested in science than in literature, but his loss of sight at the age of

sixteen made him follow a literary career. A number of writings were, then, brought forth by Aldous Huxley, of which his novel *Brave New World*, written in 1932, obtained an enormous popularity, with its world being built upon a scientific utopia.

The world just emerging from destructive world war, is all unified under one world state. In this brave new world entirely based upon scientific advances' dominance, the state supervision has replaced every social and human institution. This entrenched a new way of life based on artificial happiness provided by drugs, promiscuity, and sex, which are encouraged by the state. Consequently, the connections between humans are disestablished, and the time when feelings of closeness and intimacy existed, or when the “parents were the father and mother” is terminated (Huxley 19); it is rather vulgar and inappropriate to associate with others emotionally and to have what became considered as vanished kinship relations with others.

Society functions on the basis of hedonism, and human beings are conditioned to stay under control of the state. Thus, non-marital relationships are encouraged as there is no legal bond to couple men and women, contraceptives are widely used to prevent natural impregnation while children are reproduced and reared in the Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Center, rather than in an established family of one's own; this would allow the state more control over its population.

Likewise, human beings are conditioned before birth to belong to a certain social strata from Alpha, the highest stratification, to Epsilon, the lowest. Hence, they are subject to having certain traits that define the societal positions which are designed for their own class, and embrace certain behaviors bond to a modern set of social codes of the World State.

Aldous Huxley stated in one of his letters that he was “writing a novel about the future — on the horrors of the Wellsian utopia and a revolt against it” (qtd. in Beauchamp 12). As

satire of the scientific utopia of H.G. Wells, *Brave New World* was written as a caricature to the modern West which was dominated by constant scientific evolution. Raychel Reiff discloses that for Huxley the evolution which the society was experiencing based on scientific development and the government's rule was gradually leading it to its abyss(61-62). In the World State, where the novel is set, humans are reduced to conditioning to serve the needs of the state. Conditioning human beings results in a loss of freedom and of affinity; which are quite essential for the human life to proceed. The life as based on serving human relations and traditional institutions of society is, therefore, abolished and replaced by a life dedicated to serving the mere objective of sustaining the stability in the state's community, which could be threatened by any close bond established between freemen.

Huxley's State is a realized utopia, where almost every idea of a perfect life exists and anguish has been eliminated. Following the world war, people of the State live in peace; and this peace in turn allows for the economy to flourish and for all efforts to be directed toward perfecting life in the State. The contentment created by an all-artificial atmosphere, satisfies the individuals' hedonistic needs, hence, annulling dependability on the community and disestablishing the committed relationships that had once bound humanity together. This establishment of control over the populace uses conditioning to facilitate the process of rendering the government's actions acceptable, unlike in Orwell's novel in which coercion is the means to achieve the same goal.

1.1.2. *Nineteen Eighty-Four (1984):*

Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was described by its publisher as:

a picture of man unmanned, of humanity without a heart, of a people without tolerance or civilization, of a government whose *sole* object is the maintenance of its absolute totalitarian power by every contrivance of cruelty. (Warburg)

Compared to Huxley's novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is set in a totalitarian state. While in the Capitalist London of *Brave New World* the government conditions people to accept its rule and laws, the Party in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*'s Socialist London utilizes coercion to subdue the citizens of Oceania. The people in Oceania are denied the right to self-expression and are deprived of any act that asserts their humanity by means of terror, propaganda, and unceasing surveillance.

The political thoughts and views of Orwell's later life shaped his latest novel along with the influence of some predecessor utopian literature of his era. Orwell, a prominent British political essayist, was a proponent of socialism, yet he rejected the total devotion to leaders like Hitler and Stalin and grew hostile to certain communist ideals, especially after he witnessed the betrayal of the Soviet Union to the Republicans in Spanish Civil War (Rossi & Rodeen 4-6). The literary influence exerted on the writing of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was most notably that of H.G. Wells's scientific utopian fiction, the Russian novelist Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*, and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. With amalgamating a reversion of the Wellsian optimistic tradition, a mold of the plot of Zamyatin's novel including the totalitarian state, synthesizing them into a pattern of themes similar to Huxley's work, and constructing all of these elements upon Orwell's own political views on totalitarianism, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* came into being (Meyers 116-117).

The ruling Party, under its leader Big Brother, outlaws privacy, loyalty and affinity in the state of Oceania, the setting of the novel. Ceaseless surveillance of the telescreens and the thought police negates privacy and aids in detecting any potential thoughts that oppose the Party's policy. In addition to that, trust and loyalty disappear as even children would declare their parents' treachery to the Party. Anything that is performed for individual goodness is, also, prohibited and no feelings of love and affinity are allowed, because "there [is] no loyalty, except toward the party. There [is] no love, except the love of Big

Brother” (Orwell 220). Based on that, the human relations and social institutions are deformed as in Huxley's work, and any existing institutions are kept but for the Party's sake or because no substitutes for them are found yet.

Winston Smith, the protagonist in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, secretly condemns the party's false practices. Unable to bear children and craving sexual freedom, he is abandoned by his wife whom he detests, and eventually meets Julia with whom he engages in a love affair. They both consider their affair an act of rebellion, which Winston views as a possible grain of which a revolt of the coming generations against the oppressing Party would emanate. While Winston considers his rebellion an act performed for the future generations to be free from the Party's control, Julia rebels for the mere sake of rebellion, because she believes that the Party cannot be defeated. Winston and Julia's relationship gets them arrested and tortured until they deny their feelings for each other and submit to declare their love for the Party alone.

Annihilating the essence of humanity and human relations with this agenda of surveillance and constraint would prevent men from coming together and rising to threaten the Party's existence, on the one hand. On the other hand, it would help to eventually disestablish the accustomed associations of society when they are of no benefit to the state; these would be replaced by institutions that would serve the state, like in the case of *Brave New World*.

Nineteen Eighty-Four is often considered a foresight into a future in which a totalitarian system takes over. Orwell's book was perceived as a direct attack on socialism which he denied (Crick 154). He disproved as well of his novel to be considered a prophecy. Instead of a prophecy, he would rather describe it as a cautioning novel (154), with which Harold Nicolson agreed in his review in the *Observer* in 1949 (7). For Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* does not actually predict the future that the world was marching toward, but rather it

creates an image of a future world that could come into existence if no necessary precautions were taken to prevent it. Yet the extent to which certain aspects of the novel are becoming reality calls into question its being just a cautionary novel. Aldous Huxley, however, came to approve of Orwell's projection of Oceania in the future in which Stalinism prevailed in his *Brave New World Revisited*, although he admitted that this prophecy is only temporal for Stalin's time (17)

1.2. Early Twentieth-Century Europe:

The optimism prevailing over Europe at the dawn of the twentieth century had its roots in the welcoming perception of the revolutionary trends of the new era. The advent of brand new technologies and modern progressive philosophies created more indulgent attitudes toward life and a rejection of the tradition. The thriving industry could provide a luxurious life for the populations, and the scientific progress did just as much. New scientific theories provided rational explanations for nature that deemed religious interpretations void, and ideas of Marx and Nietzsche, among other philosophers, were highly advocated and discussed by masses seeking to achieve a meaningful life outside the boundaries of church (Lichtheim 44-68).

This optimism, however, was interrupted by a growing grief over what the unrest of that age had induced (Trevor 1471). The technological innovation included the development of refined weaponry which left the continent devastated following the First World War, and which heightened pessimism in the general atmosphere. Einstein's original theory of relativity, for example, was to be used along with other theories of nuclear energy, to construct a massive destruction bomb (Peat 3-8). The advents in eugenics and artificial reproduction, although aimed at enhancing human offspring, put their ethical practices under question, and contraceptives contributed to the spread of sexuality. Furthermore, following liberal and progressive ideologies, a tendency toward moral decay was

conquering the new totalitarian regimes which were established. This was considered the most defective of all the revolutionary trends of the twentieth century. This turmoil, doubtlessly, led to a cynic vision of the future in the futuristic novels rather than to a hopeful one.

1.2.1. A Revolution Leading to Turmoil

By 1900, the technological revolution was about to change the world altogether. The scientific inventions and discoveries of the era, issued a new way of life in Europe. The need for power supplies led to an advancement in harnessing several sources of power supply; this in turn contributed to the advancement of weaponry. Furthermore, innovations in medical technology, among other fields, enhanced to a great extent the quality of life in the West in general.

Energy to serve distinct uses needed to be processed from distinct source. According to Arthur J. Taylor, after the nineteenth century there was a need to turn into more effective energy sources. Fossil fuels, for instance, came to replace wood, wind and water-generated power (173); oil fields provided fuel for the new motor transportation utilities and it gradually displaced coal as the major energy source. The most notable source of energy of the century, however, came to be the atomic-generated energy, whose use diverted to render it the fashion which led to the world's most nightmarish arms' race.

Emerging during the interwar period in Europe, and heightening in the Cold War, totalitarianism is often coupled with the dictatorships arising in Russia, Germany and Italy; thus becoming one of the most nightmarish terrors of the twentieth century Europe. The term totalitarianism was first coined by the fascist leader Mussolini who summarized the oppressive tenets of the totalitarian state in one statement (Sturzo 222). Totalitarianism is mainly associated with three aspects: centralization of the government which seeks to

accomplish a certain goal; the annihilation of individuality; and finally the abolition of the social institutions that are deemed to be of little benefit to the totalitarian state.

1.2.2. Eugenics and Reproduction

The late nineteenth century faced with such issues as that of the over-population in an industrial Europe and the desire for enhancing human reproduction, presented policy-makers with a serious question that concerned itself with the desire to control the population, both in quality and quantity. This intends to maintain the social and economic policy functioning properly. Viewing this as a major threat to the Western Europe and America, scientific planning, through eugenic engineering and biotechnology, came to contribute with what the existing social and political institutions of the time sought as difficult to achieve (Allen 1-3).

