"The Architecture of Anti-Utopias: Critiques of Modern Public Housing from London to Orwell"

Ryan Youell

A dissertation
submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington
2018

Reading Committee:
Brian Reader, Chair
Jesse Oak Taylor
Robert Abrams

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:
Department of English Language and Literature

©Copyright 2018

Ryan Youell

University of Washington

Abstract

"The Architecture of Anti-Utopias: Critiques of Modern Public Housing from London to Orwell"

Ryan Youell

Chair of Supervisory Committee

Brian Reed

Department of English Language and Literature

In my dissertation I analyze how Jack London, Robert Hugh Benson, Aldous Huxley, and George Orwell adopt anti-utopian perspectives to show the inherent flaws of supposed utopian belief systems. Building off of Gregory Claeys and Lyman Sargent's definition of the anti-utopian genre, I attest that London, Benson, Huxley and Orwell in their respective works show nuanced analyses extending beyond mere personal sentiment; each author concerns himself with *how* capitalism, socialism, scientific management, and totalitarianism positively and negatively impacts not only individuals, but also the world at large. Therefore, rather than focusing on ideology alone, I dissect their respective cityscapes and illustrate *how* the systems they analyze extend to impact the architecture and urban layouts (especially in terms of public housing) in London's *The Iron Heel* (1908), Benson's *Lord of the World* (1907), Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932), and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949).

Chapter One Overview

In my first chapter I first supply a critical overview that traces the development of the terms utopia, dystopia, and anti-utopia to better frame my intentions in exploring the works of Jack London, Robert Hugh Benson, Aldous Huxley, and George Orwell as anti-utopian texts. Next, I supply a literary overview and, briefly, discuss the three main periods of utopian literature before turning to Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516). While More sets an important precedent by creating a fictionalized good place, I argue that his advocation of labor and land reform for the common people distinguishes him from the classical philosophers that, previously, also detailed speculative, ideal governments. Next, I analyze the work of Ambrose Bierce to argue that, in subverting his reader's positive views of wars, his fiction and non-fiction exemplifies one of the first American anti-utopian perspectives. Finally, I claim that London consciously adopts an anti-utopian perspective in the first half of *The Iron Heel* (1908) to illustrate the inherent flaws of capitalism.

Dissertation Reflection

Yet first I would like to start begin with a meta-perspective on my dissertation itself. Interestingly, I read each texts of my surveyed authors—London, Benson, Huxley, and Orwell—outside of the classroom setting and for pure pleasure. When reading and re-reading (and re-reading again) *Brave New World* (1932) I wished to understand a few simple questions: why does Huxley create a supposed dystopian world yet emphasize its economic and social functionality in the midst of the Great Depression? If he wished to merely criticize Fordism/Taylorism why did his A.F. society not have more in common with the nightmares imagine by London or Zamyatin? Or, more simply, why did his future seem hedonistically fun? In part, my dissertation extends from my Master's Thesis, "The Greening of A.F. London:

Reading *Brave New World* in the Utopian Tradition" (2013), integrated in Chapter Three of my dissertation. Here, I argue that Aldous Huxley plans his future metropolis off of Ebenezer Howard's Garden City Plan. Yet in this earlier work I had yet to discover Gregory Claeys and Lyman Sargent's concept of anti-utopia (as detailed later in this section, a critique of utopian thought and/or systems) and, as a result, framed my analysis around a term of my own creation, what I then called an inverted utopia. As my understanding of utopian criticism continued to advance during my PhD studies, I came to recognize that the fault of the recognizing these distinct genres did not lie with me alone. Though Claeys and Sargent are two of the most influential utopian scholars today, many critics do not embrace the distinction between utopia, dystopia, and anti-utopia. In part, I wanted to apply the concept of anti-utopia to works before Glenn Negley and John Max Patrick introduced the term dystopia in their anthology *The Quest for Utopia* (1952). I believe that influence of *Quest for Utopia* and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) deeply impacted 20th century utopian criticism to the degree that critics ignored the anti-utopian genre until the 1990s.

These questions lead me to read the bulk of Huxley's non-fiction essays—many of which he wrote for popular publicizations like *Harper's* Magazine to maintain a steady stream of income—and realize his concerns regarding population control and ecological preservation. Such essays, of course, illustrated his embrace of eugenics. Yet they also showed me that while his future purged of art and intellectual individualism constitutes a negative society, that fact alone does not mean he condemns every aspect of his future society. This led me to closely analyze his cityscape and correlate his earlier support of Howard's plans to the creation of A.F. (after Ford) London.

Part of what attracted me to *Brave New World* in particular was the overriding critical sentiment that the novel was less "prophetic" when compared to *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and the way in which Orwell anticipated the rise of Cold War tensions. While Huxley himself—both when writing to Orwell personally and in *Brave New World Revisited* (1952)—argued that his future was ultimately more realistic and probable, I detest the manner in which the strengths of these works are often evaluated in regard to how correctly they correlate to the future. In many ways, I began to view these works as apocalyptic. In these novels, history slows to a stopping point, but, more importantly, (to use the literal Greek translation) authors "uncover" or "unveil" revelations. Such revelations not only detail concerns about the future, but also "uncover" or "unveil" the past to contemporary readers. In his Book of Revelation John, exiled on the island of Patmos, details a future to, in part, condemn to the Roman Empire and, in doing so, illustrates to us today the power of Roman authorities in the late 1st century. In the same way, London, Benson, Huxley and Orwell's perspectives give us insight into the power of capitalism, socialism, scientific management, and totalitarianism at the first half of the 20th century. In particular, my interest in analyzing these works, not as a prophecy of the future, but as a reflection of the past lead me to analyze Robert Hugh Benson's critically ignored *Lord of the World* (1907).

While London, Huxley and Orwell's works are mentioned in almost any utopian canon, I came about Benson much by chance. In 2015, when planning my Jack London section for my 200 level English Course, "Before *1984*: The Evolution of the Modern Dystopian Novel," I read again and again how the *The Iron Heel* constituted the first dystopian novel of the twentieth century. However, I had happened upon Benson's *The Lord of the World* in a used book store and knew that his work predated London's (though just by one year).

I believe my section analyzing Benson's quiet advocation of socialism during a time in which Pius X condemned modernity in full constitutes one of the strong areas of my dissertation. Some of my chapters had one specific question in mind: for instance, in Chapter One, why did London detail the First and impending Second Revolt against the capitalist oligarchy rather than describing a time of the capitalist oligarchy in bloom (like in, for instance, Ignatius Donnelly's Caesar's Column, published 1890) or how did Orwell anticipate the rise of brutalism? In the case of Benson, my exploration mirrored that of Huxley. Largely, the work is only discussed among Conservative Catholics—and the last two popes—as a warning against secularism. Yet, again, I found myself perplexed by the same question that I faced when reading *Brave New World*: if he wished to condemn secularism, why did Benson create a world—up until the introduction of the Anti-Christ—that many a reader would happily reside in? Why did his dystopian socialist government not only function, but thrive?

In the case of Benson, I faced an interesting paradox: though there are only a few academic articles in existence that mention him at all—most of which merely use him as a minor framing device—his biographies, which fail to illustrate him as anything other than as a model Catholic, nonetheless detail a man in imperfect alignment with Church teachings. I believe my chapter on Benson constitutes the first, and only, critical and biographic reappraisal of Benson that situates him—at least for a very brief moment in 1906-1907—as an individual wedded to, but still independent of, Catholic orthodoxy.

Therefore, with each author surveyed, I first begin with a biographic reflection to detail their personal views on the very systems that they scrutinize. As my dissertation illustrates, the criticisms produced by London, Benson, Huxley and Orwell in their respective works show nuanced analyses extending beyond mere personal sentiment; each author concerns himself with *how* capitalism, socialism, scientific management, and totalitarianism positively and negatively impacts not only individuals, but also the world at large. Therefore, rather than focusing on ideology alone, I dissect the cityscapes and illustrate *how* the systems they analyze extend to impact the architecture and urban layouts of their projected futures.

Critical Overview of Literary Utopias

The earliest study of utopias, Henricus Ahlefeld's *A Philosophical Argument Concerning Fictional Republics* (1704), sets a precedent followed by almost every critical text to follow: it introduces the concept of utopia with Thomas More's titular Greek pun *eu*-topia (εὗ τόπος), the good place, and *ou*-topia (οὐ τόπος), no place. Yet, as Sargent notes in "The Problem of the Flawed Utopia" (2013), "utopias are not descriptions of perfect places."[i] The same issue arises with the term dystopia, first introduced into the critical lexicon by Negley and Patrick in *Quest for Utopia*, the first academic anthology of utopian and dystopian texts. Here, the critics create the juxtaposing characteristics of the genres readers understand today: "the opposite of eutopia, the ideal society…is a dystopia, if it is permissibly to coin a word."[iiiii] In their introduction, Negley and Patrick avoid a strict dichotomy and define both define utopias and dystopias as fictional communities created, either positively or negatively, with the aim of supplying political commentary.

Similarly, critics like Jean Pfaelzer in *The Utopian Novel in America 1888-1896* (1984) employ a singular definition of both utopias and dystopias as "extended literary metaphors embodying theories about social change."[iv] Pfaelzer logically uses a pliable definition since, as Leszek Kolakowski notes in *Modernity on Endless Trial* (1997), utopia as a "literary genre" goes back "into antiquity, far beyond the historical moment of its invention" and the same rings true for dystopian fiction.[v] In essence, the dystopian genre extends from the utopian genre. In particular, George Kaleb claims in *Utopia and its Enemies* (1963) that the prevalent dystopian authors of the early twentieth century specifically write with the concept of utopia in mind. He argues that E.M. Forster's "The Machine Stops," Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, express "almost every fear that utopian ends arouse."[vi] Though he does not define it as such, works that subvert and critique the execution of utopian principles are best analyzed and understood not as dystopias, but as anti-utopias.

While the term anti-utopia predated dystopia in popular usage before 1952, Lyman Sargent's terminology, key to my critical analysis, holds a more exacting definition. He defines anti-utopia as a genre in "The Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited" (1994), the three faces being 1) utopian literature 2) utopian practice, including intentional/real life communities 3) utopian social theory. He also, defines the three separate sub-genres distinct from utopian literature to better match their reality: 1) anti-utopia: "a non-existent negative society…as a criticism of utopianism" 2) dystopia: a society "worse than the society in which that reader lived" 3) critical utopia: "intended to be viewed as better than contemporary society, but…takes a critical view of the utopian genre."[vii] By the time he and Gregory Claeys publish their anthology *The Utopian Reader* in 1995, Sargent merges the concept of critical utopia with anti-utopia to constitute a work that describes a negative fictional community to re-evaluate supposed utopian principles.[viii]

In doing so, Sargent builds off a growing critical understanding distinguishing the two genres[ix] In 1993, when segregating the concept of dystopia from anti-utopia Edith Clowes notes that while former refers to a "novelistic form of narrative that depicts a bad place, or 'dys-topia'" the anti-utopian genre "refers to a philosophy or worldview critical of positive utopian schemes."[x] Subsequent works, like Philip Wegner's *Imaginary Communities* (2000) and Darko Suvin's "Theses on Dystopia 2001" (2003), use Sargent and Claeys' terminology. [xi] In the former, when discussing *We*, Wegner attests that Zamyatin "dramatically revises the generic institution of the narrative utopia" in the way that it criticizes innately utopian ideals like Le Corbusier's architectural modernism.[xii] Suvin, also using Zamyatin as his example, defines anti-utopia in a similar manner. He, not unlike Clowes, also denotes what he calls a "simple dystopia," a straightforward bad place, to "avoid inventing yet another pre-fix."[xiii] Yet, ignoring the growing consensus, many critics continue to use the terms dystopia and anti-utopia interchangeably.[xiv] Claeys admits that it "seems an unlikely event that we can agree on particulars" as "'dystopia' is often used interchangeably with 'anti-utopia' or 'negative utopia,'" to describe either "negative social and political developments… or as a satire of utopian aspirations which attempts to show up their fallacies, or which demonstrate, in B.F. Skinner's words, 'ways of life we must be sure to avoid.'"[xv]

However, the distinction remains important, especially among texts that precede the term dystopia itself. Before the 1950s authors who deviate from the utopian tradition and portray negative political systems do much more than warn of the consequences of ideologies that they find objectionable. Rather authors like London, Benson, Huxley, and Orwell embrace the anti-utopian genre and, in doing so, highlight the limitations of utopian-minded philosophies (capitalism, secular socialism, Taylorism, and totalitarian socialism respectively). When analyzing works like *The Iron Heel* (1908), *Lord of the World* (1907), *Brave New World* (1932), and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) as anti-utopian, rather than dystopian, texts a reader discovers that the authors do not simply warn against supposed bad places. Instead the authors I survey highlight the failings of numerous utopian minded schemes, including belief systems that they actively endorsed, with a high degree of nuance; therefore, such authors go beyond the two-dimensional good/bad dichotomy that separates dystopias from utopias. While critics like Claeys and Sargent stress the importance of understanding the anti-utopian tradition at the end of the twentieth century, many major utopian critics continue to downplay this distinction.

For instance, M. Keith Booker defines dystopian literature in a similar manner to anti-utopian literature in the way that it "situates itself in direct opposition to utopian thought, warning against the potential negative consequences of arrant utopianism" in *Dystopian Literature* (1994).[xvi] Though this work precedes *The Utopian Reader*, Booker nonetheless superimposes the two genres in more recent publications as well. Though he references the work of both Sargent and Suvin in his reference guide, *Literature and Politics Today: The Political Nature of Modern Fiction, Poetry, and Drama* (2015), here he continues to conflate the terms. Rather than referencing the codified concept of anti-utopia that Sargent and Claeys articulate in *The Utopian Reader*, he refers only to the separate concepts of anti-utopia and critical utopia that Sargent introduces in “The Three Faces of Utopia Revisited.”[xvii] Yet, even here, he does not interrogate the necessity of the different terminology; he merely references Sargent’s earlier work to reflect his knowledge of the critical conversation. Therefore, in his section defining dystopian literature earlier in the work, he haphazardly notes that “the term *anti-utopia* is also sometimes used” and then, throughout the work, uses the terms interchangeably.[xviii]

He goes on to note, correctly, that three main works—*We*, *Brave New World*, and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*—contribute to “the genre in its modern form,” but ignores how Zamyatin and Huxley radically differ from Orwell in their criticisms of totalitarianism.[xix] While Orwell does subvert a utopian concept, peace, through perpetual war between the three inter-continental super-states, he does not orient *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as a critique of pacifism. In contrast, Zamyatin and Huxley engage with supposedly utopian concepts of collectivism, scientific management, and modern architecture to remark on the benefits and limitations of such philosophies. Designating *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as a dystopia, Claeys argues that the other works that make up the trinity of dystopian literature constitute anti-utopias reacting works like Wells' *A Modern Utopia* (1905), *Men Like Gods* (1923), and *The Shape of Things to Come* (1933). In my dissertation I do not contest the established influence of Wells on such works but aim to expand my exploration to other influences. Sargent notes in "Themes in Utopian Fiction Before Wells" (1976) that over 400 utopian works exist before 1900, many of which had no relation to science fiction.[xx] I argue that to read *We* or *Brave New World* as purely anti-Wellsian work of fiction reduces the scope and extent of Zamyatin and Huxley's technological criticisms and their ability to engage with the larger utopian canon.

Though she does not cite Sargent's work when defining anti-utopia (almost verbatim), Dohra Ahmad brings up an important point regarding the history of anti-utopia. In *Landscapes of Hope* (2009), she correctly claims that, beginning at the turn of the twentieth century, anti-utopian works begin to emerge as "an entirely new subgenre."[xxi] However, before analyzing the evolution of the anti-utopian genre, and why it develops alongside literary modernism, I will first provide a general overview of utopian literature. Doing so contextualizes the anti-utopian genre as a uniquely modernist reaction to the inherent positivism that defines utopian genre.

Before discussing the various movements of utopian literature, I first will define utopia. In "The Concept of Utopia" (2010) Fatima Viera adopts what she denotes as "a more inclusive definition of utopia," since she correctly argues that "More's concept of utopia…differs from all the previous crystallizations of the utopian desire."[xxii] She argues the concept of "the desire for a better life" serves as the "most important" characteristic of utopias as it as "it allows for the inclusion within the framework of utopia of a wide range of texts."[xxiii] Yet, according to her, even this broad definition puts limits on the utopian canon. For instance, Viera notes that since some Christian texts, like St. Augustine's *The City of God*, emphasize not a better life, but the afterlife, they represent "not a utopia but an alotopia."[xxiv] Since Robert Hugh Benson in *Lord of The World*, one of my surveyed texts, affirms the necessity of the afterlife through faith even Viera's broad definition does not suit my analysis. Like Suvin, I aim to avoid unnecessary prefixes and therefore use his definition for utopia: "the construction of a particular community where sociopolitical institutions, norms, and relationships between people are organized according to a radically different principle than in the author's community."[xxv] Therefore, Eutopia (the good place), anti-utopia (the unideal place), and dystopia (the bad place) all fall under the moniker of utopia.

Literary Overview

Though numerous exceptions exist in each subsection, utopian literature encompasses three distinct movements: golden age utopias (classical to Renaissance), utopias of navigation (sixteenth to eighteenth centuries), and futuristic utopias (nineteenth century to present day). Within each movement, authors respond to the loci that define their respective eras and thereby produce utopias defined first by philosophy (religious or secular), exploration, and finally scientific advancement. Though authors may focus on considerations of religion, exploration, or technology in any of the utopian eras discussed below, the unique communities they describe will largely be defined by the topic that invites the interest of their intended reader.

For instance, Robert Hugh Benson orients his perspective to advance Christian religious thought, but secular scientific advancement defines his age; therefore, his narrative centers not on a religious community, but on rational atheists. Even though Francis Bacon wishes to advocate the scientific method in *The New Atlantis,* he organizes his discussion around the prevalent theme of his time, the exploration of the new world. According to Viera, since an author "situates utopia at the boundary between reality and fiction," the utopia must be "anchored in real society."[xxvi] To explore the author's projected world—be it worthy positive or negative—that world must relate to the reader's grounded reality.

In the first era, golden age utopias, authors envision a society, often lost, that supports humankind in its ideal element. In the cases of the Book of Genesis (5th century BCE-6th century BCE), Hesiod's *Works and Days* (ca. 700 BCE), and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (7 CE) humanity's idyllic state of nature lies in the past, while works like Heliodorus of Emesa's *Aethiopica* (ca. 1st or 2nd century CE), Tao Yuanming's *(The Record of) the Peach Blossom Spring* (421 CE), and Sir Philip Sidney's *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* (1580) detail a far removed, but not unattainable, bucolic environment. To other authors, the golden age has yet to come. Aristotle's *Politics* (350 BCE) and Plato's *The Republic* (ca. 280 BCE) describe man's model relationship with government. In the New Testament, authors, like John of Patmos in the Book of Revelation (ca. 1st Century CE), respond to religious persecution by projecting a golden age brought about by the Second Coming. Works like Revelations connect to earlier Gospels, like Mark 13 (ca. 66-70 CE), that not only react to historical Roman suppression, but also detail eschatological history. When the imminent arrival of Jesus stalls, authors as varied as St. Augustine in *The City of God* (Earth 5th century CE) and Dante Alighieri in *Paradiso* (14th century) detail utopia in the heavenly, rather than the earthly, realm. In each text, be it from divine will or pure happenstance, society finds itself isolated from its natural state.

Golden age utopias harken back to either a time before private land or, as is the case with Plato, argue for reform to reduce society's practice of individual ownership. Ovid's poem "The

Golden Age" (1st Century BC- 1st century CE) evokes a time before agriculture and land ownership where "the earth herself/ untouched by spade or ploughshare, freely gave/ as of her own volition, all [that] men needed."[xxvii] Plato's *Republic* (380 BC) calls for a new way of life where no citizen "should have any property of his own beyond what is absolutely necessary; neither should they have a private house or store close against anyone who has a mind to enter."[xxviii] Lucian of Samosata's "Saturnalian Letters" (ca 160 CE) calls to Saturn to resurrect the Golden Age, the age "the poets inform me…when you were king" and "earth bestowed her gifts upon them unsown and unploughed, [when] every man's table was spread automatically, [when] rivers ran [with] wine and milk and honey."[xxix] Yet, as the age of discovery exposes Europeans to previously unrecognized societies and geographies, the concept of utopia becomes less ephemeral and speculative.

After European explorers contact the American continent, utopias of navigation emerge in the early sixteenth century. Inspired by the discovery of the New World, authors orient utopia as a geographic place rather a heavenly or pastoral ideal. In particular Thomas More, whom I analyze in greater detail later in the next section, takes inspiration from the letters of Amerigo Vespucci, Christopher Columbus and Angelo Poliziano when writing *Utopia* (1516).[xxx] Influenced by More's work, as well as the continued colonization of the Americas, authors like Tommaso Campanella in *The City of the Sun* (1623) and Sir Francis Bacon in *New Atlantis* (1627) transport readers to imaginative new lands. Due to the popularity of these works, authors like Joseph Hall in *Mundus Alter et Idem* (*An Old World and New,* 1605), Margaret Cavendish in *The Blazing World* (1666), and finally Jonathan Swift in *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) subversively satirizes the genre—a development that leads to the creation of the anti-utopian genre. Though *Mundus Alter et Idem*, a work that lampoons More's *Utopia* and parodies Roman Catholic customs, inspired *Gulliver's Travels* Swift, in his work, moves beyond comical satire. In Book IV, he adopts a misanthropic attitude and uses his race of intelligent horses, the houyhnhnms, to question humanity's ability to achieve perfectibility.[xxxi] More than a century later, my surveyed authors do much of the same by interrogating the notion that industrialization can facilitate the development of an ideal state.

Finally, as everyday men or women begin to contextualize the globe in full, utopia becomes a time rather than a place. In *Looking Backward* (1888), a novel that inspired generations of writers and over 162 Bellamy Book Clubs in the United States alone, Edward Bellamy advocates socialism in his description of an ideal future state. Likeminded authors like Anna Bowman Dodd in *The Republic of the Future* (1887), William Morris in *News from Nowhere* (1892), Upton Sinclair in *The Millennium* (1924) depict future societies to promote their respective worldviews. Admittedly, many utopian novels of this time depict new worlds. However, unlike the previous era, authors here illustrate advanced technologies that emphasize that such utopias, regardless of geography, occur in futuristic states. Authors like Edward Bulwer-Lytton in *The Coming Race* (1870), Mary Bradley Lane in *Mizora* (1880), William Dean Howells in *A Traveler from Altruria* (1894), and, of course, H.G. Wells in works like *A Modern Utopia* (1905) and *Men Like Gods* (1923) depict utopias on different planets, but still orient their utopias based on futuristic technological developments. Even when imagining new geographies, authors emphasize the advanced nature of their technologies and, in doing so, accentuate that these utopian spaces exist in the future rather than in some undiscovered realm.

More does not describe incredible industrial advancements that aid egalitarianism, but in *Utopia*, he does propose a radical reconfiguration of public land to help eradicate institutionalized poverty. Therefore, he has much in common with authors who, centuries later, envision scientific advancement achieving the same ends. In the next section I argue that More wrote *Utopia* to criticize the way in which Tudor common land reform increases systematic vagrancy. Furthermore, I attest that he merges his analysis with fantasy to safely, and prudently, soften his assessment—a move that allows him to attack Henry VIII's government while staying in the good graces of the monarch. Finally, I argue that he describes the Utopian institution of slavery not to support entrenched bondage, but to make a subtle case for government funded public work projects to support displaced peoples. Though my dissertation focuses on modern anti-utopian texts, More's seminal text warrants analysis because he, like London, Benson, Huxley and Orwell after him, investigates how a state can control a population at large.

The Origins of the Utopia: Thomas More

In "Work to Text" Roland Barthes notes that a Work acts as a concrete object—a realized, published work like More's *Utopia*—and a Text represents a non-definitive object, a force.[xxxii] I analyze *Utopia* in detail because More's Text manifests itself in numerous forms: from the religious and socialist utopian communities founded in the nineteenth century to the technocratic wonderlands depicted in the novels of H.G. Wells, the utopian tradition lives on in the collective imagination. Yet a Text with such an expensive force makes More's work difficult to contextualize in the spirit of the English Renaissance. Such a reading proves even more problematic with the fact that Thomas More's well-documented political and religious views often contradict the very ideals that his narrative extols. Chapter Two explores More's religious arguments in greater detail, but, here, an analysis of *Utopia* illustrates how he criticizes specific policies of Henry VIII—while still maintaining a friendly personal relationship with the monarch. By 1529, More not only authored the wildly popular *Utopia*, a work that underwent five editions in four short years, but also served as a diplomatic envoy to Henry VIII, the Privy Councilor, the speaker of the House of Commons, and, finally, Lord Chancellor of England.[xxxiii]

As mentioned in the last section, utopian authors that predispose More often harken back to either a time before private land or, as is the case with Plato, argue for reform to reduce society's practice of individual ownership. In *The Praise of Pleasure* (1957) Edward Surtz notes that a reader can better understand More's principles by examining the "few evident differences" between More's utopia and its classical antecedents.[xxxiv] Importantly, More does not situate Utopia as a pre-agriculture state. Nonetheless, he does share these aforementioned classical author's beliefs that land ownership prevents an ideal society from forming on earth. Therefore, More orients *Utopia* alongside its classical predecessors with one important commonality: the lack of private land.

Before continuing further, a brief summary of *Utopia* proves necessary. Those well acquainted with the work may choose to skip ahead. However, a narrative overview should be expressed here, early in my dissertation, as a point of reference. The first book of *Utopia* describes More's meeting with Raphael Hythloday, a Portuguese traveler and philosopher who, after five years of living on the island nation of Utopia, returns to Europe to spread its ideals. More frames the narrative of Book One around an actual diplomatic mission he undertook in Venice for Henry VIII in 1515.[xxxv] More meets the traveler alongside his contemporary colleagues Peter Gilles, clerk of Antwerpt, and John Morton, the Archbishop of Canterbury and former Lord Chancellor.[xxxvi] After some conversation about the ordering of society, the three accompany Hythloday to dinner; upon finishing the meal, their mysterious guest lays out the Utopian system in great detail.

Book Two of *Utopia* consists of an in-depth description of the island's geography, its people, and their social structure. Situated off the American continent, General Utopus, the Utopia's founder, conquered the land's original inhabitants. He then "brought the rude and uncivilized inhabitants to good government" and, using the natives and his own soldiers as workers, ordered the building of a fifteen-mile channel that separated Utopia from the mainland.[xxxvii] While it has limited contact with both the European and American continents, its geography, customs, and even its language, as documented by More's creation of the Utopian alphabet in the book, reflect a unique society.

Unlike Cavendish, who uses fanciful elements in *The Blazing World* to draw attention to her radical feminist claims, More grounds his narrative in the preposterous to soften his criticisms. Stephen Greenblatt's vocabulary of self-fashioning and self-cancellation in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (2005) helps expose the limitations of freedom of speech in the Renaissance period. In particular, he defines self-fashioning as "the crafting of a public role" and argues that self-cancellation stems from "the profound desire to escape from the identity so crafted."[xxxviii] While he notes that the positioning of More and his contemporaries alongside Hythloday "heighten the realism" of the character and his travels, it more importantly functions to create a separation between More and the unorthodox ideas of the Utopians.[xxxix] Greenblatt rightly notes that to "break through fiction is dangerous- one can have one's head broken."[xl] Therefore, More constructs his Utopia in two different realities: on one hand he uses his island state to seriously satirize England; on the other he positions his narrative as a fanciful joke, a travelogue to an impossible land. Throughout the work, he jokingly disinherits the very reality of Utopia. For instance, the very name Hythloday literally means windbag, adding a joking quality that prevents the narrative he extols from acting as a serious, and thus threatening, political chronicle. More even fills his ideal civilization with joking allusions in the original Latin version: the colossal main river of Anydrus actually means no-water; the largest of the Utopia's fifty-four cities, the capital city Amaurot, which contains boulevards twenty feet wide, translates as castle-in-the-air.[xli]

In other words, More uses fantastic elements as a shield to discuss the problems of the day. Rather than treating the work as a severe political treatise, which could easily result in imprisonment or execution, the fanciful nature of the Utopia allows More to comically satirize the nature of sixteenth century England without positioning himself as a revolutionary dissenter. In *Utopia,* he blends his political criticism with fantasy as an act of self-cancellation, allowing More to safety distance himself from the more radical elements of his work—especially regarding common land reform.

The Tudor period, beginning with Henry VII's reign, marks an increase in enclosure—the legal practice of consolidating numerous, small landholdings in larger farms. Resultingly, amalgamated lands no longer belonged to the commons, but to individual landowners. A century and a half before, as the Black Death (peaking in 1351) ravaged Europe, such enclosures occurred as a natural response to depopulation. Yet, during this time, landowners began to enclose land with only profit in mind. In *Henry VII's New Men and the Making of Tudor England* (2016), Steven Gunn notes that Tudor landowners aggressively enclosed lands as English wool became more profitable than crops.[xlii] In moving lands from arable to pasture use, landowners not only took advantage of producing costlier exports, but also reduced the number of laborers necessary to do so. However, in doing so, landowners also displaced tenant farmers, effectively making them vagrants.

More situates his most direct criticisms regarding enclosure in Book One, a fact that does not go unnoticed by Greenblatt; he applies the dichotomy of self-fashioning/self-cancellation to Thomas More's *Utopia* primarily in Book One. He notes that by placing himself in the narrative, More self-fashions his own image as a statesman. Yet in utilizing the image of another, the book's protagonist Raphael Hythloday, he segregates his beliefs from those described in the narrative. Of course, More, regardless who narrates the story, depicts Utopia to the reader. Nonetheless, while More's depiction of himself as a traveling diplomat "is at once the perfect expression of self-conscious role-playing," such a move also contains a degree of "limitation."[xliii] More must portray himself conservatively inside the narrative structure and thus uses the introduction of Hythloday to allow him to "represent all that More deliberately excluded from the personality he created and played."[xliv] Paul Turner admits that while such a realistic framing device facilitates a knowing wink to "amuse intelligent readers by hoaxing the unintelligent" the aspect of Hythloday's second-hand narrative best serves as a "protective technique."[xlv] Therefore, the creation of Hythloday allows More to discuss radical points of view while maintaining a distance from the philosophy detailed in the work: in essence, an act of self-cancellation ensues.

Granted, by titling the first edition *De Optimo Reipublicae Statv deqve noua insula Vtopia libellus uere aureus, nec minus salutaris quam festiuus, clarissimi disertissimique uir Thomae Mori inclytae ciutatis Loninensis ciuis & Vicecomitis* [*The Best State of a Commonwealth and the New Island of Utopia: A Truly Golden Handbook, No less Beneficial than Entertaining, by the Distinguished and Eloquent Author Thomas More, Citizen and Sheriff of the Famous City of London*] More claims ownership of the work outright. Writing in Latin, he intends for audiences to approach his work of travelogue fiction as a serious academic work.

Likewise, More's influences—namely Plato's *Republic*, Aristotle's *Politics,* Augustine's *The City of God,* and Thomas Aquinas's *Commentary on Aristotle's* Politics—and the fact that his friend Erasmus aided in *Utopia*'s first printing speaks to More's scholastic intentions. Thierry Martins published the first edition in Leuven, home to the oldest university in the Netherlands (today in Belgium), the Catholic University of Leuven (founded 1425). After its initial run, other publishing houses quickly produced unauthorized Latin editions in other university centers, among them Florence, Vienna, Frankfurt, Amsterdam, and Oxford. Quickly, humanist scholars of the period began to praise the work—so much so that the editions published in 1518 in Basel (Switzerland) included introductions by Hieronymus van Busleyden and Guillaume Budé.[xlvi] Though he commiserates with disenfranchised lower classes in Book One, More—writing in Latin—speaks to both scholars and those in high political office. Ultimately, the first English language translation of the work did not appear until Ralph Roberson's 1551 edition.[xlvii]

Though he authored the work in Latin to speak to a continental audience, More models the geography of Utopia off of Britain specifically. In "Mapping *Utopia*" (1970), Brian Goodey claims that Utopia's geography "consists of a subtle blend of the ideal and the actual"—in terms of realism, he argues, More bases Utopia's dimensions from those supplied by the Saint Albans Chronicle (1515).[xlviii] In particular, he notes that though Utopia's crescent shape does not match its British counterpart, its two-hundred mile width matches the Chronicle's two-hundred miles width of Britain and that Utopia's distance from the mainland (fifteen miles) mirrors the shortest width of the English channel (twenty-one miles).[xlix] Goodey extends his analysis to discuss how More situates Utopia's capital, Amaurotum, as a stand-in for London and ideal, grid based classical city designs. Given More's complex understanding of the British capital his claim rings very true. However, I go further and argue that he concerns himself with rural as well as urban planning as More understands the complex interplay between both environments.

In particular, More references the wool trade in Book One during a conversation Hythloday and another dinner guest, a lawyer, at the house of Cardinal John Morton (1420-1500). The lawyer in question debates why thievery continues against the threat of "severe execution." He notes that England contains so many thieves "that there were sometimes twenty on one gibbet [gallow]!"[l] Hythloday, who More notes "took the boldness to speak freely before the Cardinal," remarks that "no punishment" will "restrain those…who can find out no other way of livelihood."[li] He clarifies his critique, and notes that stealing, of which the lawyer speaks, stems from a cause "more peculiar to England."[lii] More uses Hythloday as a voice box and answers that "the increase of pasture" permits sheep "to devour men and unpeople, not only villages, but towns."[liii] His litany of criticisms, detailed below, illustrates the unintended impact of the English wool trade on peasant farmers. Though More exactingly condemns the process of enclosure, he nonetheless blends realism and fantasy in the dinner scene. While he grounds the discussion in a home he knew well—More served as a page under Morton two decades before—the discussion occurs more than fifteen years after the Cardinal's death.

Furthermore, though the fictionalized More sits at the dinner too, he does not actively join this part of Hythloday's conversation—an act of self-cancellation so that he may distance himself from Hythloday. More dissociates himself from Hytholday's opinions since he, in criticizing enclosure, berates the landowning elite. Hytholday argues that everyone, from "nobility and gentry" to "abbots," moved to the wool trade to earn a "living at their ease" with "no good to the public."[liv] With irony he denounces these "worthy countrymen" of turning "the best inhabited places into solitudes" by "trick or force."[lv] Landowners then replace the "many hands" needed for fieldwork with "one shepherd," so that, though not a "monopoly, "few hands" already "so rich" reap the rewards.[lvi] Hence, he describes an enclosing landowner as an "insatiable wretch, who is a plague to his country."[lvii] More directs a harsh condemnation of the landowning aristocracy but veils his criticism through Hytholday's narration because his intended audience represents the very object of his critique.