The main social aim of eugenics was sustaining control over the population by means of this enhancing the quality of the human offspring through eliminating defective genetic qualities from the fetus, and regulating birth rates to conform it with the government policies' goals. This was made simple by advancing techniques of artificial insemination and sterilization and contraception.

What social and political institutions of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century conceived sometimes as problems related to society, genetics came to identify with humans themselves. People with genetic deficiencies for example could be viewed as providing additional burden on the governments' expenditure if they proliferated, since they would transmit their genetic traits to their offspring, and this found its solution in sterilization operations and artificial reproduction, employed either to sterilize the defected or to enhance the genetic qualities of their offspring whenever possible. Both techniques were popularized at the wake of the twentieth century (Allen 4)

The beginnings of the development of contraceptive technology were not as promising, no successful effects could be claimed for it in the nineteenth century (Potts and Campbell 9). However, experiments led finally to successful effects following the First World War. The most famous experimentations on hormonal sterilization were launched by the Austrian physiologist Haberlandt, they provided the basis for what was to develop into the contraceptives as known today (11).

While supported enthusiastically by the state and eugenicists, eugenics' relevance to morality was often questioned. Policy makers welcomed artificial reproduction and its techniques for it contributed to social stability. But on the other hand, artificially enhancing human reproduction was socially and religiously opposed; some novelists of the era, including Huxley, have even condemned its use and presented the world with pictures of what would happen if eugenic engineering got too far from moral implication.

Conclusion

Given that marriage is an ever-changing social institution, numerous scholars have acknowledged that attempting to set forth a universal definition of marriage might prove problematic. Due to countless factors, marriage has evolved throughout the ages and has been used to denote different cultural practices and rituals. Considering that marriage represents different meanings to social communities, the misconceptions that frequently arise when scholars endeavor to distinguish marital practices from non-marital ones. The one definition, which may meet the requirement of including the different marital practices and family lifestyles that have shaped relationships between the sexes, is that marriage is a union between a man and a woman engaging in a sexual activity sanctioned by law or social norms. This chapter explored the history of marriage with

reference to the institution of marriage ancient civilizations and how it organized and prevailed over their social life, such as Rome, Greece and Medieval Europe. As for Modern times, new concepts and practices were included in contemporary marriage and family life; cohabitation became almost synonymous with marriage in many Western societies, whereas contemporaries perceive love and intimacy to be essential elements for long-life marriages.

As for Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the first chapter aims at revisiting Europe during the penning of the novels and relating them to contemporary revolutionary trends which were hailed by men of literature. In the 20th Century, Europe was advancing and flourishing with the aid of the industrial and technological advances; however, this development was disrupted by the turmoil that prevailed the whole world and the emergence of totalitarian regimes.

Chapter Two: The Future of the Institution of Marriage in Orwell's Oceania and Huxley's World State

Introduction

According to what the first chapter has elucidated and demonstrated, Huxley's and Orwell's prophetic works, which were penned during the social and political unrest of the 20th century, were commented on and labeled by their writers per se as cautionary novels. Although the careful reading of the two works may as well yield different interpretations and perspectives on the predictions that the writers present, most critics are affiliated toward classifying the worlds of Huxley and Orwell as dystopian. Since the foreseeable future of marriage appears to be gloomy to scholars as well, this chapter therefore will discuss the major ideas presented in the novels and delve into the analysis of those predictions in order to understand the future of marriage as it is anticipated in both novels.

In order to identify the root causes that led Huxley and Orwell to prophesize the downfall of the institution of marriage, family life and traditional gender roles, this chapter will therefore explore the major factors leading to their decline and abolishment and how these changes have been built up and developed in the World State and Oceania. Also, this chapter will demonstrate and analyze how governments replaced parenting and human reproduction, how people are indoctrinated to appreciate sexual love and abandon monogamous love in *Brave New World* by the Ten World Controllers; whereas for people of Oceania they are socially indoctrinated to break away with sexual pleasure, strong emotions and individual thought .

1. The Government Replacing Parenthood

In the 1920s and 1930s, totalitarianism swept across the world leading to the establishment of many totalitarian governments such as Germany, Italy, Spain, and Japan.

In this respect, Huxley's *Brave New World* and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* were composed in the midst of this global oppression and the turmoil of the two world wars. Aldous Huxley and George Orwell attempted to envisage the possible future manifestations of totalitarian thought based on a careful examination of totalitarian regimes, the advancement of humanity, and the contemporary world events. Orwell and Huxley did not only tackle the issue of authoritarian states in the modern world; their futuristic novels presented their substantial views on the future development of social institutions and relationships between individuals as well. Moreover, it is the government as a conditioning entity that represents the edifice of Orwell's and Huxley's prophesized templates.

The late Marxist theorist Antonio Gramsci explains through his *Theory of Hegemony* that the new form of hegemony, which the state utilizes to maintain its control over people, is nearly completely reinforced without the use of force. He argues that "man is not ruled by force alone, but also by ideas" (Bates 351). Hence, a particular regime would combine force with consensus as its system of rule in order to make people believe that the use of force is based on the consent of the majority and for the welfare of the majority (363).

This form of conditioning may be found in *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eight-Four* in which people are led to believe in the righteousness of the state's tyranny. In the very first pages of *Brave New World*, for instance, the Director of the Hatchery and Conditioning Center explains to his students that the system of Conditioning "is the secret of happiness and virtue- liking what you've got to do. All conditioning aims at that: making people like their inescapable social destiny" (Huxley 12).

In the two dystopian worlds designed by Huxley and Orwell, the governing body is in the form of a dominant minority of rulers who indoctrinate the other classes in society to serve the social order. In *Brave New World*, the world is administered by the World State

and represented by the Ten World Controllers. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, however, the government is headed by the omniscient Big Brother and the Inner Party. Both governments are totalitarian, but force is far from being the main tool they use to subdue people. Louis Althusser, a notable Marxist thinker, in his *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus*, explains the role of ideology in making people subjects to the social order and the ruling class. Althusser identifies two main forms of social institutions; the first one serves the interests of the state by using force and oppressive means, while the other institutions use certain ideological and societal mechanisms to create obedient citizens. He terms the first framework “Repressive State Apparatuses” (65), which uses forces such as the police, the military, the prison system, or the government itself. The other framework is “Ideological State Apparatuses” which is represented by civil institutions, such as the church, the family, the school, the media, sports and the arts (78-79).

The social institutions that Althusser identified as paramount for the stability of one unquestioned social system are employed differently in the two novels. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, and contrary to Aldous Huxley’s novel, the government and its social institutions are not abolished but refashioned to serve the Inner Party of Oceania. “Our duty to the Party” is hence a frequently uttered slogan by Winston’s wife in the novel (Orwell 110). Whereas, in *Brave New World* all previously known social institutions are abolished because they are a danger to social stability. As the novel relies on technological advancement as a replacement for nowadays civil institutions such as family and schools, the government plays the role of parents and teachers to ensure that its citizens are being brought up in its advanced centers according to its rules. Thus, stability is what matters most to the World State as Mustapha Mond explains:

‘Stability’, insisted the Controller, ‘stability. The primal and the ultimate need. Stability. Hence all this.’ With a wave of his hand he indicated the gardens, the huge building of the Conditioning Centre, the naked children furtive in the undergrowth or running across the lawns. (Huxley 36)

In her article *Parenthood in English Literature*, Margarita Georgieva presents an overview about how parenthood was depicted by men of letters throughout history in their literary works. She states that:

[Parenthood] . . . involves a number of daily responsibilities, and financial and affective obligations such as the education and instruction of one's children. The notion of "parenthood" also presupposes an active concern for a child's welfare, physical and intellectual development. Initially, parenthood was concerned with teaching the taboo, with what is forbidden (2).

However, in *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* the duty of parenthood is significantly transformed. On the one hand, children in Huxley's work are brought up and reared in factories by machines, that is to say that the government is the sole responsible for the child. In Orwell's world, on the other hand, parenthood is not completely abolished. In fact, childbearing becomes people's duty to the state because they have to produce children who would become future servants of the Inner Party. Hence, parenthood becomes more complicated and at the same time devoid of emotion. Here Althusser's theory of Ideological control appears again regarding how the minds and lives of "the working class [are] manipulated to accept the ideology of the dominant one" (Dobie 80). Consequently, in the two novels, the state is represented as the sole parent of all citizens and society as one big family.

1.1. Hatchery and Conditioning Centers

In Huxley's future world, science and technology are the most fundamental building blocks of society. In fact, Huxley believed that, with the rapid advancement of science and technology, future governments would design "a fully developed science of human differences, enabling government managers to assign any given individual to his or her proper place in the social and economic hierarchy" (qtd. in Rieff 66). According to Huxley's prediction, the advancement of science and technology would perform the functions of civil institutions, including the institution of marriage and family, and deprive

them of their importance as the building blocks of social systems. As Bowering argues, the World State in the novel uses science to create “a race which loves its servitude, a race of standardized machine-minders for standardized machines who will never challenge their authority. The [. . .] thinking and spiritual man has been sacrificed in his entirety” (66). This means that Huxley’s *Brave New World* does not only prophesize the future of humanity, but it also presents the possible impacts of technology on humans in the future.

Hatchery and Conditioning Centers are high-tech facilities where people are genetically engineered. In *Brave New World*, natural procreation exists no more and childbearing and rearing are replaced by the work of highly advanced machines at the Hatcheries. The opening lines of the novel describe Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Center where people are produced using eugenic breeding techniques to yield five different social castes. This Hatchery and Conditioning Center “is little more than a factory that produces socialized humans” (Bloom 21).

Much to our surprise, humans are not only produced at the Hatchery and Conditioning Centers. Once the five castes are engineered, ranging from intelligent Alphas and Betas to less intelligent Gammas and Deltas then to moronic Epsilons, the children are then subjected to “mind- and body-altering technology, including hypnopaedia (hypnosis during sleep), Pavlovian conditioning, elaborate cosmetic surgery, and happiness pills” (Posner 13). These processes aim at making all castes accept their position in society which would consequently eliminate class struggle. For instance, the Elementary Consciousness Lesson at the hatchery goes as the following:

Alpha children wear grey. They work much harder than we do, because they’re so frightfully clever. I’m really awfully glad I’m a Beta, because I don’t work so hard. And then we are much better than the Gammas and Deltas. Gammas are stupid. They all wear green, and Delta children wear khaki. Oh no, I don’t want to play with Delta children. (Huxley 22-23).

Moreover, Richard A. Posner points out that the future technology described by Huxley in his *Brave New World* does not stem from the government's desire to improve the lives of its citizens and rid them of all responsibility related to parenthood (14). However, the government's real intentions are "to create the conditions in which a tiny elite can combine complete control over social, political, and economic life with the achievement of material abundance" (Posner 14). Despite it being totalitarian, the World State Government succeeds in eliminating what Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels term, in their *Communist Manifesto*, "class struggle and class antagonisms" (33).

1.2. Mass Surveillance

In Orwell's future world, the oppressive state regards social stability and the passivity of the populace of Oceania of great importance because the task of designing passive citizenry, in order to perpetuate the dominance of the ruling class, may be easily hindered by the minority that might exhibit its belief in individualism. Moreover, although the technology that is portrayed by Orwell in his novel is ahead of its time, Posner argues that "Huxley's novel is much more high-tech than Orwell's" because Huxley was brought up by a scientific family to be a doctor, but Orwell "had no familial or educational background in science" (12). However, technology in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is what the government relies upon, it takes advantage of it to organize social institutions and direct people's lives.

Perhaps every change that has occurred in Oceania was directed by the state and not in any way did it stem from the natural course of events. Indeed, every human being and every institution in Oceania was crystallized by the Inner Party to meet its interests. O'Brien explains that to Winston; that the state aims at controlling and directing people's minds and not only their behavior. He, thus, emphasizes that "the Party is not interested in the overt act", and that "thought is all [they] care about" (Orwell 209). As it realized the importance of mind control, the Inner Party thereupon embarks on its mass surveillance

program in order to perpetuate social blindness, and that not any sort of rebellious or individual thought will ever lurk in the darkness again.

The state, with the help of technological innovations, keeps the people of Oceania under total surveillance. The telescreen, an instrument used by the Party to monitor people's actions, keeps people on line and reminds them that "Big Brother is always watching" (Orwell 05). In his paper *Propaganda and Surveillance in George Orwell's 1984*, Michael Yeo points out furthermore that surveillance does not aim at monitoring people's actions and speech only, but also their "thought and belief" (55). Therefore, the difference between the society of *Brave New World* and that of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is that the social order created by the government is engineered in people before birth in the first, while forced on people in the latter by means of total surveillance, propaganda, and brainwashing.

1.3. Marriage and Family in *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

In the two futuristic novels of Huxley and Orwell, the portrayal of the development of marriage and family relations has resulted from the writers' views on totalitarianism, oppressive regimes, technological advances, and the effects of these on social institutions and citizens. In fact, the meaning attached to marriage and family in *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* may seem unprecedented in human history to modern readers, but Stephanie Coontz argues, in *Marriage, a History*, that almost all forms of marital rituals, sexual activities, and family relations that we may think of as unprecedented have been practiced before in human history (02). In regard to this, the major concept that surrounds and reinforces the representation of marriage and family in the novels, despite them being represented differently, is the insignificance of these two institutions.

In Huxley's *Brave New World* and due to technological and scientific advancement, all previously known social institutions and practices were disestablished and abolished including the institution of marriage and family relations. According to the system of

thought that pervades the brave new society, marriage and family, monogamous relationships, and fathers and mothers are all “sources of misery, tension, and painful strong emotions” (Posner 87). This is because, as stated by characters in the novel, those institutions and relationships are complexities that may, if not most definitely, lead to global warfare and social chaos. With the aid of technology that enabled the state to produce humans at the Hatcheries, the necessary evil of marriage and family could be deinstitutionalized because society does not need any more to assign the task of child-rearing to mothers and fathers, nor does it need males and females to produce them. Regarding the meaning of family to the citizens of *Brave New World*, the Controller Mustapha Mond explains that “Ford [who is a kind of deity in the novel] had been the first to reveal the appalling dangers of family life”, and as a result people in Huxley’s world tend to feel profoundly offended whenever things related to marriage and family are mentioned (Huxley 33).

In Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, marriage and family are not, yet, completely abolished because the Inner Party does not possess the means necessary to eliminate them entirely. However, the sanctity that has been attributed to the institution of marriage and family in the social groups previous to that of Oceania is not observed in the novel. That is, despite the fact that there are husbands, wives, children, and family life in Orwell’s world, the meaning of all these expressions is perceived in a new way by the people of Oceania because the state keeps refashioning them according to its interests. As the state cannot abolish marriage and family in society because no replacement is yet available, it instead decides to put marital and familial relationships under its watch and eliminate motherly and fatherly love.

Moreover, children in Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are not the offspring, if we may say, of their biological mothers and fathers, but the offspring and future servants of the

state. Children in Oceania are “turned into ungovernable little savages”, used as spies against their parents, and assigned to the task of detecting “symptoms of unorthodoxy” (Orwell 24). Due to the fact that the government needs obedient sons and daughters, the Inner Party encourages marriage in society “for the sole purpose of begetting children”, and divorce is only permitted “in cases where there were no children” (Orwell 57). In the novel, O’Brien communicates to Winston the future plans of the Party and Big Brother in regard to family relationships and he states that:

In the future there will be no wives and no friends. Children will be taken from their mothers at birth, as one takes eggs from a hen[. . .] Procreation will be an annual formality[. . .] Our neurologists are at work upon it now. There will be no loyalty, except loyalty towards the Party (Orwell 220).

In other words, the Party’s plan is to turn men and women into machines that need to produce human being according to the needs of the ruling class and consume its products. According to O’Brien's explanation, the coming social system would be based on mass production and mass consumption with total passivity on the part of the people.

As the idea of marriage and family abolition is of interest to Marxist and Feminist theorists alike, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels express in their works their rejection of the family institution (Weikart 664). The two philosophers were influenced, as Weikart claims, by the French socialist Charles Fourier who “believed that monogamy was an institution contrary to human nature”, and that society should be one big family while the state’s duty is to rear children instead of parents (658). According to these abolitionists, the family system must be disestablished because the duties assigned to husbands and wives are unequal. Moreover, children need to be liberated from the parental control inflicted on them at least by weakening the parent-child ties (665). In regard to monogamous relationships, this latter need to be replaced by “free love” because, according to Charles Fourier, monogamy is against human nature, limits human happiness, and enslaves the female sex (657-658).

The aforementioned concepts seem to be all put together and experimented in Huxley's *Brave New World* and aspired to by the society of Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. For instance, monogamous relationships and family life are prohibited by the World State in *Brave New World* because, according to the Controller in the novel, "everyone belongs to everyone else" (Huxley 34). Although Marx Bernard rejects this lifestyle, due to a birth defect, as he wishes to have a monogamous relationship with the pneumatic Lenina, all other citizens in the *Brave New World* embrace "free relationships" because they are engineered and indoctrinated to accept them. Unlike people in Oceania, people in Huxley's future world are, both men and women, happy and content as Marx, Engels and, Fourier said they would be, but the absence of individuality and freedom in the future world may be what these philosophers had missed.

2. The Disestablishment of Gender Roles

According to the French Feminist Simone de Beauvoir, marriage is more inclined to be established on the basis of what society necessitates; the cord associating a couple with each other, then, has less to do with their relationship itself, and more to do with their community (423). Accordingly, under the association of her new life after marriage, the woman has a number of roles to transact for the society, two major roles of these are to be dealt with in this section: the first of which is to "provide society with children..." (Beauvoir 416), and the second is to nurse and care for those children (Chodorow 4).

As one is biologically conditioned to have the physiological structure that defines her as the child-bearer, the female is resolved to perform the task of reproduction. In spite of that social and biological conditioning of the woman, and due to the progress brought by science in the field of eugenics, de Beauvoir discloses that for more than a century "the reproductive function in particular has no longer been at mercy solely of biological chance; it has come under the voluntary control of human beings" (467). Modern technology can

now provide an artificial, well-conditioned environment for the embryos to develop outside the uterus; in addition to contraceptive means that allow for preventing impregnation, which both account for the decline of the human reproduction as a necessity.

If for de Beauvoir marriage is more associated with reproduction, it is for the feminist Nancy Chodorow strongly associated with child-rearing as well (4). Once a woman bears a child, she is initiated within her maternal role. Assigned to the social projection, the woman, then, conceives that she is responsible for nursing and loving her child. Chodorow mentions that the role of mothers as care-providers for their children, and of the family in general as an educator for them, is in decline. This is mainly due to the influence of industrialization and the adaption to the modern lifestyles on families (32).

In the novels under investigation, the institution of marriage and family is deemed to perform the obligations required of it by the society, and those obligations ascertain a number of gender roles bound to them. However, the states in both novels seek to replace those gender and family roles, which in turn would affect the way they function within the institution.