Speaking to an educated, elite audience, More, using Hythloday as a voice box, sympathizes with peasants as openly as he condemns the landowning elite. He argues that "stop[ping] the course of agriculture" not only increases "the price of corn" but also forces "men and women, married and unmarried, old and young" to "change their seat" and look for employment elsewhere.[lviii] More emphasizes that the vagrant, when displaced by landowners, faces little choice but to steal for his or her subsistence: "what else can they do…for they have worn out both their health and their clothes and are tattered."[lix] Arguing that capital punishment has little impact on thievery, More frames the issue as a religious, as well as economic, concern. Cardinal Morton questions Hytholday if another form of punishment "will be more useful to the public" and muses that the removal of capital punishment permits "an invitation to commit more crimes."[lx] Hytholday replies that "God has commanded us not to kill" and claims that "the mutual consent of men in making laws" does not free "people from the obligation of the divine law."[lxi] He contends that courts that punish murder and thievery with equal severity actually "provoke [thieves] to cruelty" to lessen the "danger of discovery."[lxii] Rather, he attests thieves should be "condemned to serve in the public works"—the preferred form of punishment in Utopia.[lxiii]

His positioning of slavery as an ethnical punishment raises an important consideration: does More, in describing Utopia's complex system of slavery in detail, condone or even actively promote institutionalized slavery as a part of an ideal state? Scholars continue to grabble with this issue, but, first, let us turn to the text itself. Hytholday indicates three distinct categories of slaves: 1) soldiers captured during active military engagements against Utopia; 2) criminals, including Utopians or those purchased or gifted from foreign powers; 3) foreigners who volunteer themselves as slaves to avoid poverty. Regardless of category, the state provides enslaved peoples with work, food, housing and basic human rights. More also attests that slavery, here, does not constitute a perpetual, renewable system of bondage. In Utopia, servitude does not pass down to a slave's children and thus, within one generation, the offspring of a slave may advance into another caste.[lxiv] The first two categories of salves can be understood as another way to avoid murder (thereby lessoning instances of killing in war or through capital punishment). Among these groups, the state affords the third the most rights: except for "imposing more labour upon them" the state treats them "as well as their own countrymen" and, though it rarely occurs, allows them to "go back to their own country" if desired.[lxv] Understanding the third group helps garner a better understanding of why More justifies slavery in his supposed ideal state.

In comparison, he positions displaced British peasants as permanently economically disenfranchised—a fact emphasizes hurts the country as a whole—so that Utopian slavery, with its guarantees of food and shelter, appear admirable in comparison. Indeed, enclosure became much more than an agricultural concern as vagrancy increased civil unrest across the nation. Historian A.L. Bier notes that "England experienced major shifts in migration patterns" as, increasingly, the "transient poor" moved long distances from the countryside to urban centers like London.[lxvi] He attests that "London vagrancy did rise dramatically in the period" and vagrants faced more than just homeless, hunger, and unemployment.[lxvii] Unlike the impotent poor, those unable to work because of age or physical limitation, the government harshly punished vagrants—including those who did not steal. He notes that with “no more occasion for country labour” peasants “are put in prison as idle vagabonds.”[lxviii] Yet, in reality, vagrants faced dangers far more alarming that a prison sentence.

In his initial response, Henry VIII enhanced the first British anti-vagrancy laws established in 1349, laws that punished the unemployed with branding or wiping. Beginning in 1495, the king authorized local constables and justices to punish vagrancy out of court; such a move meant vagrants “never saw a jury” and could face any number of bodily punishment ranging including flogging, hair-cropping, ear-cropping, and even duck-stooling (the equivalent of waterboarding today).[lxix] Since vagrants, who subsisted on begging, could rarely afford fines such public punishments became commonplace. Henry VIII’s statues also allowed for abuses from more lucrative constables and justices: since vagrants did not see a courtroom, an official could easily confiscate any money on a vagabond’s person in lieu of (or in addition to) physical reprimand.

Yet none benefitted more from enclosures than Henry VIII himself, a fact not lost on More. Though enclosures increased greatly during the reign of Henry VII, his conservative expenditures allowed his son to inherit a budget surplus. Unlike his prudent father, Henry VIII doubled his household expenses and wielded wars in Scotland which, in turn, led to an increased taxation on English lands.[lxx] The solution to increase profits proved simple to many of the landowning elite: convert their lands into low-cost, high yielding sheep pasture and to hell with the tenants. Before Henry VIII, via Thomas Cromwell, confiscated and sold monastery land after turning away from Catholicism, taxes from enclosure filled his war chest and kept his royal purse full.

Most steadfastly, the structure of Utopia condemns the landholding practices of England during the early sixteenth century. While he forms his society on distinct castes –slaves, farmer, artisans, politicians, and scholars—the civilization lessens abuse by preventing the ability to amass, and thus pass on, material wealth. Rather, society gathers material goods in great warehouses and each head of household chooses the pertinent goods as needed without any form of payment; Utopia encourages further detachment from material goods by forcing each family to change houses every other year. In the same regard, the society has eradicated private property and holds all property in common. While Utopians do trade with other nations and thus acquire currency of gold and silver, such materials hold a negative connotation to the Utopian: precious metals make up chamber pots and slave chains; furthermore, Utopians connect jewels and fine ornament with juvenilia as children begin their lives covered in finery and, as they reach maturity, strip themselves of such embellishments. Therefore, the greatest figures of the land do not use the iconography of royalty or the supreme pontiff to designate themselves. Instead, a pedestrian traveling the streets of a Utopian city may identify a Prince by a sheaf of corn carried before him and a high priest by same the procession of one single lit candle.

Such a criticism does not only condemn the English landowning elite, but also decries, indirectly, Henry VIII as the source of such destitution. With this in mind, the self-shielding narrative techniques that More utilizes makes even more sense. Remember, *Utopia* is not an anonymous pamphlet distributed to the literate public; rather, it is a work written in Latin, the *lingua franca* of its time, and sold to popularly throughout the continent with Thomas More's name and likeness attached to it. Yet, his self-cancelling tendencies, specifically removing himself as the narrator as Greenblatt describes and convoluting his own narrative in Book Two with societal elements he did not agree with, protected him from indictment and controversy.

Utopia represents a balancing act of self-censorship and, simultaneously, unmitigated criticism. More's clever narrative techniques extended his life; though ultimately, he died for his unwillingness to compromise with the Henry's particular reformation, *Utopia* serves as a testament to his ability to traverse the limitations of freedom of speech in the Renaissance era. Henry VIII himself owned a copy of *Utopia*: such a reality proves that, like the surrounding rocks and shallows that make the journey to Utopia nearly impossible, an author may nonetheless navigate past the limitations of speech that block his way.

Ambrose Bierce and the Origins of American Anti-Utopian Fiction

The most well-known anti-utopian authors, Zamyatin and Huxley, write their novels after World War One (and, in Zamyatin's case, Russia's descent into totalitarianism) illustrates the horrors of unrestrained, weaponized industrialism. Yet, in the nineteenth century, Ambrose Bierce adopts a consciously anti-utopian perspective to argue against the inherit merits of military service. Granted, the battlefields of the Civil War, in themselves, does not constitute utopian landscapes. However, during the rise of American nationalism, Bierce stands alone in condemning war and orthodoxy to duty. Therefore, he represents an important figure whose fiction and non-fiction contests the innate goodness of sacrifice during times of war. In particular, he uses his lived experience as a veteran to censure those who flippantly view military service as a beneficial vocation. In this way he precedes America's first anti-utopian writer, Jack London, who, through his own first-hand experiences, denounces the supposed utopianism capitalism in *The Iron Heel.*

First, Bierce distinguishes himself earlier nineteenth century authors who embraced sentimentalism in an effort to change a reader's awareness. According to Joanne Dobson, literary sentimentalism "envisions the self-in-relation [to others]" so that its "principle theme.…[is] the desire for bonding."[lxxi] Popular sentimental novels like Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852) and Louisa May Alcott's *Little Women* (1868-1869) aimed to be "fundamentally instructional" in changing reader's viewpoints about slavery and poverty, respectively.[lxxii] In many ways they succeeded, as a large portion of the American reading public flocked to such novels. As Mary G. De Jong notes in her "Introduction" to *Sentimentalism in Nineteenth-Century America* (2013), the "variability and seeming omnipresence of sentimentalism in nineteenth-century literature" elicits the question "was *everything* sentimental?"[lxxiii] However Dobson, noting the genre's popularity, also argues that sentimental fiction owes its wide range to "conventional and familiar elements" that authors used to reach "as wide an audience as possible."[lxxiv]

However, by embracing the familiar, such authors did little to connect their readers to the reality of battle; conversely, the defects of sentimentalism became obvious to soldiers, like Bierce, who fought in the Civil War. Robert Arbour notes as early as 1861 American artists faced an "ideological crisis" when attempting to integrate sentimentalism into war-time art. In particular he examines how war-era popular music, which detailed valiant soldiers desiring to return to the comfort of an idealized mother and home, "fail[ed] as a representational strategy for the Union."[lxxv] He notes that this failure "forc[ed] poets and composers alike to search for different modes of representation" and concludes that Walt Whitman incorporated, but revised sentimentalist elements in *Drum-Taps* (1865).[lxxvi] Though Whitman volunteered in a rank, unsanitary military hospital in Washington D.C. after Confederates wounded his brother George in the Battle of Fredericksburg, no other well-known author of the age came as close to the battlefield as Bierce. Bierce himself expressed his dislike of America's Civil War poet. While Whitman evoked rural platitudes in his pastoral elegy "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard

Bloom'd" (1865) Bierce rejected sentimental views of death in full. Instead, as detailed later in this section, he uses his fiction and non-fiction to claim that death has no meaning. In doing so, he, more than any other American author of the nineteenth century, expresses the purposeless carnage and adopts an anti-utopian perspective to encourage his readers to reexamine the supposed merits of armed service.

In *The Unwritten War: American Writers and the Civil War* (1973), Daniel Aaron notes that Bierce seemed an unlikely candidate to chronicle the Civil War. In his view, Mark Twain, Henry James, William Deans Howell, and Henry Adams represented "the men probably best endowed, if not the most temperamentally suited, to record the war in history or fiction."[lxxvii] However, "the four malingerers" as he calls them "never got close enough to fighting to write about it."[lxxviii] Each author found himself far removed from the fields of battle: in his autobiography *Notes of a Son and a Brother* (1914) James enigmatically claims that "a horrid even if an obscure hurt" prevented him from joining the army; when Abraham Lincoln appointed his father as United States Ambassador to the United Kingdom Abrams traveled to London to serve as his personal secretary; Twain, meanwhile, traveled to the western territories with his brother.[lxxix][lxxx] With the exception of Twain's "A Short History of a Campaign that Failed," a sensationalized and partly, if not entirely, fictional account him joining the pro-Confederate Marion Rangers in his hometown of Hannibal, Missouri, none of the authors mentioned above wrote directly about the defining event of nineteenth century America. Even the events detailed in *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1884) took place "forty to fifty" years before its publication, setting the novel well into the antebellum South. In *Mark Twain's America* (1932) historian Bernard DeVoto problematically notes that "the war did not greatly disquiet most of our authors." [lxxxi] Only Bierce gained enough personal acquaintanceship with the viciousness of the Civil War to write about the event with concrete authority.

Beginning in April 1861 and until he resigned from the Army with the rank of brevet major in January 1865, Bierce fought in numerous southern conflicts including the Battle of Shiloh, the Battle of Chickamauga, and the Battle of Nashville. During Union Maj. Gen. William Sherman's failed full frontal assault in the Battle of Kennesaw Mountain Bierce's head was "broken like a walnut" by a Confederate bullet.[lxxxii] Though he joined as an earnest recruit, he noted that the war turned him, like so many others, into "hardened and impenitent man-killers, to whom death in its awfulness forms is a fact familiar to their every-day observation; who sleep on hills trembling with the thunder of great guns, dine in the midst of streaming missiles, and play cards among the dead faces of their dearest friends."[lxxxiii] As a result, Bierce writes not about lilacs or "a shy and hidden bird…warbling a song," but about the purposeless destruction of human life in his short stories.[lxxxiv] Writing with the frankness and honesty of an experienced veteran, he strives to make the terrors that he faced known to the American public—and, as shown in the literary overview above, he truly was the only man for the job. Much like the poets of the Great War, Bierce rebukes the ethical goodness of patriotism. Yet, unlike the chorus of voices who decried the barbarity of the First World War, Bierce stands alone in condemning military service, regardless of side.

Importantly Bierce published each of the short stories analyzed in this section in *The San Francisco Examiner*; due to the popularity of his columns, William Randolph Hearst permitted Bierce almost total artistic and editorial freedom (and the chance to make a living through his writing). After resigning from the army, he settled in San Francisco in 1867 and began his career as a writer in earnest. Here, he contributed to local periodicals like *The Argonaut*, the *Overland*

Monthly, *The Californian*, and *The Wasp* where he wrote the widely read column “Prattle” and later served as editor from 1881 to 1887. Ultimately, his popularity drew the attention of William Randolph Hearst who hired him and facilitated the move of Bierce’s column to the *Examiner* in 1887. At first hired for $35 a week to produce a bi-weekly “Prattle” column, his continued popularity lead to a permanent raise of $100 a week and a promotion as the *Examiner’s* chief editorial writer.[lxxxv]

His tenure at the paper lasted until 1909 and, during this time, Bierce formed an amicable, and mutually beneficial, relationship with Hearst. During his first decade at the *Examiner,* he often attacked east coast elites and their political machinations. Hearst, who built his media empire from the “new money” extracted from his father’s Comstock Lode, relished Bierce’s fiery condemnations of the established, old money order and the resulting increase in the *Examiner*’s circulation. For instance, in 1896 Hearst personally dispatched Bierce to Washington D.C. to prevent the passage of a bill excusing the Union Pacific and Central Pacific railroad companies of low-interest loans they received from the federal government when constructing the First Transcontinental Railroad.

Dennis Drabelle colorfully details the episode in *The Great American Railroad War* (2012), noting that executives like Central Pacific’s Collis P. Huntington wished to quickly and silently push the bill through congress; with interest, the loans totaled over $130 million ($3.88 billion today).[lxxxvi] Huntington, with the knowledge of Bierce presence and the fact that both the *Examiner* and Hearst’s *New York Journal* would publish his report, angrily confronted him outside the Capital and asked him to name his price for his secrecy. To the detriment of Huntington, Bierce’s reply, recorded by newspapers throughout America, referenced a very specific amount: “My price is one hundred thirty million dollars. If, when you are ready to pay, I happen to be out of town, you may hand it over to my friend, the Treasurer of the United States."[lxxxvii] Yet his association with Hearst allowed Bierce to do more than expand his reach while receiving a comfortable income. More so, the amiability between writer and publisher allowed Bierce to further develop an unrestrained, quick-witted authorial voice that defied nineteenth century morality conventions and celebrated the macabre.

Bierce developed the modernist elements that mark his well-known short stories published in *Tales of Soldiers and Civilians* (1892)—namely psychological interiority, a-linear narrative arcs, and the brevity of his language—through his experience as an editorial columnist. Granted a rare amount of artistic and intellectual autonomy from Hearst, he did more than attack the established order of capital oligarchs; he also used his columns as a public platform to confront established moral truths, namely the innate positivity of national service. For instance, in "The Right to Take Oneself Off" (1893), he adopts a hard-edged claim that mirrors Jonathan Swift's Juvenalian satire, *A Modest Proposal* (1729). Whereas Swift hyperbolically claims that the Irish can ease their poverty by selling their children as meat for the upper-classes, Bierce claims that "suicide is always courageous": he does so to condemn how the American public views military deaths as innately noble and respectable.[lxxxviii]

Bierce begins his essay by rebuking the idea that life itself contains meaning and purpose. He rejects a sentimental view of unique existence and notes, in his first sentence, that one who "loses heart and hope through a personal bereavement" resembles a "grain of sand…complaining" of the tide washing "a neighboring grain out of reach."[lxxxix] Yet unlike "the bereaved grain [which] cannot help itself," a person "can quit" as "no reason" exists to struggle against "hard to bear" conditions. He describes "some purpose (not disclosed) that derives from a higher "Power" as a "tiresome irritation" and an "'argument'…not worth attention." Death, when "summoned," arrives without ceremony "by small-pox," "by the bludgeon of a blackguard," or even "by the kick of a cow," and without great purpose. Framing death as banal, he argues that, rather than a waste, the act of suicide holds merit: the suicides of "Antony, Brutus, Cato, [and] Seneca" each represent a "courageous, reasonable, unselfish act" and, here, his focus shifts to redefine the concept of courage.

Bierce argues that "we"—his American reading public—"must reform our vocabulary."[xc] While a soldier "merely" faces death, facing the possibility of death alone goes with "a certainty of 'glory,'" while "the suicide [here a proper noun]" "incurs it" with the "certainty…of reproach." While certain acts of suicide are "selfish and cruel," he distains the "universal application" of suicide as a synonym for cowardice—which he defines as "the fear of danger, not the shirking of duty." He argues that when one faces irreparable physical, mental, or psychological damage, substance abuse, poverty, or disgrace a person is "justified in removing themselves" and, in some cases, "it is a duty" in itself. Suicide, in each of these instances, not only helps the actor but also the general public that must bear the weight of his or her incapacity.

Therefore, he concludes, that when "we honor the valiant solider, sailor, [and] firemen" the public does so because they only "brave the danger of death."[xci] In contrast, "the suicide…never miss[es] a mark" since he or she "braves death itself!" Granted Bierce does not actually mean to suggest that those who serve represent cowards. Rather he contends that when a solider serves he or she merely gives up their literal body to institutions (the armed forces) and circumstances (wars) that extend beyond their control. Bierce recognizes that, through service, one gives up one's autonomy and, by doing so, permits forces outside of their control to dictate their life and death. Unlike the soldier, the suicide maintains absolute free will even if it results in non-existence. In his final line he quotes the twelfth century Rubáiyát (English trans. 1859) to conclude that though “the wild ass of public opinion” condemns the suicide, they “‘can not [sic] break his sleep.’” Rejecting a soldier’s death as an admirable and purposeful sacrifice, he echoes the other sentiments of the Persian poet Omar Khayyám: “One thing is certain and the rest is Lies/ The Flower that once has blown for ever dies.”[xcii] Through satire, Bierce dismantles the positive connotations that civilians too readily apply to any kind of patriotic service. Bierce first published each of the short stories discussed below in the *Examiner* and, echoing his essay’s claim, adopts an anti-utopian perspective to highlight the negative consequences of military service.

In “Chickamanga” (1889), “The Horseman in the Sky” (1889) and, his most famous work, “An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge” (1890) Bierce subverts his protagonists glamorized views of war; this analysis aids the understanding to why the anti-utopian genre develops alongside the rise of literary modernism.[xciii] Here, Bierce situates unreliable narrators whose stream of consciousness exposes a commonality that often occurs in modern literature: that fact that unique individuals are infinitesimal in comparison to greater systems of power and external circumstances. In these stories, collected alongside one another in *Tales of Soldiers and Civilians* (1892), Bierce details male characters in varying stages of life who ultimately reject the idealized rectitude of military service. In his collection, divided into two sections (soldiers/civilians), Bierce places these three stories at the forefront. Granted, none of these short stories constitute examples of anti-utopian literature in their own right. Though his explorations of interior psychology designate him as an early modernist, Bierce, building off his own war experiences, entrenches himself in the realist tradition. While the verisimilitude of his narratives logically segregates his short stories from the anti-utopian canon, he nonetheless approaches war with an anti-utopian mindset. Bierce produces more than straightforward anti-war fiction as he also dissects how and why men view warfare as an innately positive experience. While I avoid defining the celebration of military service as an “utopian” impulse, it must be noted that in each short story, summarized in the following endnote, Bierce describes protagonists who choose to explore the supposed “good place” of war zones only to find that the idealized realm of brave heroes and grand battles constitutes an empty myth, a “no place.”[xciv]

In particular Bierce portrays male characters who—though completely inexperienced in service—hunger for a soldier’s life. In the first story of the collection, “A Horseman in the Sky,” Bierce describes “the son of wealth parents” and “an only child, Carter, who “left the home of his childhood to go soldiering.”[xcv] Even though he “commended himself” through acts of “devotion and daring,” Bierce introduces him “asleep at his post of duty,” correlating his present state to his previous life of “ease and cultivation and high living.” In his next story, “An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge” Bierce again grounds his protagonist’s description with details of his domestic life. Even though his attempt to blow up a union-controlled supply line mark him as a terrorist, Bierce denotes Farquhar as “no vulgar assassin,” but “a civilian: and “well to do planter.”[xcvi] Safe on his estate some “30 miles” from Owl Creek Bridge, Bierce notes that only his self-conception as a dedicated Southerner draw him into the trap laid by a “Federal scout” donned in Confederate grey. Though “a slave owner” and “an original secessionist” an unnamed “inglorious restrain” robs him of “the larger life of the soldier, the opportunity for distinction.” Bierce notes that since he believes opportunity “comes to all in wartime,” then his removal from “the disastrous campaigns” does little to impede a man “who was at heart a solider.” Finally, in “Chickamauga,” Bierce argues that even physical limitation and age do not impede visions of wartime glory. Here, Bierce details an unnamed child undertaking a mock adventure in the vein of the “memorable feats of discovery and conquest” of his ancestors.[xcvii] A young deaf-mute with little expectation to serve, he nonetheless inherits his view of war from his veteran father, now living "the peaceful life of a planter." In particular, the "military books and pictures" that fill his home encourage him "to make himself a wooden sword" and imitate "the postures of aggression" he learned from "the engraver's art." Imagining the world around him on an epic scale, he envisions "a shallow brook" as a "great sea and a rabbit as an "formidable enemy" whose sight alone leads him to run deep into the woods. In each short story, Bierce details characters whose inclination to fight stems from their desire to ascend to an idealized image of a man who serves his country first. However, Bierce uses the majority of his narratives to detail the shift that occurs between his characters expectation of war and their lived reality.

For instance, in "Chickamauga," Bierce sequesters the child away into the woods so that he can, in complete innocence, detail the bloody results of second deadliest battle of the Civil War. Bierce uses a third person omniscient point of view to provide a panoramic view of the various surrounding actions before centering again on the child's perspective. As the deaf-mute child falls asleep Bierce zooms upwards and outwards from the woods. He signals this towards full omniscience through the use of sound: as the deaf-mute child falls asleep Bierce calls attention to birds singing "merrily above his head."[xcviii] Bierce then draws attention a "far away" "strange muffled thunder," the sounds of battle, before pivoting to the plantation "where white men and black were hastily searching the fields." When the child wakens, Bierce defamiliarizes retreating Union forces to underscore how the child's understanding of a soldier, adopted from his father, rings false. The child sees "a strange moving object" and describes its "shambling, awkward gait" as "familiar" and akin to the crawling movements of "some large animal." While Bierce notes that "an elder observer" would conclude that their broken shuffling indicates to wounded and dying men, the child only notices that the men "crept like babes." As the men he witnesses do not match the patriotic engravings that emboss his home, the child reacts to them playfully sine “being men they were not terrible.”

Though he tells his story from an omniscient perspective, Bierce, here, focuses on the child’s perception of the troops. Unlike the familiar, sentimental elements that mark fiction in late nineteenth century America, Bierce uses the child as an unreliable narrator to defamiliarize the troops. Though his work presupposes the term, Viktor Shklovsky’s concept of defamiliarization contextualizes how Bierce, and later anti-utopian writers of early twentieth century, encourage their characters *and* their readers to reevaluate philosophies and/or systems that, beforehand, they viewed as intrinsically good. In “Art as Technique” (1917, also published as “Art as Device”), Shklovsky argues that prose must “make ‘objects’ unfamiliar,” or defamiliarize them, to “increase the difficulty” of a reader’s experience “to make one feel things.”[xcix] Here, Bierce does so by focusing on the child’s bemused, curious reaction to these enemy troops. He describes them as “singularly white” and “gouted with red,” a visual that reminds “him of the painted clown.”[c] As a result, he laughs openly at “these maimed and bleeding men” and even mounts one of them like a horse since “his father’s negroes creep upon their hands and knees for his amusement.” However, this “merry spectacle” soon dissolves when the soldier flings him off and he, instead, perceives “a great bird of prey crimsoned…by the blood of its quarry.” The child, from a distance, saw the soldier as a clown, but, in actuality, he “lacked a lower jaw” with his chin replaced by “a great red gap fringed with hanging shreds of flesh and splinters of bone.” Only with this visceral image does the child take “a more serious view of the situation” of the “hideous pantomime.” The “swarm of great black beetles” moving in “profound, absolute” silence challenges the child’s, and a reader’s, conception of a singular, brave soldier whose battle cry leads others into battle.

In this way, Bierce defamiliarizes the Union troops to rebuff two-dimensional portrayals of soldiers. Shklovsky argues that archetypes, like the engravings Bierce mentions, come from "over-automatization."[ci] While automatization "permits the greatest economy of perceptive efforts," Shklovsky also contends that it encourages "habitualization." As a result, he attests that work, love, reading, or even "the fear of war" becomes "unconsciously automatic." To Bierce, the sentimental literature of the Civil War period downplays the banal violence and loss caused by the war. By withholding the horseman's true identity, the reality of Farquhar's escape, and the child's inability to hear or speak, Bierce obscures the actual conflict occurring and, thus, slows down the process of reading. Avoiding familiar, comforting images, he defamiliarizes war by 1) generating very detailed, highly realistic spaces and 2) juxtaposing them with his character's unreliable stream of consciousness which 3) challenges a reader to reassess a character's relationship to war.

For instance, in "A Horseman in the Sky," Bierce details the surrounding landscape to emphasize the stakes of the primary conflict and, in doing so, obscures the actual predicament Carter faces. Hidden in "a clump of laurel" Carter sees the horseman standing on a ledge "jutting out northward"; the horseman's vantage point provides him with a view of the "small natural meadow" where "five regiments of Federal infantry" camp "one thousand feet" below."[cii] To save his fellow troops, Carter must kill the Confederate scout, but Bierce emphasizes his hesitancy to act. Waking, Carter describes the unmoving scout as "an equestrian statue of impressive dignity" of "heroic almost colossal size." By describing the scout from Carter's point of view, Bierce defamiliarizes the object and focuses on Carter's "intensity of emotion," namely timidity. While Carter "cautiously" aims at the horse contemplates if "it is so terrible to kill an enemy," Bierce emphasizes that he "grew pale," "shook in every limb, turned faint." His hesitancy turns to indecision as “his hand fell away from his weapon” until his father’s “divine mandate”—"‘Whatever may occur, do what you conceive to be your duty’”—encourages him to fire with “nerves…as tranquil as a sleeping babe’s.” In withholding the scout’s true identity, Bierce insinuates that Carter has never killed a man before; therefore, the reader assumes that his actions stem from his fidelity to the Union.

However, in reality, Carter faces his father and *this* causes his indecision, triggers the memory of his father’s words, and *that* memory emboldens him to act. With this knowledge, Bierce challenges his reader reconsider Carter’s motivations and the supposed merits of his action. When Bierce claims that “duty had conquered” him he stresses that Carter’s concept of duty comes, not from the army, but from his father’s words.[ciii] Admittedly, in his reluctance, Carter only shoots the horse. However, Bierce uses the father’s orthodox view of duty to incite Carter to commit patricide. In defamiliarizing the scout Bierce draws attention to Carter’s psychological distress, perverting an action that at first seems necessary, brave, and utilitarian.

Though Shlovsky defines defamiliarization during the early twentieth century, the term nonetheless applies to earlier works like Bierce’s short stories. In his essay he argues that contemporary modernists not only embrace defamiliarization. In fact, he uses Leo Tolstoy’s short story “Shame!” (also known as “Kholstomer” or “Strider,” 1886) as his main illustrative example when defining the term. In particular, he analyzes an episode that depicts flogging and, here, Shlovsky claims that Tolstoy “makes the content of the story seem unfamiliar” by orienting the description from the horse’s perspective.[civ] Shklovsky correctly notes that “the technique of defamiliarization is not Tolstoy's alone.” Just as Tolstoy challenges his readers to examine animal abuse, Bierce uses unreliable narrators to defamiliarize and challenge his reader’s understanding of military service. In the case of Carter, Bierce choreographs a confrontation that appears to necessitate his actions and, with the knowledge of the horseman's identity, requires the reader to reexamine the episode.

As the only nationally known author condemning the Civil War due to his personal experiences, Bierce provides an anti-utopian assessment of military service to highlight how the imagined conception of war in no way matches its lived experience. In his short stories he largely does so by manipulating narrative time: Bierce begins each of the stories selected *in medias res*; while Bierce uses a linear story arc "Chickamauga," in "Horseman" and "An Occurrence" he divides the stories into four chapters and three chapters, respectively, to signal the shift between psychological projections (flashbacks/memories/delusions) and the present narrative action.

Therefore, Bierce creates a harsh difference between story-time—what film critic Seymour Chatman defines as" the duration of the purported events of the narrative"—and discourse-time—"the time it takes to peruse the discourse."[cv] Admittedly, unlike film, the act of reading practically guarantees a discrepancy between story-time and discourse-time (unless an author constructs a story out of pure dialogue). Nonetheless, Bierce manipulates story-time so that, in only a few pages, he provides complex insight into his characters backstories. In doing so, he highlights 1) how his protagonists became indoctrinated to see war as an admirable venture, 2) their motivations to serve, and, most importantly, 3) the shift between their expectations of war and its reality. In "An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge," Bierce contrasts story-time, here a matter of seconds, with discourse-time to expose Farquhar's final thoughts. Though he finds his "wrists bound" and a "rope closely encircle[ing] his neck" upon the very bridge he attempted to destroy, Bierce uses his stream of consciousness to demonstrate that Farquhar's allegiance lies with his family rather than the Confederacy.[cvi]

` Here, Bierce describes the Union troops in realistic detail and, instead, defamiliarizes time. In a “Prattle” column, Bierce derided “bad readers,” accusing them of “lacking the habit of analysis” so that they “take whatever is put before them” with the “slop-def conscience of a parlor pig.”[cvii] Here, he grants the attentive reader with a great amount of evidence that he intends to manipulate time rather than describe an improbable event: he describes “the ticking of his watch” as “a sharp distinct metallic percussion” like an “anvil” to emphasize his “impatience” and “apprehension.”[cviii] Though his watch ticks regularly, Bierce notes that, to Farquar, “the intervals of silence grew progressively longer” as his thoughts turn to his wife and child. Bierce also organizes the surrounding troops to foreshadow the unlikelihood of Farquar’s escape: next to him stand “two private soldiers of the Federal army,” behind them “was a captain,” at “each end of the bridge” two additional soldiers blockade the bridge, and, finally, “a single company of infantry” watches from below with “the butts of their rifles on the ground.” When in the water, Bierce describes him impossibly dodging many “shining bits of metal” and, even though “some of them touched him on the face and hand,” he depicts him emerging from the river unscathed by Union bullets. Though he ends his story with a sort of epiphany—in his final seconds Farquar thinks not of the Confederacy, but of his wife’s “smile of ineffable joy”—Bierce, much like in “The Right to Off Oneself” argues that such a realization alters nothing. He does not show Farquar entering a heavenly version of his home as, instead, only “silence and darkness” surround him when his neck cracks. In doing so, Bierce stresses the futility of his actions and, more importantly, the purposelessness of death—even a death incurred at the altar of one’s nation.

Therefore Bierce, by using unexpected perspectives, defamiliarizes war and challenges his readers to re-evaluate the supposed virtue of wartime service. Importantly, London does much of the same in his anti-utopian novel, *The Iron Heel*—like Bierce, London assumes his readership views capitalism positively and goes about to alter their perspective. Unlike Bierce, London does not defamiliarize his narrative; if anything, his protagonist, Avis, acts a stand-in for the reader. Though London's America devolves into an outright dystopia after the rise of the capitalist oligarchy, in the novel's first half he pulls from his personal experiences to illustrate the inherent falsities of this supposedly utopian economic system—thereby creating an anti-utopian narrative.

London presents the main body of *The Iron Heel* as Avis's incomplete memoir written in 1932, a work subsequently hidden in a hollow oak tree. Her biography examines the years 1912-1917 when the capitalist oligarchy, eventually called the Iron Heel, swiftly subverts democracy to consolidate its rule. As socialists like Ernest begin to gain a legislative majority, the Iron Heel reconfigures political, economic, educational, religious, and artistic systems for their own gain. Avis's account ends midsentence as the Iron Heel succeeds in crushing the Second Revolt. Ultimately, academics rediscover the lost manuscript and London uses the preface and footnotes of historian Anthony Meredith as a framing device, Meredith provides commentary on the "Everhard Manuscript" and details the failure of the socialist uprising, and the execution of Ernest, on the very first page. London's time shifts permit him to create three distinct literary spaces: the anti-utopia of a peaceful, near-future America, identical to the milieu of 1908, where capitalist influence nonetheless pervades; the dystopia of the Iron Heel marked by violent, and open, suppression of dissenters; finally, the socialist utopia of the Brotherhood of Man set 700 years in the future.

London learned about the blight of the lower class in three important experiences that would directly influence *The Iron Heel*. Through his experiences, London came to better understand how modern American industrialism impacted the lower classes, experiences that soured the supposed utopianism of capitalism. The first, a one-month prison sentence for vagrancy in 1894, illustrated the inherent rot of social structures that attempted to sequester away, rather than support, the poor and disenfranchised. The second, a string of menial, low-paid jobs in California, taught him that industrialization provided little subsistence and no security for the working class. Finally, when writing *The People of the Abyss*, he approached his lower-class subjects much like a guerilla documentarian; in doing so, he began to understand the ideological chasm that allowed people to contextualize capitalism as the answer, rather than the problem, to numerous social ills. In "How I Became a Socialist" (1905) he stresses that his experiences with poverty in America led him to socialism, but, nonetheless, his experiences in London solidified his commitment to socialism. Though his autobiographical writings detail the hellish nature of these experiences, they nonetheless educated him about the realities of the working class in America and Britain.

In the Eric County Penitentiary in Buffalo, New York London struggled against vindictive, and at best indifferent, prison officials. Biographer Kershaw quotes a letter from London describing a prison "filled with the ruck and filth, the scum and the dregs, of society—hereditary inefficient, degenerates, wrecks, lunatics, addled intelligences, epileptics, monsters, weaklings, in short, a very nightmare of humanity."[cix] London, in listing their afflictions, may at first appear unsympathetic to the blights his fellow inmates. However, he does so to highlight his horror of being confined in such a place. Typical to America prisons in the 1890s, officials did little to specialize the various needs of their prisoners, as the simply housed numerous law-breakers away from proper society with little concern for their well-being of basic human rights. In his autobiography *The Road* (1907), he recalls "a handsome young mulatto" who "got the insane idea" to "stand up for his rights."[cx] He describes how "eight hall-men" flung him "down five flights of steel stairs" and then continued to beat him until "leaving him wholly naked and streaming blood from every portion of the surface of his body."[cxi] He notes that "every convict…who heard him scream had learned a lesson," including him, and concludes that "it is not a nice thing to see a man's heart broken in a minute and a half."[cxii]

Yet, even once released from prison and gainfully employed, he learned that systematic abuse still followed him. When shoveling coal into the Hayward Electric Company's blistering furnaces he learned that his position replaced two workers even though he received only a portion of one of the worker's original pay. For ten cents an hour he worked twelve to eighteen hours a day filling jars with pickles at the Hickmott Canning Company; he even recalls working thirty-six hours straight at the Pacific Jute Manufacturing Company for the same hourly rate. While visiting the Belmont Academy spying on his friend working in its steam laundry, Frank Atherton recalls "Jack and his partner…plying every muscle to keep up with the 'set speed' of the machinery."[cxiii] He describes them as "human beings" acting as "robots," with London acting as automaton that the prep school "had virtually hired out as a slave." These experiences impacted London both physically and mentally and allowed him to see American capitalism from the bottom looking up. He now described American workers as "work beasts" who, once advanced age or injury rendered them inefficient, would be "thrown into the scrap heap like any worn-out machine."[cxiv] His personal experiences remain important to note: not only did they encourage his embrace of socialism and growing discontent with industrial capitalism, but he also came to view first-hand knowledge as inseparably valuable to his writing.