2.1. Ectogenesis Takes-Over

In *Brave New World* biotechnology reigns over the World State, and affects every aspect of the people's lives. Eugenics comes to be the most prominent field of this technological development which renders mating for the sake of procreation needless. Female ova are artificially inseminated and then kept in incubators, fetus are then decanted artificially. All the processes resulting in human reproduction are now performed in special centers: the Hatcheries, which provide suitable environment to perform unnatural selection procedures. This selection is regulated in accordance with what the industry of the state demands. In the *Savage Reservation*, by contrast, the traditional human reproduction is preserved as there is no need to abolish it.

Following a massive world war, the aim of the rulers of the World State becomes maintaining stability and preventing any potential future conflicts from arising. To achieve this purpose the state has to gain control over the world population (Huxley, *Revisited* 63). The use of compulsion was far from achieving the desired goal, hence, the key could be found in reproductive technology that eased both reproducing and conditioning human beings:

In one set of bottles biologically superior ova, fertilized by biologically superior sperm, were given the best possible prenatal treatment and were finally decanted as Betas, Alphas and even Alpha Pluses. In another, much more numerous set of bottles, biologically inferior ova, fertilized by biologically inferior sperm, were subjected to the Bokanovsky Process (ninety-six identical twins out of a single egg). (Huxley, *Revisited* 39-40)

Undergoing certain processes of unnatural selection and conditioning, cloning that allows for a mass procreation, and hastening the course of maturity of the ova, human beings are procreated so as to sustain the World State's "social stability," which is the advantage that the human natural reproduction does not grant.

The one fertilized egg for the elite factions, and the Bokanovsky division for the Gammas, Deltas and Epsilons, allow for regulating the count of each class in the population proportional to the number of roles that are necessitated to be filled, in order to maintain the stability of society. While the Alphas and Betas, the more intellectual than the rest, occupy the few higher professions that are preserved for them, a larger populace of the other factions is needed to be employed in menial works; this makes of the Bokanovsky process essential.

Another point is referred to in the opening chapter; the Director of the Hatchery Center explains to the students the significance of "Podsnap's Technique" (05). The Director points out that the eggs would take quite a long time to mature, the task of the Hatcheries is, then, to limit that time as maintaining the populace stabilized calls for a rapid

procreation, not just a mass productive one, which is again something the maternal reproduction does not yield.

Since the state would need a huge count of the population conditioned after what its policy requires to execute industry and maintain social stability, the traditional human reproduction cannot be depended on, either in terms of count or in terms of the time required for reproduction. The conveniences provided at the Hatcheries contribute in exceeding the limitations imposed by the natural reproduction, thus rendering the role of women as child-bearers nullified in the *Brave New World* of Huxley.

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four* the story of the gender role of child-bearing is different. For the means to artificial reproduction are not attained yet, marriage still has to exist. Yet the “only recognized purpose of [it] was to beget children for the service of the Party” (57). Women are needed to procreate, so they are still considered the child-bearers. Oceanians are forbidden by the party to form any intimacies or enjoy sex with each other, not even spouses are allowed to. Thus the best practice seems to the Party to be denying individuals their right to choose a partner, for the only approved unions are those in which the spouses are intending merely to perform their “duty to the party” (57-58).

A good example of the institution created to meet this interest of the Party is that of Winston Smith and his wife Katharine. Winston views Katharine as frigid, and fails every attempt he makes to render her otherwise. Katharine hates sexual intercourse, which the party viewed as “disgusting,” but as long as it was the duty she had to perform for the Party, she did it on a regular basis in hopes for producing a child. After she makes sure they are unable to bear a child, Katharine parts ways with Winston (58).

The child-bearing role is, thus, still preserved in Orwell's novel because no substitute for it has been settled for yet. Child-bearing is implemented as a service for the Party, and her certainty that she cannot bear a child with Winston, makes Katharine see their

relationship under marriage as futile and, so, she decides to leave. Despite their current unavailability, the Party sets plans to develop techniques of artificial insemination, which would help in reproducing children without the need for mating which it despises, only then could human reproduction be annihilated (57).

2.2. Disestablishing Parenthood

Once a woman bears a child, she is initiated into her maternal role; becoming a mother for her child now, a child-mother relationship is formed. This child-mother band is basically related to the mother's nursing tasks that she undertakes toward her child, and is closely linked to the broader educational role of the family.

In the World State of Huxley, motherhood is altogether annihilated and women, encouraged to have contraceptives before every intercourse with men, do not bear children themselves anymore. Since the Hatcheries are taking over the roles of reproduction and education of the children, there is no need for the traditional motherhood with both roles of bearing and rearing to exist. Human reproduction is deemed by the state as something of the past, something that is rather obscene, and so are parents.

In the Hatchery Center, the Director's mentioning that “the parents were the father and the mother” (Huxley 19), in the course of explaining how children used to be instructed in the past, ensues silence among the students. The students are told that in the past the education of the child used to be conducted at home by the parents. He then talks about the mother-child relationship describing it as obscene and trying to arise the student's disgust at it. Now with all the technology that the Hatcheries are endowed with, there is no need for domestic child-rearing, and the words mother and father are no more in use, they even turned to be vulgar and socially inappropriate, and “asking someone who his mother was [is regarded] a ‘dirty joke’” (50).

The World Controllers succeed in prescribing the concept of parenthood as inappropriate, that Linda, even after being a mother for a long time in the Reservation, and even though she admits that she finds solace in her son, is still feeling ashamed:

“And I was so ashamed. Just think of it: me, a Beta-having a baby: put yourself in my place.” (The mere suggestion made Lenina shudder.) “Though it wasn’t my fault, I swear; because I still don’t know how it happened,[. . .], I swear it; but all the same it happened, and of course there wasn’t anything like an Abortion Centre here.”(103)

As a former World State conditioned resident, neither living in the Savage Reservation for a while, nor her being a mother of John, awakens her motherly instincts to change the way she views her stance and embrace with comfort the role of being a mother. Linda is indoctrinated with the thought that getting impregnated and having a baby is a wrong and shameful act. She does not obliterate from her head the idea that it was a “fault,” although she insists it was not her own fault. When she encounters the Director after she is back to the World State, she tells him that he is the father of her son; but realizing, then, that the crowd of people was looking at her silently, she covers her face in distress. As much as Linda is, the Director retreats from the room distressed with Linda's accusation to him of fatherhood.

In Oceania, the family is only kept together for the purpose of reproduction; intimate relationships between its members are pointless, as much as they are with other people. The Party, unable to manage the issue of child-rearing without the help of the family, outlaws intimacy and dismantles the loyalty established between children and their parents.

The Party's aim is to take the responsibility for child-rearing from the parents when the right institutions are established for it. O'Brien, while overseeing Winston's torture, states:

We have cut the links between child and parent, and between man and man, and between man and woman. No one dares trust a wife or a child or a friend any longer. [. . .] Children will be taken from their mothers at birth, as one takes eggs from a hen. [. . .] There will be no loyalty, except loyalty to the Party. There will be no love, except the love of Big Brother. (220)

The Party considers parents ineligible enough to rear the children to rise up to its expectations, and thus their relationship with their children should be adjusted by the state (Theis 36). To quote Bertrand Russell, for the Party, parents “cannot be relied upon to take as much care of their children as the general feeling of the community considers necessary” (75). Thus, the Party's intention, representing the desired community intentions, requires constant rearing and surveillance of the children away from their families, which is the future aim of the Party that O'Brien mentions.

Winston's recurrent memories of his mother associate him with his past child-mother relationship. Winston's mother is a sketch of motherly love, loyalty, and sacrifice. It is apparent that she sought her relief in pleasing him while he used to act selfishly; the portrayal of her nursing his little sister with care, when he was a child, and the gesture of taking him into her arms then (133), recur to remind him that expressions of motherly love and devotion as she communicates it “could not happen today” (28). It is these recurrent flashbacks that remind Winston of the role his mother attempted to have in teaching him such human traits as unconditional love, care and generosity. It is with her and with the red-armed prole woman, whom he observes while she shows satisfaction with the roles she undertakes, that Winston associates real motherhood and the salvation of humanity.

When compared to the case of the Parsons, both Parsons and his wife are less capable of showing such devotion to their kids as the expression of emotions is rather denied to them by the state. Parsons's children are the example of the family loyalty and child-parent relationship gone sour. The two children do not obey their parents, and additionally they work as junior spies for the Thought Police; they are trained to detect unorthodoxy and to denounce even their parents if needed. When Winston is arrested in the Ministry of Love, he meets Parsons who tells him with a “doleful pride” that his daughter turned him in to

the Thought Police after she heard him speak unorthodox thoughts while asleep (Orwell 192).

This revered picture of the mother decided on by Winston, is later erased; it becomes considered as part of false memories that need to be eliminated. When torturing him in the Ministry of Love, O'Brien is finally able to convince Winston of the defectiveness of his memory, that what he should rely on to define his values is the Party not his memory (210), he, then, gives up on the memories of his mother. For the memories of his mother are a thing that makes sense of humanity for him, their loss means the loss of the real, pure, human love that was associated with the old days when people cared for each other. This along with the Party's declaration of its intentions to end parenthood, initiates the decline of the role of child-rearing.

When the states are engaged in performing those roles, the institution is affected and it ceases to perpetuate in the traditional sense of it. With the states conducting those obligations specific to the parents under it, the institution of marriage and the family is affected. Consequently, in Huxley's World State, marriage and the family are abolished all at once since the means to replace every social function of them came into existence. On the other hand, in Orwell's Oceania marriage has altered its purpose to involve a single function that the state is yet incapable to replace, that is, reproduction. The disestablishment of this institution, or at least the traditional meaning of it in Oceania, comes with its becoming unnecessary as a social institution when the roles it performs can already be performed outside of it.

3. The Male-Dominated Society

3.1. Second-Class Citizens

In the worlds of the two novels, it seems at first glance that the new governments have disestablished the traditional gender roles, or are on the way to completely disestablish

them, and thus women are liberated and equity between them and men is established. However, liberating women may take more than abolishing two gender roles, the position that the female retained after deserting their conventional roles of the past, confirms just the opposite since the absence of those roles does not end their subjugation and maintains women's inferiority in a still-patriarchal society.

In Huxley's novel, the Hatcheries take up the tasks previously performed by the mother, both childbearing and rearing. Sterilization, contraception, and the legalized abortion, grant more promiscuous freedom which is promoted by the state itself, females also have equal rights to males when it comes to a number of granted licenses. This, in the new world, sets females free from their domestic and maternal gender roles and allows them more freedom than in the reservations, which are the only places where the old roles are still enacted.

Much like Huxley's novel, Orwell's involves a radical change underlying the female gender roles; although not abolished at once, they are adjusted to function within the frame of serving the state's own objectives, and, thus, it lost its significance. The institution is only intended to be enacted until the state finds a substitute; instead of completely abolishing the gender roles, the Party only abolishes the family's educational role. Incapable of minding the role of procreation on its own yet, the Party keeps the institution functional, with the abolition of intimacies between its members, and maintains sex only as a "duty to the Party" (Orwell 58), although sex is permitted sometimes outside of those boundaries, "as an outlet for instincts which could not be altogether suppressed..." (57).

This alone, nonetheless, does not make of the World State or Oceania egalitarian states. Other stances in which women are still considered unequal to men and subject to objectification and devaluation are apparent throughout the course of the books, which make the two visionary societies sustain their patriarchal quality.

In the Savage Reservation, where Linda is found, family is not disestablished, and the traditional gender roles are still enacted. Unlike the World State, the reservation is a place where “nobody’s supposed to belong to more than one person” (Huxley 105). The old gender roles of mother and father define the relationship existing between the two genders as monogamous, which is the only form of relationship tolerated by the people in the reservation. Linda, a female conditioned to live a life of promiscuity in the World State, gets lost and has to stay in the reservation until she meets Bernard and Lenina on their visit to the Reservation. Linda faced difficulties in adopting to the way of life of the Reservation; every time she engages in an affair with one of the tribe's men, she's assaulted by their wives and children (105); the “everybody belongs to everyone else” principle ceases to be at work here. What emphasizes the idea of gender inequality is that Popé, Linda's lover in the Reservation, is not treated as harsh as she was treated for engaging in an affair. Being a male shelters him against blame or sanction for what he commits wrong, the only one who objects against him is Linda's own son, John (114-115).

Comparing life in the reservation to that in the new world, the genders in the State are apparently equal at first sight. Females, just like males, have access to every freedom allowance the state provides. They have no domestic or familial commitments they are bound, they contribute to industry and hold state jobs as much as males do. Furthermore, since promiscuity is propagated for by the state, they have equal access as males to a promiscuous life, even when it has to do with choosing their own sex partners. This is due to the abolition of the traditional gender roles. June Deery, however, explains that the abolition of the old norms of gender in *Brave New World*, and establishment of new ones, based on individual freedoms, are liberating to females but restraining and debasing to them at the same time (131-136). The higher positions in the State are all preserved for male characters, and women are still objectified and viewed as means for sexual pleasure.

When considering the conditioning process at the Hatchery Center, new born babies are conditioned to belong to varied strata, from 'Alpha' to 'Epsilon,' they are socialized to be "future sewage workers" or future "World controllers," or "Directors," based on their strata (Huxley 10), 'with the indication that *Alpha*' is the highest in this classification system. The two main female characters, Lenina and Linda, are both revealed to be Betas, with no indication that any female character belongs to the Alpha class. While a range of male characters are Alphas, females are *Betas*, and in no way are Alphas, and are assigned tasks of assisting and nursing, instead of tasks of administering or controlling. Linda talking to Lenina at the reservation reveals her intellectual inferiority to the upper class, which only men are destined to fall into, by stating how hard it was for her to raise John and answer all his questions:

There's so much one doesn't know; it wasn't my business to know. I mean, when a child asks you how a helicopter works or who made the world- well, what are you to answer if you're a Beta and have always worked in the Fertilizing Room? What are you to answer? (105)

De Beauvoir quotes Aristotle in her book when he sets a woman as inferior for she lacks certain qualities (15), with the assertion throughout all her discussion of the situation of the female on her social constructivism. The passage makes clear that Betas are conditioned to be inferior to alphas in terms of intellectuality; the Alphas, the World controllers and the intellectuals, are endowed with enough knowledge to answer such questions that Linda finds herself unable to answer because she is a Beta class citizen. That the highest class and its assigned jobs and high intellectuality is preserved for males while females are only conditioned to be Betas or lower in class, indicates the persistent inequity of the sexes in a state that, allegedly, provides freedom and equality to all her citizens.

Critics disagree on the viewpoint about gender that Orwell sought to illustrate in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The representations of Winston's mother, the prole woman, along with that of Julia, as positive portrayals of the female in the Oceanian society is defended

by some critics, while the opponents of this stance stress that this was directed toward emphasizing the traditional gender roles, supporting the idea that society maintains its patriarchal mold.

Erwin Hester's point is that for the memories of his mother and the descriptions of the prole woman, Winston attempts to associate with the two women's traits of purity, love, and devotion which are not any more traits of the Party women (Hester & Patai 256). While the women of the Party are taught that chastity should be devoted for the Party and are conditioned to adhere to it (Orwell 59), his mother and the prole woman followed a doctrine that was not part of the Party's rule; their devotion and purity were gifts they bestowed upon their families alone. Although Winston associates both of them with the lack of intellectuality, he admits his admiration for the emotional traits and loyalty they had which the Party could not undermine.

Patai agrees that Orwell has viewed the two women, in addition to the strong-willed Julia, positively through the eyes of Winston. The prole woman is stereotyped as an ideal mother, one who "had no mind," but "had only strong arms, a warm heart, and a fertile belly" (181). She has no intellect, but she is devoted to her femininity which the Party aims to abolish, and which is the trait that makes her humane. Winston's mother as well is identified as "less an intelligent" woman (136), despite that, Winston venerates the memories of her. Her feminine traits of purity and loyalty to the family she loves, which are dissociated from women in Winston's time, makes her a reverent figure for him. In spite of that, Patai explains that these representations highlight the reverence for the traditional gender roles, not with the women's traits themselves, and for the time that Winston views as the time "when men were real men," since the roles for females were defined by them. Women are, thus, defined identified with a second-class (Hester & Patai 257).

3.2. Sexual Objectification

In the two novels, women are viewed as what Beauvoir calls “erotic objects,” (506). While women are discharged completely from the domestic roles in Huxley's novel, and seem to be partly freed of them in Orwell's, they are still devalued. While the previous section showed the persistence of the idea of inferiority of women in the two dystopias, this one discusses the sexual objectification of them, both by the males of their society and by themselves.

One major instance which indicates the unchanging attitude toward women in the new World State, is their treatment as mere sexual pleasure providers which the state approves of. When Bernard Marx is passing by the changing-room, he overhears a conversation between Henry Ford and an Assistant Predestinator about Lenina and gets enraged at it:

‘Talking about her as though she were a bit of *meat*.’... ‘Have her here, have her there. Like mutton. Degrading her to so much mutton. She said she’d think it over, she said she’d give me an answer this week.’ (Huxley 39)

Bernard attracted to Lenina himself, could not stand the fact that she is treated like a “bit of meat,” but he gets frustrated when he knows that she herself does not mind it. Bernard becomes convinced that not only others perceive Lenina as a “bit of meat,” but that she also “thinks of herself that way. She doesn’t mind being meat” (80), thus she performs the act required of her by society by becoming an “erotic object.”

Likewise, Lenina is approached by the Director of the Hatchery earlier at the nursery, where he pats her behind without any objection from her part; she just smiles at him (13). Sandra Bartky believes that women objectify themselves and get to consider themselves ‘prey’ as they attempt to live up to what is aspired of them (73). With her smile earlier, Lenina confirms her acceptance to the way she is treated as a machine to provide pleasure; when she converses with Bernard she tells him that it pleases her that she is liked by everyone (80). Women in the World State tend to act like Lenina, offering themselves to

men whenever they are needed; this objectification is internalized within the females themselves.

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, in addition to being procreation machines, women are still regarded as sex machines as well. The Party, actually, calls for chastity and despises sex performed for pleasure:

The aim of the Party was not merely to prevent men and women from forming loyalties which it might not be able to control. Its real, undeclared purpose was to remove all pleasure from the sexual act. Not love so much as eroticism was the enemy, inside marriage as well as outside it. (Orwell 57)

Julia explains to Winston that the hysteria people get from intercourse shall be harnessed by the Party to serve its own ends, that is, turned into devotion for the Party and its leader alone(110). The unwanted act of sex is to be necessary only for the purpose of procreation, the “duty” prescribed by the Party, and with people approved by the Party. However, there are those times when the Party is “inclined to encourage prostitution, as an outlet for instincts which could not be altogether suppressed” (57). Julia reveals her having sex with Party members “scores of times” before she met Winston, justifying that with her love to the act itself (104-105). Winston on his part reveals that he could not endure staying with his chaste wife because of sex, and that he strongly desires to have it with Julia, although he intends to carry it out as an act of political rebellion against the Party.