For instance, when writing *The People of the Abyss* (1903), he pulled from direct knowledge to avoids the judgmental overtones that infect the first edition of H.G. Wells's

Anticipations (1901)—the work of non-fiction that brought the phrase, "the abyss" i.e. the urban poor, into common usage.[cxv] Its influence cannot and should not be downplayed: Wells biographer David Smith notes that the work "took England by storm" to the degree that "every significant thinker apparently read and thought about the book."[cxvi] Here, Wells argues that the mechanical revolution of transportation (railways) still impacts society; he attests, astutely, that citizens of the early twentieth century are living through an era of great change as industrialism alters every aspect of life from city structures, war, to language.[cxvii] However, in his final chapter, he advocates negative eugenics by arguing for "euthanasia of the weak and the sensual."[cxviii] Furthermore, he theorizes that, with religious beliefs declining, a "World State" will adopt Malthusianism to "check" and "control" populations "to favour the procreation of what is fine and efficient and beautiful in humanity."[cxix] He concludes that such eugenic practices orient themselves towards "a purpose greater than happiness," as instead they permit a "spacious…. future for our race."[cxx] Admittedly, in *H.G. Wells: Traversing Time* (2004), W. Warren Wagnar notes that, "to Wells' credit" he "would soon abandon such thoughts."[cxxi] Only a few years later, Wells largely abandoned negative eugenics to the degree that, in *The Outline of History* (1919), he argues against "racial purity" and instead supports racial mixing.[cxxii] However, Wells' privilege—that is to say his distance from his own subject, the urban poor—allows for an otherwise fascinating study to devolve into typical, prejudiced early twentieth century talking points.

In contrast, London adopted a documentarian perspective like that of pioneering photojournalist Jacob Riis. In *How the Other Half Lives* (1890), Riis used photography to introduce his middle-class readership to the squalid, overcrowded tenement houses of New York City. Yet unlike Riis, whose camera created an unintentional fourth wall between artist and subject, London attempted to integrate himself by dressing and acting like a fellow slum dweller. To better understand the lives of the lower classes in London' East End, he donned second-hand clothes and, realizing that his accent differentiated him from others, took on the role of a penniless American sailor stranded in London. In his introduction to the work, he notes that he "went down into the under-world of London" like an "explorer" so he could learn from "the evidence of my eyes rather than by the teachings of those who had not seen."[cxxiii] He dove deeply into this work and, only seven weeks after arriving in England, London finished his book. He later commented that "of all my books…I love most *The People of the Abyss*" since "no other…took so much of my young hear and tears as that study of the economic degradation of the poor."[cxxiv]

Importantly his East End explorations divide his early socialist phase at the end of the century, when he believed that socialism could reform the American government, and his radical period, when between 1905-1911 he advocated confrontational, even revolutionary, steps to end class divisions. In *The People of the Abyss*, London notes how class, and its corresponding power or powerlessness, divides the landscape of capital itself. Some areas, like "the most splendid site in Europe," Trafalgar Square, exist to support the existing status quo.[cxxv] Here, when watching a military parade, he notes that the procession projects the "overpowering force" of the Empire while "the East End of London…toils, rots, and dies."[cxxvi] He continuously contrasts the grand sites that celebrate British Imperialism against the bleak landscape of the forgotten poor to mock the supposed greatness of such systems of power. Rather, he contends, great spectacles intend to unsuccessfully hide the faults, and declining power, of a nation: "I never saw anything to compare with that pageant, except for Yankee circuses and Alhambra ballets; nor did I ever see anything so hopeless and so tragic."[cxxvii] As *The People of the Abyss* neared completion, London wrote to a friend that though “things are terrible here in London” that the general sentiment, among the middle and upper classes at least, was that “times are good and all are employed save the unemployable.”[cxxviii] By experiencing poverty and class exploitation first hand, even after putting away his sailor garb, London feared, in his words, falling into “the Social Pit.”[cxxix] He came to realize that these displays of wealth and power, like the procession in Trafalgar Square, permitted an illusion of economic and social prowess—an illusion also meant to distract citizens from the reality of the underprivileged.

In particular, Avis resides in a false utopian space where she aligns herself with those of her class; only when she witnesses the underprivileged first hand does she begin to understand the dystopian nature of capitalism. She admits that as a “creature of environment”, before meeting Ernest, she “had strong class instincts” that prejudiced her worldview unknowingly.[cxxx] As the daughter of a successful University of California physics professor she resides in a bubble of Bay Area intelligentsia, but, wrongly, considers her family’s position as independent from capitalist abuses. When Ernest first details the failings of her class, noting that her father invests money in the Sierra Mills, she harshly rebuffs him. Yet, when she visits Jackson, a former mill worker now permanently injured and improvised after an accident, she begins to understand that her utopian existence creates another’s dystopia.

In the chapter “Jackson’s Arm,” London produces a conversion narrative as Avis begins to recognize capitalism as an intrinsically malevolent system. She speaks with Peter Donnelly, “a scab foreman” trying to feed his family, Colonel Ingram, the lawyer for Sierra Mills, and Judge Caldwell, a judge (and friend of Ingram) who presided over Jackson’s unsuccessful attempt to win monetary recompense.[cxxxi] As a result, Avis comes to recognize, even though his case had merit, that his attempts to sue were futile: bypassing worker safety, the Mill can afford a to keep a corporate lawyer on retainer for “twenty thousand dollars a year” (more than $500,000 today); since capitalism encourages those with the best skills work for those who can provide the best income, Jackson can only afford a “brow-beaten and confused” attorney. Meeting with Ernest afterwards, he emphasizes that “not one of them was a free agent” as capitalism ties all “to the merciless industrial machine.” Therefore, London creates an ideological confrontation between Avis’ naïve illusion of benevolent capitalism and a class system that rewards the wealthy with divides, makes workers like Donnelly wage slaves, and casts out those, like Jackson, who can no longer work to support themselves. “Confronted by the concrete” knowledge of class’s abuses, her utopia of the first order falls away as Avis realizes that she “learned nothing but theories of life and society that looked very well on the printed page.” Therefore, she concludes, that her education at “university” “had not been real” and she begins to align herself with Ernest in full.

Though London designates Ernest as a continual voice-box for truth, he also justifies Avis’ attraction—and her adoption of his socialist leaning—to him by emphasizing his prowess. Though unintended, Avis commically describes Ernest as a man who exudes a seductive machismo. Though she rebuffs his advances early on, in the same initial episode she pronounces him “a superman, a blond beast such as Nietzsche…described.”[cxxxii] Later, Avis describes him as a Christ figure: “Ernest rose before me transfigured, the apostle of truth, with shining brows and the fearlessness of one of God’s own angels, battling for the truth and the right, and battling for the succor of the poor and lonely and oppressed.” Aaron Shaheen notes that Ernest’s “occasional reference[s] to the Bible in Avis’ company” grates against “his scientific idealism,” to give Ernest, a character of “near-one dimensionality,” a “glimmer of interiority.”[cxxxiii] Simply, too often Ernest parallels London’s own perspective supporting atheistic Socialism; his sympathies of religion, though few, prevent him from acting as an absolute stand-in for London. [cxxxiv]

Though London's depiction of Ernest is someone ham-fisted—he orients him not only as a beacon of truth, but as a prophet every event to unfold—nonetheless he serves as a catalyst of ideological change for Avis. London positions Avis, who views capitalism as a necessary and natural economic system, as a stand-in for his reader. Yet, unlike in *The People of the Abyss*, London does more than discuss the blight of the working poor; he makes wealthy oligarchs the true antagonists of his novel.

Specifically, London positions capitalists the active aggressors even before the revolution unfolds. Through his sermons, Ernest only converts Avis, her father, and Bishop Morehouse to the Socialist cause; London stresses that his ideals only encourage derision, and in some cases outright hatred, among others. When speaking to the Philomath Club, whose members rank among the "wealthiest in the community" with a light "a sprinkling of scholars," Ernest utterly fails to convert any listeners to his point of view.[cxxxv] Rather, these "lords of society," revolt against his argument that they failed in [their] management of society" and that the working class must "take the management away from you." The evening's elderly society hostess, Miss Brentwood," falls into a convulsing "hysteria" while his debate opponent, corporate lawyer Colonel Van Gilbert, yells out that Ernest produces "fallacy upon fallacy." Yet, when Ernest asks him to produce "an intellectual answer to my intellectual charge that the capitalist class has mismanaged society" London foreshadows the class war to come and argues that the capitalists can only respond in brute force: Van Gilbert attests that "we are in power" and that "by virtue of that power we shall remain in power." In situating members of the capitalist oligarchy as antagonists before their power becomes threatened, London destroys the myth of the kindly capitalist. By doing so, London encourage readers to reject capitalism and instead move towards socialism. Part of London's success comes from situating contemporary America as an anti-utopia—as space meant to highlight the failings of capitalism—before the country devolves into an outright dystopian landscape.

In the following chapters I analyze how Benson, Huxley, and Orwell adopt anti-utopian perspectives to show the inherent flaws of supposed utopian belief systems. In Chapter Two I analyze why Robert Benson, an ardent Catholic, details an atheist government with a perfectly functioning welfare state in *Lord of the World* (1907). I argue that while he introduces the Anti-Christ to his futuristic state—ultimately making it a dystopia to keep his novel in line with Pope Pius X's arguments against modernity—he nonetheless celebrates the way that his speculative socialist administration supports the world population. Therefore, I argue, Benson makes a subtle case that the Church must modernize and supply the very systems that the Labour Party, after winning a majority in the 1906 general election, aims to establish. Next, I move to Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and argue that though he condemns society After Ford (A.F.)—and its Le Corbusier inspired high-rises—he also models the London metropolitan area off of a utopian urban plan he actively supported. By integrating Ebenezer Howard's Garden City Movement Huxley illustrates how such a design achieves an ecological balance with industry. Therefore, while he condemns the World State's totalitarianism, he nonetheless appreciates its ability to achieve an equilibrium between nature and industry. Finally, in Chapter Four, I contend that while George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* ebbs more towards an outright dystopia than anti-utopia, I argue that he describes the effects of ill-applied socialism—a movement he himself supported. I claim that in devolving socialism to its totalitarian extreme, Orwell also hyperbolizes modern architecture's emphasis on monumentality and, in doing so, anticipates the rise of Brutalism in the 1950s. I conclude that both Orwell's fictional Ministry buildings and real post-war public housing projects illustrate the inhospitality of single-use, monolithic, modern high-rises.

When approaching possible revisions, my first and fourth chapters would contain heavy additions. Simply, constraints of time kept my discussions briefer than I would wish and do not reflect the entirety of my research. In particular, I would better situate Ambrose Bierce's condemnation of war—what I call an anti-utopian perspective on national service—in line with authors that follow him: namely T.W.H. Crosland's anti-war poetry ("Slain") following the Boer War and the Great War poetry of Wilfred Owen and Siegfried Sassoon. Also, I would extend my analysis of London's *Iron Heel* to detail the fall of the Chicago Commune: here, I would detail the civil unrest mirrors the Haymarket Affair of 1886 and how such labor unrest impacted architecture. I would first begin discussing, on a micro-level, how the riot impacted local works like H.H. Richardson's Romanesque Glessner House and extend the analysis to the City Beautiful Movement. London makes key mention of the wonder city of Asgard in *The Iron Heel* and, in many ways, the City Beautiful Movement did not only wish to inspire civic pride as it also used monumental space to evoke the power of the state. I would extend this analysis to Charolette Perkins Gilman's *Herland* (1915) and discuss how she uses such designs to create a progressive state that also maintains a racial oligarchy. Therefore, I would detail how many City Beuauitful Projects in the South like Richmond's Monument Avenue were designed to demonstrate the power of the state—and therefore the power and continued proliferation of legal segregation. Connect these racial histories to housing projects like the Pruitt Igoe buildings to note that, in America and even Britain to a lesser degree with colonial immigrants, these progressive projects are infused with racial politics.

---

[i] Lyman Tower Sargent, "The Problem of the 'Flawed Utopia': A Note on the Costs of Eutopia," In *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2003), 225-31.

[ii] Glenn Negley and J. Max Patrick, *The Quest for Utopia: An Anthology of Imaginary Societies* (New York: H. Schuman, 1952),

[iii] Before Negley and Patrick, John Stuart Mills provided the only recorded instance of the term dystopia during a Parliamentary debate in 1868: "It is, perhaps, too complimentary to call them Utopians, they ought rather to be called dys-topians, or caco-topians," with the Greek "caco" as bad. See: "Dystopia," *Oxford English Dictionary*. Accessed 2 April 2016.

[iv] Jean Faelzer, *The Utopian Novel in America 1888-1896* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1984), 80.

[v] Leszek Kolakowski, *Modernity on Endless Trial* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 131.

[vi] George Kaleb, *Utopia and its Enemies* (Schocken Books: New York, 1972), 20.

[vii] Lyman Tower Sargent. "The Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited." *Utopian Studies: Journal of the Society for Utopian Studies* 5, no. 1 (1994): 1-37.

[viii] Gregory Claeys and Lyman Tower Sargent, *The Utopia Reader* (New York University Press, 1999).

[ix] Before Sargent and Claeys embraced the term, earlier critics, though fewer in number, use the concept of anti-utopia in their work. See E.J. Brown, "*Brave New World*, *1984,* and *We*: An Essay on Anti-Utopia," in *Zamyatin's* We*: A Collection of Critical Essays,* ed. Gary Kern .(Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1988) 209-227; Mark Hillegas, *The Future as Nightmare: H.G. Wells and the Anti-utopians* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), 99-109; Krishan Kumar, *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987).

[x] Edith Clowes, *Russian Experimental Fiction: Resisting Ideology after Utopia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 10.

[xi] See: Phillip E. Wegner, *Imaginary Communities: Utopia, the Nation, and the Spatial Histories of Modernity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000); Darko Suvin, "Theses on Dystopia 2001." In *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 187-201

[xii] Wegner, 150.

[xiii] Suvin, 3.

[xiv] For example, Chris Ferns, in *Narrating Utopia* (1999), conflates dystopia with anti-utopia to mean a parody of the traditional utopian model. Matthew Beaumont's *Utopia Ltd.* (2005) uses dystopia and anti-utopia interchangeably and even re-appropriates Jeremy Bentham's term "cacotopianism" ("the worst seat of government") as a genre concerned primarily with the proletariat. See: Chris Ferns, *Narrating Utopia Ideology, Gender, Form in Utopian Literature* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1999); Matthew Beaumont, *Utopia Ltd. Ideologies of Social Dreaming in England 1870-1900* (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

[xv] Gregory Claeys, "The Origins of Dystopia: Wells, Huxley and Orwell" in *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Ed. Gregory Claeys (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 107.

[xvi] M. Keith Booker, *Dystopian Literature: A Theory and Research Guide* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1994), 3.

[xvii] M. Keith Booker, *Literature and Politics Today: The Political Nature of Modern Fiction, Poetry, and Drama* (Westport: Greenwood 2015), 331.
[xviii] Ibid. 93.
[xix] Ibid. 4.
[xx] Lyman Sargent, "Themes in Utopian Fiction in English Before Wells." *Science-Fiction Studies* 3 (1976): 275-82. Accessed 21 Feb 2016.
[xxi] Dohra Ahmad, *Landscapes of Hope: Anti-colonial Utopianism in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 210.
[xxii] Fatima Vieria, "The Origins of Utopia" in *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Ed. Gregory Claeys (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 6
[xxiii] Ibid.
[xxiv] Ibid.
[xxv] Suvin, 2.
[xxvi] Vieria, 8.
[xxvii] Ovid, *Metamorphoses*. Trans. Henry Riley (Philadelphia: David McKay, 1899), 19.
[xxviii] Plato, *The Dialogues of Plato*. Trans. Benjamin Jowett (New York: Macmillan, 1892)106
[xxix] Lucian of Samosta, "Saturnalian Letters" in *Lucian, the Syrian Satirist.* Trans. Henry William Lovett Hime (New York: Longmans, Green, & Co, 1900), 67.
[xxx] Vieira, 4.
[xxxi] David Womersley, "Dean Swift hears a Sermon: Robert Howard's Ash Wednesday homily of 1725 and *Gulliver's Travels*." *Times Literary Supplement.* (February 20, 2009), 14-15.
[xxxii] Roland Barthes, *"From Work to Text,"* in *Modern Literary Theory: A Reader*. Ed Rice Philip and Patricia Waugh (London: Edward Arnold, 1989),151-165.
[xxxiii] Richard Marius, *Thomas More: A Biography* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984),140-153.
[xxxiv] Edward Surtz, *The Praise of Pleasure: Philosophy, Education, and Communism in More's Utopia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), 151.
[xxxv] Marius, 62.
[xxxvi] While Thomas More's relationship with Morton is well documented, he served as a page his household and respected the man greatly, it should be noted that Morton died in 1500, some sixteen years before *Utopia*'s publication. Caroline M. Barron, "The Making of a London Citizen," in *The Cambridge Companion to Thomas More*, ed. George M. Morgan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 9.
[xxxvii] Thomas More, *Utopia*, (London: M.S. Rickerby, 1852), 78.
[xxxviii] Stephen Greenblatt, "At the Table of the Great: More's Self-Fashioning and Self-Cancellation," in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005) 13.
[xxxix] Greenblatt, 18-19.
[xl] Ibid.
[xli] More, *Utopia*, 82-83.
[xlii] Steven Gunn, *Henry VII's New Men and the Making of Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 247.
[xliii] Greenblatt, 20.
[xliv] Greenblatt, 23.
[xlv] Paul Turner, "Introduction" to *Utopia* (New York: Penguin, 1965), 9-10.

[xlvi] See: Reinald W. Gibson and J. Max Patrick. *Saint Thomas More: A Preliminary Bibliography of His Works and Moreana to 1750* (Yale University Press: New Haven, 1961).
[xlvii] Ibid.
[xlviii] Brian Goodey, “Mapping *Utopia*: A Comment on the Geography of Sir Thomas More.” *Geographical Review* 60, No. 1. (1970): 17.
[xlix] Ibid, 19.
[l] More, Utopia, 25.
[li] Ibid. 25-26.
[lii] Ibid. 32.
[liii] Ibid.
[liv] Ibid.
[lv] Ibid. 33.
[lvi] Ibid. 33-34.
[lvii] Ibid. 33.
[lviii] Ibid.
[lix] Ibid. 28.
[lx] Ibid. 29.
[lxi] Ibid. 40.
[lxii] Ibid. 41.
[lxiii] Ibid. 43.
[lxiv] Ibid 140.
[lxv] Ibid. 141.
[lxvi] A.L. Beir, *Masterless Men* (Methuen: London, 1985), 31.
[lxvii] Ibid. 14.
[lxviii] More, *Utopia*, 33.
[lxix] A.L. Bier, *The Problem of the Poor in Tudor and Early Stuart England* (Methuen: London, 1983) 33.
[lxx] Linda Levy Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London: Routledge, 2004), 147.
[lxxi] Joanne Dobson, "Reclaiming Sentimental Literature," American Literature *69.2 (1997), 266-267.*
[lxxii] Ibid.
[lxxiii] Mary G. De Jong, “Introduction” to *Sentimentalism in Nineteenth-Century America*, ed. Mary G. De Jong (New York: Fairleigh Dickinson, 2013), 7.
[lxxiv] Ibid.
[lxxv] Robert Arbour, "'Such Verses for my Body Let Us Write': Civil War Song, Sentimentalism, and Whitman's *Drum-Taps*” in *Sentimentalism in Nineteenth-Century America*, ed. Mary G. De Jong (New York: Fairleigh Dickinson, 2013), 168.
[lxxvi] Ibid.
[lxxvii] Daniel Aaron, *The Unwritten War: American Writers and the Civil War* (Mobile: University of Alabama Press, 1973), 92.
[lxxviii] Ibid.
[lxxix] Dobson, 268.
[lxxx] John W. Crowley, “Howell’s Obscure Hurt.” *Journal of American Studies* 9, No. 2. (1975):199-201.

[lxxxi] Bernard DeVoto, *Mark Twain's America* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 112.
[lxxxii] Ambrose Bierce, *Ambrose Bierce: The Devil's Dictionary, Tales, & Memoirs*, (Washington D.C.: Library of America, 2001), 129.
[lxxxiii] Ibid. 134.
[lxxxiv] Walt Whitman, "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd," Poetry Foundation, Accessed 29 June 2017. https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems/45480/when-lilacs-last-in-the-dooryard-bloomd.
[lxxxv] Robert Gale, *An Amboise Bierce Companion* (New York: Greenwood Press, 2001) 126.
[lxxxvi] Dennis Drabelle, *The Great American Railroad War: How Ambrose Bierce and Frank Norris Took on the Central Pacific Railroad* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2012).
[lxxxvii] Lucian-Vasile Szabo, "Bierce, Eminescu, and Their Investigations of the Railway Business." *Ephemerides* 58, No. 1 (2013), 131.
[lxxxviii] Ambrose Bierce, "The Right to Off Oneself" in *Ambrose Bierce: The Devil's Dictionary, Tales, & Memoirs*, 93.
[lxxxix] Ibid.
[xc] Ibid.
[xci] Ibid.
[xcii] Omar Khayyám, *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám*, trans. Edward Fitzgerald. Ed. Christopher Decker (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1997), 184.
[xciii] Ambrose Bierce, *The Collected Works of Ambrose Bierce*, Vol. 2 (New York: Gordian Press, 1966). eBook. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/13334/13334-h/13334-h.htm
[xciv] In "Chickamunga" an unnamed six-year-old deaf-mute, the son of a plantation owner and veteran of the American Indian and Mexico-American Wars, runs away into the woods during a mock battle with a rabbit, falls asleep, and later wakes to the sight of troops retreating The mangled, wounded bodies of the soldiers do not match the child's idea of a soldier so responds by playfully jumping on them. He then returns to find his mother shot and his home ablaze. In "A Horseman in the Sky" a young Virginian, Carter Druse, falls asleep at his post, wakes to find a Confederate scout on a ledge overlooking a Union camp in the valley below, and, at first, hesitates to fire. Remembering that his estranged father, aligned to the Southern Cause, commanded him to do his duty, he timidly shoots the horse. The horse and its rider careen over the cliff's ledge and startle his superior below. Upon being questioned his superior, who witnessed the apocalyptic image referenced in the title, Druse admits that he killed his father. In "An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge" Union troops prepare Peyton Farquar, a civilian plantation owner, to be hanged for attempting to sabotage a railroad bridge; in a flashback, Bierce reveals that a disguised Union scout planted the idea to provoke Farquar. Bierce returns to the present where Farquar astoundingly escapes his captures, travels 30 miles home, and rushes to embrace his wife. In reality, Bierce reveals that his supposed journey was actually Farquar's last memory, a memory formulated in the final seconds between his drop from the bridge and the noose breaking his neck.
[xcv] Ambrose Bierce, "A Horseman in the Sky," in *The Collected Works of Ambrose Bierce*, Vol. 2 (New York: Gordian Press, 1966). eBook. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/13334/13334-h/13334-h.htm. Np.
[xcvi] Ambrose Bierce, "An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge," in *The Collected Works of Ambrose Bierce*, Vol. 2 (New York: Gordian Press, 1966). eBook. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/13334/13334-h/13334-h.htm. Np.

[xcvii] Ambrose Bierce, "Chickamaunga," in *The Collected Works of Ambrose Bierce*, Vol. 2 (New York: Gordian Press, 1966). eBook. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/13334/13334-h/13334-h.htm. Np.

[xcviii] Ibid.

[xcix] Victor Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," Accessed 20 June 2017. https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/english/currentstudents/undergraduate/modules/fulllist/first/en122/lecturelist-2015-16-2/shklovsky.pdf

[c] Bierce, "Chickamauga," np.

[ci] Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," np.

[cii] Bierce, "An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge," np.

[ciii] Ibid.

[civ] Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," np.

[cv] Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980) 62.

[cvi] Bierce, "An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge," np.

[cvii] Marcus van Heller, *The Devil's Advocate,* (Olympia: Olympia Press, 2013). eBook. Np.

[cviii] Bierce, "An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge," np.

[cix] Alex Kershaw, *Jack London: A Life* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 1997), 36.

[cx] Jack London. *The Road* (New York: Peregrine Press, 1907), 108.

[cxi] Ibid.

[cxii] Ibid, 109.

[cxiii] Frank Atherton, "Jack London in Boyhood Adventures." *Jack London Journel*, no. 6 (1997): 35.

[cxiv]

[cxv] In *Anticipations,* Wells refers to "the abyss" twenty-seven times and "people of the abyss" eight times.

[cxvi] David Smith, *H.G. Wells: Desperately Mortal, A Biography* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1986), 92-95.

[cxvii] H.G. Wells, *Anticipations of the Reaction of Mechanical and Scientific Progress Upon Human Life and Thought* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1901).

[cxviii] Wells, *Anticipations*, 332.

[cxix] Wells, *Anticipations,* 322.

[cxx] Wells, *Anticipations*, 343.

[cxxi] W. Warren Wagar, *H.G. Wells: Traversing Time*. Middletown, (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 2004), 90-91.

[cxxii] H.G. Wells, *The Outline of History* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1921), 1:298

[cxxiii] Jack London, *The People of the Abyss* (London: MacMillan, 1904), vii.

[cxxiv] Charmian (Kittredge) London, *The Book of Jack London* (New York: The Century Co, 1921), 1:381.

[cxxv] Jack London, *The People of the Abyss* (New York: First World Publishing, 2005), 112.

[cxxvi] Ibid.

[cxxvii] Ibid. 111.

[cxxviii] Leonard Cassuto et. al. *Rereading Jack London.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 55.

[cxxix] Ibid.

[cxxx] Jack London, *The Iron Heel.* Accessed 30 July 2017. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1164/1164-h/1164-h.htm. np

[cxxxi] London, *The Iron Heel*, np.

[cxxxii] Ibid.

[cxxxiii] Aaron Shaheen, “The Competing Narratives of Modernity in Jack London's *The Iron Heel*,” *American Literary Realism* 41, no. 1 (2008) 40.

[cxxxiv] Anatole France, "Preface to The Iron Heel," in Tavemier-Courbin, 35-37; the text of Trotsky's 1937 review can be found in Joan London, 313-315.

[cxxxv] London, *The Iron Heel*, np.

Chapter Two Overview

Though critically ignored, in *Lord of the World* (1907) Robert Hugh Benson (1871-1914) creates a dazzling portrait of a functioning socialist government that utilizes commodified industrial, social, and educational systems for the benefit of its citizenry.[cxxxvi] Benson, an Anglican convert who would ultimately be promoted until he became Chamberlain to Pope Pius X in 1911, also positions this modern, advanced society as the ideal place for a great evil to emerge—the Anti-Christ. In terms of perspective alone, *Lord of the World* stands out amongst early twentieth century utopian works. Like London, Zamyatin, Huxley and Orwell, Benson chiefly concerns itself with critiquing a huge government apparatus, but, unlike these authors, he does so as a rallying cry for religion. In *The Iron Heel,* London positions institutional religion as yet another part of the capitalist machine while in *We, Brave New World,* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* Zamyatin, Huxley, and Orwell—respectively—orient the state as the focal point of religious devotion in itself. In this chapter I re-evaluate *Lord of the World* as an anti-utopian, rather than dystopian, novel and reassess the Benson, who critics largely disregard, as a figure worthy of academic study.

While his other texts constitute unsubtle pieces of dated Catholic propaganda, in *Lord of the World* Benson celebrates advanced technologies to argue that the Church too must step into the future. However, due to what would ultimately prove legitimate censorship concerns, Benson veils his critique. Due to the fact that the Anti-Christ emerges from the secular world it seems that Benson merely intends to villainize non-Catholic institutions. Yet, before the Anti-Christ's appearance, Benson stresses that the atheist, socialist government he depicts not only functions well but has done so for numerous generations to the advantage of all. As detailed in the following chapter overview, I argue that Benson celebrates elements of the socialist welfare state, but from an anti-utopian perspective, to make the case that the Church should revolutionize and provide such services.

In this chapter's first section, I provide a detailed overview of Christian utopian literature. Doing so first orients Benson as an outsider of both twentieth century utopian fiction and its Christian sub-genre. The survey also contextualizes Benson's anti-utopian perspective as unique from earlier Christian anti-utopian authors. Though he criticizes Catholicism, he, unlike other the authors mentioned above, does not abandon religion altogether. Rather, like authors centuries before, he creates an imaginary world to argue for religious reform. The section also illustrates the historic movements that brought about the modernist crisis in the Catholic Church.

In my next section I discuss how modern religion thought—perspectives, religious or otherwise, that challenge the authority of the Catholic Church and Biblical literalism—impacted Benson professionally. Serving under the authority of Pope Pius X (1835-1914), Benson adopted the pope's conservativism and, like him, rejected liberal interpretations of the Bible and the Church's teachings. At this time in the Church's history, Benson must adopt a harsh, anti-modernist stance, both in his fiction and his religious writings, to rise in the Catholic hierarchy. Even though he appreciates the benefits of the welfare state, Pius X's extreme hatred for modernism forces Benson to seemingly condemn the secular world at large. Understanding this contextualizes why Benson must adopt an anti-utopian perspective that can easily be confused with a dystopian perspective. Due to Pius X's condemnation of modernism—enforced by papal doctrine—Benson can only discretely celebrate the technological and social advancements brought about by non-religious institutions.

After this, I provide a biographical reassessment of Benson. Here, I also supply a critical overview since most writings about Benson stem not from academic essays, but from his biographies. His biographers, all Catholic, produce a rigid image of a man who does not openly question the Church's practices. I disagree and argue that Benson produces *Lord of the World* during a period of time that marks a highpoint of personal and philosophical liberality. Importantly, as he wrote the novel he formed a relationship with Frederick Rolfe. During this time Benson not only explored his sexuality, but also began to openly question how the Church could increase its relevance in the twentieth century. Yet, due to difficulties in this relationship and the negative attention that it drew from Church officials, Benson's liberality ended here. Therefore, this brief biography helps place *Lord of the World* as a unique work worthy of attention—unlike the majority of his fiction. This section, to a minor degree, additionally situates and explains Benson's prominence as a Catholic celebrity a century before. However, largely, I argue that *Lord of the World* represents a brief moment of autonomy for Benson as an author where he does not completely and simply parrot Pius X's talking points.

Yet Benson's commitment to the Catholic Church remains important. It provides insight to why he turns his narrative away from a shining, happy socialist Britain that, at first, he describes as admirable. Benson's self-fashioning as a Christian apologist gives him the freedom to admire technological advancement *and* make the case for its permanence. He critiques the modern future not by its functionality, but due to its *ability* to function and thrive without God and the Church. Therefore, his future socialist Britain does not constitute an outright dystopia—as much as its godlessness repels Benson—but an anti-utopia. The same can be said of his description of a unified Rome: he does not depict it as an utopia. While he lovingly describes Rome in the twenty first century as antiquated and devoid of technology—with the exception of the Pope's typewriter and lift—he also argues that society cannot retreat backwards. By organizing his anachronistic eternal city around industrialized suburbs full of faithful Catholics, he makes a subtle case that modernity and faith can, in fact, coexist. He goes beyond mere engagement with the counter-argument as, here more than in any of his other works, he explores and appreciates the inherent logic of the universal welfare state. His appreciation remains important since he began his novel the same year the modern British welfare state was born with the Liberal-Labour pact (1903).

Finally, I claim that in his next novel, *The Dawn of All* (1911), Benson self-corrects his criticisms of the Catholic Church. In the novel, the Church and science grow together as one and he allows himself to celebrate these achievements without any level of detachment. However, like his later works, the novel is—to be blunt—quite uninteresting. To stimulate his professional rise in the Church, Benson censors his voice and creates a mere work of Catholic propaganda. Ultimately, officials rewarded him for his efforts, promoting him to one of the highest positions in the Church and financing two trans-Atlantic speaking tours. However, the authorial compromises he made after *Lord of the World* impacted his reputation—or lack thereof. Though British and American readers flocked to him a century before, today Benson represents a largely forgotten figure in the utopian canon.

Robert Hugh Benson and *Lord of the World*

On an April day in 1914, more than 700 Notre Dame students waited in anticipation for one of the age's greatest religious personalities. Not only did the visiting priest address more than 100,000 listeners during his 1910 and 1912 transatlantic tours, but he also authored more than 30 popular works of historical fiction, science-fiction, apologetics, and even children's literature (in just ten years). That day, in Washington Hall's spire-topped auditorium, the campus welcomed the lecturer with thunderous applause worthy of a vaudeville star. The *Notre Dame Scholastic* reported that the "distinguished English visitor" performed "a splendid lecture...[with]

the undivided attention of his audience throughout."[cxxxvii] The "pleasing and powerful speaker," a papal chamberlain ordained by Pope Pius X, took to the stage and railed against "the absurdity of a hundred sects" and made an "impregnable case for Papal jurisdiction."[cxxxviii] Though the Reverend Monsignor's conservative orthodoxy surprised none of his listeners, a decade prior few in the audience knew anything of the commanding figure who preached before them. Largely unknown to Americans before his conversion in 1903, the British public previously knew the speaker, Robert Hugh Benson, only as the sixth and youngest son of the late Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury. Less than six months after speaking to the campus community Benson suddenly died at the age of forty-two from apparent exhaustion. Though he passed away at the height of his celebrity, audiences today know little to nothing of the man who once dominated both the pulpit and a dedicated readership.

More than 100 years after he spoke at Notre Dame, Pope Francis promoted Benson's *Lord of the World* (1907) as required reading material. Though his recommendation gestures towards Benson's limited popularity—in his interview he calls the work "*The Lord of the Earth*, or *The Lord of the World*….one of those*"*—Francis contends that the novel anticipates the "drama of ideological colonization."[cxxxix] Here, Francis refers to the growth of the secular, bureaucratic state that Benson depicts in his novel. Set in the early twenty first century, Benson, not unlike George Orwell in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), details a world divided into three competing states: the secular European Federation and their African colonies, the secular American Republic, and the Eastern Empire that worships an emperor as the "Son of Heaven." At the novel's opening, citizens fear a total war between the Eastern Empire and the European Federation as tensions escalate. Benson focuses on three main protagonists in the European

Federation: Father Percy Franklin, one of the few remaining Catholics; Oliver Brand, a Labour MP; Oliver’s wife, Mabel.

While Father Percy attempts to prevent atheism from overtaking the few remaining Catholics, Oliver travels to Paris to negotiate a peace. He returns successfully, but only thanks to the efforts of a mysterious American senator, Julian Felsenburgh—whom Benson later reveals as the Anti-Christ. Felsenburgh’s power increases and he ultimately becomes the leader of the world. A man fluent in all languages with no discernable background, he ultimately imposes the worship of man—Humanism—as the state religion. He also mandates religious observation and makes Oliver the Minister of Public Worship. To the horrors of Mabel, an enthusiastic early convert to Humanism, Felsenburgh begins to violently purge the Catholic minority once in power.