Winston recalls the thought of his wife, the frigid woman who is indifferent from the Party's chaste women, who used to necessitate of him the engagement in a weekly joyless sex ceremony that she performs to fulfill “[their] duty to the Party” (110), he reveals that it was for sex that he could not endure living with her. The sexual repression that the Party's chastity imposes upon him, makes Winston desire fulfilling his sexual lust as a form of political rebellion, which is the thing his wife could not

provide. When Julia confesses to him her desire to have sex with him Winston is finally pleased that he could now rebel against the Party.

It is Julia who initiates their meetings for having sex, thus, representing a case similar to *Brave New World's* Lenina. Winston sees it as a political act of rebellion, while Julia concedes that she does it just for the sake of pleasure. Julia tells Winston about her experience of prostitution with the Party members, which excites Winston who intends their love making as an act that would inspire the coming generations for changing the Party ways, yet Julia adds that she is only interested in the act itself. Thus, unlike Lenina, Julia views herself as an “erotic object,” but her aim is not to please those around her but to please her own self being in Winston's words “only a rebel from the waist downwards” (129).

4. Love and Intimacy

In her book “*The Second Sex*”, Simone de Beauvoir explains, particularly from the standpoint of women, feelings of love and what it means and feels like to be in love. She acknowledges the differences in the experience of love between men and women, and claims thereupon that women do not embrace love and react towards it in the same way as men do. According to Beauvoir, love for a woman is an annihilating experience that, unfortunately for the female sex, directs her towards the inescapable destiny of abandoning her being and existence for the sake of her lover (773). In contrast with Cécile Sauvage, who claims that forgetting oneself for the woman is the law of nature, de Beauvoir argues that the annihilation of the self that women experience when they fall in love is due to their upbringing and to society's designed gender roles and is by no means related to nature (774). In parallel with the explanation that she puts forward, de Beauvoir acknowledges, however, the substantial influence that love exerts on men as they might be passionate lovers as well, but instead of abandoning the self “men want to integrate her [their lover]

into their existence, not submerge their entire existence in her” (773). On the basis of de Beauvoir’s explanation, therefore, one might easily notice the strength of emotions, the total devotion, and the profundity that may characterize love between men and women.

In Huxley’s and Orwell’s future worlds, the state and the citizenry conceive of love as of danger to society’s stability and to the well-being of humans. Therefore and with the aid of science and technology, the government in these two worlds could establish a stable society that enables people to live in harmony despite them being unhappy as in the case of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. In both worlds, as love is abolished and prohibited, the extent to which the government would go in order to eliminate the danger of love was explained by O’Brien to Winston Smith, when the latter was held by the Inner Party, as he states that:

Never again will you be capable of ordinary human feeling. Everything will be dead inside you. Never again will you be capable of love, or friendship, or joy of living, or laughter, or curiosity, or courage, or integrity. You will be hollow.
(Orwell 337)

In other words, the state does not only wish to make people fear love and by consequently avoid it, but it attempts to eliminate such a strong emotion from the human self. In regard to society in *Brave New World*, the World State achieves its program of abolishing love because humans are indoctrinated to follow a certain social order from birth, detached from their humanity, and disentangled from every human emotion for that matter. Huxley explains why love is abolished in the novel by showing the damage it has inflicted on societies prior to that *Brave New World*, as he points out that “their world [the contemporary world of Huxley] didn’t allow them to take things easily, didn’t allow them to be sane, virtuous, happy. What with mothers and lovers, what with the prohibitions they were not conditioned to obey” (35). That is to argue that love is a strong emotion that causes unhappiness and dooms people to insanity.

Regarding love and marriage in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the Inner Party prohibits any form of love to be expressed or felt between husbands and wives. Marital relationships therefore are no more than people's duty to the party with the purpose of producing children who would serve the state. For instance, Winston's relationship with his wife Katharine is the typical sort of relationship that the state encourages, but they had separated because they could not produce a child. Unlike Winston, Katharine is a frigid and an unresponsive citizen who submits to her role as a wife and whose primary role, as assigned by the state, is to produce children.

4.1. Sexual Promiscuity in *Brave New World*

Huxley's prophecies extend beyond the mere description of the future of totalitarian regimes and social institutions; for he attempted through his novel to delve into the depths of the human being and social groups. Thus, Huxley presents his prediction in regard to people's future sexual practices and how they would be substantially influenced by a myriad of things. To begin with, Huxley believes, for a number of reasons, that sexual promiscuity would be the "opiate of the masses" in the future high-tech world (Bloom 83). As Cass R. Sunstein explains, the importance of sexual freedom and promiscuity lies in its ability to diminish rebellious thoughts and maintain social satisfaction towards the state because, even though regimes tend to value and put the interests of the ruling class above all, people would overlook other matters by feeding their animal instinct (84).

In the *Brave New World*, society succeeds at making people conform to the practice of promiscuous relationships through abolishing the traditional social systems, such as family and marriage (Reiff 70). Regarding women, most of them are sterilized so that they never get pregnant, while the others use contraceptives instead because they would be needed in hatcheries (71). The process of sterilization that women must go through envisages a not very pretty picture of the future of women and how their bodies would remain subject to

commodification and exploitation. It would be fair, however, if one argued against that by stating the fact that the different processes of human engineering are for both sexes, but the portrayal of women as bodies to be had, which pervades the novel, strengthens the first position against the latter. Nevertheless, sexual promiscuity is embraced by females and males equally as they are both enthusiastic about it and conceive it as their world's greatest pleasure along with soma³.

Catharine A. MacKinnon, in her book *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State*, unravels the rationale behind the way men and women express their sexuality and how they perceive it. The chief matter that she tries to elucidate is that male and female sexual desire, the way men and women manifest and express it, and the way they respond to it and conceptualize it are all socially and politically directed (131). By examining the different opinions on this matter, the inference that may be drawn out is that it is the woman who needs to suffer the consequences of this social scheme; women are often led to repress their sexual needs or express them within the scope of what society perceives to be feminine. Under the wings of an oppressive ruling system, sexuality is generally fashioned, confined, and supervised. This probably does not reflect precisely the case of *Brave New World*, but it most definitely strengthens the presumption that sexuality is man-made.

In the novel, men and women are fashioned to embrace the sexual revolution in the World State, and both genders are allowed to have as many sexual partners as they wish. However, the state prevents them from abstaining from sex because the Ten Controllers of the world conformity to social norms is necessary while individual behaviors are of danger to the new established order. When still being in Hatchery centers, people and specifically children would be punished by electric shots if they did not respond positively to lessons on promiscuity using sleep-teaching techniques. For instance, as Lenina reveals to her

³ Soma: is a drug that was developed by the World State in order to keep people in a state of unconsciousness and ensure stability.

friend Fanny that she does not feel “keen on promiscuity” anymore, the latter then explains to her the danger that such a thing may put her in.

4.2. The Prohibition of Sexual Promiscuity in 1984

In contrast to Huxley’s world, the world that Orwell prophesizes perceives sexual freedom as society’s greatest danger that must be completely eliminated. As for sexual relationships within marriage, it must result in producing offspring or otherwise it is of no use. Sexual relationships between marrieds in the state of Oceania, explains Orwell, “was to be looked on as a slightly disgusting minor operation, like having an enema” (57). The war that the state wages against intimate and passionate sex stems from its worry that such a strong self-expression would give birth to rebellion and love for things other than Big Brother. Winston realizes this after his encounter with Julia and the passionate relationship that develops between them gradually; Orwell thus explains the thoughts residing in Winston’s mind and declares that “not merely the love of one person but the animal instinct, the simple undifferentiated desire: that was the force that would tear the Party to pieces” (105). Winston comprehends then the significance and the necessity of sexual repression and rigidity for the perpetuation of the ruling class dominance. Thus, Cass R. Sunstein points out that:

Sexual freedom embodies freedom and individualism, and it is the deepest enemy of a totalitarian state. A state that allows sexual freedom will be unable to repress its citizens. This is why O’Brien must achieve victory over Julia. (85)

Notwithstanding the fact that this goes in contrast with Huxley’s view on the ways that the state would approach in order to oppress and subdue the citizenry, sexual repression seem to work for the benefit of the government in Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Orwell supports this idea as he sheds light on the fact that “the sex impulse was dangerous to the Party, and the Party had turned it to account” (Orwell 111). In other words, a state may suppress people by suppressing their basic needs, annihilating the human self, and

disfiguring the human body and into something repulsive and sickening. Also, as in the case of *Brave New world*, the state may achieve social stability by popularizing the culture of promiscuous sex in society, but both types of planned society orders aim at conforming individuals into displaying one common human behavior that does not challenge the interests of the ruling class and its stability.

Conclusion

This chapter was concerned with the role of social changes as being the edifice upon which Huxley and Orwell built their theories on the future world of humanity. In the two novels and due to these changes, the belief system that the Party and the World State have established does not take into consideration people's welfare and freedom which they were secretly striving to acquire. According to the premises that Marxists have set forth concerning ideology, an oppressive state would choose to deeply ingrain the populace with the belief that the state owes them their devotion and loyalty; for it organizes their social interactions and provides them with all they need to make them content and satisfied with their lives and roles as social beings. In the case of the novels under investigation, the state outlaws the traditional roles ascribed to men and women and which have assigned them to taking care of offspring for millennia. Instead, the governing body in the state becomes the sole parent of the children forming some sort of a communal family .