In doing so, Benson transforms the once peaceful, utilitarian European government into a violent regime that oppresses dissenters. After traveling to Rome on the Pope’s directive, Father Franklin learns of a Catholic plot to assassinate Felsenburgh and his inner circle at Westminster Abbey. The Pope sends him back to Britain to stop the bombing, but, before he can do so, Felsenburgh discovers the plot. While traveling in the air, Father Percy helplessly witnesses a squadron of volors (airships) heading to firebomb Rome in retaliation. Back in London, a disheartened Mabel learns that Oliver co-signed Felsenburgh’s order to destroy Rome. Disillusioned with both her newfound faith and her husband, she checks into a legal euthanasia clinic without Oliver’s knowledge and commits suicide. After Felsenburgh’s fleet destroys Rome the few surviving cardinals appoint Father Franklin pope. He subsequently stylizes himself as Pope Sylvester III and settles in Nazareth. Discovering their location, Felsenburgh personally leads the charge of another squadron of firebombing volors. As the pope and the remaining cardinals gather around the Host and chant the *Tantum Ergo* bombs rain down and Benson uses his ambiguous final line, “this world passed, and the glory of it,” to signal the end of the Christian world or, possibly, the world entire. Yet before analyzing *Lord of the World* in greater detail, a survey of Christian utopian literature helps situate the novel as an anomaly of its time; unlike the other authors I analyze, Benson stands alone in situating religion as his paramount concern when constructing his anti-utopian future.

An Overview of Christian Utopian Literature

While Chapter One provides a general overview of utopian literature, the following section contextualizes Robert Hugh Benson an outlier of its Christian sub-genre. In particular, Christian utopian literature encompasses three distinct movements: its origin beginning with Thomas More, its seventeenth century zenith, and its subsequent exponential decline. By the time Benson emerges in the early twentieth century, utopian authors, for the most part, no longer concern themselves with religious considerations. Though inspired by contemporaries like H.G. Wells, Benson also drew from authors who, centuries before, used utopian fiction to project the ideal relationship between church and state. Like More’s *Utopia*, Benson uses fantastical descriptions to promote his opinions on religion *and* to safety distance himself from the more radical notions of those views.

In *The Story of Utopias* (1922), Lewis Mumford designates texts like Benson’s *Lord of the World* as *utopias of reconstruction*.[cxl] He argues that such works aim to reform political and social institutions while *utopias of escape* “leave the external world the way it is.”[cxli][cxlii][cxliii] In particular, Mumford attests that *utopias of reconstruction* begin with Thomas More’s *Utopia* (1516). Though More focuses his analysis on Utopia’s government, as discussed in Chapter One, he also makes the case for basic religious unity.[cxliv] The narrator, Hythlodaeus, notes that

Utopians, like Christians, worship “a single divinity” who “they attribute the origin, increase, progress, and ends of all things.”[cxlvcxlvi] He remarks that the state permits total religious freedom, but it harshly punishes charismatic religious fervor. Though he does not refer to Protestantism by name, More uses Hythodaeus as a voice box to critique charismatic Christian believers who destabilize religious unity during his time.

When Hythlodaeus and his fellow travelers introduce Christianity to the island, More frames a Utopian convert—who took it “upon himself to preach the Christian religion publicly, with more zeal than discretion”—as a dangerous element.[cxlvii] According to the narrator he “set our religion above the rest” and “condemned all others as profane.”[cxlviii] The State punishes the overzealous man with exile, not for his religious beliefs, but for “creating a public disorder.”[cxlix] Hythlodaeus frames the punishment as understandable given that, in Utopia, “one of their oldest rules [is] that no one should suffer for his religion.”[cl] More subtly uses Hythlodaeus’ discussion of religious freedom to argue for cohesion even between diverging belief systems.[cli]

In the same section, Hythlodaeus shares the state’s sole exceptions to religious tolerance: citizens must reject 1) the belief that “the soul perishes with the body” and 2) the conviction “that the universe is ruled by blind chance, not divine providence.”[clii] More uses these limitations to demonstrate that freedom in Utopia stems from discipline instead of absolute liberty. While the pursuit of pleasure drives society, he emphasizes that virtue, instilled by “a religious fear of the gods,” motivates the island’s citizenry.[cliii] When a citizen denies godly intervention, for instance, he or she does not endanger orthodoxy, but destabilizes social order. Here, Utopia’s government verges towards totalitarianism, illustrating More’s chief concern of maintaining a unified, functioning society.[cliv] As religious disunion continued to fracture the European continent in the seventeenth century, one unique commonality stood firm: utopian fiction.

With the Inquisition, the Thirty Years War, and sectarian violence between Catholics and Protestants dividing Europe, utopian authors detailed idealized governments that would provide stability in tumultuous times. Since authors of the period concentrate not only on political, but also on religious concerns, early utopian literary critics viewed this period with great distain. Writing in 1952, Marxist historian A.L. Morton described such utopias as "low quality" to the degree that they contain "little positive value to the development of the Utopian conception."[clv] Even though they briefly mention the period in their survey's introduction, in *Utopian Thought in the Western World* (1979) Frank and Fritzie Manuel all but ignore seventeenth century British texts.[clvi] With "The Utopian Impulse in Seventeenth-Century England" (1987) Keith Thomas begins to reexamine the period and encourages other critics to do the same.[clvii] Thomas divides utopias into eight categories, the first pertaining to literary utopias. Yet literary utopias at this time form two rough constellations of thought rather than a single cohesive movement. The first follows More's tradition of *utopias of reform* where authors depict ideal states that provide religious and political unity. In the second, authors reject the possibility of Christian unification and fantastical elements begin to dominate discussions. In this second movement, authors begin to form what will ultimately become the anti-utopian genre.

Like More before him, in *The City of the Sun* (1602) Italian Dominican philosopher Tommaso Campanella takes inspiration from Plato's *Republic* and *Timaeus* to illustrate a paradise defined by religious cohesion.[clviii] Reimaging a reborn Catholic Church, Campanella depicts a theocracy based on the equal division of labor and communal living. Yet, unlike More's isolationist state, Campanella details a government that will spread throughout Europe. Through the aid of astrology at novel's conclusion he prophesizes that Spain and the papal government will spread the True Faith first to Protestant lands and then to the entire world.

Other authors, like Sir Francis Bacon in *New Atlantis* (1624), focus on an isolated, model state like More's *Utopia*.[clix] Partially modeled off of Johannes Valentinus Andreae's *Christianopolis* (1619), he details a society where Christianity and natural science exist side by side. Even though the island's citizens miraculously received a Bible and an accompanying letter of explanation from Saint Bartholomew some years before, Bacon shows that scientific exploration dominates the society. In particular he describes "the very eye of this kingdom," Saloman's House, a school of natural science "dedicated to the study of Works and the Creatures of God.'"[clx] Bacon rejects Biblical literalism to create, not a perfect government, but a model for an ideal scientific university. Though Campanella and Bacon approach Christianity from radically different perspectives, each explores the possibility of religious unity fostered by a utopian state.

As previously mentioned in the Chapter One, Jonathan Swift (*Gulliver's Travels,* 1726) and his radically pessimistic view of mankind marks an important shift in utopian literature. In *Restoration and Augustan British Utopias* (2000) Gregory Claeys notes that utopian literature "was much more common in the half century before 1660" than in the latter half. He attests that during the advent and fall of the English Commonwealth British authors began to take a "conspicuously anti-utopian" approach to their fiction. He goes on to demonstrate that while concerns for religious unity still dominated utopian works, authors moved to analyze science, social reform, the discovery of new worlds, and class equality. Before Swift, two authors of the seventeenth century, Margaret Cavendish and Henry Neville, signal both the rise of the anti-utopian genre and the decline of Christian utopian fiction.

In *Tbe Blazing World* (1666) Cavendish rejects Christianity altogether. Her unnamed protagonist accedes to become empress of a new world and forms a state religion around her cult of personality. She ultimately unifies the multiple animal-men of the Blazing World to create a peaceful society that openly questions natural laws and rejects the hierarchy of the sexes.[clxi] Her radical feminist text does not fit easily in the utopian canon of its time. Rather, it marks a shift when concerns of navigation and governance outweigh religious considerations. Similarly, Neville reorients his interest towards these concerns and, going even further, frames religion as a destructive force.

Whereas Bacon aligns Christianity with scientific development and Cavendish uses her state religion to bring about gender equality, Neville (*The Isle of Pines,* 1668) does not embrace religion as a unifying power.[clxii] Instead, he discusses religion only nominally and, ultimately, ends with a pessimistic view of his island's English inhabitants. At first, he depicts a utopia where a shipwrecked crew form an Arcadian society. However, upon closer examination, their Dutch discoverers do not find the utopia they expected. Rather, Neville creates an anti-utopia to criticize the Edenic connotations applied to the state of nature—humankind before established civil society. Disconnected from the world at large and without technology, he depicts the island's inhabitants not as bucolic settlers, but as bellicose savages. As colonists overpopulate the island, the author illustrates how the settlers reduce a paradise to a land defined by tribal warfare.

Neville focuses his critique on the unprepared shipwrecked English colonists to reject the myth of the primitive paradise.[clxiii] In the scope of only ninety-eight years the island's population balloons from five inhabitants to more than ten thousand without any advancement in technology or culture. Though some tribes attempt to bring social order through Christianity, he claims that "no tie of religion [is] strong enough to chain up the depraved nature of mankind."[clxiv] Unlike Swift, who satirizes all humankind, Neville focuses his critique on the shipwrecked inhabitants who, segregated from the benefits of centralized government, devolve into barbarity.[clxv] Ultimately, both Swift and Neville illustrate a growing disinterest in religious unification, a disinterest that increases as arguments of the Enlightenment replace the ideological battles between Protestants and Catholics.

After the seventeenth century, authors recede from writing Christian utopias as the philosophical battle between radical and moderate Enlightenment replaces the debate between religious sects. According to Johnathan Israel in *Radical Enlightenment* (2001), radical enlightenment thinkers based their beliefs on Spinoza's rationalist materialism while moderate Enlightenment philosophers founded their belief system on the "argument for design"—that a Creator shaped the world for the benefit of man.[clxvi] Scientific advancement fueled this division as experts in natural science began to challenge the Christian notion of a world created "as is" for humankind. Admittedly scientists (like Bacon) in the last century, with their breakthroughs in astronomy and natural science, challenged Biblical literalism. However, by the end of the eighteenth-century geologists like James Hutton, whose *Theory of Earth* (1795) proposes an infinite, self-subsisting cycle of change to explain the Earth's crust, refute Christianity's creation myth. Further scientific discovery and technological advancement in the nineteenth century ultimately brought about the modernist crisis in the Catholic Church.[clxvii] The modernist crisis not only influenced Benson's religious beliefs, but also his fiction—especially *The Lord of the World*.

The Modernist Crisis in the Early Twentieth Century

In the context of Catholicism, modernism is a broad assortment of varying theological opinions that challenges the orthodoxy of the Church. Modernism, defined by Pope Pius X in *Pascendi dominici gregis* (1907), encompasses four basic principles: 1) a rationalistic approach to the Bible that ignores literalism and frames various readings alongside historical, social, and scientific realities; 2) a disavowal or questioning of official Church doctrines; 3) an appreciation of secularism and the need to separate religion from social, governmental, scientific, and educational institutions; 4) modern philosophies not directly grounded in Catholic thought including Kantian, Platonic, Aristotelian thought as well as scientific perspectives. As scientific observation replaced fidelity to Christian beliefs, Pope Pius X issued his compulsory oath against modernism, *Sacrorum antistitum,* in 1910.[clxviii] As the list above illustrates, modernism encompasses any perspective that does not fully recognize the innate legitimacy of the Church. To Pius X, Catholicism not only faced opposition from scientists, revolutionaries, and atheists, but also needed to confront enemies within—liberal theologians and students who challenged Catholic orthodoxy.

In Pius X's view, keeping the eternal church meant an unwavering rejection of any text, even those produced by Catholics, that challenged any Catholic belief. He fully rejected modernists who viewed the Church as a living, evolving body that changed alongside history. Instead, he framed such thinkers as apostates.[clxix] Modernism, simply defined by Pius, represents a "synthesis of all [the] heresies" where any delineation from Catholic conventions constitutes a break with the Church.[clxx] In *Sacrorum antistitum,* Pius X stresses that he was "completely opposed" to modernists who believed "that there is nothing divine in sacred tradition" and argues for extreme orthodoxy of belief. He contends that the apostles' doctrines maintain "the same meaning," affirms the necessity of Biblical miracles, and attests that faith comes from an "external source" rather than from within.[clxxi] He concludes that history and science cannot contradict the Church as doing so constitutes heresy. He goes on to "condemn and reject…that a well-educated Christian" may "hold things that contradict the faith of the believer."[clxxii]

Pius X's revolt against liberal Biblical interpretation emphasizes his underlying fear of schools of thought that developed outside of the Church. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century philosophers espousing positivism, structural functionalism, pragmatism and other sociological perspectives—though not necessarily counter-religious in nature—did so without grounding their beliefs in Christian thought. Strengthened by the concept of papal infallibility established by Pius IX's First Vatican Council (1869-1870), Pius X battled against modernism in masse. His League of Pius V, the pope under Thomas Aquinas, gathered evidence about possible heretics and the pope himself held little empathy for those he viewed as spiritual interlopers. Pius X notes that "they [modernists] want to be treated with oil, soap and caresses," but instead argues that they "should be beaten with fists."[clxxiii] His extreme views naturally created infighting in the Church among figures like Alfred Loisy, who read Genesis as mythological poetry rather than a literal, historical fact.[clxxiv][clxxv] Importantly, Pius X's shadow looms large over Benson's life and the twentieth century itself. As he rose in the Church hierarchy, Benson eventually adopted Pius X's traditionalist view of Christianity as an unchanging, unfaltering ancient belief system to aid his professional rise.

In *Non-Catholic Denominations*, Benson critiques the practitioners of "New Theology" a movement that eventually influenced the reforms of the Second Vatican Council.[clxxvi][clxxvii] Proponents of New Theology argued that, for the church to regain its footing and flourish, it must return to the sources of the Church Fathers (*ressourcement*), inspire open debate of Biblical interpretations, discard supernaturalism, and create a dialogue between Biblical and current events. Here Benson defines the movement as a New-Age feel-good cult: he argues that "the more solid students of Presbyterian theology" view professors within the movement "as mere innovators and amateurs" while they "are not considered by their brethren as very sound or erudite scholars."[clxxviii] He goes on to parrot Pius X's concerns noting that "many Protestant minds have been for long, and inevitably" approaching the New Theology that "has won a place for itself in modern Non-Catholic thought."[clxxix] Pius and Benson suggest that moving away from fundamentalism catalyzes atheism.[clxxx] Yet, unlike Pius X, Benson does fear liberal thought, but the secular institutions that modernity inevitably supplies.

Benson stands out due to his often-paradoxical relationship with modernism. Unafraid of technological advancement, he nonetheless criticizes modern system's lack of concern for God. In "Catholicism and the Future" he designates modernity's "important contributions" as "obvious" especially in regard to "popularizing science."[clxxxi] However, rather than critiquing the Church's growing apprehension of modernity, he claims that "independent thinkers have injured" themselves by "assuming an authority…they repudiate."[clxxxii] Here, he means if a scientist forgoes the Church then he or she positions another discipline as the voice box of truth. He argues that "the specialization of…knowledge" allows modern advancement to lose "touch with life and thought" and positions itself as an antithesis to religion. Instead, he concludes, "certain enormous facts" should be left to the Church's authority alone.[clxxxiii][clxxxiv]

The modernist crisis reverberates greatly in *Lord of the World* as Benson positions two religious camps—those of Catholicism and Humanitarianism as oppositional forces. As Felsenburgh gains power in the continent, the Pope claims that the population turns against Christianity not because "fathers have rejected it," or due to "*the deceitful riches of the world* [original emphasis]," since even "*science falsely so-called"* does not inhibit faith.[clxxxv] Instead, "*the Son of Perdition*" the Anti-Christ, encourages a form of worship where man places *"himself above all that is called God*."[clxxxvi] Father Percy concurs and argues that the persecution of Catholics stems not from atheism, but from "this new outburst of enthusiasm for

Humanity."[clxxxvii] Benson, using his Catholic characters to project his religious views, argues that modern religious thought creates, not atheism, but an entirely new belief system.

However, before analyzing *The Lord of the World* in detail, I provide a biographical reassessment of Benson. As shown in the following section, Benson's biographers project him as a model Catholic—that is to say a rather saintly, but ultimately dull, figure. I aim to illustrate that, though Benson echoes the Church's condemnation of modernism, his novel emerges during a time when Benson questions his own relationship with the Catholic Church due, in part, to a same-sex love affair. When exploring his sexuality, Benson also begins to interrogate the Church's relationship, or lack thereof, with modern social and government systems—especially in regard the Liberal welfare reforms beginning in 1906. While he supports Pius' talking points regarding modernism, he uses his anti-utopian perspective to criticize and celebrate *both* religious and secular institution's ability to support and protect British citizens. Granted, Benson deeply entrenches himself in Catholic orthodoxy in *Lord of the World*—a perspective representative of his entire body of fiction. Yet, in this work, his independent authorial voice emerges more than in any of his later fiction. Even though shortly lived, Benson's highpoint of personal liberality stems from his relationship with the notorious Frederick Rolfe, better known by his penname, Baron Corvo.

Uncovering the Hidden Complexities of a Catholic Icon

Benson's biographers ignore his critiques of the Catholic Church as they, instead, memorialize him as an exemplary Catholic. Though the outbreak of World War I greatly minimized the news of his passing, multiple authors published works on Benson immediately after his death. Arthur Benson (*Hugh: Memoir of a Brother,* 1915), Blane Warre Cornish (*Memorials of Robert Hugh Benson,* 1915), and Katharine Olive Parr (*Robert Hugh Benson: An*

Appreciation, 1915) use his letters, lectures, and even personal vignettes to create a trilogy of loving eulogies.[clxxxviii] Yet none approach Benson critically as an author or religious figure. Parr, better known by her penname Beatrice Chase, creates a small, informal character study discussing the final years of his life in Buntingford. Arthur Benson, writing as a dedicated brother, produces a largely sterile biography.[clxxxix] Likewise, Cornish edits an anthology of essays by Benson's friends that details his personal affinities, but does little to illustrate his private and professional complexities. Each author views his reputation as a great writer and theologian as a foregone conclusion and, in doing so, reduces him to a two-dimensional figure of piety.

Even Cyril Charles Martindale (*The Life of Monsignor Robert Hugh Benson*, 1916), who disapproved of Benson's celebrity, does not question his literary merit. Martindale—who viewed himself as the superior scholar and an even better biographical subject—felt obliged to accept the commission since Francis Bourne, Archbishop of Westminster, commissioned the work.[cxc] Bourne distrusted Anglican converts and formed little more than a working relationship with Benson. Nevertheless, he understood the scope and impact of Benson's writing on English speaking Catholics. Martindale, heavily indebted to the plethora of family letters that Arthur compiled and provided him in full, touches on some of his eccentricities, but paints Benson as a perfect Catholic. Other than the influx of biographies written immediately after his death, no biographer examined Benson in detail until the end of the twentieth century

In *Robert Hugh Benson: Life and Works* (1998) Janet Grayson provides a more detailed portrait of the author, but she too concentrates on his career as a religious figure rather than an author.[cxci] She admittedly touches on his entire body of fiction, but her study goes the way of earlier biographies. Building off of Benson's collected letters she provides a narrative that introduces his life and work, but she rarely assesses his literature critically. Instead she approaches his fiction as cultural artifacts produced by someone worthy of merit, not because of literary output, but due to his place in history as the most famous convert since John Henry Newman. Unlike her predecessors, she begins with the rhetorical question "does anyone read Robert Hugh Benson anymore?"[cxcii] She does need to provide an answer since Grayson goes on to claim that Benson's popularity mainly stems his celebrity status as a convert. She credits not his prose, which she sees as formulaic and sensational, but his ability to curate "an international audience drawn from all classes including royalty and stretching across two continents."[cxciii] As a result, Grayson discusses each of his published works only as a frame of reference for his life events.

Yet I am indebted to these biographies because, with only a few exceptions, academic critics ignore Benson outright. Outside of his biographies, only Brian Sudlow's *Catholic Literature and Secularization in France and England, 1880-1914* (2011) and Simon Goldhill's *A Very Queer Family Indeed: Sex Religion, and the Benson's in Victorian England* (2016) explore Benson within a book-length academic discussion—then only minorly.[cxciv][cxcv] When looking for criticism regarding *Lord of the World*, even the broadest academic search comes up surprisingly short.[cxcvi] Critics who reference Benson at all only do so to highlight other little known utopian authors.

For instance, in "Apocalyptic Visions and Utopian Spaces in Late Victorian and Edwardian Prophecy Fiction" (2011) Axel Stähler places Benson's *Lord of the World* in conversation with Joseph Compton Rickett's *The Christ That Is to Be* (1891) and Sydney Watson's apocalyptic trilogy *In the Twinkling of an Eye* (1904), *The Mark of the Beast* (1911), and *Scarlet and Purple* (1913).[cxcvii] He provides just a brief analysis of Benson's text and argues that the author melds the genres of utopian and apocalyptic fiction to create an imagined community that aligns directly with his religious ideals.[cxcviii] Situating him as unique in his approach to the utopian genre, he argues that Benson divides his imagined future into two distinct utopian spaces. He claims that Benson's utopia of the first order, the modern world, devolves into a dystopia and permits the utopia of the second order, the Second Coming, to succeed.[cxcix] However, this chapter argues that Stähler's utopia of the first order can be better defined as an anti-utopia. Though he detests secularism, Benson celebrates certain facets of the modern bureaucratic state, namely its ability to provide basic necessities for all citizens.

Though he began *Lord of the World* the same year he converted to Catholicism (1903), the year leading up to its publication (1906) marks a highpoint of his personal liberality. During this time, he began what would constitute his only serious connection outside of his family and the Church: his relationship with the failed priest, author, photographer, and unrepentant homosexual Frederick Rolfe. Yet, as detailed here, Benson did not successfully balance his religious calling with his burgeoning, but possibly celibate, romance with Rolfe. Unlike his mother, Mary, who sustained serious lesbian romantic affairs while maintaining a prominent place in Victorian society, Benson sacrificed both his personal and artistic freedom to the Church. Though his professional compromises led to his fame and prominence at the turn of the century, it, until now, has made him an uninteresting biographical figure.

While she essentially ignores the personal controversies that surrounded Benson in 1906, Grayson importantly argues that one must understand his family to best understand Benson—addressed as Hugh when discussing the Benson clan for the sake of clarity. First, his background contextualizes the cultural shock that resulted from his religious conversion. Next this section will explore how his surviving brothers, Arthur and Edward Fredrick (denoted as E.F., his penname, to distinguish him from his father), shaped his literary estate and reputation. Yet, to begin, his early fame as a covert largely stems from the position of his father, Edward White Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury. Though largely forgotten today, the elder Benson lived a life, as noted by Mary Benson biographer Rodney Bolt, of “relentless success.”[cc] In the scope of 26 years he advanced from schoolmaster to the principal leader of the Church of England. The eldest of eight children of a failed Birmingham chemical manufacturer, Benson largely owed his exponential rise to his wife, Mary “Minnie” Sidgwick.[cci]

Though Arthur destroyed Hugh’s correspondences that implicated his same-sex inclinations after his death, Mary’s letters and diaries remain largely intact. From these and other correspondences E.F. and Arthur wrote a total of eight memoirs about members of the family and themselves. Though the correspondences between the Benson siblings often illustrate a close-knit, loving family, life in the Benson household held darker secrets. The financial struggles of Edward’s younger life and the weight of familial responsibilities thrust upon him as a young teenager contributed to a lifelong battle with depression. Arthur noted that his siblings feared Edward’s “constant scrutiny” and the “overwhelming anxiety” evoked by even the “smallest sign of moral indolence.”[ccii] E.F. further admitted that, when their father was in attendance, the children adopted a form of “woodenness” so that their “washed hands and neat hair and low voices…minimized the risks of his society.”[cciii]

Society-at-large knew little the family’s discontent since Mary developed the reputation, as recalled by E.F., of a world class hostess. She relished throwing dinner parties that “took an infinity of rapturous trouble” adding that the “bigger they were the more…she enjoyed them.”[cciv]On the topic of conversation, he argued that she naturally opened herself up to “complete and unlimited leisure for talking.”[ccv] Maggie, writing to Hugh while he attended Eton, even comically noted her mother's social ease when faced with a faux pas that would leave lesser hostesses feeling faint. When hosting a tea for Hawaiian Queen Kapiʻolani —who visited London as a part of Victoria's Golden Jubilee in 1887—she "stopped" her from dipping "a sponge cake in her tea" with a simple, discrete nod of the head.[ccvi] Ultimately, praise of her sociability reached the highest echelons of English society. During a dinner table debate about the cleverest English woman at Hawarden Castle, the Prime Mister's home, William Gladstone deftly countered it could not be Mary as she constituted the "cleverest woman in Europe."[ccvii]

After the birth of her sixth child, Mary fell ill, convalesced in Wiesbaden, Germany and here met a fellow vacationer, Miss Hall. In her private diary, she later admitted that she "lost [her] head" in the affair and censors herself when saying that she cannot fully explain "the way I worryed [sic] my dear ones."[ccviii] Yet she also mentions her "husband's pain" and how he "bore" "*our talk* [original emphasis]" "lovingly" and "gently."[ccix] Her writing makes it unclear if she sexually consummated her first same-sex love affair. However, she clearly illustrates the fact that her husband came to know of the true nature of their friendship. In her study of Mary in *Intimate Friends: Women Who Loved Women* (2004), Martha Vicinus correctly notes that, in her personal writings, she reconciled her same-sex sentiments by developing an understanding of God's love as innately motherly. Such a move, as Vicinus argues, allowed her to "never consider her love of a woman to be adultery."[ccx] A public façade of a strong marriage, coupled with the support of lovers like Tan Mynle, allowed Mary to discretely maintain what the public and, at least initially, her children viewed as only close friendships.

While Vicinus focuses on the personal growth detailed in Mary's diary entries, her marriage, oddly enough, proved vital to her success in navigating her newfound love life. Cornish, in *Memorials of Robert Hugh Benson*, describes Mary as someone who "never wrote," whose “gifts of converse” stemmed from “an inward silence,” and who, towards the end of her life, practiced “Catholic devotion” in her “secluded home in Sussex.”[ccxi] By self-fashioning herself as the ideal English hostess, and contributing to the burgeoning career of her husband, the power dynamics within the household altered. Arthur wrote that later in life Edward “was not really at home in an atmosphere of perfect equality.”[ccxii] Ultimately, Mary found a lasting companion with Charlotte Mary Bassett, who, with her husband’s consent, lived with her until her death in 1918.

Mary’s narrative pertains to Hugh not only due to their familial closeness, but also because it illustrates a successful example of one navigating same sex desire alongside one’s given social role. Hugh, unlike his mother, extinguished his only ardent personal connection at the request of Church officials. While Grayson’s text expands greatly on the work of her processors, she does not explore his sexuality in detail. She does emphasize his often-paradoxical nature: an author who shocked the Catholic Church with his science-fiction, yet who nonetheless moved towards more conventional apologetics at the encouragement of the church; a man who rejected modern materialism yet relished interior design and the aestheticism of the church; a preacher who worked strenuously, but whose own egotism alienated him from his peers.

When she approaches the question of Benson’s sexuality, her ability to explore the nuisances of his character abruptly ends. Today, contemporary critics like Goldhill frame Hugh’s homosexual tendencies, and that of his siblings, as rather obvious. Such a shift comes not from new textual findings, but simply from the growing normalization of homosexuality. Though little surviving correspondences of Hugh give definitive evidence regarding his sexuality, the discomfort of his biographers in approaching his relationship with Rolfe starkly suggests that his relationship contained a deep underpinning of homosexual desire.[ccxiii]

Though Martindale shared unpublished fragments of their correspondence via his own notes to Rolfe biographer A.J.A. Symons, a more detailed picture of Benson's personal relationship with Rolfe can be only inferred. In *Confessions of a Convert* Benson admitted that he found marriage "quite inconceivable" as he preferred "a sober bachelor existence."[ccxiv] Like his siblings, Benson probably held homosexual inclinations. Like Arthur (though not the promiscuous E.F.), little suggests that he did not live in absolute celibacy. In a letter to Maggie, Mary notes that, to her, Hugh admitted that "he can't at present conceive the possibility of giving his heart to a wife" and by no account did Benson even remotely pursue a heterosexual romance.[ccxv] Arthur attests that Hugh's personality—namely his "isolation, his independence, his lack of any real deference"—made the Catholic Church his only true connection, allowing him to "repose on something august, age-long, [and] overpowering."[ccxvi] Benson's self-fashioning as a man married to the church, compounded by the taboo nature of homosexuality at the time, meant that his biographers ignored, or outright censored, his sexuality.

Yet Benson appeared to find a kindred spirit in Rolfe, whose *Hadrian VII* (1904) heavily inspired *Lord of the World*.[ccxvii] An odd underdog story that also functions as an exercise in sheer egotism, Rolfe superimposes himself unto the protagonist, a chain-smoking failed priest named George Arthur Rose. When invited back into the Church, Rose helps break a deadlocked Papal concave that then, to his surprise, makes *him* Pope. He models himself on Adrian IV (1100-1159) and, through a combination of luck and raw charm, he restructures the church bureaucracy (until he is ultimately assassinated). Benson's attraction to the novel stems from his admiration of a hero who brought the Church into the twentieth century, a man, in Benson's words, "who said 'Tomorrow' and meant it." He wrote to Rolfe and raved about the novel: "I have read it three times, and each time the impression has grown stronger of the deep faith of it, its essential cleanness and its brilliance."[ccxviii]

Meeting after their initial correspondence, Benson and Rolfe undertook a walking tour of England and began planning a biography of Archbishop Thomas Becket. According to Martindale's biography, Benson tasked Rolfe with researching "the stage setting and the properties" and, as their published correspondence shows, he wrote Benson multiple research sketches.[ccxix]

Though he published *The Holy Blissful Martyr Saint Thomas of Canterbury* (1908) a year after *Lord of the World*, his earlier collaborative work predates his novel and highlights Benson's attitudes regarding the growth of the secular state. Writing to Rolfe, Benson argues that Henry II's governmental changes "must slowly darken through the book before he appears."[ccxx] Here, much like in *Lord of the World,* Benson concerns himself with the growth of English secularization. In the work, he compares Henry II—who represented "earthly dominion"—to Herod and Nero for bringing "the kingdom of God into subjection to his own."[ccxxi] Here, faith and orthodox belief to that faith, rather than political acumen, define personal success for Benson. While the modernist controversy remained a heated issue within the Church's scholastic community, Benson's novel shares his concerns with a popular audience before the controversy became a mainstream debate in the mid-century.

Though the first Benson biographer to refer to the erotic dimension to his friendship with Rolfe, Grayson nonetheless continuously asserts Benson's chastity to the point of asexuality. Grayson admits that Hugh's early correspondence departs from his "normal style" of writing as "it is still and rambling and pedantic."[ccxxii] Yet she claims that he "was not homosexual, or sexual in any way" not from "timidity," but from a hypothetical, unnamed "physical impairment."[ccxxiii]

Since Rolfe played a large role in the initial conception of *Lord of the World* and, though quickly extinguished, constituted his most fervent relationship, he cannot be ignored biographically even by the likes of Martindale.

Martindale, for one, frames Rolfe as a less-talented hanger-on rather than an intellectual equal. Instead of framing the attraction as mutual, he argues that the relationship stemmed from Rolfe alone: "the correspondence itself became a severe tax, involving, very soon, letters, not only weekly, but at time daily, and of an intimate character, exhaustingly charged with emotion." [ccxxiv]Though the biographer largely quotes letters dealing strictly with the Becket biography, a few passages suggest a kinship born from more than intellectual attraction. In one such letter, Rolfe suggests that "I should not have given you priesthood," since "you know that you can relieve many physical ills by touch."[ccxxv]

Rather than downplaying their relationship, Grayson frames Rolfe as Benson's arch-nemesis. Even though interest in their relationship grew with Symons, Week, and Benkovitz's respective biographies of Rolfe, Grayson nevertheless relegates the majority of her discussion to an addendum. Describing him as a "disreputable fellow with a monstrous ego" she frames him as "the most sinister figure to enter Hugh's life."[ccxxvi] Other than this brief condemnation, she does her best to avoid the subject entirely. She attests that "he was not romantically inclined towards women (or men)" and goes on to argue that "women were drawn to him as a lodestone."[ccxxvii] Such an assertion remarkably counters Arthur's own observations to the contrary—he notes that women largely ignored him completely.

Due to Alfred's destruction of their correspondence, the true extent of Benson and Rolfe's short, but intense, connection largely remains unknown. What is evident—in even the earliest accounts of Benson's life—is that towards the end of their project an irreparable schism began to form. Out of the few correspondences that survive, a post-card from Hugh dated July 10, 1908, attests to the fact that friendship devolved into a poison pen correspondence:

> I'm returning your letters unopened to the postman: so do not send me more. I shall probably have to communicate your name and address to the Postal authorities if any more arrive. I haven't read either of them, except the first two sentences of the first. I'm keeping that one.[ccxxviii]

Symons notes that Benson wrote to Rolfe—and in Rolfe's words "showed the cloven hoof'—asking for his name alone to grace the title page.[ccxxix] Per Martindale, Benson noted that an unnamed agent told him that their work would sell better with his name alone attached to the project. While Benson's unnamed agent may be a catspaw, *Hadrian VII* did indeed fail financially. Since it did not sell at least six hundred copies, Rolfe received no royalties for the work per the publisher's agreement.

Yet, Benson's motivations do not appear to be financial in nature. E.F. notes that Hugh offered to distribute the profits with an additional payment of £100 and an acknowledgement to Rolfe in the preface.[ccxxx] Rolfe, in turn, rejected the offer. E.F. goes on to note that Hugh ultimately offered him the entirety of the book's potential profit since "Hugh's work had a very considerable sale and that Rolfe's had failed to find a public."[ccxxxi] This offer Rolfe refused outright as well.

However, it appears that Church officials' knowledge of the affair ultimately encouraged Benson to distance himself from Rolfe. In *Catholic Converts*, Patrick Allitt supports the underlying narrative regarding financial tensions purported by Benson's biographers. However, he also argues that earlier, in the planning stages, church officials approached Benson and warned him of Rolfe's "disreputable past and his promiscuous homosexuality."[ccxxxii] Admittedly, London society did not know Rolfe, the son of a piano tuner, as a model of discretion.[ccxxxiii] Due to his antics, his conversion to Catholicism in 1886 did not induce a successful career like it did in the case of Benson. As a likeminded convert, Rolfe's interest in reuniting Anglicans with the Catholic tradition and modernizing the church struck a chord with Benson—until their relationship opened up the possibility of negatively effecting Benson's professional rise.

Ultimately, the finalized *The Holy Blissful Martyr Saint Thomas of Canterbury* held no mention of Rolfe. Benson changed the original novelization to a brief biography and replaced his acknowledgement to Rolfe with preface detailing the tensions of "God against Caesar."[ccxxxiv] As an act of revenge, Rolfe superimposed Benson unto *The Weird of the Wanderer*'s (1912) Father Bobugo Bonsen, "a stuttering little Chrysostom of a priest with…the face of the Mad Hatter…and…an Etonian who insanely neglects to take any pains at all with his temple of the Holy Ghost, but wears paper collars and a black straw alpine hat."[ccxxxv] As Symons' biography notes, Rolfe's natural charisma and duplicitous nature attracted him to many—but only for a short time. E.F. argues Rolfe defined his life based on two obsessions: "that the priesthood of the Catholic Church" meant to ruin him and "that all who professed friendship for him were scheming treachery."[ccxxxvi]

When E.F. describes their falling out in greater detail, he also hints at Arthur's, not Hugh's, destruction of their correspondence. Beside their excited communication regarding *Thomas,* E.F. notes that Rolfe authored "abusive and obscene postcards" (sent to Hugh) and "reams of calumny" (sent to friends, family, and even Hugh's Bishop)—a testament to his "black heart."[ccxxxvii] Yet, in response, Hugh did not destroy the letters. Each letter came with a grotesque illustration—sexual in nature—and he choose to instead display these on his mantel piece at Hare Street to publicly illustrate his lighthearted apathy regarding the entire debacle. Even E.F.

admits that, Rolfe's emotional instability aside, Benson did emotionally distance himself from Rolfe with a quick severity outside of his brother's typical character.

The volatility of the brief relationship, and the public's knowledge of it, meant that even Benson's earliest biographers could not ignore his interlude with Rolfe. Yet, near the time of Rolfe's death, Hugh confessed to Reginald Watts his admiration for his former collaborator: "The man's a genius and I love him. If he'll only apologize I'll ask him to come and live with me. He's quite destitute now but is welcome to everything I've got."[ccxxxviii] By this time, Rolfe ruined most of his fruitful connections, left England for Venice, and slowly drank himself to death between intermittent sexual affairs with teenage gondoliers.

Partially, the extremity of their falling out can be explained by Rolfe's personality, but the intensity of their initial intellectual connection and its swift end suggests a deeper bond. Benson knew many admirers but held few close friends and the loss of Rolfe should not be downplayed. His friendship with him constituted one of the few close non-familial relationships in his life; the destruction of that connection contributed to Benson's emotional isolation and his increased reliance on the Catholic church. With their friendship dissolved, the strength of his orthodoxy, already established before meeting Rolfe, increased tenfold.

Benson's fullhearted embrace of Catholicism after Rolfe negatively affected the quality of his subsequent works. For instance, in his final novel *Loneliness* (pub. 1915), Benson creates a two-dimensional, overtly sentimental narrative.[ccxxxix] Here, he rejects any appreciation of differing religious opinions. Marion, a singer influenced by her friendship with an older Catholic woman (Maggie), converts to the Catholic faith and finds hidden depths in her voice. With her faith, she masters the complexity of *Tristan und Isolde*'s Liebestod, sings at Covent Gardens, and eventually falls in love with the wealthy Max Merival. When Max declares that he will neither convert nor raise Catholic children, Marion goes through a trial of faith. After choosing the love of Max over her fidelity to the church, her voice grows hoarse and wearisome, her career dissolves, Maggie dies, and Max briefly abandons her. Only after rejecting Max a final time does she find her true "knight"—Jesus Christ.[ccxl] Benson's severe melodramatic treatment of Marion shares little commonality with his complex portrayal of atheists in *Lord of the World*—a work written only seven years before.

The Lord of the World

In *Lord of the World* (1907) Benson depicts an efficiently functioning socialist state that exists without the aid of religion. Even though he frames Communist Britain's atheism as highly problematic, he does not depict the future as an outright dystopia. In his novel's prologue, he makes it clear that conservative governments do not solve this issue. Here, Templeton refers to Conservatives as Individualists and describes their political demise as inevitable since the working class constitutes "ninety-nine [out] of a hundred." Instead, Benson creates an anti-utopian space to celebrate the government's advanced public transit systems and liberal welfare state. He does so to argue that the reunified, but antiquated Rome described in the novel's latter half must modernize and provide likeminded support to the population at large: doing so, he claims, allows the Church to survive and flourish in the future. Benson, who shows an inherent distrust of the masses and governments, attests that people must be supported by a greater institution—ideally a more socially conscious Catholic Church.

Early in the novel, Templeton argues that the peaceful Communist state disproves the notion that "without religion there could be no adequate motive among the masses for even the simplest social order," but Benson upends his theory. When a Catholic renegade attempts to assassinate Oliver during his speech marking the fiftieth anniversary of the Poor Law reforms, Benson argues that state leaders, though peaceful, do little to mitigate a citizen's violent impulses. Before the assassination attempt, Benson emphasizes Oliver's ability to moderate the responses of his 100,000 listeners. Mabel describes him as a "born actor" who elicits "a murmur of applause" or "a storm of laughter" whenever needed. Like a conductor, Oliver need only gesture to provoke a response from his audience. However, when a "sharp crack" of a gun interrupts his speech—at the very moment he declares "that Braithwaite had done more for the world by one speech than Jesus and all His saints put together"—Oliver loses control of the crowd. Despite his protestations, the crowd surrounds the would-be assassin and "trample[s] and strangle[s] [him] instantly." Benson uses his murder to foreshadow how Felsenburgh will succeed in converting an aesthetic population into violent, religious firebrands: by playing off of their base emotions.

Nonetheless, Benson does not vilify individual followers of Humanism. Instead, he depicts such idolaters as misguided in their attempt to find religious bearing. Benson positions Father Francis, who leaves the Catholic Church as his faith dwindles in the novel's first section, as one of the first to encourage Humanism's rise. When Oliver confirms that Felsenburgh will restore "Divine Worship," Benson describes Francis as overjoyed since "the loss of worship" hurt him greatly. Charged with planning the opening festival, Francis notes that the failure of Empire Day—first celebrated in 1902, the year after Victoria's death—stemmed from its literalism. He argues that "worship involves a touch of mystery." Felsenburgh adds that touch by not only constructing an idol as a focus of worship, but also by encouraging an outpouring emotion among his followers that would make a Pentecostal blush.

Felsenburgh's Humanism celebrates the "visible" "web of life," as expressed through man's intellect and the material results of such explorations. In doing so, "sorrows were ignored" and Benson frames the religion as an empty positivism: it celebrates current technological achievements without challenging its followers to look beyond themselves. However, Benson also describes Humanism as attractive to those, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, who hunger for religion. Early in the work, Mabel attests that Christianity "was not ludicrous," but "terribly pathetic," a "lovely dream" and, at best, "an exquisite piece of poetry." Since her personal philosophy, like her husband's, grounds itself in materialism she initially finds "a transcendent God…unthinkable" as she does the "Incarnation" of Jesus Christ. Benson claims, that without the Church, leaders like Felsenburgh will mislead followers to support their own selfish ends. In doing so, he reflects his inherent distrust of both everyday men and women and non-Catholic leaders.

Unsurprisingly, Benson describes the idols as a perversion of Catholic iconography. The figure of Maternity, for instance, replaces the conservatively shrouded Virgin and child with a childless "nude woman, huge and majestic." Yet the figure does not hold the Son of God; Markenheim, the sculptor, positions her "arms down stretched" and her "hands a little raised" in anticipation as if "waiting for her child." Felsenburgh later uses this composition to assert his own person in the place of Jesus Christ during his first service in St. Paul's. When he unveils the statue during the festival of Maternity, Benson stresses that a "supreme miracle took place": the "huge, white and protective" Mother stretches out to the tribune so that Felsenburgh, speaking from the stage, replaces "the Child" as the "one passionate incarnation of love." As he decries the "Mother of us all, and Mother of Me" the worshippers begin to worship him as an "Supreme Being." Due to his exalting placement in the *mise-en-scene* Benson notes that the Anti-Christ situations himself as "the humble superhuman son of a Human Mother"—a stand-in for the ideal incarnation of man.

The subject of the next chapter, Aldous Huxley, proves helpful when analyzing the success of Felsenburgh's religious revolution. In *Brave New World Revisited* (1952) Huxley analyzes Adolf Hitler's speeches and argues that his political success stemmed not from his rhetoric, but from his ability to connect emotionally to his audience. Looking at filmed performances he notes that each time Hitler used words like "hatred, force, ruthless, crush, [or] smash" he accompanied "these violent words with even more violent gestures" to the extent that "his face would turn purple." Furthermore, he argues that "strong emotion…is the highest degree of contagious." He describes his rallies as "orgies" where "the malignant frenzy of the orator" infects the audience until they "groan and sob and scream" with the speaker. Like Hitler, Felsenburgh's ability to connect with his audience's emotions allows him to utilize mob psychology as a destructive force.

Benson describes Mabel and the other congregates, waiting for Felsenburgh in Westminster Abbey, as engaging in a form of emotional groupthink. He describes the worshippers as "a great broken mosaic of human faces" so that only "the exquisite roof…alone gave the eye an escape from humanity." The space contrasts against the quiet meditativeness of a church, as Felsenburgh uses the Abbey as a performance stage. As "delicate sunlight" pours "long shafts of colour" through the stained-glass windows, worshippers concentrate, not an invisible God, but on the arrival of Felsenburgh.[ccxli]

Here, Benson shows the Felsenburgh's total command of the crowd. Mabel, like so many others, subordinates her individuality to the mass of worshippers, losing herself in "an ecstasy that was very near agony."[ccxlii] With his entrance, "the murmur of ten thousand voices" ceases, replacing light chatter with a "great wave of emotion." As worship begins Mabel's heart beats like "an over-driven engine" and her excitement mirrors that of the crowd who rise in "enormous assemblage." Francis, the master of ceremony, "gesticulate[es] like a conductor," splits the crowd down the middle for Felsenburgh's arrival, and then makes a signal for silence with such success that Benson notes that it was "as if a god had lifted his hand for quiet." Benson stresses that he "no longer held them passive to listen" as Felsenburgh instead rouses "them to some supreme act." At this stage, the act constitutes only an upwelling of emotion, yet Felsenburgh latter uses it to purge his dissenters.

Benson again stresses that Felsenburgh's power comes not from his rhetoric, but his ability to stimulate passionate, emotional reactions from the crowd. Mabel admits that, after the service, "she could never adequately remember" what he spoke as "she lost the continuous consciousness of self" to the emotion of the masses.[ccxliii] She notes that, to her, "no one else existed" as the "vast assemblage" transformed into "one vibrating atmosphere of immense human emotion" focusing on the Anti-Christ. At the moment his speech begins, Benson pivots forward in time and stresses, again, Mabel's inability to "record within her…what he said." Her "conscious process" of forming memories devolves as she gives herself up to the ferocity of the crowd. Therefore, Benson stresses that the Anti-Christ's speech succeeds due to his ability to connect with his audience: as "waves of emotion" sweep the crowd and "cries and sobs" deafen the Abbey. Here, Mabel losses herself not by evoking God, but by succumbing to the crowd and worshipping Felsenburgh.[ccxliv]

Yet though she earlier prided herself that Humanism held "no mediaeval horror" like Christianity, Mabel's faith changes when she witnesses the violent effects of mob psychology.[ccxlv] Percy disquietingly notes that, after Felsenburgh's speech, the "crowd was as no other" as it "possessed a sense of unity unlike any other." Benson defines their communal emotion as a "magnetism" that fused "thousands of individual cells" into "one huge sentient being with one will, one emotion, and one head"—directed by Felsenburgh. Mabel, leaving a day of prayer, finds "a troop of young men" with linked hands, moving in unison ahead of, not a mosaic, but "a pack of faces." Mabel cannot distinguish individuals among the "stream of heads and faces" except for two: the broken, stripped "body of a child" and a priest with a "black-capped head twisting" from a noose. Disillusioned, Mabel reacts to the loss of her newfound faith by committing suicide.

However, Benson sympathizes with Mabel's situation and presents her actions, not as a grave sin, but as understandable: without faith to guide her, Mabel simply retreats from life. Alienated by Humanism and her husband's role in its spread she travels to Manchester, goes "through her private examination before the magistrate," and successfully applies for euthanasia.[ccxlvi] Though a state facility, the staff treats her with kindness and the nurses even go by the modifier "sister." Yet Benson surprises the reader with the effects of her actions. As Mabel's body shuts down "an amazing thing" occurs as her consciousness continues into "limitless space." She realizes that her "panting body is alive" though "it was one, yet it was many" and "something resembling sound or light" envelopes her. Benson here suggests that, regardless of her mortal sin, Mabel proceeds to heaven. Therefore, he does not judge his character's religious beliefs—or lack thereof—as much as he questions the systems of industry that allow the Anti-Christ to propagate his message so successfully.

Benson claims that the Anti-Christ's victory stems from his utilization of the material rather than the ephemeral: Felsenburgh uses modern technology to bring his worship of humanity to life. Though Father Franklin indicates that worshippers revere not so much man "but the Idea of man," material idols bring his belief to life.[ccxlvii] Felsenburgh's new faith of Humanism grounds itself in quarterly festivals celebrating "Maternity, Life, Sustenance and

Paternity," each corresponding to a marble idol placed in "cathedral after cathedral" throughout Europe. Benson notes that within four days of Felsenburgh's political ascendance "four thousand replicas had been dispatched to every important centre…reproduced by ordinary machinery." Felsenburgh spreads his new dogma with a machine-like efficacy: "telegraphic reports" from "everywhere" report that the "new movement had been received with acclamation." By using modern systems of reproduction, the Anti-Christ orchestrates a religious revival throughout a formerly secular Europe.

In particular, Benson stresses that the Anti-Christ's success stems from the commodified, nationalized systems of communication at his disposal. When Felsenburgh successfully arbitrates a peace with the Eastern Empire, Benson makes purposeful mention of the support he receives from the secular British state. After the Paris peace summit, Benson notes that the "Government took a few discreet steps" to prepare for his arrival in London. Yet, more so, their actions increase the population's anticipation of his ascension. "Eclectic placards in every quarter of London," as well as those in "large provincial towns" announce his coming while, at the same time, authorities attempt to maintain peaceful assembly of the masses. The state sends "half-a-dozen regiments" to "preserve order," warns the railroads, and clears out public spaces like Paul's House. Just as the reproductions of his idols enable a religious revival, the state's centralized control of its populace aids the escalation of the Anti-Christ.

Before the arrival of Felsenburgh, Benson describes atheists like Oliver and Mabel as misguided, but logical in their outlook. Mabel describes life in Britain as "so sensible and peaceful" and correctly so.[ccxlviii] Though the threat of war with the Eastern empire looms during the novel's first third, Benson also emphasizes that Western empire's socialistic materialism aids in the creation of utilitarian homes. The Brand's home, furnished "according to the universal custom," captures the efficiency of Margarete Schütte-Lihotzky's Frankfurt kitchen (1926) in its compartmentalized design. Benson stylizes the Brand's room with "sensible" furniture, including a dining room table that rests on a "broad round column [to hold] dishes." During mealtime, such tables allow for the "raising and lowering the courses by hydraulic power." Though a top government agent, even Oliver's floor emphasizes cheapness and ease: "noiseless, clean, and pleasant," a new invention from America—asbestos cork—fills the house.

In situating the Brand's home outside of London, Benson highlights the growing propensity of middle and upper-class urbanites to move to the suburbs. Largely, dense urban concentration of the masses characterizes London in the nineteenth century, but, beginning in 1870, suburban rings begin to grow outside of the city proper.[ccxlix] Partially, the early rise of suburban communities stems from the construction of railway lines towards the south of London to connect economically important towns like Croydon, where the Brands reside, and Kingston that would ultimately be engulfed by Greater London. Oliver himself notes the first lines traveled to the big towns of England before engulfing the entire country. Since his house sits on a corner of "one of those the huge spider-webs" of train tracks, Oliver can travel to Westminster in ten minutes and the ocean in twenty.[ccl]

While the introduction of the automobile and the massive program of highway construction during the early 1920s accelerated suburban growth, transportation alone does not explain the rise of suburban communities. Rather, as noted by Faye Hammill, "the early twentieth century suburban ideal" encompassed "comfort, modernness, and above all privacy."[ccli] Oliver notes that "all wealthy persons" moved "at least a hundred miles from the throbbing heart of England" since, even in Croydon, the buzz of transportation still dominates.[cclii] When Oliver overlooks the scene, Benson describes the view as "inspiring" "only to a Communist." He gazes out on “an immense plain of house-roofs” interrupted only by the “short towers…marking public buildings” and the “vast tracks” of transportation lines. Oliver’s vista foreshadows Benson’s main concern: the rise of the secular government and the welfare state.

Estimates suggest that 5,056,00 Protestants and 2,061,000 Roman Catholics lived in Britain in 1900.[ccliii] Even though Catholics became more immersed in public life at the turn of the century, the time also marks the rise of the Liberal and Labour Parties. Decades before, the so-called civilizing mission of Victorian-era churches encouraged missionary efforts and relief programs throughout the nineteenth century. However, by the turn of the century, issues of class began to dominate political, rather than religious, life. The growing concern for state education, child welfare, and class welfare culminated in the 1906 Liberal welfare reforms that continued until 1914. Admittedly, the previous Conservative government did pass both the Unemployed Workmen Act and the Employment of Children Act the year before, but the Conservative government also supported religious schools as well. The 1902 Education Act, for instance, funded religious instruction both for the Church of England and Roman Catholic institutions. Such actions irritated the Liberal Government who wished to secularize such schools as France did in 1904.

In the novel’s prologue Mr. Templeton, a Catholic and former Conservative MP, designates the secularization of French schools as “the fall of the French Church” when discussing the rise of Secular Humanism with Father Franklin. [ccliv]Templeton argues that the death of the Catholicism began with “the rise of Modernism at the beginning of the century,” but connects this movement with the rise of a national welfare system. He attests that Communism established it permanence with “the Poor Laws”—historically referring to the Elizabethan era poor relief efforts and the New Poor Law (1834) that established the workhouse system.

However, Templeton explicitly refers to the "abolition of the workhouse system," hinting that Benson means to critique more recent reforms.

He argues that the main proponent of the laws—Braithwaite, a fictional figure who passed fifteen years prior— "knew his stuff" and "established the Communists forever."[cclv] The figure of Braithwaite appears again in Chapter III when Oliver gives a speech underneath his statue in front of St. Paul's Cathedral (renamed Paul's House). He makes his speech "on the fiftieth anniversary of the passing of the Poor Laws Reform" echoing the welfare reforms of the turn of the century Liberal government. Though a Royal Commission aimed to reform the Poor Laws in 1905, the Liberal party, working with the Labour Party, established welfare programs separate from the Poor Laws. Historian Lynn Hollen Lees notes that the Liberal Party slowly dismantled the Poor Laws gradually so that they "die[d] by attrition and surgical removals of essential organs" rather than by outright repeal.[cclvi] Factually this dismantling did not begin in earnest until 1911. Yet, Templeton, a stand-in for Benson, claims a link between the rise of Communism and the rise of the Labour Party.

When Templeton contends that "Communism really began" with the 1917 Labour Parliament, Benson makes purposeful parallels to the contemporary state of British politics.[cclvii] The rise of the Labour party, founded in 1900, disrupted the two-party system between the Conservative and Liberal parties that dominated the previous century. In 1906, Labour won 29 seats and actually aided the Liberal party's agenda—though it led to the eventual decline of the Liberal Party in the 1920s.[cclviii] The Gladstone–MacDonald pact of 1903 (Lib-Lab pact), a secret agreement where the Liberal Party agreed to not run candidates in constituencies that also favored Labour candidates, allowed both parties to form an anti-Conservative voting bloc.

Such a move allowed David Lloyd George's Parliament to push through an ambitious series of social reforms beginning in 1906. Historian Eric Evans argues while the Lib-Lab pact "looks to have been a tactical disaster for the Liberals" it actually "might even have been the best option" as it allowed for the continued success of Liberal causes into the twentieth century.[cclix] The alliance, which ultimately lead to the consolidation of the Labour party as the opposition to the Conservatives, does not go unnoticed by Benson in his prologue. He never mentions the Liberal party by name in his novel as he conflates the two into a single political entity: the early Labour party successes he mentions, namely "the reorganizations of Old Age Pensions," pertains to one of the Liberal party's main campaign issues leading up to the 1906 general election.[cclx][cclxi]

In 1906 alone, the Liberal Party passed the Trade Disputes Act (protecting labor unions), the Workmen's Compensation Act (in case of work injuries), the Education Act (suppling free school meals), and the Agricultural Holdings Act (reducing landlord rights on tenant farms). Efforts grew exponentially, culminating in Lloyd George's Finance Bill (1909), or "the People's Budget," which planned to tax the rich to fund the growing welfare state. However, George's motivation did not lie in pure altruism as, more so, he grew concerned with Britain's international reputation. After the Second Boer War exposed him to the mass malnourishment of working class recruits, social welfare became a national, and therefore political, priority.

Concerned with the success of Bismarck's social legislation and the growing economic power of the United States, George decided to declare war on poverty:

> This is a war Budget. It is for raising money to wage implacable warfare against poverty and squalidness. I cannot help hoping and believing that before this generation has passed away, we shall have advanced a great step towards that good time, when poverty, and the

> wretchedness and human degradation which always follows in its camp, will be as remote to the people of this country as the wolves which once infested its forests.[cclxii]

Though the budget held widespread support among the party—only Liberal MP Harold Cox voted against the measure, declaring that it undermined individual responsibility—the budget met intense opposition from the House of Lords. The Lords obstructions created a legislative stalemate until the newly crowned George V threatened to create 500 new Liberal seats if Lords did not cease their effort. Looking back at the time in his *War Memoirs*, Lloyd George attested the liberal reforms from 1906-1914 created "partisan warfare…so fierce that by 1913 this country was brought to the verge of civil war."[cclxiii]

Benson himself supported welfare endeavors, but preferred they stem from the church rather than the state. In *The Dawn of All,* discussed in detail in the next section, Father Jervis comments on the success of likeminded programs introduced by the Catholic Church in the utopian future:

> Aren't the Religious Orders the very finest association ever invented? Aren't they exactly what Socialists have always been crying for, with the blunders left out and the gaps filled in? As soon as the world understood finally that the active Religious Orders could beat all other forms of association at their own game—that they could teach and work more cheaply and effectively, and so on—well, the most foolish Political Economist had to confess that the Religious Orders made for the country's welfare.[cclxiv]

Benson does not detail the particular blunders or gaps of the secular welfare system as he assumes, quite simply, that the Church will succeed in the same undertakings if given the opportunity. Martindale confirms this when he reluctantly—and briefly—notes that Benson desired a “more liberal” Catholic Church.[cclxv] Benson’s concern, therefore, stems not from the growing welfare state, but the English government’s role in its creation.

Outside of *Lord of the World*, Benson’s historical-fiction reflects a distrust for non-Catholic institutions of power, especially in regard to the growing secular state during the English Reformation. While he specially criticizes Protestantism, such works also suggest an inherit skepticism of non-religious institutions of power. In *By What Authority* (1904) and *Come Rack! Come Rope!* (1913) he details Catholic oppression under Elizabeth I while he reassesses Mary Tudor’s reputation in *The Queen’s Tragedy* (1907). Such works aim heavily for historical accuracy, but nonetheless constitute unsubtle Catholic propaganda. In his essays “The Death-beds of ‘Bloody Mary’ and ‘Good Queen Bess’” (1906), he reframes the research of Elizabeth biographer Agnes Strickland and firsthand sources to counter the prevailing public sentiments regarding each queen.

While he does not paint Elizabeth as an absolute despot, he criticizes “the tolerant Elizabeth” for “strip[ping] and disembowel[ing] living priests and laymen for the crime of allowing their Private Judgement to differ from her own.”[cclxvi] He notes that though Mary looked back “on a short life that had apparently failed,” she died with a true faith intact while Elizabeth, in the “midst of honours and success, after a long and magnificent reign” found herself surrounded by “hedge-priests.”[cclxvii] In his personal life Benson evidenced the Church of England’s communion “qualifying clauses”—namely the English monarch as the church’s supreme head “as far as is allowed by the law of Christ”— as a catalyst for his conversion. To him, such qualifying clauses distanced the English church from the universal Church and, even more detrimentally, gave additional power to the burgeoning state.[cclxviii]

Understanding Benson’s perspective on the welfare state recontextualizes Stähler’s “utopia of the first order,” the atheistic Communist government, as an anti-utopia, not a dystopia. When Oliver, again, looks out to “glorious vision” of the socialist state Benson suggests his real apprehension originates not from the ornate welfare state laid before him, but from the fact that the state controls these public works in entirety.[cclxix] From the “pinnacled schools” that teach “Citizenship” rather than Godliness to the “endless house-roofs” and the “high glass vaults of the public baths and gymnasiums” secular governmental control marks Benson’s anti-utopia.

Such a designation remains important since Benson, at first, appears to situate the antiquated city of Rome as a utopian foil to modern London. Benson describes Rome as a microcosm of the old world where, “under the shadow of Peter’s Throne,” survives an “assembly of the world’s royalty” alongside “the old Church pomp.”[cclxx] On arriving in Rome Father Franklin describes London as “not a bad specimen…of the superior mansions of hell” as he, instead, finds pleasure in returning a city frozen in time. Describing it as “an extraordinary city,” he notes that antiquarians define Rome as “the one living example of the old days.” As a result, Vatican City “stood still” as the “world…moved on,” emphasizing that the Church thought little of “physical improvements” as “the spiritual weight of the earth rested entirely upon her shoulders.”

Previously the secular Italian government-controlled Rome, but, in the course of nine years, the Pope yielded all “the churches through to whole of Italy to the Government” to regain control of the entire city.[cclxxi] He argued that “since Peter was the Rock” and that “the City of Peter was the Capital of the world” that the Catholic Church must “set an example to its dependency” on the ancient city. He organizes the city and divides it into “national quarters,” Anglo-Saxon, Latin, Teutonic (Germans), and Eastern. The Pope’s reason for segregating the city—that individual nations contain “its peculiar virtues”—hints at the xenophobic descriptions to come. Each quarter expresses distinct regional styles— “a progeny of Gothic churches” flood the Anglo-Saxon and German quarters while, with racist undertones, “dirty and homely” churches populate the Eastern and Latin quarters. However, the unsanitary, crowded, hodge-podge city of Rome does little to support the Catholic population in terms of providing public services. Rather than building hospitals and schools, the Pope “raised shrines, religious houses, and Calvaries” to bejewel the religious capital. The Pope who “set about ruling his city” with total autonomy organizes a city that holds little commonality with what Father Franklin calls “the very gates of heaven.”

Here, the “gilt coaches” of Cardinals replace railways as Benson substitutes the cleanliness and order of modern London with “the ill-smelling streets” of the pre-modern age.[cclxxii] As Father Franklin’s loving description falls away, Benson mentions that the outside world sees the city as an “appalling retrogression” since the Vatican does nothing to maintain “the improvements of the Italian government.” The secular modern world, where complex bureaucratic systems support transportation, education, health and governance, only sees a city defined by wastefulness, one of “ancient inconveniences, the insanitary horrors, the incarnation of a world given over to dreaming.” When Father Franklin expresses his surprise at seeing an elevator and typewriter in the Pope’s otherwise Spartan audience room he asks a Cardinal why Rome remains in the past. Incredulously he replies “puzzled” and answers thus: "Is it? I suppose it is. I never thought of that.” Father Franklin’s festishization of the ancient city does not mean all facets of the modern world reflect an outright dystopian perspective. Rather, Benson illustrates a Church out of step with modern times.

Due to its relative low density, the remaining population of Catholics cannot reside in the city proper. The Pope limits the urban population to only aging Catholic men above fifty years of age, allowing younger men a "permit" to reside in the Holy City for no "more than one month each year."[cclxxiii] Laywomen, to Benson's annoyance, hold no special place regardless of age. Due to the lack of high-rise apartment buildings, like those that dominate all of Britain, the Pope takes steps to reserve a certain "number of streets at fixed prices." However, other than this small fraction of affordable houses, the majority of housing goes "to the millionaires"—the decedents of the displaced Catholic royalty, aristocracy, and Conservative politicians who reside in Rome.

In actuality, Benson argues that Rome only survives as a mirror image of its former self *because* of its connection to the modern world. While the population of the city of Rome numbers in the thousands, Benson notes that six million Catholics inhabit the suburbs. Though he mentions that metropolitan Rome "fled from the new system for refuge to the Church" because of their despair "of modern life," they are nonetheless dependent on the suburb's modern infrastructure.[cclxxiv] Here, the "manufactories, the monster buildings of the new world, the stations, the schools, the offices" all fall under "secular dominion" and support the population in a way that the ancient, unchanging Rome simply cannot.

While the Church in *Lord of the World* struggles greatly, Benson stresses that it does so because of its own incompetence in supporting the population in a meaningful way. Father Franklin criticizes the current state of the Catholic Church and notes that, even into the twenty first century, "woman had been given no active work but either menial or connected with education."[cclxxv] He argues that, like the church the century before, surviving Catholics put too great an emphasis on "traditions and customs." Instead, he claims, that a "new Order" must work "without pride even in their most sacred privileges, without a past history in which they might take complacent refuge" to form an active army of Christ not unlike "the Jesuits."

Rejecting the status quo, Benson attests that the Church must consolidate its power among "priests, bishops, laymen and women" and reject the "ownership of corporate wealth" so that its egalitarianism mirrors that of the Communist state.[cclxxvi] He contends that each monetary gift passed to a bishop must support "necessaries of life" to the very "diocese in which it was given." Yet Benson undermines the strength of Father Franklin's critique by describing it as "a rhapsody" and "a scheme as old as the eternal hills." Largely, the narrative turns away from examining the failings of the Catholic Church and as Benson instead focuses on the rise of modern religious thought and the power of the secular state. Nonetheless, Benson also highlights his ability to critically examine the Church's weaknesses and, in doing so, provides a nuanced perspective that he fails to utilize in his subsequent works.

Therefore, even though Benson—through Father Franklin—lovingly describes a rustic, pre-Industrial Rome, his descriptions of exiled royalty on parade and the perfectly preserved Vatican complex cannot hide the city's severe structural flaws. In this way, to use Stähler's vocabulary, the utopia of the second order—Catholic Rome—actually allows Benson to celebrate secular Britain's functioning welfare state. Consequently, Benson's utopia of the first order—secular Britain—does not constitute an outright dystopian environment, but an anti-utopia where Benson criticizes, not the welfare state, but the Church's inability to create such an expansive network. Benson should not be confused as an outright liberal, Catholic reformer: his prejudices regarding the lower classes, his disregard for modern religious thought (and other religions in general), and his fervent support of the Catholic church mark him as a conservative ideologue. However, in *Lord of the World* Benson subtly supports the welfare systems that he believes, if brought about and administered by the Catholic Church, will lead to monumental and positive changes to the world's population.

Benson's *The Dawn of All* as Catholic Propaganda

In his utopian novel *The Dawn of All* (1911) Benson attempts to self-correct his balanced appreciation of the Communist state and his criticisms of the Catholic Church. In many respects, *The Dawn of All* serves as a companion piece to *Lord of the World*: both detail a technologically advanced future, but, in this work, the Church ascends to global dominance. Here, Benson frames Catholicism as the universal belief system whose tenets go unquestioned as ultimate truths by the Earth's population. Benson's protagonist, Monsignor Masterman, wakes up in Westminster Hospital with a severe case of amnesia, remembering nothing of the rise of the Catholic Church.

In doing so, Benson aligns the reader's point of view with that of Masterman to first justify a weighty exposition. Yet he also superimposes Masterman with the reader so that both move from unbelieving skeptic to full believer. Masterman, forgetting the ensuing years, wakes up as a version of his younger self: a former priest and museum researcher who defines himself as "not even a Catholic" since "science had knocked all that religious nonsense on the head."[cclxxvii] Benson signals a change in history as multiple people approach him asking if he would like to speak to a priest—rather than a medical professional. Yet Masterman begins to realize his new surroundings when he witnesses the first of many scientific spectacles: "extraordinarily ingenious" walls and ceilings that move up and down "like lifts" "to give him more air."

In Benson's utopian work the Catholic Church exists symbiotically with science and betters the world population. As noted earlier, very few contemporary critics examine Benson, but, among them, Maxim Shadurski pays close attention *The Dawn of All*. In "Debating National Identity in Utopian Fiction" (2011), "A Catholic England: National Continuities and Disruptions in Robert Hugh Benson's *The Dawn of All"* (2012), and "Religion and Science in Robert Hugh Benson's *The Dawn of All"* (2013) Shadurksi utilizes the same basic argument with different text pairings: he claims that novel's time jumps and the protagonist's lapse in memory allow Benson to articulate his orthodox religious views while subtly celebrating the excitement of modern advancement (seemingly, though he does not use the term, an act of self-cancellation).[cclxxviii] The previous section argues that Benson did the same in *Lord of the World*. There, I argue that Benson's empathetic portraits of aesthetics and the socialist state illustrate—not a critique of modernism—but an argument against the growing secular state. Such a distinction remains important because Benson's Communist state does not represent an outright dystopian state; rather it constitutes an anti-utopia where Benson critiques state sponsored technology, but not modern advancement itself.[cclxxix] Unlike in his anti-utopian novel, Benson does not criticize Catholicism at all in *The Dawn of All*, but, rather, fully applauds futuristic technologies since they stem from the Church.

Benson celebrates the marriage between religion and science outright, and, largely, does the same with Catholicism's relationship with politics. The political changes, namely the overthrow of liberal democracy, parallel Benson's own worldviews. Just as Father Franklin laments the lack of female representation in the Church in *Lord of the World*, in Benson's utopia the "enfranchisement of women" permits the Catholic Church's political "tide to turn once and for all"; with divorce illegal and fornication "made a felony" large, happy families populate the future.[cclxxx] As discussed in the last section, he laments the decline of the monarchy in *Lord of the World* and positions a union between the Pope and various Catholic monarchs as utopian.

The same occurs here as a monarchical government replaces the “intoxicating nightmare of democratic government” where, in the rare event of a ballot measure, an educational test removes 69 out of every 70 prospective voters.[cclxxxi] His celebration of intellectuals and the aristocracy also emphasizes his political distain for the lower classes’ propensity for Socialism: he notes that the religious revolution only came through the “dispersal...of innumerable people of the lower classes who were known as Socialists,” a population most greatly purged in America.[cclxxxii] Though the majority of the text illustrates a utopian mindset that mirrors Benson’s personal sentiments, he uses his novel to criticize the Church in one specific regard. He expresses his limited skepticism—via Masterman—of the Church’s political prowess. In particular, he uses the opportunity of a heresy trial to briefly criticize its ability to censor unorthodox perspectives. The defendant in question, Priest Dom Adrian Bennett, authored a book that Rome “condemned,” but refuses to withdraw it from publication as he “is perfectly confident of his orthodoxy.”[cclxxxiii] Benson does not go into great detail about Dom Adrian’s thesis—it contentiously argues that cures orientate from natural, not supernatural, conditions, but still attests that such cures stem from faith. The Cardinal makes the important distinction that Dom Adrian “[is] not exactly heretical” but argues that since “he’s so extraordinarily clever” the Church cannot silence him without a trial.[cclxxxiv] Benson uses Dom Adrian as a stand-in as himself who, after publishing *Lord of the World* to popular acclaim, received a disgruntled rebuke from the Catholic Church.

In the work’s preface Benson argues that he does not mean “to withdraw anything that I said” in *Lord of the World* but confesses that “I was informed repeatedly that the effect of the was exceedingly depressing and discouraging to optimistic Christians.”[cclxxxv] Though Benson does not name his informants, Martindale—writing as a representative of the Catholic Church—

argues that his detractors came from outside the Catholic hierarchy. Admittedly, he does reproduce actual letters Benson received regarding his novel. In particular he refers one dejected Protestant fan who bemoans the fact that Benson, “a guardian of the faith,” ended *Lord of the World* pessimistically.[cclxxxvi]

Yet, largely, he includes letters that praise the work and supply only minor criticisms. Among the letters printed a writer from Saint Ignatius’ College, Riverview’s *Alma Mater* magazine praises the “thrilling yarn,” but suggests that "it would be nicer if...Mabel was all right in the end.[cclxxxvii] He also cites diplomat Sir Mark Sykes who shares his admiration of the work, but politely notes that he “underestimate[s] the spirituality of the East.”[cclxxxviii] While a Father Joseph Rickaby celebrates the “charming, decorous, [and] attractive” nature of Benson’s seductive Anti-Christ but asks him to produce a work of historical-fiction about “England’s evolution apart from the Reformation—India, Ireland.”[cclxxxix] Martindale cites these documents to present a false public controversy to distract from the fact that the Church, more than the general public, found his work displeasing.