Having explored a wide range of explanations to the abolition of marriage and family life, the newly established gender roles in the World State and Oceania stretches its impacts on other matters such as sexual relationships, love and intimacy in the dystopian future worlds. In their dystopian masterpieces, Huxley and Orwell predict that feelings of love and passionate relationships would cease to exist in the future, because the state deems them threatening, unorthodox and of danger to social stability. Furthermore, it is

technology and its innovations that fuel the new social order and enables the state to control people, replace human reproduction, indoctrinate and turn people into obedient machines. As for women in Huxley's and Orwell's future worlds, they gain much of the equity that they have struggled and demanded for. Despite them having the same rights, women in the novels are still depicted as sexual and erotic bodies that men could have whenever they wished .

GENERAL CONCLUSION

For millennia, the institution of marriage has been entrusted with the task of organizing social groupings, uniting individuals, and vitalizing family relationships. Given that the vast literature dealing with marriage deems the institution ever-changing and ever-developing, the rapid changes in marital and familial relationships nowadays do not only put researchers in front of an ever-transforming institution that they can hardly fathom; these changes have also led current and recent studies to visualize the future of marriage and family life and investigate the assumption that marriage might be on the ropes. On the basis of the issues and changes facing the institution of marriage, this research examined the predictions of Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, for these writers attempted through their works to prophesize the future of the world as being under the wings of high-technology, yet disfigured by oppressive governments. This research aimed at identifying the reasons which led to the decline of the marriage-family system, and examining the anticipations illustrated by Huxley and Orwell in their novels.

According to the insights that Huxley and Orwell provide through their cautionary novels, oppressive states tend to focus even on the tiniest of details in society in order to ensure their dominance and perpetuate stability. In Huxley's *Brave New World*, for instance, the World State makes use of science and technology by designing a new world order in which machines replace human beings. As the World State is empowered by the advances of biotechnology and eugenics, the Ten World Controllers decide to outlaw human reproduction due to its indispensability and replace it with artificial reproduction at Hatchery and Conditioning Centers; humans are then conditioned to conform to their ascribed roles in society using Hypnopaedia (sleep-teaching). In Huxley's high-tech world,

both the role of childbearing and parenting become the duty of the government, whereas the institution of marriage, along with the rich lexicon related to it, is disestablished and held to be invalid, offensive, and provocative. By contrast, Orwell's world cannot disestablish marriage and parenthood altogether because the governing body, namely the Inner Party, lacks the technology that the World State employs in *Brave New World* to control human beings. This, however, did not dissuade the state from presiding over its citizens, for it exerts almost the same level of influence on citizens that the World State does on its brave new people. In order to maintain that authority, the Inner Party uses surveillance tools to subdue people and prevent them from developing unorthodox thoughts, such as telescreens, Thought Police, and children .

In both novels, men and women are indoctrinated to convey emotionlessness and impassivity in their relationships because love and intimacy pose a threat to the stability of society and may weaken people's loyalty to the state. In *Brave New World*, males and females are encouraged to be sex enthusiasts and discouraged from developing monogamous relationships because the principle that "everyone belongs to everyone else" ,which necessitates having multi-sexual partners, is ingrained in them. While both sexes are instructed to be sexually promiscuous in Huxley's future world, their counterparts in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are exposed to more forms of oppression and tyranny, for the reason that the state prohibits love and intimacy between men and women; and the one form of relationship that may exist between a man and a woman is a loveless and passionless marital relationship, in which they are assigned to the duty of producing children and are encouraged to nullify the union in case they fail to perform their duty.

Given that gender roles are established and reinforced by society, relationships between men and women and the roles attributed to them in the future worlds are directed by the

state. In the two future worlds, the woman, who is supposed to be the child-bearer and rearer of her

child, is entirely detached from her instinct to care for her offspring. As the World State in *Brave New World* prohibits human reproduction, most women are therefore sterilized while the others are instructed to carry contraceptives with them and use them regularly. However, women in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are kept with their role as mothers to their babies, but the state turns children against them and appoints them as spies to detect any possible signs of unorthodoxy .

Despite the changes that have followed the disestablishment of marriage and family system, male dominance is still one of the main features that characterize relationships between the sexes in the two literary works; the thing which may deform the future worlds to nowadays' readers. Although women are no more disfavored by the rules of marriage which the World State and the Inner Party have abolished completely, women are still objectified in the two dystopias and treated either as sexual pleasure machines and bodies to be had, or that their role is limited to producing children and rearing them .

This study concluded that Aldous Huxley and George Orwell, through their works *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, anticipated the abolition of the institution of marriage and family system. Despite being limited in length, this research explored the factors upon which the two writers have laid their predictions and which eventually led to the disestablishment of the institution, such as totalitarian regimes, the advances of technology, the disestablishment of gender roles, and the abolishment of family and parental control.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. Toronto: Vintage Canada, 2007. Print.

Orwell, George. *1984*. New York: Signet Classic, 1949. Print.

Secondary Sources

A. Books

Althusser, Louis. *On the Reproduction of Capitalism: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. London: Verso, 2014.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Harcourt Brace & Company, 1976.

Beckford, James A. *Social Theory and Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003, 33–43.

Bloom, Harold, ed. *Bloom's Guides: Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2011.

Bloom, Harold, ed. *Bloom's Guides: George Orwell's 1984*. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2004.

Bloom, Harold, ed. *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: George Orwell's 1984*. New York: Infobase Publishing,

Booker, M. Keith. *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature*. Greenwood Press, 1994.

Burns, Tony. *Political Theory, Science Fiction, and Utopian Literature*. Lexington Books, 2008.

Chodorow, Nancy. *The Reproduction of Mothering*. University of California Press, 1978.

- Coontz, Stephanie. *Marriage, a History: How Love Conquered Marriage*. New York: Penguin, 2006.
- Cott, Nancy F. *Public Vows: A History of Marriage and the Nation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2002.
- Davison, Peter. *George Orwell: A Literary Life*. New York: St. Martin's, 1996.
- De Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. Translated by H. M. Parshly, Lowe and Brydon, 1956.
- Engels, Friedrich. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, in the Light of the Researches of Lewis H. Morgan*. New York: International, 1971.
- Ferns, Chris. *Narrating Utopia: Ideology, Gender, Form in Utopian Literature*. Liverpool University Press, 1999.
- Friedrich, Carl J. and Zbigniew K. Brzewinski. *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy*. Praeger, 1956.
- Grossi, Renata. *Looking for Love in the Legal Discourse of Marriage*. Acton, A.C.T.: ANU, 2014.
- Lichtheim, George. *Europe in the Twentieth Century*. Praeger Publishers, 1972.
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard UP, 1991.
- McLennan, John Ferguson. *Primitive Marriage: An Inquiry into the Origin of the Form of Capture in Marriage Ceremonies*. London: Macmillan, 1886.

- Meyers, Valerie. *Macmillan Modern Novelists: George Orwell*. Macmillan P., 2nd ed, 1986.
- Marx, Karl, Friedrich Engels, Samuel Moore, and David McLellan. *The Communist Manifesto*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- O'Kane, Rosemary H. T. *Paths to Democracy, Revolution, and Totalitarianism*. Taylor & Francis, Apr 1, 2004.
- Orwell, Sonia, and Ian Angus. *The Collected Essays, Journalism, and Letters of George Orwell*. 4 vols. Martin Seeker & Warburg Limited, 1968.
- Peat, F. David. *From Certainty to Uncertainty: The Story of Science and Ideas in Twentieth Century*. Washington, Joseph Henry P, 2002.
- Pomeroy, Sarah B. *Spartan Women*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2002.
- Reiff, Raychel Haugrud. *Aldous Huxley: Brave New World*. Marshall Cavendish Corporation, 2010.
- Russel, Bertrand. *Marriage and Morals*. Routledge, 2009.
- Theis, Mary Elizabeth. *Mothers and Masters in Twentieth Century Utopian and dystopian Literature*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2009.
- Tokma, Béla. *A Social History of Twentieth-Century Europe*. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Westermarck, Edward. *The History of Human Marriage*. Second Edition ed. London: Macmillan, 1894.
- Westermarck, Edward. *The Future of Marriage in Western Civilization, By Edward Westermarck*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1936.

Zamyatin, Yevgeny. *We*. Tr. Mirra Ginsburg. New York: Avon, 1972.

B. Articles and Essays

Amato, Paul R. & Alan Booth. "Changes in Gender Role Attitudes and Perceived Marital Quality." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 60, No. 1, Feb, 1995, pp.58-66.

Bates, Thomas R. "Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony." *Journal of the History of Ideas*. Vol. 36, No. 2, 1975, pp. 351-366.

Beauchamp, Gorman. "All's Well That Ends Wells: The Anti-Wellsian Satire of Brave New World." *Utopian Studies*, No. 2, Pen State University Press, 1989, pp. 12-16.

Becker, Gary S. "A Theory of Marriage". *The Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 81, no. 4, 1973, pp. 813-846.

Bierkan, Andrew T., et al. "Marriage in Roman Law." *The Yale Law Journal* Vol. 16, No.5, 1907, p. 303.

Biring, Margret F., and June Carbone. "Rethinking Marriage: Feminist Ideology, Economic Change, and Divorce Reform." *Tulane Law Review*, vol. 65, no. 5, 1991, pp. 954-1009.

Bisland, Elizabeth. "The Modern Woman and Marriage." *The North American Review*, vol. 160, no. 463, 1895, pp. 753-755

Boehnke, Mandy. "Gender Role Attitudes around the Globe: Egalitarian vs. Traditional Views." *Asian Journal of Social Science*, Vol. 39, No. 1, 2011, pp. 57-74.