In particular, Martindale zeroes in on one unnamed critic who argues that the ambiguity of the final lines—“then this world passed, and the glory of it”—imply “the destruction, not of the world, but of the Church.”[ccxc] Martindale takes this further to argue that real-world Socialists “delighted” in the death of Christianity as expressed by Benson. However, here, he does not cite his source. Subsequent research to find the review in question suggests at best an exaggeration, or at worst an outright fallacy. Martindale’s conclusion, that Benson “appreciated” and “obeyed” the general reading public’s criticism to create a novel antithetical in tone and outlook from *Lord of the World*, hides a greater truth.[ccxci]

In arguing that Benson wrote *The Dawn of All* to placate his readership, Martindale obscures the fact that Catholic Church officials disliked Benson's move from the Catholic-sympathizing historical-fiction that dominated his early career. Grayson notes—in a brief aside—that Church officials "bristled at the suggestion that materialism could succeed in doing what faith had failed to do"—i.e. create a welfare state that supported the health and happiness of humankind.[ccxcii] While Benson attempts to balance his religious orthodoxy with an exploration of the positive merits of modernization in his anti-utopia, the Vatican's position regarding modernity—as explored earlier in the chapter—held little room for nuance.

Benson's case mirrors that of Dom Adrian except, in the case of the fictional priest, his penalty will be more severe than professional decline. Masterman learns that if a guilty defendant does not repent, the case will be passed to a secular judiciary. The punishment in such cases almost always results in death. Interestingly, Benson uses Dom Adrian's quiet acceptance of his predicament to distance himself from this biographical superimposition; Masterman, not Dom Adrian, argues against his persecution. Masterman attests that "the old Protestants were right" in arguing that "Rome would persecute again if she could."[ccxciii] However, Dom Adrian goes to great lengths defend the Catholic Church. He claims that the Church does not and will not condemn him to death, but that "it is society that puts to death."[ccxciv] He argues that in subverting the authority of the Church, the secular government executes heretics, like it does Socialists, since they "menace [Britain's] very existence as a civilized community."[ccxcv] Since the religious sanctions uphold the civil state he attests that "*if I am a heretic*, I must be put to death by society."[ccxcvi] When ultimately condemned only Masterman sees the episode as innately dystopian as Dom Adrian trusts his judges outright and thanks them for their service. Not unlike More's *Utopia* that punishes those who disturb social cohesion as discussed in Chapter One, Benson represents Dom Adrian as a biographical stand-in. Here, the Church punishes a devout, though disruptive, author for his individual, though not unorthodox, perspective.

In his own life, Benson did not martyr himself for the sake of his fiction; instead, he entrenched himself deeper within the Church professionally and personally to the detriment of his creative voice. His later works advocate Catholic orthodoxy and rarely sympathize apologetically with alternative points of view. Such changes correspond directly to his exponential rise in the Church. Contemporary fiction like *The Conventionalist* (1908)—which criticizes the materialism of upper-class English Protestants—and *The Necromancers* (1909)—an admonition of spiritualism and New Age mysticism—mirror the Church's talking points on each subject. As a result, by 1911, the Church funded the first of Benson's international tours—where, unsurprisingly, he spoke against Spiritualism and Protestantism—and promoted him exponentially until he appointed a private Champlain to Pope Pius X. His retreat away from complex portals of non-Catholic subjects not only helps justify his successful career, but also explains his poor reputation in critical circles and his continued admiration among the conservative Catholic press.

Regretfully, when faced with the Church's criticism of the work, and a chastisement of his sexual affinities, Benson's fiction shifts away from complex apologetics to more simplistic arguments supporting the Catholic faith. Though his choice encouraged his professional rise, it negatively affected not only his later critical reception, but also his personal life. In his final decade, he lived in semi-isolation in Hertfordshire, where he bought Hare Street House for "an extraordinarily low sum."[ccxcvii] The house, an irregular Tudor white plaster and wood structured fronted by an overtly formal 18th century brick facade, had fallen into disrepair by the time of its purchase. Here, in between his lecture circuits, Benson created a world free of "officialdom and backbiting."[ccxcviii] With his incomes from his novels he began to express himself in interior and decorative work that reflects the dynamic personality sadly lacking in his later work.

Living and training alongside artist Gabriel Pippet, whose woodblock prints adorn Hugh's novels (including *Lord of the World*), Benson developed his painting, tapestry, and woodworking skills. He made numerous interior design additions, now largely lost by Archbishop William Godfrey's full restoration in 1962. E.F. noted his most eccentric alteration: painted panels embellished with "highly disquieting robed skeletons, stepping the Dance of Death" adorned a guest bedroom. Hughes "merrily consecrated" the *memento mori* for "the use of heretic Anglicans…in the pious hope that waking in the night and finding themselves encompassed with these gruesome reminders of mortality" might spur the need for "salvation."[ccxcix] Yet he also admitted towards the end of his life completed the project in the memory of Rolfe, who came up with the idea as a joke during their walking tour.

Yet in the memorial chapel built upon his burial site in attached orchard, two original works by Hugh remain. Above the side altar of the unassuming grey structure hangs *Notre Dame des Diables*, a statue of the Virgin Mary trampling the serpent carved by Benson himself. The green painted snake, constricted around a grotesquery of anguished, howling demonic faces representing various heresies suggests that Hugh's now lost *Dancing Dead* truly did solicited a few nightmares. Yet tucked away deeper in the chapel, Benson also placed a small statue of Saint Sebastian, a statue that he jokingly noted "came without even arrows, but I made them myself and stuck them in."[ccc] Though only a small acknowledgement of his sexuality, these small mementoes of his time with Rolfe—a relationship downplayed by generations of biographers—still remains. Yet, more important that this icon, readers still may still enjoy the imaginative and complex portrayal of socialist England that Benson depicts in *Lord of the World.* As new generations read the work, I hope it will not be seen as mere Catholic propaganda, but as a call for the Church to modernize and contribute materially to bettering the lives of those less fortunate.

[cxxxvi] Robert Hugh Benson, *Lord of the World* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1908) http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/14021/pg14021-images.html

[cxxxvii] "Monsignor Benson on the Papacy," *Notre Dame Scholastic* 47, no. 25 (25 April 1914): 614-615.

[cxxxviii] Benson struggled with a severe childhood stutter that he carried into adulthood. To hide this fact, he integrated his speech impediment into his unique style of public speaking. Diplomat Shane Leslie, who attended Cambridge University when Benson served as chaplain, noted that he mastered "his stammer…by convulsions and gestures" so that "it was difficult to say if he were [sic] wrestling with his stammer or with Satan." At such times, he would "mop his brow, wave his arms" and fall "back into convulsions" as if overcome by a religious experience. See: Shane Leslie, *Long Shadows* (London: John Murry, 1966), 106.

[cxxxix] Pope Francis, interview by Jan Cristoph Kitzler, In-Flight Press Conference of Pope Francis from the Philippines to Rome, January 19, 2015.

[cxl] Though More creates one of the first *utopias of reconstruction,* he succeeds in doing so by incorporating elements of *utopias of escape*. While More illustrates Utopia as a *eu-topos*/"good place" to illustrate the benefits of common land reform, as detailed in Chapter One, his emphasis on the island state as *ou-topos*/"no place" softens his critique of Henry VIII's policy. Therefore, More uses fanciful elements as a gesture of self-cancellation to distance himself from his more radical ideas. In doing so, he uses fantasy to self-fashion himself as a loyal Tudor while using *Utopia*'s escapism to criticize Henry VIII with impunity.

[cxli] Lewis Mumford, *The Story of Utopias* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1922), eBook, 15.

[cxlii] Demands for real-world change separate More from earlier Christian writers like Augustine of Hippo. In *The City of God* (ca. 5th century CE) he asks the reader to abandon the evils of the external world in the hope of eternal salvation. Written after the Sack of Rome (410 CE), Augustine argues that the decline of the earthly empire matters little in comparison to the New Jerusalem, the City of Heaven. While he details divine governance, a speculative utopian-like vision, he holds little concern for the present. As Lyman Sargent notes in "The Problem of the Flawed Utopia" (2013), "utopias are not descriptions of perfect places" like heaven, but self-acknowledged imaginary worlds encompassing higher political and social ideals. Augustine's *utopia of escape* centers on heaven: an unseen, but not fictional, manifestation of perfection (at least from the author's point of view). Before the Renaissance, Christian writers like him provide an earnest promise of ascension more than escapism. See: Augustine, *The City of God against the Pagans,* trans. R.W. Dyson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Lyman Tower Sargent, "The Problem of the 'Flawed Utopia': A Note on the Costs of Eutopia," in *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2003), 225-31.

[cxliii] Accordingly, ancient Greek bucolic poetry like Hesiod's *Works and Days* (700 BCE), Sir Philip Sidney's *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* (1590), and even William Morris's *New from Nowhere* (1890)—Mumford's preferred example—transports readers to a static, pastoral ideal without a clear argument regarding reform. Whereas *utopias of reconstruction* "consult a surveyor and an architecture and a mason to build a house" Mumford claims that *utopias of escape* "build impossible castles in the air." See: Mumford, 15.

[cxliv] Ascending to Chancellor after Cardinal Woolsey's fall in 1529, More wrote six books in defense of the Catholic faith: *A Dialogue Concerning Heresies* (1528/1529), *The Supplication of Souls* (1529), *The Confutation of Tyndale's Answer* (1532-33), *The Apology of Sir Thomas More*

(1533), *The Debellation of Salem and Bizance* (1533), and *An Answer to a Poisoned Book* (1534). At first glance, More pre-Chancellorship holds little similarity to the man who burned protestants Thomas Hitton, Thomas Bilney, Richard Bayfield, John Tewkesbery, Thomas Dusgate, and James Bainham at the stake. However, even as a humanist opposed to violence, More placed even greater significance on the continued solidity of the Church. Admittedly, the religious tolerance described by Hythlodaeus does not totally align with the author's worldview. However, his depiction of the Utopian religion foreshadows his personal convictions to maintain a cohesive populous that moves together in unity of thought and action.

[cxlv] Thomas More, *Utopia*, ed. George Logan, trans. Robert M. Adams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 99.

[cxlvi] As previously mentioned in the last chapter, Plato's *Republic* served as More's main inspiration. Yet More also uses other Platonic works as inspiration for his Utopian god. In *Laws* (348 BCE), Plato uses *dēmiourgos* for "God," a word that literally translates to "one who works for the people." In *Timaeus* (c. 360 BCE) he notes that the demiurge fashioned and shaped physical existence, but he claims that the figure goes beyond a mere creator: intrinsically benevolent, the demiurge—colloquially meaning "craftsman" or "artisan"—continues to shape the world according to a divine model. More derives the purpose of Utopians and their godhead from Plato's model. Here, both man and god strive to create a physical manifestation of perfection. To More, like Plato, the symbiotic relationship between a godlike entity and a society working towards perfection creates the ideal city state. See: Plato, *The Republic*, trans. Benjamin Jowett (New York: Coismo Classics, 2008); Plato, *Laws*, trans. Benjamin Jowett (New York: Dover, 2006); Plato, *Timaeus*, trans. Peter Kalkavage (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2016);

[cxlvii] More, *Utopia*, 99.

[cxlviii] Ibid.

[cxlix] Idid.

[cl] Ibid.

[cli] Not unlike Benson's *Lord of the World*, More's *Utopia* positions the author at an important moment of intellectual liberality. Whereas Benson retreated further away from understanding the secular world as he became more entrenched with the Catholic Church,

More swiftly moved towards orthodoxy almost immediately after *Utopia*'s publication. The next year, Martin Luther posted his *Ninety-five Theses* (1517) and More began to define himself as a strict Anti-Lutheran. He aided Henry VIII in writing *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum (Defense of the Seven Sacraments* 1521) and, by 1528, the Bishop of London, Cuthbert Tunstall, gave him a special permit allowing him to read heretical books to create compelling counterarguments in favor of the Catholic Church. Tunstall believed, since he "rival[ed] Demosthenes in our vernacular as well as in Latin," More could connect with the everyday English citizen and upend "these traitorous subverters [sic] of the Church." See: E.F. Rogers, *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More* (Cambridge: Princeton University Press, 1947), 387.

[clii] Ibid., 100.

[cliii] Ibid., 107.

[cliv] Ironically, William Barlow first codified the definition of utopia as an idealized political state in his *Defense of the Protestant's Religion* (1601).

[clv] A.L. Morton, *The English Utopia* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1952), 60.

[clvi] Frank Manuel and Fritzie Manuel, *Utopian Thought in the Western World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977) 2-3.

[clvii] Keith Thomas, “The Utopian Impulse in Seventeenth-Century England” in *Between Dream and Nature: Essays on Utopia and Dystopia,* ed. Dominic Baker-Smith and C.C. Barfoot (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1987), 20-46.

[clviii] Tommaso Campanella, *The City of the Sun* (New York: Cosimo Classics, 2007).

[clix] Francis Bacon, *The New Atlantis* (London: Ward, Lock, and Tyler, 1874).

[clx] Ibid., 303-309.

[clxi] Though a radical feminist text, *The Blazing World* does not neatly fit into the genre of *utopias of reform*. Nicole Pohl argues that Cavendish created a hermaphroditic text by combining multiple utopian traditions. As Pohl attests, she “intervenes in the classical model of utopia” by incorporating “the popular genre of celestial utopias” like Cyrano de Bergerac’s satire *The Other World* (1657). Even though Pohl argues that “*The Blazing World* is precisely about the process of ... political and social reform” her writing does not detail that process in great detail. As a result, Anna Battigelli argues that “though there are utopian moments in Blazing World ... the text yields no utopian readings without immediately problematizing them.” For instance, her Socratic dialogues, discussed between the protagonist and spirits, do not bring about a clear picture of how a society defined by gender equality would come to fruition. Since the spirits recognize that “no difference of Sexes [exist] amongst them,” they simply agree with most of the empress’s philosophic musings. Unlike More, Cavendish does not incorporate the fantastical as an act of self-cancellation: she writes freely and directly to a female audience with the support of her husband as patron. While the empress’s evolving political views do not reduce the work to a mere phantasmagoria, Cavendish replaces philosophical debate about creating a gender-neutral society with adventure sequences. Therefore, Cavendish writes a *utopia of reconstruction* that can be better classified, not as a *utopia of escape*, but as a work of early science-fiction. See: Nicole Pohl, “The Architecture of Paradise: Eden and Jerusalem,” in *Women, Space and Utopia, 1600-1800* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 35; Anna Battigelli, *Margaret Cavendish and the Exiles of the Mind* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1998), 154; Margaret Cavendish, *The Description of a New World, Called the Blazing-World* (London: A. Maxwell, 1668), np. http://digital.library.upenn.edu/women/newcastle/blazing/blazing.html

[clxii] Henry Neville, *The Isle of Pines,* ed. John Scheckter (New York: Ashgate, 2011).

[clxiii]Though John Dryden first used the term *Noble Savage* in *The Conquest of Granada* (1672), Thomas Hobbes vehemently protested against an idyllic state of nature in *Leviathan, or Commonwealth* (1651). Here, Hobbes argues that without society life was “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" and “a war of all against all.” Before publishing *The Isle of Pines*, Hobbes attests that Neville heavily aided (or, as he put it, “had a finger in that pye”) James Harrington in writing *The Commonwealth of Oceana* (1656). Here Harrington provides a detailed constitution that will permit the growth of a utopian republic. See: John Dryden, *The Conquest of Granada by the Spaniards* (London: Henry Herringman, 1672), 7; Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (London: Andrew Cooke, 1651) https://www.gutenberg.org/files/3207/3207-h/3207-h.html;Vickie B. Sullivan, "The Distinctive Modern Republicanism of James Harrington" in *Machiavelli, Hobbes, and the Formation of a Liberal Republicanism in England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 144.

[clxiv] Neville, 22.

[clxv] Swift ends his novel by detailing a utopian community of talking horses, the Houyhnhnms, that ultimately exiles Gulliver since he shares characteristics of the lowly humanoid yahoos.

[clxvi] Jonathan I. Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), xxxi.

[clxvii] James Hutton, *Theory of Earth* (London: Burlington House, 1899).

[clxviii] Like Pius X's encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis* (1907)—which argues that if Catholicism reconciles with science the Church will devolve into liberal Protestantism—and *Lamentabili sane exitu* (1907)—which defines the modern affinity towards agnosticism as a natural inclination to outright atheism and heresy—the oath positions Catholicism and modernism as opposing forces. See: Pius X, "*Pascendi dominici gregis:* Encyclical of Pope Pius X on the Doctrines of the Modernists." Vatican Publishing House, Accessed August 1, 2017. http://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-x/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-x_enc_19070908_pascendi-dominici-gregis.html; See: Pius X, "*Lamentabili sane exitu:* Syllabus Condemning the Errors of the Modernists." Papal Encyclicals Online, Accessed August 1, 2017. http://www.papalencyclicals.net/pius10/p10lamen.htm

[clxix] After distributing his *Doctoris Angelici* (1914), Pius X gathered professors of philosophy to clearly articulate the tenements of Thomism. The resulting work, The 24 Thomistic Theses, divides his philosophy into four sections: Ontology (1-7), Cosmology (8-12), Psychology (13-21), Theodicy (22-24). While admittedly providing an accurate exegesis of Thomism, the Theses more importantly situate the school of thought to counter notions of modernity. The ontology theses emphasize a "unique" God that creates a "twofold composition" in all beings; the cosmology theses attest that though the body may be material in natural, an invisible substance makes up the soul—so that the twofold composition refers to the duality of the body and soul; "Psychology" notes that the soul, though changeable to outside influences, anchors alongside God's perfection and in his final judgement; finally, "Theodicy" argues that no "immediate intuition" aids the recognition of God as the Church proves it "a *posteriori*" as life itself proves God's hand as literal creator. Just as Aquinas countered Greek empiricism, so too does Thomism contradict the materialism of modern thought. See: Pius X, "The Twenty-Four Fundamental Theses Of Official Catholic Philosophy," trans. Hugh McDonald (1914), http://www.u.arizona.edu/~aversa/scholastic/24Thomisticpart2.htm

[clxx] Robert Kugelmann, *Psychology and Catholicism: Contested Boundaries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 48.

[clxxi] Pius X, "The Oath Against Modernism." Papal Encyclicals Online, Accessed August 1, 2017. http://www.papalencyclicals.net/pius10/p10moath.htm

[clxxii] Ibid.

[clxxiii] Eamon Duffy, *Saints and Sinners: A History of the Popes* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), np.

[clxxiv] Martindale, aligned with the church's anti-modernist stance, stresses that Loisy "had long ceased to be a Catholic," but also admits to Benson's "favourable, but mistaken judgement" of him. Writing to his mother, Benson describes Loisy as "the only person who knows about the Bible at all, in France" and defines his writing as "inopportune" rather than incorrect. See: Martindale, 1:301-302.

[clxxv] Priests like Alfred Loisy, mentioned previously, attested that Genesis did not so much serve as a literal retelling of the emergence of life, but constituted a poetic interpretation of creation by an ancient people. His viewpoints led to public censorship by the Church and a loss of his professorship in Paris—though he viewed himself as an ardent Catholic. Modernists like Baron Friedrich von Hugel and George Tyrrell celebrated his *The Gospel and the Church* (1904) which, oddly enough, aimed to defend the history of the Catholic Church. His work serves as a counterargument to Adolf Harnack's *Essence of Christianity*, a series of talks that claimed the Church appropriated pagan rights to the degree that the Church contradicts the Gospels. In the

---

work, he argues that the church must move away from an absolutist doctrine and, rather, concentrate on spreading Jesus's message of hope. The Papacy viewed the author, who took four years to close-read and counter Harnack's series of sixteen lectures, as an apostate and placed his work in the *Index of Forbidden Books*. See: Alfred Loisy, *The Gospel and the Church*, trans. Christopher Home (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904); Adolf Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1950).

[clxxvi] See: Robert Hugh Benson, *Non-Catholic Denominations* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1910).

[clxxvii] Reginal Garrigou-Lagrange's essay "Where is New Theology Taking Us?" brought the Catholic debate regarding *Nouvelle Theologie* to an international stage. A strict Thomist, he argued that such alterations "seek only to reconcile us to modernism." He claims that belief in evolution, disbelief in transubstantiation, and, most paramount, any alteration in rudimentary Catholic truths aligns followers "to the modern position." He notes that intellectual curiosity leds followers "to attend the classes of the masters of modernist thought in order to convert them" only to "be converted by them." Like Benson's earlier critique, he attests that any realignment with modern, secular thought constitutes a betrayal of the church. Garrigou-Lagrange attacks modernism en masse: to him, secularism, scientific reasoning, psychology, individualism, and even archeology endangers the Catholic Church. See: Reginal Garrigou-Lagrange, "Where is New Theology Taking Us?" in *Beatitude: A Commentary on St. Thomas' Theological Summa*, trans. Patrick Cummins (London: B. Herder Book Co, 1956), 309.

[clxxviii] Robert Hugh Benson, *Non-Catholic Denominations*, 115, 144.

[clxxix] Ibid. 145.

[clxxx] The conservativism of Pius X severely clashes with both the rhetoric and actions of his predecessor, Pope Leo XIII. Leo XIII first papal record (praying of the Ave Maria), the first Papal records (slowly and stiffly waving), and re-opened the Vatican Observatory to "embrace [solid science], encourage it, and promote it." Whereas the loss of the Papal States marked Pius IX's tenure, Pius IX approached the emerging Italian state with a degree of relative openness. Italy did much to consolidate non-Vatican City property under state control and revert Catholic schools to secular state schools, but Pius recognized the state's power to aid the less fortunate. In *Rerum novarum* (1891), he admits to the secular state's ability to erode the Church's authority, but calls upon those states to aid the poor and disenfranchised. Here, he attests that as "public institutions and the laws set aside" Catholicism, so too did "isolated and helpless" working men and women surrender to "the greed of unchecked capitalism." While he critiques both unrestrained capitalism and socialism— "working on the poor man's envy of the rich"—he calls upon "the general character and administration of the commonwealth" as well its rulers to maintain "public well-being and private prosperity." He notes that governments "must go no further" to redefine society. He, in essence, argues that to preserve stability, a state must work to secure a citizen's economic rights. In doing so, Leo XIII claims that the state maintains its legitimacy in a way that also allows private religious societies to flourish. He fully recognizes the power of the state since "the mass of the poor…must chiefly depend upon the assistance of the State," but approaches government as an ally, not an outright enemy. See: Leo XIII, *Motu Proprio*, "The Refounding and Restructuring of the Vatican Observatory, March 14 1891; Leo XIII, "*Rerum Novarum*: Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII on Capital and Labor." Vatican Publishing House, Accessed August 1, 2017. http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_15051891_rerum-novarum.html

---

[clxxxi] Robert Hugh Benson, "Catholicism and the Future," University of Notre Dame. Accessed June 13, 2017. http://archives.nd.edu/episodes/visitors/rhb/essays07.htm

[clxxxii] Ibid.

[clxxxiii] Ibid.

[clxxxiv] Benson's full acceptance of the Church's infallibility contextualizes his uneasy place in contemporary criticism. Today, mainly conservative Catholic publications like *The Catholic Herald*, *Crisis* Magazine, and the *Catholic World Report* discuss Benson, framing him as a titan of prophecy who anticipated the growth of secularization. While Benson's critique of the secular state remains important to this chapter, such outlets completely ignore the complexity of his views.

[clxxxv] Robert Hugh Benson, *Lord of the World*, np.

[clxxxvi] Ibid.

[clxxxvii] Ibid.

[clxxxviii] Arthur Christopher Benson, *Hugh: Memoir of a Brother* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1915); Blane Warre Cornish, *Memorials of Robert Hugh Benson* (New York: P.J. Kenedy & Sons 1915); Katharine Olive Parr, *Robert Hugh Benson: An Appreciation* (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1915)

[clxxxix] Arthur's *Hugh: Memoirs of a Brother* intimately details letters, diary entries and first-hand accounts to create a brotherly portrait of Benson, but reduces Hugh to a pleasant, but inoffensive, lump. While the American press took kindly to the memoir, *The Spectator* (London) disagreed, noting that while "the book is interesting to near relatives and those of Father Hugh Benson's converts" it does little to shine a light on a "really striking personality." See: "Father Hugh Benson" *Spectator* (London) (April 17, 1915): 20.

[cxc] Cyril Charles Martindale, Vol. 1 and Vol. 2 of *The Life of Monsignor Robert Hugh Benson* (London: Longsman, Green, and Co., 1916).

[cxci] Janet Grayson, *Robert Hugh Benson: Life and Works* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1998).

[cxcii] Ibid xiii.

[cxciii] Ibid.

[cxciv] Sudlow examines the "post-secular moment" when Catholic writers flooded popular markets. However, his discussion of Benson remains anecdotal at best. He deviates from his main objective to place turn of the century Catholic authors alongside their more famous secular counterparts. Rather than a critical literary reappraisal, Sudlow provides an Anglo-French historical analysis examining the catalytic societal changes that brought about Catholic revivalism at the turn of the century. He best succeeds when discussing canonical figures like G.K. Chesterton, but rarely makes a dynamic case for less-popular writers like Benson—mostly due to a simple lack of attention. See: Brian Sudlow, *Catholic Literature and Secularization in France and England, 1880-1914* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011).

[cxcv] Though he delivers a charming, conversational 25-chapter biography, Goldhill relegates Hugh to a single, short chapter. Rather, he focuses his examination on Hugh's brother Edward Frederic, but with clear warrants: E.F. Benson wrote the massively successful *Mapp and Luccia* novels (1920-1939) that both Channel 4 and BBC adapted into popular miniseries. To Goldhill, he also makes for a more interesting biographical subject since, unlike Hugh, E.F. (very) publicly acted on his homosexual impulses. Attune to Hugh's queer sensibilities, he writes a multi-faceted character study of a dynamic literary family but does not supply an in-depth literary appraisal of

---

either Benson. See: Simon Goldhill, *A Very Queer Family Indeed: Sex Religion, and the Benson's in Victorian England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016).

[cxcvi] Critics published only a handful of academic articles about Benson in the last 25 years. Among them examinations of his subpar utopian novel, *The Dawn of All*—analyzed later in fuller detail—sadly prevail. In "A Catholic Vision of Ireland" (2014) Bryan Fanning best captures Hugh's motivations. He argues that Benson utilizes the utopian genre to stress the improbability of Catholic dominance in the modern world. First, he attests that Benson's optimistic perspective places the work within the genre of science fiction. Next, he analyzes the failure of Catholic social programs in Ireland due to emerging populist sentiments and continuing papal conservatism regarding social change. Though he focuses on Irish politics, this chapter argues that the populist movements in England also impacted Benson, especially when writing *Lord of the World*. See: Bryan Fanning, "A Catholic Vision of Ireland" in *Are the Irish Different?* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 44-53.

[cxcvii] Axel Stähler, "Apocalyptic Visions and Utopian Spaces in Late Victorian and Edwardian Prophecy Fiction," *Utopian Studies,* 23, No. 1 (2012) 162-211.

[cxcviii] Although Stähler argues that Benson's "other apologetic and exhortatory writings" merit particular attention, he does not analyze the work as a piece of apologetic fiction. He does so because his broad scope prevents him from discussing Benson in detail. Even H.G. Well's short story "A Vision of Judgment," used as a framing device to define his use of apocalypse —here, literally world ending, but also in the way it creates a shift between primary and secondary utopian spaces—receives more attention than Benson's novel. His overarching argument counters Philip E. Wegner's claim that the narrative utopia represents a "uniquely modern literary genre." He argues that such works critique modernity and "actually challenge" modern literature's emphasis on both the state and technology by discussing the ephemeral. He attests that narrative utopias develop from Biblical, plot-minded apocalyptic narrative. According to him they provide an "alternative response to the fragmenting, decentering, and spiritually draining impact of 'high modernity' on traditional societies." All three authors, according to Stähler, create an initial utopian space that defines as a dystopian space, that becomes infiltrated with the truer, secondary Christian utopian space. By shifting the narrative's settings, he argues, each author suggests a better alternative to the utopia of the first order. See: Axel Stähler, "Apocalyptic Visions and Utopian Spaces in Late Victorian and Edwardian Prophecy Fiction," *Utopian Studies*, 23, No. 1 (2012) 162-211.

[cxcix] Ibid 200.

[cc] Rodney Bolt, *Mary Benson biographer Rodney Bolt* (London: Atlantic Books, 2011), i.

[cci] After the death of his father in 1843 and his mother in 1850, the Benson children found themselves divided and placed into the homes of extended family and friends. As the eldest sibling Edward worked to support the family. The Reverend William Sidgwick and his wife Mary, also the parents of the philosopher Henry Sidgwick, housed his sister, Ada, beginning in 1852. Here, when Mary was 11—and he 23—Edward decided, or dictated, that he would marry her. The courtship, encouraged by a "mother feared rather than loved," included Edward proscribing her education and courting her throughout her teenage years. See: Martha Vicinus, "'The Gift of Love': Religion and Lesbian Love" in *Intimate Friends: Women Who Loved Women, 1778-1928* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 89.

[ccii] Deborah Alun-Jones, "This Entertainment is Inexhaustible: The Benson and de Waal families at Lincoln" in *The Wry Romance of the Literary Rectory* (London: Thames & Hudsom, 2013), np.

[cciii] Edward Frederic Benson, *Our Family Affairs: 1867-1896* (London: Cassell and Company, 1920), 39.

[cciv] Ibid. 170.

[ccv] Ibid.

[ccvi] Arthur Christopher Benson, *Life and Letters of Maggie Benson* (London: J. Murray, 1917), 103.

[ccvii] E.F. Benson, 166.

[ccviii] Vicinus, "'The Gift of Love': Religion and Lesbian Love," 90.

[ccix] Ibid.

[ccx] Ibid. 96.

[ccxi] Cornish, 12.

[ccxii] Vicinus, 92.

[ccxiii] Greater knowledge of the relationship between the two men largely stems from interest in Rolfe, not Benson. Alphonse James Albert Symons' biography *The Quest for Corvo* intimately details the paradoxical nature of Bensonian research. Previous work, largely done by Arthur, anthologized a great bulk of Benson's writings, both professional and personal, and, in doing so, surreptitiously censored evidence of Benson's probable homosexual leanings. Symons' work, subtitled as "An Experiment in Biography" (1934), expertly details Rolfe not chronologically, but as a meta-perspective from a researcher's point of view: as Symons gains access to primary sources, a fuller picture of Rolfe comes to fruition. According to Symons, Martindale gained complete access to the correspondence from Arthur. As a result, his biography attests to Rolfe's influence, but, writing for the church, he leaves the true nature of their relationship enigmatic. Symons goes on to note that, when he wrote to E.F.—Arthur died in 1925—that he admitted that no correspondence between the two could be found, suggesting that the papers "had been destroyed" by Arthur. Like Benson, Rolfe's literary reputation continued to wain after his death, but, unlike Benson, Rolfe saw a midcentury resurgence with the publication of Donald Week's *Corvo, Saint or Madman?* (1971) and Miriam Benkovitz's *Frederick Rolfe/Baron Corvo: A Biography* (1977). Interest in queer lives acted as the catalyst for both biographers and explains why Rolfe's best-known work today remains *The Venice Letters* (1974) a somewhat shockingly frank account of pedantry during his final year in Venice—only a year after Thomas Mann published *Death in Venice* (1912). See: A.J.A. Symons, *The Quest for Corvo: An Experiment in Biography* (New York: New York Review Books, 2001); Donald Weeks, *Corvo, Saint or Madman?* (London: Michael Joseph Ltd., 1971); Miriam Benkovitz, *Frederick Rolfe/Baron Corvo: A Biography* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1977); Frederick Rolfe, *The Venice Letters* (London: Cecil Woolf, 1987).

[ccxiv] Robert Hugh Benson, *Confessions of a Convert* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1915), 29.

[ccxv] Grayson, 23.

[ccxvi] Arthur Christopher Benson, *Hugh Memoirs of a Brother*, 140-141.

[ccxvii] Frederick Rolfe, *Hadrian VII* (New York: Penguin Classics, 2018).

[ccxviii] Martindale, 2: 95.

[ccxix] Ibid., 97

[ccxx] Ibid., 105.

[ccxxi] Robert Hugh Benson, *The Holy Blissful Martyr Saint Thomas of Canterbury* (London: Macdonald and Evans, 1908), 72.

[ccxxii] Grayson, 90.

[ccxxiii] Ibid., 82.
[ccxxiv] Martindale, 2: 96.
[ccxxv] Ibid.
[ccxxvi] Grayson, 81.
[ccxxvii] Ibid., 195.
[ccxxviii] Ibid., 90.
[ccxxix] Symons, 198.
[ccxxx] Symons, 188.
[ccxxxi] Edward Frederic Benson, *Final Edition: An Informal Autobiography* (New York: Read Books Ltd., 2016), np.
[ccxxxii] Patrick Allitt, *Catholic Converts: British and American Intellectuals Turn to Rome* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), 284.
[ccxxxiii] Due to his indiscrete homosexual affairs, the church expelled Rolfe from seminary twice: first from St. Mary's College, Oscott (1887) and then from Scots College, Rome (1890). After his second expulsion he found himself, with no small amount of luck, a guest at Caroline Shirley's Palazzo Sforza Cesarini. Duchess Sforza Cesarini and a widow to a great fortune, Shirley served as his main patron until his literary output began to recede. Once he returned to London he erroneously claimed that Shirley adopted him and legitimized her within her family. Nothing suggests that Shirley, a meticulous estate manager with two adult sons, did anything of the kind. She and her former husband, Duke Lorenzo Sforza Cesarini, actually held four marriage ceremonies—a civil ceremony, an Anglican ceremony, a Catholic ceremony, and another in the Papal States—to guarantee the legitimacy of their marriage and their newly combined fortunes. Though Shirley cut him off a few months later, Rolfe nonetheless began to stylize himself as Baron Corvo. Once he adopted his new persona he began to wear two rings: one, a signet ring with the mark of raven (Italian for *corvo*), and the other, a studded ring. He adamantly told friends and strangers alike that the latter aided his evasion of a Jesuit assassin—the ring's studs, he proclaimed, cut the assailant, left him blinded by blood, and gave Rolfe time to escape. See: A.J.A. Symons *The Quest for Corvo: An Experiment in Biography* (New York: New York Review Books, 2001).
[ccxxxiv] Robert Hugh Benson, *The Holy Blissful Martyr Saint Thomas of Canterbury,* 4.
[ccxxxv] Benkovitz, 185.
[ccxxxvi] E.F. Benson, *Final Edition,* np.
[ccxxxvii] Ibid.
[ccxxxviii] Goldhill, 246.
[ccxxxix] Robert Hugh Benson, *Loneliness* (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1915).
[ccxl] Ibid., 371.
[ccxli] In *Lord of the World* Benson also rebukes the ornamentation of John Francis Bentley's Byzantium Westminster Cathedral to highlight how he "hated" monumental churches with "open spaces of sun and trumpets in unison." Benson criticizes the "glory of the place"—the "gorgeous marbles and gildings," a huge baldachin, and high peaked windows—since the space permits Father Percy to fall into prayer too deeply. He illustrates that Father Percy's absorption in prayer—he calls it a "deliberate act of self-exclusion—allows him to ignore the visit of the elder Mrs. Brand. Distracted by prayer, he curtly answers her initial inquiries and literally turns his back on her to concentrate instead on the "dim, splendid chapel." In doing so, he alienates a possible convert, the mother of a high-ranking government official at that. Whereas Mabel lost

---

herself to the crowd, Percy losses himself to prayer, introspection inspired by the grandiose architecture around him. See: Robert Hugh Benson, *Lord of the World*, np.