- Brown, Heather A. "Marx on Gender and the Family: A Critical Study". Vol.39. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2012. Historical Materialism Book Ser.
- Burke, Chloe S. and Christopher J. Castaneda. "The Public and Private History of Eugenics: An Introduction." *The Public Historian*, Vol. 29, No. 3, summer 2007, pp. 5-17.
- Burns, Tony. "Science, Politics, and Utopia in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four." *M. Keith Booker (Ed.), Critical Insights: Dystopia*. University of Arkansas, pp.91-108.
- Cherlin, Andrew J. "The Deinstitutionalization of American Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 66, no. 4, 2004, pp. 848-861.
- Collette, Christine. "Women and Politics, 1900-1939." *A Companion to Early Twentieth-Century Britain*. Ed. Wrigley, Chris. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2003, pp. 118- 134.
- Coontz, Stephanie. "The Origins of Modern Divorce." *Family Process*. Vol. 46, No.1, 2007, pp. 7-16.
- _____. "The World Historical Transformation of Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 66, No. 4, 2004, pp. 974-979.
- Davis, Audrey B. "Medical Technology." In Trevor Williams (Ed.) *A History of Technology*. vols VII. Oxford Press, 1978.
- Davis, Peggy Cooper, and Carol Gilligan. "Reconstructing Law and Marriage." *The Good Society*. Vol. 11, No. 3, 2002, pp. 57-67.
- Davison, Peter. *George Orwell: A Literary Life*. New York: St. Martin's, 1996.
- Dobie, Ann B. "Feminist Criticism." *Theory into Practice: An Introduction to Literary Criticism*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 2002, pp. 97-119.

- _____. "Marxist Criticism." *Theory into Practice: An Introduction to Literary Criticism*. Heinle & Heinle, 2002, pp. 79-96.
- Evans-Grubbs, Judith. "The Age of Marriage in Ancient Rome." *Mouseion: Journal of the Classical Association of Canada*. Vol. 7, No.1, 2007, pp. 67-71.
- Fellman, David. "What is Liberalism?" *Prairie Schooner*, Vol. 19, No. 3, Fall 1945, pp. 204-218.
- Firchow, Peter E. "Review: The Brave New World of Huxley Studies." *Journal of Modern Literature*, vol. 1, no. 2, 1970, pp. 278-83.
- Fowler, Roger. "Versions of Realism." *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: George Orwell*, ed. Harold Bloom. Infobase publishing, 2007, pp. 29-48.
- Georgieva, Margarita. *Parenthood in English Literature*. 6 p. 2009.
- Glazebrook, Allison, and Kelly Olson. "Greek and Roman Marriage." *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. 2013, pp. 69-82.
- Gordon, Linda. "Who is Frightened of Reproductive Freedom for Women and Why? Some Historical Answer." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 1986, pp.22-26.
- Gurian, Waldemar. "The Totalitarian State." *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 40, No. 4, Oct, 1978, pp. 514-527.
- Hester, Erwin and Daphne Patai. "Women in 1984." *PMLA*, Vol. 98, No. 2 (Mar., 1983), pp. 256-258.

- Jones, Harriet. "The Impact of the Cold War." *A Companion to Contemporary Britain 1930-2000*. Edited by Paul Audison and Harriet Jones. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2005, pp. 23-41.
- Kiernan, Kathleen. "Cohabitation in Western Europe: Trends, Issues, and Implications." *Living Together: Implications of Cohabitation on Families, Children and Social Policy*. Edited by alan Booth & Ann C. Counter. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002, pp. 3-31.
- Kohlmann, Benjamin. "Introduction." Rosalyn Gregory, Benjamin Kohlmann (Eds), *Utopian Spaces of Modernism*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, pp. 1-15.
- Kozak, Agata. "Post-modern Changes in Marital and Family Life." *Journal of Education Culture and Society*. 2011, pp. 73-79.
- Kensinger, Loretta. "(In)Quest of Liberal Feminism." *Citizenship in Feminism: Identity, Action, and Locale*, vol. 8, No. 1, Fall 1997, pp. 178-197.
- Leitch, Vincent B., editor. "Louis Althusser 1918-1990." *Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, W.W. Norton & C., New York, 2001, pp. 1476-1508.
- Lubenow, W. C. "Mediating 'The Chaos of Incident and The Cosmos of Sentiment': Liberalism in Britain, 1815-1914". *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 47, No. 3, Jul., 2008, pp. 492-504.
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. "Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: An Agenda for Theory." *Singns*, vol. 7, No. 3, Spring 1982, pp.515- 544.
- McGee, W. J. "The Beginning of Marriage." *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 9, No. 11, Nov, 1896.

- M. Decker, James. "George Orwell's 1984 and Political Ideology." *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: George Orwell*, ed. Bloom Harold. Infobase publishing, 2007, pp. 133-144.
- Mews, Stuart. "Religion, 1900-1939." *A Companion to Early Twentieth-Century Britain*. Ed. Wrigley, Chris. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2003, pp. 470-484.
- Potts, Malcolm and Martha Campbell. "History of Contraception." *Gynecology and Obstetrics*, Vol. 6, N. 8, 2002.
- Rossi, John, and John Rodden. "A Political Writer." *The Cambridge companion to George Orwell*. Edited by John Rodden. Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 1-11.
- Sachse, Carol and Atina Grossmann. "Human Rights, Utopias, and Gender in Twentieth-Century Europe: Introduction." *Central European History*, Vol. 44, No. 1, March 2011, pp. 1-12.
- Sturzo, Luigi, "The Totalitarian State." *Social Research*, Vol. 3, No. 2, May 1936, 222-235.
- Sunstein, Cass R. "Huxley and George Orwell's Contrasting Views of Love and Sex." *Bloom's Guide: Brave New World*. Edited by Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2011, pp. 82-86.
- Sutcliffe, Anthony. "Culture in the Scept'r'd Isle." *A Companion to Early Twentieth-Century Britain*. Ed. Wrigley, Chris. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2003, pp. 485-501.
- Ubbelohde, A. R. "Edwardian Science and Technology: Their Interactions." *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Jun., 1963), pp. 217-226

Weikart, Richard. "Marx, Engels, and the Abolition of the Family." *History of European Ideas*, vol. 18, No. 5, 1994, pp. 657-672.

Yeo, Michael. "Propaganda and Surveillance in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: Two Sides of the Same Coin". *Global Media Journal*. Vol. 3, No. 2, 2010, pp. 49-66.

C. Encyclopedias

Ponzetti, James J. *International Encyclopedia of Marriage and Family*. 2nd ed., Macmillan Reference USA, 2003, pp. 315–323.

D. Electronic Sources

Allen, Garland E. "Social Origins of Eugenics." *Eugenics Archive*. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory. Web. 24-04-2017.

Cartwright, Mark. "Women in Ancient Greece." *Ancient History Encyclopedia*. n.p., 27 July 2016. Web. 17 Apr. 2017.

Creek, H. L. "Love in Mediæval Romance." The Johns Hopkins University Press, n.d. Web. 17 Apr. 2017.

Maxwell, C. Mervyn. "Women in the Greco-Roman World." *Biblical Research Institute*, n.d. Web. 16 Apr. 2017.

Posner, Richard A. "Orwell versus Huxley: Economics, Technology, Privacy, and Satire." *Chicago Unbound*. Coase-Sandor Institute for Law and Economics, 1999. Web. 7 May 2017.

Postman, Andrew." My Dad Predicted Trump in 1985 – it's not Orwell, he Warned, it's Brave New World." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media Limited. 02 Feb 2017. Web. 31 March 2017.

Totalitarianism. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc, 2017. 7 May 2017.

Tupper, Frederick. "A Mediæval Husband." Internet Archive. *The Johns Hopkins University Press*, n.d. Web. 17 Apr. 2017.

Wasson, Donald L. "Roman Family." *Ancient History Encyclopedia*. N.p., 26 Feb. 2016. Web. 17 Apr. 2017.

E. Dissertations

Gerhard, Julia. "*Control and Resistance in The Dystopian Novel: A Comparative Study*." Master's Thesis. California State University, 2012.

Misic, Tomislav. *The question of intimacy in the novels Brave New World by Aldous Huxley and 1984 by George Orwell*. MA thesis, J.J. Strossmayer University, 2016.

Uldus, Özlem. "*Changing Patterns of Marriage and Family in England from the Late Medieval to the Early Modern Ages*." Master's Thesis, Middle East Technical University, History Department, August 2003.

ملخص

رغم تعدد الأبحاث والدراسات عبر العصور عن تطور المؤسسة الاجتماعية للزواج والحياة العائلية إلا أن إمكانية التنبؤ بمستقبل هذه المؤسسة وإذا ما كانت ستواصل انحطاطها حتى تضمحل قليلة جدًا. عكف كل من جورج اورويل وألدوس هاكسلي في روايتهما: 1984 و عالم جديد رائع على التنبؤ بمستقبل الإنسان والحياة الاجتماعية و مؤسساتها، مجانين في ذلك الواقع الحقيقي لهذه المؤسسات. بالرغم من أن الدراسات التي عالجت تنبؤات الكاتبين كثيرة ومتعددة، يبقى التصور الذي قدامه عن مستقبل الزواج والحياة العائلية، والذي ستتطرق إليه هذه الأطروحة، قضية لم تنل من الدراسة حقها. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحليل العالمين المستقبليين المقدمين في الروايتين وعلاقتها بالعالم الواقعي، مركزة على العلاقات الاجتماعية بين الجنسين والأسباب التي قادت مجتمعي الروايتين إلى التخلي عما يربطهما بمؤسسة الزواج والحياة العائلية والمتعلقة بتنظيمات الدولة، استعمال التكنولوجيا، وإبطال أدوار الجنسين التقليدية. بناءً على هذا ينتهج هذا البحث منهجًا اجتماعيًا يعتمد على النظريتين الماركسية والنسوية بغرض تحليل معطيات الدراسة.