[ccxlii] Robert Hugh Benson, *Lord of the World*, np.

[ccxliii] Ibid.

[ccxliv] Throughout the novel, Benson argues that church architecture succeeds, despite of its grandiosity, as long as it contributes to the function of selfless prayer *and* communion. In, *Confessions of a Convert*, he notes his admiration for church architecture, arguing that since "the soul must always be seeking" a parishioner must gaze upwards to contemplated "God who hides himself." He attests that Gothic architecture "represents to soul aspiring to God" and Renaissance/Romanesque architecture "represents God tabernacling with men," arguing that the ideal church combines both sentiments. He goes on to stylize himself as "a Northerner pure and simple" who craved the meditative space of "the shadow of the deep woods." See: Benson, *Confessions of a Convert*, 154.

[ccxlv] Robert Hugh Benson, *Lord of the World*, np.

[ccxlvi] Ibid.

[ccxlvii] Ibid.

[ccxlviii] Ibid.

[ccxlix] Robert Fishman, *Bourgeois Utopias: The Rise And Fall Of Suburbia* (New York: Perseus Books, 2008), 74.

[ccl] Robert Hugh Benson, *Lord of the World*, np.

[ccli] Faye Hammill, "Stella Gibbons, Ex-Centricity and the Suburb" in *Intermodernism: Literary Culture in Mid-Twentieth-Century Britain*, ed. Kristin Bluemel (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), 80

[cclii] Robert Hugh Benson, *Lord of the World*, np.

[ccliii] Ross McKibbin, *Classes and Cultures: England 1918-1951* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 265-73

[ccliv] Robert Hugh Benson, *Lord of the World*, np.

[cclv] Robert Hugh Benson, *Lord of the World*, np.

[cclvi] Lynn Hollen Lees, *The Solidarities of Strangers: The English Poor Laws and the People, 1700-1948* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 311

[cclvii] Robert Hugh Benson, *Lord of the World*, np.

[cclviii] Roger E. Backhouse, "Economists in Parliament in Britain: (1848-1914)" in *Economists in Parliament in the Liberal Age: (1848–1920)*, ed. Marco E.L. Guidi and Massimo M. Augello (New York: Routledge, 2017), np.

[cclix] Eric Evans, "Labour, Welfare and Social Conflict (1900-1914)" in *The Shaping of Modern Britain: Identity, Industry and Empire 1780 – 1914* (New York: Routledge, 2014), 433.

[cclx] Robert Hugh Benson, *Lord of the World*, np.

[cclxi] A campaign poster published by the Liberal Publication department in 1905 illustrates the Tory's robbing the elderly. To right side of the poster shows Conservative Chancellor of the Exchequer, Austen Chamberlain, entering an old woman's home under the heading "the raider." He reaches out towards her kitchen as she hungrily crutches a loaf of bread and says "I mustn't have your loaf? Then I'll have your tea-pot, just as I've had your sugar-basin." On the left, under the heading "The Cast-Off Child," shows Miss Chamberlain abandoning a baby at a friendly society whose swaddling clothes say Old Age Pensions. Though he mentions only the Labour party by name, Benson's prologue critiques the anti-Conservative agenda that began in 1906. He conflates the Labour and Liberal party to argue that such an alliance holds the seeds of

---

Communism. See: “Ten Years of Toryism.” London School of Economics and Science Library. Accessed July 2, 2017. https://www.flickr.com/photos/lselibrary/3269534302/

[cclxii] Royston Pike, *Documents of the Lloyd George Era* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1972), 105.

[cclxiii] David Lloyd George, *War Memoirs* (London: AMS Press, 1982), 44

[cclxiv] Robert Hugh Benson, *The Dawn of All* (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1915), 99.

[cclxv] Martindale, 2: 284.

[cclxvi] Robert Hugh Benson, "The Death-Beds of 'Bloody Mary' and 'Good Queen Bess.'" University of Notre Dame. Accessed June 13, 2017. http://archives.nd.edu/episodes/visitors/rhb/essays03.htm

[cclxvii] Ibid.

[cclxviii] In *Non-Catholic Denominations,* Benson argues that such “legal fictions” reflect the influence of “severely logical and argumentative” Calvinism in the church: he notes that in the Anglican Church “relations between God and the soul are legal in character, rather than filial.” To Benson, personal faith expressed by “fervent and sincere confession” without the fervent belief in “the sacramental system” leads to “amateur theologians.” According to him, a believer can truly commune and gain absolution from God from the Catholic communion. He attests that Protestantism’s emphasis on faith and faith alone develops “a kind of sentimental optimism.” While he goes on to praise the “real dignity” of Presbyterian schools in spreading the teaching of Christ, he warns of the growing “liberalism” in the church. See: Robert Hugh Benson, *Non-Catholic Denominations* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1910), 111-113.

[cclxix] Robert Hugh Benson, *Lord of the World*, np.

[cclxx] Ibid.

[cclxxi] Ibid.

[cclxxii] Ibid.

[cclxxiii] Ibid.

[cclxxiv] Ibid.

[cclxxv] Ibid.

[cclxxvi] Ibid.

[cclxxvii] Robert Hugh Benson, *The Dawn of All,* 5.

[cclxxviii] See: Maxim Shadurski, “Debating National Identity in Utopian Fiction,” *Trames* 15, no. 3 (2011): 300-316; Maxim Shadurski, “A Catholic England: National Continuities and Disruptions in Robert Hugh Benson's *The Dawn of All,” The Modern Language Review* 107, no. 3 (2012): 712-728; Maxim Shadurski, “Religion and Science in Robert Hugh Benson's *The Dawn of All” English Studies* 94 (2013): 404-421.

[cclxxix] In *The Dawn of All*, Benson celebrates the same modern systems—namely high-speed railways and airships—that occur in his anti-utopia, but Catholicism replaces the government as “the center and not merely a department of national life.” He explains that the rise of universal Catholicism stems from science proving the power of faith. Illnesses, for instance, result from a psychosomatic disconnection from the Church—in the future faith cures both the body and the soul—and explains why priests run the hospital. Scientists record miracles, once thought to be fantasy, and prove their physical existence. Faith counts for little in the future as scientists objectively conclude the inherent power of the Catholic religion. Here, Benson glorifies a pre-Reformation mindset where the Church, as a political and scientific entity, goes unquestioned. In creating utopia where the “concrete and effective” Church reigns supreme, Benson argues that science need only take the power of Christianity as a foregone conclusion to prove its ultimate power. See: Robert Hugh Benson, *The Dawn of All,* 196, 110.

[cclxxx] Robert Hugh Benson, *The Dawn of All,* 49-50.
[cclxxxi] Ibid., 177.
[cclxxxii] Ibid., 366.
[cclxxxiii] Ibid., 186.
[cclxxxiv] Ibid., 154.
[cclxxxv] Ibid., i.
[cclxxxvi] Martindale, 76.
[cclxxxvii] Ibid., 75.
[cclxxxviii] Ibid., 76.
[cclxxxix] Ibid.
[ccxc] Ibid., 75.
[ccxci] Ibid., 76.
[ccxcii] Grayson, 88.
[ccxciii] Robert Hugh Benson, *The Dawn of All,* 241.
[ccxciv] Ibid., 240.
[ccxcv] Ibid., 242.
[ccxcvi] Ibid.
[ccxcvii] Martindale, 2:121.
[ccxcviii] Arthur Christopher Benson, *Hugh: Memoirs of a Brother*, (167).
[ccxcix] E.F. Benson, *Final Edition,* np.
[ccc] Reginald J. J. Watt, *Robert Hugh Benson: Captain in God's Army* (London: Burns & Oates, 1918), 195.

Chapter Three Overview

Though he details a largely negative society in *Brave New World* (1932), Aldous Huxley embraces the anti-utopian genre when creating futuristic London. In After Ford (A.F.) London's urban design, Huxley plans his future world pragmatically, constructing not a nightmarish dystopia, but a gleaming, sustaining metropolis. In his novel Huxley centers his futuristic world state around eugenics, population control, and the management of natural resources—systems that he not only supported during the time of publication, but beliefs he reinforced twenty years later in *Brave New World Revisited* (1952). While Huxley's support of eugenics remains well established, critics largely ignore Huxley's avid interest in urban planning. Huxley models his future London explicably from a concept he actively supported, Ebenezer Howard's Garden City, the first modern urban plan to segregate areas by functional use. Huxley uses the Garden City design to first demonstrate how Howard's policies create a functional, clean, and stable industrial metropolis, but secondly to illustrate how such a design embeds the growth and development of a given city with the aim of stability in mind. Embracing the anti-utopian genre, Huxley first supports the effectiveness of Howard's design on a macro-level. The functional success of Howard's urban plan in *Brave New World* allows Huxley to also critique A.F. London's machine-like efficiency on the micro-level of the individual building. Whereas he agreed with the merits of Howard's design, Huxley uses A.F. London's banal high-rises to attack Le Corbusier's famous edict, "A house is a machine for living in." Remarking upon the dangers of machine-like sentimentality, the assembly line, and seeing workers as mere commodities, his novel subverts the Fordian principles that Le Corbusier celebrated in full. Therefore, he not only critiques the sterile, dormitory-like spaces that dominate his cityscape, but also celebrates how a decentralized city, separated by functional zones, restrains industrialism and aids conservationism.

Critical Overview

When facing a work of so-called dystopian literature a reader expects to open the gates of hell described by Dante Alighieri: "Through me the way to the suffering city/ Through me the everlasting pain/ Through me the way that runs among the Lost."[ccci] Yet Dante's *Inferno* does not merely constitute an anti-*Paradiso*; his Hell brings the reader into a realm far more interesting that *Paradiso*'s Heaven where "that sun which erst with love my bosom warmed."[cccii] In the same manner, *Brave New World* represents more than a Wellsian critique of *Men Like God*s. As mentioned in Chapter One's critical overview, Huxley's work goes beyond subverting Well's scientific state.[ccciii] Rather, Huxley realized that though he began "writing a novel about the future- on the horrors of the Wellsian utopia and a revolt against it," the end product turned into something else entirely.[ccciv] Writing in 1972, George Woodcock quite rightly declared that "if any vision runs more persistently through Huxley's works, from *Crome Yellow* (1921) down to *Island* (1962), it is that of Utopia."[cccv] Yet as the dystopian genre formalized in the mid-century criticism, discussion again and again has emphasized the work's dystopian, rather than utopian, qualities.

Published the same year that British unemployment peaked at its Depression era high with 3.5 million unemployed workers, Huxley's society of merry laborers holds little tonal commonality Orwell's post-war nightmare.[cccvi] On the novel's first page Huxley introduces the Word State's motto of "Community, Identity, and Stability," signaling that his future stems from utopian principles.[cccvii][cccviii] While a society purged of all art and culture in no way encapsulates Huxley's ideal civilization, the World State efficiently supplies full stomachs, entertainment, and advanced medical access for the highest ranked Alpha and the lowliest Epsilon.[cccix] Early reviewers like *New York Times* book critic John Chamberlain correctly place the work in line with the utopian tradition, though he declares that Huxley "buil[t] the Utopia to end Utopias."[cccx]

While Huxley confronts certain utopian belief systems without apology—Nicolas Murray goes so far to argue that his pessimistic portrayal of Taylorish/Fordism and "its jaundiced view of the materialist Utopia" resulted in the novel initially selling poorly in America—he largely explores both the positive and negative elements of the systems that he interrogates.[cccxi] Though he asserts that civilization After Ford (A.F.) orients industrial, social, and psychological systems that do not create an ideal society, he nevertheless details how they function for the benefit of the world populace. His nuanced perspective, concerned with *how* the World State uses such systems rather than moralizing about the systems themselves, designates *Brave New World* as an anti-utopian novel. In this genre, he interrogates the technological systems that keep the world populace happy and docile and even extends his analysis to imagining the results of an urban plan he heartily endorsed.

A memorial retrospective of the author, *Aldous Huxley* (1965), commissioned by his brother Julian, sheds particular light on how critics began to frame *Brave New World* in regard to his canonical body. Given the continued interest in Huxley's novel, at first it appears odd that the critics selected rarely discuss his most famous work and, when they do so, comment on it disparagingly. The contributors, all friends of the author, define *Brave New World* as an innately dystopian novel to largely distance their conversation from Huxley's embrace of eugenics. Most critics included mirror the sentiments of Johnathan Wain: he suggests that while the novel allows "free play to [display] the author's marvelous wit (the jokes about Ford, etc.)," it lacks the nuance of his later works, particularly his last work, *Island* (1962).[cccxii][cccxiii]

It must be remembered that by the time of his death Huxley had replaced his earlier, almost nihilistic tone with a more considerate perspective. In *Island* Huxley utilizes advanced technology and popular drug use for the advancement, rather than for the ruination, of society. While still pragmatic and realistic, Huxley's later writing not only criticizes unrestrained capitalism, but offers, according to his 1946 preface to *Brave New World,* constructive options. Huxley noted that if he could amend his earlier novel he would introduce another way of life to his future landscape: "If I were to rewrite the book, I would offer the Savage a third alterative…[as] between the Utopian and primitive horns of his dilemma [lays] the possibility of sanity." [11] In *Island* Huxley achieved such a middle ground. As noted by Milton Birnbaum, the Huxley of *Island* "no longer offers man the choice he offered him in *Brave New World*- the meaningless diversions of a mechanized Utopia or the almost equally barren existence of the primitive as [it instead attempts]…to make the best of both worlds."[1] Differing from the Huxley of the 1930s, the mature author wished to provide constructive solutions to the problems he sensed the future facing. Yet critics continued to largely focus on A.F. London's negative qualities until David Bradshaw reevaluated Huxley's personal philosophy in his anthology *The Hidden Huxley* (1994).

In his introduction Bradshaw declares that "the authentic 1930s Huxley has languished misunderstood and unread for over fifty years." [cccxiv] He attests that the true Huxley, as best seen in his essays, supported many of the undesirable elements found in *Brave New World*. In his "Introduction" and opening essay "Open Conspirators: Huxley and H.G. Wells 1927-35" Bradshaw reassesses Huxley in line with his personal philosophy. Though he frames his scholarship as a new discovery, Bradshaw reorganizes, chronologically, a number of Huxley's popularly published interwar essays to highlight his support, specifically, of eugenics. While it constitutes a fine anthology, and a particularly useful one since his chorological ordering aids the reader more than the thematic groupings found in *Aldous Huxley: The Complete Essays* (2000), Bradshaw does not produce the buried treasure trove that his title suggests. Rather he amasses essays that Huxley published in American and British magazines—essays previously utilized by earlier critics like Theodor Adorno in "Huxley and Utopia" (1967).[cccxv]

In avoiding the strict dichotomy of utopia/dystopia, critics like Maartjen Schermer better understand Huxley's intentions in *Brave New World*. Though he does not reference the term anti-utopia, in in "*Brave New World* Versus *Island*: Utopian and Dystopian Views on Psychopharmacology" (2007) Schermer makes an important point about how Huxley framed his A.F. society.[cccxvi] He claims that in *Brave New World* and *Island* Huxley produces "elaborate thought experiments of what the world *could* look like" so that both novels serve as "heuristic 'tools'" to educate his readership about technological possibilities.[cccxvii] He contextualizes *Brave New World* as more than a satirical (as his early critics designate) or a reactionary work (as Bradshaw suggests). Rather, he emphasizes how the societies described in *Brave New World* and *Island* express "possible" futures that often embrace the same technology to different ends.[cccxviii]

With the introduction of the Model T (1908) serving as year zero, Huxley opens his novel in the year 632 A.F. (2540 AD).[cccxix] The Nine Years' War and the resulting Great Economic Collapse push leaders to create a technocratic World State that, oriented around ten different zones, emphasizes stability and the utilitarian good.[cccxx] The novel itself is best dissected in three parts. The first segment, later examined in greater detail, takes place in London and introduces the geography and politics of A.F. London. Next a disgruntled state psychologist, Bernard Marx takes fellow Londoner Lenina Crowne to the Savage Reservation, a New Mexico settlement where "repulsive habits and customs" like Christianity and the family structure prevail. Here they find John Savage whose mother, Linda, got lost in the same wilderness years before during her own vacation. Shamefully finding herself pregnant, despite contraception, she raised John away from the World State's welfare infrastructure. In the third and final section Huxley focuses on John's experience. He details his visit to the world state, his eventual disillusionment with the brave new world of which he dreamed, his failed escape into nature, and, finally, his subsequent suicide.

While Huxley paints a fantastical London of personal helicopters, wonder drugs, ultra-fast rockets, and bottled babies, ultimately the reader learns that advancement has stagnated. Resident World Controller of Western Europe Mustapha Mond curiously notes that "in the time of Our Ford" society "imagined that [scientific progress] could be allowed to go on indefinitely."[cccxxi] Yet unregulated advancements ultimately led to the Nine Years War and the breakdown of traditional society. Fearing another world war, the World State became "wary of applying new inventions" since "every discovery in pure science is potentially subversive"; after all, Mond concludes, "we have our stability to think of."[cccxxii] Stability not only results from an engineered caste system and mental conditioning, but also from A.F. London's urban plan. Huxley's city epitomizes order and, in doing so, the cityscape itself works to sustain the established social fabric that Mond so fervently praises.

Reacting against the economic, political, and social disorder of the 1930s, Huxley orients his future around consistency and order. Historian A.J.P. Taylor details that, in reaction against the relative chaos of the time, "planning was the key word of the 1930s… a planned economy, plan for peace, planned families, plan for holidays…the standard was Utopia."[cccxxiii] Taking up such a call, Murray states that in writing *Brave New World* Huxley "is searching for an answer to the perennial question: how then must we live?"[cccxxiv] *Brave New World* and Huxley's essays published in the late 1920s and the early 1930s emphasize his interest in urban planning as a way to bring about stability.[cccxxv] In Huxley's view, uncontrolled industrial advancement acted as an enemy to stability. In his essay "Industrial Progress and Social Stability" (1932) he prophesizes that "financial and social chaos" would reign "until the industrial world had adjusted to the new conditions imposed by the technology."[cccxxvi] With the Garden City Movement, Huxley believed he found a solution to check industrial growth.

Ebenezer Howard's Garden City

Initially described in *To-morrow: A Peaceful Path to Reform* (1898) and then expanded in *Garden Cities of To-morrow* (1902), Howard advocated the Garden City Movement to decentralize and contain industrial cities. Specifically, his plan moved to break up the metropolis into confined zones. He separates these zones by functional use to make each area—industrial sites, garden cities (self-contained residential spaces) and agricultural centers—functional, but distinct, miniature cities in their own right. These industrial, residential, and agricultural areas, connected by a series a municipal railways and roads, radiate around a larger central city. Such "satellite cities" revolve around an urban core creating a symbiotic exchange between them. Functionally the satellite cities would be codependent on one another for workers, raw materials, and even leisure activities to create a balance between smaller and larger urban spaces. To contain the growth of each satellite city, and the central city for that matter, Howard advocated "greenbelts," permanent agricultural and forestry areas, to serve as natural borders. Such land, owned in public trust, would prevent unrestrained growth, help contain populations, and allow residents to live and work alongside the beauty of nature.

By the time Huxley published *Brave New World,* Howard's Garden City Association had already built two model satellite towns in England: Letchworth (1903) and Welwyn Garden City

(1919).[cccxxvii] In “Sight-Seeing in Alien Englands” (1931) Huxley references these two towns in particular and notes that the “promoters of the Garden City schemes…enjoy the amenities of country life without sacrificing their urban advantages.”[cccxxviii] Here, Huxley adopts the popular belief that the Garden City Movement represented the best compromise between urban and rural life. Yet Huxley wished for more than a synthesis between manmade and natural landscapes.

Rather, he hoped that the movement, by creating controlled spaces, would reign in the growth of a city and its respective population: “In time, it is to be hoped, the greater part of our industrial population will be distributed in properly planned towns of this kind.”[cccxxix] For he notes that, currently, most “modern urban growth remains…fundamentally unorganized, chaotic, cancerous.”[cccxxx] Huxley asserts that “the chaos of nineteenth-century town planning was informed by no idea” as “towns were allowed to grow like cancers—shapelessly, indefinitely—[to which] London and the lesser cities of industrial England abundantly testify.”[cccxxxi] He attests that with the advent of twentieth century “a plan is needed” to order cities; nonetheless, he goes on to observe that, “as usual, there is no plan” to uniformly organize modern cities[cccxxxii] At a time when unplanned growth of “new outer suburbs” infected the “organism of London” with “monstrous excrescences,” the Garden City Movement provided an ordered salvation.

Born in 1850, Howard grew up in the heart of London and, like Huxley, found nineteenth-century cities wanting.[cccxxxiii] Born in the midst of the capital of industry he remarked how the city’s density and suffocating atmosphere encouraged him to engineer a new urban planning movement:

> I went into some of the crowded parts of London, and as I passed through the narrow dark streets, saw the wretched dwellings in which the majority of the people lived, observed on every hand the manifestations of a self-seeking order of

> society and reflected on the absolute unsound [sic] of our economic system, there came to me an overpowering sense of the temporary nature of all I saw, and of its entire unsuitability for the working life of the new order- the order of justice, unity, and friendliness.[cccxxxiv]

Here, Howard pejoratively describes a London that idolizes industrial gain over the wellbeing of its citizens. Just as the World State declared "Community, Identity, Stability" for all, Howard's mantra of "justice, utility, and friendliness" points towards a utilitarian use of industry. Traveling throughout London he noted how unrestrained industry benefited only the select few and, largely, made the city not only an economic center, but also a locus for disease, crime, and pollution.

Huxley, using Manchester as an example, argues that the mid-nineteenth century city looked "decidedly infernal" with industrial spaces creating a "hell-city in bud." [cccxxxv] Then the greatest producer of cotton, the city's population ballooned to transform the entire region. Only decades before, Thomas Pether painted *View from Kersal Moor* (1820), a landscape he oriented towards the direction of Manchester.[cccxxxvi] Here, he portrays on uninterrupted vita of a countryside dotted by trees and meandering river. Yet by 1850, almost 400,000 inhabitants crammed alongside the city's rising smokestacks. In *Manchester from Kersal Moor* (1852) William Wylde illustrates the growing metropolis and the poisoned atmosphere of which Huxley speaks.[cccxxxvii] Commissioned by Queen Victoria, Wylde portrays Manchester as a smoldering Pandæmonium slowly encroaching on acaridan meadowland. Victoria, after visiting Manchester in 1851, wrote that she witnessed a very "unhealthy-looking population" dirtied by the city itself.[cccxxxviii] In his depiction, Wylde elongates the protruding smokestacks with soft brushes of gray smog, blending his watercolors with the sunlight to produce an oddly tranquil, golden haze of pollution. He juxtaposes the warm yellows of the sky and cool grays of Manchester with the bright greenery of Kersal Moor and the Castle Irwell Racecourse. In his foreground he portrays a pastoral archetype: a rustic farm couple, supplanted from Pether's time, tending to their goats. Emphasizing the stark contrast between the greenery of the moor and glowing red heat of the factory city he portrays the dueling entities of nature and industry.

The mid-nineteenth century birthed not only new industrial advancements, but also a new type of city: the factory town, or what Charles Dickens would call a "Coketown" in *Hard Times* (1854).[cccxxxix] The cities that resulted were, in themselves, inhuman extensions of the factory and acted like a leviathan suffocating urban citizenry. In particular, Dickens describes Coketown like Wydle's Manchester as a "town of machinery and tall chimneys, out of which interminable serpents of smoke trailed themselves forever and ever, and never got uncoiled."[cccxl] In the *Story of Utopias* (1922) Lewis Mumford, adopting Dickens' lexicon, notes that in Coketown "the factory became the new social unit" and "in fact…the only social unit."[cccxli] Mumford declares that large-scale factories "transformed the industrial towns into dark hives, busily puffing, clanking, screeching, smoking for twelve and fourteen hours a day, sometimes going around the clock."[cccxlii] In the Victorian era, the dark brute of industrialism transformed a city's layout, its buildings, and even its air.

While A.F. London utilizes advanced technology, Londoners do not mirror the dirty masses encountered by Victoria. Initially, the dark hive described by Mumford suggests a parallel between the "hive of industry" of Huxley's Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Centre. However an important distinction sets them apart as, unlike Mumford's hive, Huxley's worker bees labor enthusiastically. [cccxliii] Granted, like Coketown, A.F. London orients itself around productivity: "the machine turs, turns, and must keep turning," Mond notes, "it is death if it stands still."[cccxliv] However, while the emphasis on productivity remains, Huxley's "hive" hums "busily, joyfully."[cccxlv] The happiness of A.F. citizens goes beyond mental conditioning as Huxley reconfigures London by incorporating Howard's utilitarian ideals and, in doing so, creates a happier citizenry.

Huxley, for one, uses the harsh landscape of the Savage Reservation to critique poor urban planning and, doubly, to reject any notion of a bucolic state of nature. The "queer" place encountered by Lenina and Bernard acts as a living history site of the pre-A.F world, a time before modern urban planning.[cccxlvi] The pueblo town crowning the mesa lacks an ordered plan and public utilities: "the dirt…the piles of rubbish, the dust, the dogs, [and] the flies" of the town parallel the unsanitary conditions of the mid-nineteenth century.[cccxlvii] Even though the Savage has Shakespeare, religion, and a monogamous society, he also has disease, death, close-minded neighbors, and a general lack of wellbeing. If centralization and order epitomize A.F. society, then the Savage Reservation encapsulates a foul reality far removed from the what John describes as "that beautiful, beautiful Other Place...a paradise of goodness and loveliness."[cccxlviii] In describing the inhospitable nature of the Savage Reservation Huxley prevents a certain moralizing about the world before technology and, in doing so, highlights the utopian aspects of the A.F. world: general cleanliness–remember "cleanliness is next to Fordliness"–and a healthy populous.[cccxlix]

Huxley's criticism about urban industrialism aligns with Howard's attempt to limit urban growth; he aimed to utilize the very powers that brought about the great industrial city to restrain it. By using rail systems to connect smaller, more contained satellite towns he meant to reduce urban populations and thereby decentralize the metropolis. In doing so, Howard recognized the dual capabilities of science. The great power of railroads may have created the leviathan of the industrial city, but it could also be utilized to hinder its growth. Huxley's future shares Howard's recognition that an engagement with technology must be brought about to restrain its effects. Mond, in particular, notes that technology held a quality that "is as dangerous as its benefit"; he continues to note that if the World State acted to "carefully limit [its] scope" then science could bring about the "stablest equilibrium in history."[cccl] Partially, Huxley achieves this equilibrium by organizing London as the central city oriented around suburban satellite cities.

Howard aimed to firstly stabilize large urban areas by decentralizing them and breaking them into smaller, more contained entities. Peter Batchelor summarizes Howard's urban plan presented in *Garden Cities of To-morrow*: a populous would radiate around a central urban space (with populations averaging around 58,000); the urban core would be surrounded "satellite cities" or garden cities (towns of 32,000 which would act as residential hybrids between city and country); finally, both the central city and the nearby garden cities would utilize "permanent agricultural belts" that would frame each city to prevent "further urban growth and an agricultural hinterland for the city."[cccli] Such agricultural belts, also known as "greenbelts," acted as natural borders to physically restrain a city's growth. Therefore, in Howard's view, industry would strike a balance with nature, containing growth while promoting both industry and agriculture.[ccclii]

Nevertheless, Howard also recognized the importance of an urban core. Robert Fishman notes that though Howard meant to alter London, he also "deeply valued the social qualities of the great cities."[cccliii] "Each city may be regarded as a magnet," Howard states, "each person a needle."[cccliv] Therefore he did not simply intend to disenfranchise the city, but to "redistribute the population in a spontaneous and healthy manner."[ccclv] Howard meant for the central city to anchor satellite towns as well. As seen in *The Three Magnets*, an illustration from *Garden Cities* *of To-morrow*, Howard desired to achieve an equilibrium by balancing the interests of town, city, and country. By connecting garden cities, industrial sites, and the countryside to the central city by highways and railways, citizens could enjoy the best of urban and rural life.

The Garden City in *Brave New World*

Huxley positions the controlled technologies of A.F. society as evidence of a greater urban plan, a plan to balance industry with stability. When analyzed in detail, the first chapters of *Brave New World* show the influence of Howard's city plan on Greater London. Erika Gottlieb notes, as a simple point of curiosity, that Huxley begins his novel with a panoramic view of the city: "the first six chapters introduce the Brave New World of London 651 AF, as it were from a bird-eye, without establishing the emotional or a perceptual focus that usually comes with the reader's identifying with the central character."[ccclvi] Gottlieb, like many critics and readers alike, find this structure odd, but Huxley purposely uses this early section to diagram a model of Howard's plan from an aerial perspective.

Huxley uses Bernard's air journeys via helicopter as an opportunity to detail the topography of the region. Traveling from London with Henry, her lover at the moment, Lenina describes the "six kilometre zone of park-land that separated Central London from its first ring of satellite suburbs"[ccclvii] Here Huxley utilizes the vocabulary of the Garden City Movement. London, separated by a greenbelt of park-land, centers itself around satellite cities. As their helicopter travels outside London, Huxley, via Lenina and Henry, continues to describe other small regional cities. Lenina views, from inside her helicopter, the geography of Stoke Poges; the landscape she details from above represents the ideal garden city. Here, workers of all castes travel to resort towns enjoy country sports. After enjoying a game of obstacle golf Henry and Lenina fly back to London while the lower castes exit beneath them.

Upon first reflection, a desire to marry country and city may seem odd as A.F. society actually "condition[s] the masses to hate the country" and works to "abolish the love of nature."[ccclviii] The Director of the Conditioning Center ironically notes that "we condition [workers] to love all country sports," just not the country itself.[ccclix] A.F. society brings nature to the masses it only does so by eradicating the appreciation of it. Country sports only serve the public good as they increase "the tendency to consume transport."[ccclx] Therefore while A.F. citizens venture to the country, acting in accordance to Howard's ideals, they subvert his idealism by rejecting the beauty of nature.

Yet this conditioned desire for country sports leads Henry and Lenina outside of the city, giving the reader a view of the surrounding satellite cities. Such a vantage point allows Huxley to display the manner in which the cities are connected. When flying back to London, Henry and Lenina notice the "departure of one of the light monorail trains which carried the lower caste golfers back from their separate course to the metropolis" of London.[ccclxi] In doing so Huxley emulates Howard's network of municipal railways linking Londoners to surrounding suburban communities.

Though many Londoners, in this case the lower castes, use the rails to travel to the garden city, Stoke Poges also plays host to many permanent residents. While "the ant-like population of [the] lower-caste" crowd the monorail station to go back to London, Lenina points out that garden city residents return home either to the "huge Lower Caste barracks" or "the smaller houses reserved for Alpha and Beta members."[ccclxii] When Huxley positions Stoke Poges as a suburban country resort town, he achieves Howard's aim in bringing about "a marriage between town and country."[ccclxiii] Stoke Poges contains the benefits of town life as dictated by Howard: "its object is, in short, to raise the standard of health and comfort of all true workers of whatever grade-- the means by which these objects are to be achieved being a healthy, natural, and economic combination of town and country life."[ccclxiv]

Furthermore, Henry and Lenina's helicopter ride to allows Huxley to make note of the surrounding greenbelts. Henry pauses the helicopter midair "for a minute or two…above the fading landscape" to make note of the "forest of Burnham Beeches." Here Huxley positions a greenbelt "stretching like a great pool of darkness towards the bright shore of the western sky."[ccclxv] Connected with the parklands of Hederley Park, Black Country Park, and Langley Country Park, Burnham Beeches acts as merely one of a series of greenbelts. These are not simply stand-alone forests since the park-lands put a geographical check on the surrounding satellite cities.

Howard's plan did not merely intend to add parks and greenery as it also meant to restrain the growth of industrial metropolises. He hoped to put "checks" on the "enterprise" of cities thereby limiting their growth.[ccclxvi] To thinkers of the day, the industrial city's thirst for expansion was unquenchable. In 1903 Georg Simmel noted that, in the metropolis, "every gain in dynamic extension becomes a step, not for an equal, but *for a new and larger extension*" whereas "every thread spinning out of the city, ever-new threads grow as if by themselves."[ccclxvii] To thwart the great industrial city Howard meant to dissect the metropolis; in doing so he wished to bring "all the advantages of the most energetic and active town life" and balance them against the "beauty and delight of the country."[ccclxviii]

Huxley also details the industrial and agricultural satellite towns separated by these greenbelts. In the distance, Lenina and Henry hear the "lowing of those thousands of cattle, signifying the agricultural factory at Farnham Royal."[ccclxix] Yet Huxley makes sure to note that they hear the sounds "northwards, beyond and above the trees" of Farnham Park, a greenbelt segregating Farnham Royal from Stokes Poges.[ccclxx] Later, Lenina and Henry follow the path of a lower caste train leading workers from the country to the "majestic buildings of the Slough Crematorium," an industrial site.[ccclxxi] Among the bright lights of the Crematorium the characters see "the dark plain" that surrounds Slough. Again, Huxley positions another area of non-development, a greenbelt.[ccclxxii] When mapping Slough one sees that it falls right beside Windsor Park. As the World State demolished all pre-modern monuments and sites of historical importance, the "dark plain" in this case simply represents a palace-less Windsor Park, utilized as a greenbelt to border the factory city.[ccclxxiii]

Granted, A.F. society has preserved farms purely "for their own sakes" and for the sake of "stability"; since "it takes longer to get food out of the land than out of the factory" natural farms slow down the pace of modern life.[ccclxxiv] Even though technology allows A.F. society to "synthesize every morsel of food" Mond notes that, instead, "we prefer to keep a third of the population on the land."[ccclxxv] In utilizing agriculture in such a manner, Huxley brings Howard's hope for an agricultural renaissance to fruition. The latter theorized that satellite towns would stimulate the rural economy as a "new town population" would demand more farm products; in doing so, Howard hoped to achieve an interdependent relationship between town and country.[ccclxxvi] In the case of A.F. society, agriculture stems not from necessity, but from a desire to slow growth. Though it utilizes the mixed economy desired by Howard, Huxley subverts Howard's ideal of a renewed agriculture system. Howard's "small holdings" and "a body of co-operators" contrasts harshly against Huxley's "great factory" of "thousands of cows."[ccclxxvii] In the case of Farnham Royale Huxley inverts Howard's utopian ideal, replacing the picturesque towns Howard desired with an a beef processing plant.

In orienting suburban London around the Garden City Movement Huxley separates satellite cities by functional use. Here, industrial sites like Slough balance out agricultural ones like Farnham Royal. Huxley achieves such an equilibrium, in particular, by using “belt[s] of country” as geographic buffer zones.[ccclxxviii] As the greenbelts present a topographic border preventing urban sprawl, Huxley emphasizes the stability of the satellite town, but also its dependency on other locals. Linking “constellation[s] of similar cities with road and rapid transit linkages” not only depopulate London, but also allows the citizen of the country to enjoy the benefits of the town and city, and vice versa.[ccclxxix] Thus Huxley positions three distinct satellite towns radiating from London: Slough serves industry, Stoke Poges represents a residential garden city, and Farnham signifies the agricultural country. Each city acts as a self-sustaining entity all while being connected to the center city of London.

Huxley uses Bernard and Lenina’s helicopter rides to present a fully actualized, functioning model of Howard’s urban plan that successfully constrains urban sprawl. While Howard wished to revitalize agriculture through the integration of greenbelts and farm towns, Huxley extended his ideals to create an eco-conscious metropolis that not only depopulates London, but also restrains growth through the use of forest preserves. Admittedly, while Mond notes that country sports like electro-magnetic golf "entail the use of elaborate apparatus....so that they consume manufacture articles as well as transport,” Huxley frames A.F. society’s consumption as restrained, efficient and purposeful.[ccclxxx] From the cremation stacks collecting phosphorus to the consolidated railways that transport the masses, Huxley creates an urban structure that works to conserve resources. Though Howard’s ideals spread to multiple continents, his two experimental towns best reflect his, and Huxley’s, concerns about restraining population growth.

The Garden City After Howard

To house Londoners displaced by the blitz, Parliament, inspired by the success of Welwyn Garden City and Letchworth, passed the New Towns Act (1946), an act that aimed to create mixed use, residential cities, capped at a population of 60,000 and connected to London via railways. Though it led to the dissolvement of the limited companies that publicly owned the townships, the New Towns Act nonetheless preserved Howard's models—while it legally instilled development corporations with the ability to regulate land use and new buildings, Howard's limited companies transplanted their control to these corporations. For instance, Louis de Soissons, appointed by Howard's Welwyn Garden City Ltd. as its chief architect and planner, retained control even after the company handed over control to the Welwyn Garden City Development Corporation.[cccclxxxi] Today, the Welwyn Garden City Society heavily influences local politics to preserve the town's Garden City design. While the Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation replaced its previous public-sector corporation, ownership of the town's structures exists in a trust that reinvests its dividends into the local economy. Therefore, in theory, Letchworth citizens still collectively own the town itself.[cccclxxxii] In doing so, Howard's original vision of a model garden city, even today, remains largely intact in these townships.

However, the subsequent towns inspired by Welwyn Garden City and Letchworth do not act as functioning satellite cities in their own right—whereas Howard envisioned economically independent cities linked to a larger urban core, the post-war cities inspired by the New Towns Act singularly aimed to house displaced Londoners, residents who would still work in the city proper. Mumford notes that Howard did not wish to create suburbs, but "the antithesis of a suburb" that reflected "a more integrated foundation for an effective urban life."[cccclxxxiii] Though purely residential, the first towns, built just outside of London, utilized rail travel until

Parliament revised the New Towns Act (1965) to create even larger suburbs oriented around automobile traffic instead. Rather than preserving the countryside and stimulating rural economies, such suburban spaces constitute the urban sprawl that Howard so emphatically wished to restrain. The destruction of the rural countryside and the government sponsored replacement of greenbelts with pseudo-green spaces, public parks and tree lined cul-de-sacs, offer a pale mirror image of Howard's principles. Yet American Garden Cities, even more than their English brethren, repudiate Howard's ideals and subvert Huxley's desire to create environmentally considerate metropolitan areas.

The Washington DC metropolitan area illustrates the various extents American Garden Cities delineated from their original designs. In 1935 the Resettlement Administration (RA) built Greenbelt, Maryland, a public cooperative city aimed to ease the capital's housing shortage and provide an influx of New Deal construction work. Most paramount, the construction permitted the Federal government to experiment with the creation of a completely self-sustaining community. The first perspective tenants underwent an extensive "tenant selection process" with the aim of curating mixed income residents who desired community engagement.[ccclxxxiv] Greenbelt citizens not only founded Greenbelt Consumer Services, Inc. to cooperatively manage the town's businesses, but also attempted to fight off developers who planned a large scale suburban mall and residential high-rises in the 1950s. Historian Cathy Knepper notes that "Greenbelt residents did not simply react against development, but rather, worked actively for a particular kind of development which they felt would enhance their community."[ccclxxxv]

Yet these efforts largely failed as the construction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway (completed 1954) more than doubled the city's population. Again, in the next decade the Capital Beltway (completed 1961) bisected Greenbelt Park, a bordering forest of more than 1,000 acres managed by the United States National Park Service, and the city itself and, again, the population more than doubled. Due to the road construction eviscerating Greenbelt Park, Greenbelt grew from just over 2,000 residents in 1940 to 18,199 in 1970.[ccclxxxvi] Today, the Greenbelt Historic District preserves the center city as a jewel of Art Deco of co-ops surrounded by pedestrian friendly residential units and parks. Yet the newer development around Greenbelt mirrors the architecture of most Washington suburban cities: vistas of strip malls, parking lots, ticky-tacky suburban homes, and sterile residential high-rises. While Greenbelt citizens have worked to constrain the sprawl that defines much of the DC Metropolitan area over the last 30 years—the population today stands at just under 24,000—developers, rather than citizens, dictated the growth of the community and, in doing so, subverted the RA's utopian ideals.[ccclxxxvii]

In *Brave New World Revisited* Huxley begins his analysis with his most paramount concern, over-population. He stresses that "by the beginning of the twenty-first century" even resource rich countries, like the United States, will face problems if "the problem of numbers [human population] in relation to available resources" continue to grow unrestrained.[ccclxxxviii] While Howard envisioned cooperative communities not unlike Greenbelt, developers moved to capitalize on the livability of his urban plans. The case of Reston, Virginia—a city that *Time* magazine named the most livable city in Virginia in 2018—illustrates the extent in which developers dictate not only urban growth, but also the next generation garden cities.[ccclxxxix]

Though Robert E. Simon founded Reston with environmental and social considerations in mind, his unwillingness to alter his design based on profit lead to his ousting. Simon, influenced by Howard's model garden cities and the New Town Acts (1946) purchased farmlands outside of DC with the goal of creating a city where citizens could work and live in self-contained, green communities. He put a premium on conservationism, as he planned his city against numerous greenbelts. However, unlike the publicly owned Greenbelt Park, his private corporation, the Reston Association, controlled such lands. Therefore, even though Simon outlined his seven founding principles of Reston his last consideration—that "Reston should be a financial success"—proved his undoing.[cccxc]

In 1967, Simon lost control over the Reston Association when, upon facing financial difficulties upon sluggish sales and high construction costs, he accepted a $15 million-dollar loan from Gulf Oil.[cccxci] Gulf Oil forced Simon out and, though it preserved many of his greenbelt spaces, it also developed the Reston Industrial Center, the Reston International Center (a hotel and conference center), and many low to moderate rent residential and commercial spaces. In a 1969 editorial, Restonian Donald Fusaro noted that, though Simon's founding documents dictate that "the focal point of all planning would be on the importance and dignity of the individual," the Reston Association cared little for the individual resident:

> The documents which establish Reston do not support the idea of an open community; they do not serve the idea of a new town in a democracy. They set up a political system which is old, namely, a feudal aristocracy. The effective concept of Reston re-energizes the notion that political power and rights of citizens adhere to those who own land.[cccxcii]

As Gulf Oil managed to make its real estate venture profitable, Reston's population increased more than 500% from 1970 to 1980.[cccxciii]

In response, concerned citizens formed the Reston Citizen Association (RCA) with the aim of preserving Simon's original vision. Though the RCA survives today, its elected council failed in its main goal incorporate the city thereby marginalizing the Reston Association's influence. As a result, when Gulf Oil sold its real estate properties to the Mobil Oil Corporation in 1978, it included 3,700 acres of "undeveloped" greenbelt land. Mobil Oil correctly speculated that the Dulles Toll Road (completed 1984) would greatly increase commercial access to Reston and built numerous commercial parks in former greenbelt areas.[cccxciv] By 1983, for the first time in Reston's history, the number of jobs outweighed Reston's households; therefore, more than 60% of the working population commuted daily.[cccxcv] Gulf Oil sold its Reston real estate to Westbrook Partners LLC in 1994 and though Westbrook built the 460-acre Reston Town Center, a mixed use downtown hub based off of Simon's original 1962 design, it largely ignored Simon's environmental concerns.[cccxcvi] Even with Simon's support Restonians failed to incorporate the city in their most recent 2005 ballot measure. Therefore, corporations still dictate the city's growth. Today only a third of Reston's greenbelt exists and what remains falls under the ownership of the Reston Association. Even more worrisome, Reston, like many satellite-cites in Northern Virginia, act as mere commuter suburbs for DC rather than self-contained live/work communities. Unsurprisingly, the American Lung Association gave Reston's Fairfax County a "F" rating for ozone pollution—pollution that not only makes air unbreathable but contributes to climate change.[cccxcvii]

In 2011, the Reston Association invited a South Korean delegation of architects, investors, and city planners to tour the city.[cccxcviii] In the past, it held such tours for Brazilian planners wishing to expand the suburbs of Brasilia and Chinese envoys hoping to successfully create successful, prefabricated suburban cities. Though Simon, then 97, provided a walking tour of the Lake Anne Village Center, a part of his original construction, attendees oriented their interest towards more recent, profitable developments like the Reston Town Center instead. Therefore, consultants, real estate investors, and members of the Reston Association directed the majority of the tour and its subsequent question and answer forum. Economic considerations, rather than environmental ones, dominated the discussion echoing concerns Huxley expressed in *Island.* In his last novel, Colonel Dipa, a dictator of the neighboring Rendang-Lobo, invades the utopian Pala to take advantage of its oil reserves. Here, the pacifistic, eco-conscious Palanese lose their autonomy in a matter of hours to the intrusive military forces. While not as forceful, real estate speculators, inspired by the economic success of cities like Reston, now usurp provinces once planned with utopia in mind. Unlike the cases of Reston and Greenbelt, Huxley's fictitious metropolitan London balances a thriving economy with conservancy.

Huxley's explicit use of the Garden City Movement, and its success in producing a stable metropolitan region, complicates *Brave New World*'s designation as a work of dystopian literature—or a straightforward utopia for that matter. According to Bradshaw, Huxley's essays show an alignment between the author's opinions and those perpetuated by the A.F. World State. Admittedly, in many cases, his claim rings true. By limiting the growth of London through the incorporation of Howard's design, Huxley provides a solution to the concerns expressed in "What Is Happening to Our Population" (1934) and "A Note on Eugenics" (1932). Bradshaw underestimates the element that made Huxley both great and confounding to his critics: the element that Jerome Meckier calls his strength of "intellectual detachment."[cccxcix] Though Huxley illustrates a world that suppresses art and individualism, he constructs an urban structure that balances economic growth with one of his chief concerns, natural preservation.

The City as Machine

The functionality of A.F. London stems from Huxley's embrace of Howard's urban plans; he attests that the symbiotic relationship between cities separated by function aids their continued coexistence. While the World State does much to organize raw materials and labor with the aim of productivity in mind, the government seeks stability over economic advancement. Such a consideration remains important since Henry Ford's own industrial success stemmed from, in part, his ability to improve consistent work practices through the installation of 8-hour workdays and worker training. However, when Ford attempted to supplant his industrial ideals deep in the Amazon, his efforts proved disastrous. Ignorant of the knowledge that different commercial centers need each one another to create a cohesive system of economic exchange, Ford attempted to create a city with one goal in mind: the production of rubber for Ford automobiles.

Deep in the forests of Brazil, in a land still flooded by the green of tropical trees, Henry Ford went about building a model American town. Founded in 1928 off the banks of the Rio Tapajós and more than two hundred miles from the closest town, Santarem, Ford envisioned Fordlandia producing a cheap source of rubber for the Model T. Furthermore, he wished to import a Fordian work ethic: "We are not going to South America," he proclaimed, "to make money but to help develop that wonderful and fertile land…[and] we'll train the Brazilians and they'll work as well as any others."[cd] Yet by 1931, despite Ford's uncompromising belief in his own ingenuity, the *India Rubber Journal* wrote: "never has such a vast scheme been entered in such a lavish manner and with so little to show for the money."[cdi] For a plethora of reasons—mismanagement, a complete failure to understand the process of growing rubber trees, widespread malaria, an imposition of the Ford's strict eight-hour workday during peak heat hours in summer—the site eventually closed. Today the forest has reclaimed Fordlandia, making it a ghost town in a sea of green.

In short, the experiment proved a failure; yet the death knell did not actually come from any of the predicaments listed above. The problem with Fordlandia and its sister site Belterra was one of planning: not managerial or agricultural planning as one might easily suspect, but one of urban planning.[cdii] Admittedly the sites, that by 1940 contained about three thousand inhabitants combined, do not constitute an urban space in their own right. Rather Fordlandia acted as a satellite city that, while independent in its own right, needed engagement and support from a larger metropolitan anchor. Due to a poorly laid plan, Fordlandia failed to flourish.

In this case, the satellite city of Fordlandia proved unstable because it was too far removed from its intended center: the great site of Ford's automobile plant, the River Rouge Complex in Dearborn, Michigan. At first glance the two sites, one a relatively small agricultural plantation and the other a major site of industry, have little in common other than the fact that both opened in 1928. Yet Fordlandia and Belterra mirrored Dearborn's purpose in supporting a larger urban core. While many of Ford's workers both lived and worked in Dearborn, Detroit—a mere 9 miles away—anchored the industrial city, serving as a cultural and trading center for the surrounding area. Constant engagement between the two sites brought about a mutual dependence between the two for jobs, workers, and goods. Fordlandia and Belterra, the latter actually being nicknamed "Dearborn in the Jungle," had no such fortune. The sites' function, to produce rubber, required a climate far removed from Michigan. However, such a reality meant that the sites could not form a bond, in terms of trade or social engagement, with the complex it was meant to support. Therefore, Fordlandia and Belterra did not act as true satellite cities: the failure of these detached spaces—unable to form a connection with their intended center—emphasis the vital nature of such a symbiotic relationship.[cdiii]

At the same time Ford's workers inaugurated these sites Aldous Huxley began, in 1931, writing *Brave New World,* a work that critiques the successes, not the failures, of Henry Ford. Remarking upon the dangers of machine-like sentimentality, the assembly line, and seeing workers as mere commodities, his novel subverts the very elements that made the industrialist, and sites like the River Rogue Complex, fruitful. Emphasizing the impact of Fordian principles, Huxley's future uses the creation of the assembly line as its Genesis narrative.

Stability in this case comes about via a manufactured caste system ranging from Alphas to Epsilons. Assembly lines produce bottled babies who become workers of the A.F. state: born of single eggs, Alphas and Betas develop naturally to become managers and leaders; lower castes, to create uniform working units, begin as Bokanovskied eggs, eggs that undergo mitosis up to ninety-six times to create uniform twin groups, and then are physically and mentally retarded with alcohol and X-rays. Education centers process—foster seems too warm of a word—members of all castes. In these centers, as Huxley's description of the Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Centre illustrates in the novel's opening, the state socially and mentally conditions children through electro-shock and sleep teaching.[cdiv] Thus, the state primes A.F. children, both behaviorally and physically, to operate in accordance with their respective roles in society.

Huxley's Interest in Modern Architecture

At first glance Huxley, who held no particular attachment to revival styles, does not appear to be an obvious detractor of modern design. In *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, John Ruskin, advocating English Neo-Gothicism, claims that the "architecture of a nation" should be " as universal and as established as its language."[cdv] While Huxley admits that "Gothic architecture" and "handicraft" constitutes "admirable thing[s]," he also claims that modern practices of such beliefs " [gave] birth to monsters."[cdvi] Heavily implemented from the mid-nineteenth century to the advent of World War One, Ruskin's nationalistic brand of Neo-Gothicism not only dotted England, but also permeated throughout the English-speaking world.

In Huxley's first novel, his characters bask in the grandeur of a grand English country house. Yet, even by 1921, Huxley's protagonist describes the Great House as "so quaint, so old-world."[cdvii] When writing an introduction to a book on modern typology in 1928, Huxley claimed, that in 20th century, one cannot hold a Ruskin-like devotion to the individual stone or handicraft:

> It has become obvious that the machine is here to stay. Whole armies of William Morrises and Tolstoys could not now expel it…The sensible thing to do is not to revolt against the inevitable, but to use and modify it, to make it serve your purposes. Machines exist; let us then exploit them to create beauty- a modern beauty, while we are about it. For we live in the twentieth century; let us frankly admit it and not pretend that we live in the fifteenth. [cdviii]

Here, Huxley rejects the notions of architectural Luddites and the nostalgic fantasies of utopian works like *News from Nowhere* (1890). Rather, he believes that "the benefits of mechanization and mass-production are so self-evident that they no longer require defense," thus making any defense of handicraft obsolete.[cdix] He declares that designers must recognize the power of the machine, and, in doing so, must adapt and harness the machine for public good.

For Huxley did not so much object to what Ruskin advocated 70 years earlier; rather, he found twentieth century imitations particularly horrific. In *After Many a Summer Dies the Swan* (1936) Jeremy Portage, crossing a moat via a "ferro-concrete bridge" with an automatic gate, witnesses such a monster in the form of Hollywood millionaire Jo Stoyt's "insolently enormous" castle.[cdx] Huxley pointedly models "the Object," as Portage calls it, off of Hearst Castle (1919-1947).[cdxi] In 1915, Hearst commissioned Julia Morgan, an architect and accomplished civil engineer, to build a bungalow for him on his San Simeon Estate. Soon, the project ballooned.

In building the Casa Grande alone, the central structure of the complex, Morgan designed a 60,645 square foot castle from a pastiche of historic architectural styles—including, but not limited to, a Spanish Revival exterior, a Neo-Gothic dining room, a Neoclassical outdoor pool (the Neptune Pool), and an indoor saltwater pool modeled after the Baths of Caracalla (the Roman Pool).[cdxii] Not unlike Stoyt's technologically advanced castle, Hearst's estate included modern amenities and even a highly complex gravity-based water delivery system designed by Morgan herself.[cdxiii] The construction of Hearst Castle—marked by continual design changes (the Neptune pool alone was built, deconstructed, and redesigned three times)—is best understood in terms of Lefebvre's third formant of capitalist space: the phallic formant. The '"phallic formant" "symbolizes force, male fertility, masculine violence," according to Lefebvre, "with the goal of progress."[cdxiv] In Huxley's fiction, the material nature of the structure mirrors the personality of Stoyt, a self-made man desperately holding onto life. He expresses this not only through his phallic Gothic towers, but also through his sentiments of "the most violent eroticism" with "his baby," Virginia—a love that he eventually leads him to murder.[cdxv]

Hearst Castle represents a kind of exuberant swan song for the Great House as, by the 1920s, such costly structures were becoming largely anachronistic. As detailed further in the following chapter, architects like Le Corbusier simply wished to speed up the process. He took the Great House's historicism, palatial size, familial ties, and revival architecture and created a modern foil: the glass box. In a radical departure from the revival styles of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, his International Style freed itself from historicism, creating new structures that utilized the "latest [in] machine production."[cdxvi] The Villa Savoye (1928) serves as a prime example of the International Style and, particularly, Le Corbusier's five points of architecture: freestanding support pillars (pilotis) to elevate the ground floor, an open floor plan, minimalistic facades, large horizontal windows, and a roof garden.[cdxvii] In the Villa Savoye, he creates a house "totally machine-like and functional without any alliance to an individual's personal style, the site's natural surroundings, or regional style."[cdxviii][cdxix]

Not unlike Zamyatin's Ancient House in *We* (1921), Le Corbusier saw the individual home and homeowner as an entity of the past. He wished to herald in the age of the unit, the single cell that only gained significance within the larger social body:

> We, must never, in our studies, lose sight of the perfect human "cell," the cell which corresponds most perfectly to our physiological and sentimental needs. We must arrive at the 'house-machine,' which must be both practical and emotionally satisfying and designed for a succession of tenants. The idea of the 'old home' disappearing and with it local architecture, etc, for labour will shift about as needed, and must be ready to move, bad and baggage.[cdxx]

Huxley's future holds equal distain for the home, introducing the concept of the individual home as foreign. "And do you know what a 'home' was?" muses Mustpha Mond in *Brave New World*'s opening montage; "Home, home," he answers, "a few small rooms, stifling over-inhabited by a man, by a periodically teeming woman, by a rabble of boys and girls of all ages. No air, no space; an under-sterilized prison; darkness, disease, and smells."[cdxxi] In *We* the Ancient House constitutes a simple relic from the past; to the cellular structure of A.F. society, the private home—and by extension the implication of a private life—acts like a gangrenous cluster contaminating the larger social body.

Seeing Le Corbusier as "the archetypal modernist architect" Huxley "ridiculed what he saw as the "antiseptic, mechanical, unforgiving qualities of modernism that he felt leave the inhabitants exposed and uncomfortable."[cdxxii] For Le Corbusier did not see people inhabiting buildings: William McDonough notes that Le Corbusier's designs constitute the "terrifying prospect" of architects "now design[ing] for the machine and not for people."[cdxxiii] Just as the A.F. society denoted people as "drops within the Social River," the architect balked at individuality and he envisioned a conglomerate of cells creating a larger social organism: "Architecture? Town planning?....[Only] the logical study of the cell and its functions in relation to the mass may furnish a solution rich in results." [cdxxiv][cdxxv]

Le Corbusier and the Rise of the International Style

Le Corbusier saw the machine as *the* paramount fixture of his ideology and believed that people must contort themselves to fit the new age of the machine. He boldly declared that "architecture is bound up with the social transition."[cdxxvi] Just as Georges-Eugene Haussmann transformed the Second Empire capital, Le Corbusier wished to standardize the 20th century city with steel-frame towers. Yet, for change to truly take foot, Le Corbusier recognized that the inhabitants of such spaces must radically adapt to fit their environment. Fishman notes that Le Corbusier believed that citizens of the city "must create a collective consciousness, a spontaneous sense of participation and union" where the individual feels a sense of community.[cdxxvii] Furthermore, he believed that "this great transformation cannot be imposed from above," as it must arise "from the individual's feeling of belonging to 'a world reborn'" whereas "collective consciousness" becomes the "highest achievement of the new order[cdxxviii]." To paraphrase, Le Corbusier's new world order could only come about in a world where, in Huxley's words, "everyone belongs to everyone else."[cdxxix]

Importantly, the minimalism of the machine aesthetic allows such buildings to transcend national boundaries. The boundlessness of the International Style remained a point of contention for Huxley. He noted that "in 3000 AD one will doubtless be able to travel from Kansas City to

Peking in a few hours;" however, such a journey would not be needed "if the civilization of these two places is the same."[cdxxx] Such a remark reminds one of Lenina and Bernard's vacation to America. While the exotic Indian reservation excites Bernard, Lenina relishes in Sante Fe's "liquid air, television, vibro-vacuum massage, radio, boiling caffeine solution, hot contraceptives, and eight different kinds of scent"—the very hallmarks of civilization that she enjoys in London.[cdxxxi]

Lenina's marked expectations mirror those of postwar American tourist. Hilton Hotels famously implemented the International Style to mark the age of post-war prosperity. Promising all the amenities of an American hotel, Hilton's landmark hotels in cities like Istanbul and Mexico City rejected all notions of regional style. Instead, directly influenced by Le Corbusier's 5 points, the Hilton Hotel Istanbul and the Continental Hilton in Mexico City were built with raised pilotis structures, white exterior walls with horizontal glass walls, and doomed with a rooftop gardens and nightclubs.[cdxxxii] Though placed on different continents, the hotels are decidedly similar in aesthetic. Here, minimalist architecture sterilizes the travel experience. Though it offers stability, it replaces cultural dynamism with comfortable familiarity.

Yet, the loss of regional style represents only a minor fatality in Le Corbusier's quest of modernization: he wished to enact his ideals on a much larger stage. Three years later, in his book *Towards an Architecture*, Le Corbusier discussed the need to reconstruct cities. In it, he boldly declares that "WE MUST BUILD ON A CLEAR SITE! The city of today is dying because it is not constructed geometrically."[cdxxxiii] Efficiency, clear lines, and functional organization defined his ideal city. Just as Haussmann replaced the winding roads of medieval Paris with large boulevards, Le Corbusier emphasized the need to build from scratch. In his plans, he wished to express a "disjunction from the surrounded city [by segregating] the new

Utopian space of the modern from the degraded and fallen city fabric."[cdxxxiv] He openly advocates what *Brave New World* calls a "campaign against the past;" just as A.F. London was built after "the closing of museums" and the "blowing up of historical monuments" Le Corbusier's modern city would rise only after the utter destruction of the old-world city.[cdxxxv]

Towards an Architecture shares its publication date with the debut of Le Corbusier's plan for *The Contemporary City for Three Million Inhabitants*, or the *Ville Contemporaine.* Unveiled at the Salon d' Automne, Le Corbusier's plan hyperbolizes order and efficiency, creating a cold, industrial city. In *Ville Contemporaine*, Le Corbusier intended to create the ultimate geometrical metropolis. He constructs his urban space with a stringent grid pattern and segregates zones depending on functional use. The result is an impersonally rational city, free of dynamism and social contact. Not unlike Howard, he segregates the city's high-rise administrative center, the outerborough lower-rise residential barracks, and suburban industrial sites by surrounding them with park space. Thus, he uses green belts to separates factories, business centers, and residential structures.[cdxxxvi] And while he integrates gardens within this urban landscape, the grid gashes an obvious line between urbanity and untouched country. Le Corbusier's inner city remarkably mirrors Huxley's "huge table-topped buildings" which sprout like "a bed of geometrical mushrooms…from the green of park and garden."[cdxxxvii]

Le Corbusier's influence on *Brave New World*'s London

To early modern architects, the geometrical form acted as Messiah as modular design contained the chaos of human experience. Le Corbusier believed that a successful urban layout could guarantee a functional society just like a schematic could express the inner workings of a machine. He relishes in the fact that his city hinders the pedestrian and limits human interaction, an element touched upon in *Brave New World* with Bernard's difficult in finding walking companions. In *Ville Contemporaine*, large roadways and aerial landing spaces at the city center and tops of buildings connect office buildings, mass housing, and industry. The same can be seen in *Brave New World.* After finishing her work shift, Lenina travels via elevator to the top of the Conditioning Center and sees “towers gleamed between the trees,” emulating how Le Corbusier distanced his high-rises with green belts to provide for optimal sunlight.[cdxxxviii] In the next instance, Lenina notices the monumental roadways being constructed around the monumental skyscrapers:

> The buildings of the Hounslow Feely Studio covered seven and a half hectartes. Near them a black and khaki army of labourers was busy revitrifying [sic] the surface of the Great West Road. One of the huge travelling crucibles was being tapped as they flew over. The molten stone poured out in a stream of dazzling incandescence across the road; the asbestos rollers came and went; at the tail of an insulated watering cart the steam rose in white clouds.[cdxxxix]

Just as the assembly line standardized goods, Le Corbusier, like Huxley, uses transportation to increase consumption and separate the castes: Alphas and Beta use helicopters, and roadways and trains are reserved for the lower castes.[cdxl] Le Corbusier treats people like the nuts and bolts of a city; if arranged in a certain manner, he believed that society would harmoniously tick in unison.

Le Corbusier, a well-known opponent of urban sprawl, leveled his criticism not one the suburbs spreading across Europe and America in the 1920s. Rather, he critiqued the city center itself. To him, the metropolis lagged far beyond its technological capabilities. Writing about New York in 1947, he noted that “it astounds a visitor to learn that Manhattan, bristling with skyscrapers, has an average building height of four and one-half stories. Do you realize that: *four* *and one-half stories*."[cdxli] Le Corbusier desired to concentrate the urban center with the high-rise as his major tool:

> The skyscraper is an instrument. A magnificent instrument for the concentration of population, for getting rid of land congestion, for classification for internal efficiency. A prodigious means of improving the conditions of work, a creator of economies and, through that, a dispenser of wealth. But the skyscraper as plume, multiplied over the area of Manhattan, has disregarded experience. The New York skyscrapers are out of line with the rational skyscraper.[cdxlii]

In essence, Le Corbusier saw the small-scale skyscraper as a leach on the city, "suck[ing] the life out of the neighboring areas," by reducing population and "destroy[ing] circulation" by clogging the gridded roadways.[cdxliii] He envisioned a city dotted with monumental skyscrapers which used high speed roadways and air pads for transportation. He founded his beliefs of urban planning on the paradox that "we must decongest the centers of our cities by increasing their density."[cdxliv] In doing so, Le Corbusier believed that cities would dually become decongested and spatially open for the benefit of its residents.

In the novel's opening, Huxley makes light of the Le Corbusier's love for monumentality when he describes the Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Center as "a squat grey building of *only* thirty-four stories."[cdxlv] Throughout the novel, he distinguishes each building in A.F. London, no matter its use, in terms of size and capacity: "Henry's forty-story apartment in Westminster;" "the Internal and External Secretions factory glared with a fierce electric brilliance from every window of its twenty stories;" "The various Bureau of Propaganda and the College of Emotional Engineering were housed in a single sixty-story building;" "The Park Lane Hospital for the Dying was a sixty-story tower of primrose tiles."[cdxlvi] Other than capacity, Huxley does little to distinguish between the architecture of home and work. The population of A.F. London works in monolithic skyscrapers and goes home to high-rise barracks. All buildings, regardless of use, function as machines for living. Le Corbusier's *Ville Contemporaine*, a gridded system of cruciform towers, joking becomes Huxley's Henry Ford inspired T-shaped skyscrapers.

Huxley also jokingly critiques the honeycomb design of *Ville Contemporaine* in *Brave New World*'s opening scene.[cdxlvii] In London, Huxley's positions the populace as worker bees, conditioned to labor enthusiastically. When returning to London from America, Bernard faces the "buzz, buzz" of a "hive…humming, busily, joyfully."[cdxlviii] Though Huxley describes his future society as insects, he simultaneously acknowledges that a hive does not embody man's natural state. Huxley admits in *Brave New World Revisited* that "biologically speaking" man is a "creature more like a wolf…than a bee or an ant" as "human societies [be] no resemblance to the hive or the ant heap;" rather, Huxley declares, human society travels in "packs."[cdxlix] Therefore Huxley's "utopian" worker society actually parallels the inhuman nature of the Le Corbusier's *Ville Contemporaine*. Neither is not built for mankind, but for machine productivity: "the machine turns, turns, and must keep turning," Mond notes, "it is death if it stands still."[cdl] Here, Mond literally means physical death. In A.F. society, all life centers around machine. If it ceased to function, Mond notes that starvation and chaos would ensue. Yet for the machine to properly function, man must subvert his natural state, becoming slave to the machine. As a mere extension of the machine, the industrial city acted as a slave camp, yoking its bees to the hive.

Most importantly, in Huxley's view, modern architecture potentially risked one's connection to the past. In *Puritanism in Art* Huxley attacked modern architecture's rejection of historicism, not because Huxley distained novelty, but because he abhorred modernism's growing detachment from human centralism:

> The Cubists and other Pharisees of modern architecture refuse to admit the existence of such trifles as national traditions, long-established habits and the congenial peculiarities of human nature. For them, man is made for modern technique, not modern technique for man. Thus, in the name of modern technique, Le Corbusier would compel us all to inhabit a mixture of green-house and hospital ward, furnished in the style of a dentist's operating chamber.[cdli]

Huxley "was most offended by [Le Corbusier's] hostility to the past and his pretensions to utopian rationality."[cdlii] In his essay "Love, Sex, and Physical Beauty" Huxley describes his attachment to tradition; here, he does not hold tradition dear for the sake of nostalgia. Rather, he notes that history binds together the human race as an unchanging whole:

> Human nature does not change, or, at any rate, history is too short for any changes to be perceptible. The earliest known specimens of art and literature are still comprehensible. The fact that we can understand them all and can recognize in some of them an unsurpassed artistic excellence is proof enough that not only men's feelings and instincts, but also their intellectual and imaginative powers, were in the remotest times precisely what they are now.[cdliii]

Yet, in *Brave New World*, tradition is extinguished with the Fordian phrase "history is bunk."[cdliv] With the dawn of the industrial age, human-centric construction seems just as blasé as the horse and carriage.

Granted, Huxley's future London changes radically due to technological advances. The reader of *Brave New World* even may feel inclined to parallel the technological revolution of the nineteenth century to the advanced machineries found in the work. However, A.F. society utilizes technology in quite a different manner. While the novel dazzles in describing innovative advancements—the personal helicopters used for transportation, the Bokanovskied cells that produce underling workers, the feelies that expand on talkies to bring touch to movie viewers—the future world epitomizes order and planning. Huxley even titles the leader of such a world not in terms of president, prime minister, or even factory boss: he instead denotes the head of the World State as the World Controller. Accentuating how the future applies science, World Controller Mustapha Mond notes that strict order, not advancement, acts as the overriding principle of technology. Here a technocratic order, Huxley's World State, works against producing a technological revolution so that the "machine turns" at a constant and unwavering rate.[cdlv]

Yet like his grandfather Thomas Henry Huxley, known as "Darwin's Bulldog" for his fierce advocacy of evolution, Huxley did not shy away from the modern age. Instead he visited industrial sites to better understand new technologies. In "Sight-Seeing in Alien Englands" he details the "nearly perfect" Bellingham factory and describes the "well-organized factory" as a "work of art"; here, "the technicians and the organizers are the artists of industry" conducting the "workman" who acts as a "movingly beautiful…instrument."[cdlvi] However, Huxley positions the workers, not the owners, as worthy of praise. He particularly feared that industrial power, wielded by a few strong capitalists, not only "resulted in the centralization" of the urban populous, but also has encouraged "complete dependence upon a few private capitalists and their managers."[cdlvii]

Though Huxley exalted the well-organized factory he remained wary of consolidated industry. More than a decade later, in *Science, Liberty, and Peace* (1946), he detailed his apprehension that " [industrial] enterprise…conducted by private individuals" would result in "the location of factories, the building of quarters for the workers" and "even the supply of water and the collection of garbage" organized "exclusively by private enterprise seeking…private profit."[cdlviii] In praising the Bellingham factory he lauds the workers, those working inside the hive. Too often in the factory system, according to Huxley, owners ignored utilitarian ethics as profits trumped the social good.

To Huxley the International Style's interest in homogenization and rapid modernization rejects the dynamic nature of the urban space. Rather, its interests lie with the machine, with efficiency, with clean design, but not with serving humankind. Huxley recognizes the importance of a shared past, be it in architecture, literature, or religion. Often utopias look so far ahead into the horizon that they see nothing else but the indistinct line of the future. Le Corbusier, like A.F. society, looked down upon the past and decided to begin again: "Whisk- and those specks of antique dirt called Athens and Rome, Jerusalem, and the Middle Kingdom- all were gone. Whisk- the place where Italy had been was empty. Whisk, the cathedrals; whisk, whisk, King Lear and the Thoughts of Pascal. Whisk, Passion; whish Requiem; whisk, Symphony; whisk…"[cdlix] Yet, by rejecting historicism, and placing faith in mechanization, Le Corbusier did society a disservice. For the past does not simply lay ideal, instead it echoes forward. In *Architecture and the City*, Aldo Rossi argues that a city of old and new structures allows citizens a sense of collective memory, where old structures speak to the present.[cdlx] The dialogue may be positive or negative, but older structures remind humankind of an age before the machine. In *Brave New World,* Huxley does not mean to propagate a sense of pre-industrial nostalgia. Rather, with the dawn of the machine age, he reminds his readers that the past grants us of a collective sense of humanity. A complete revolution under the machine distances one from their past and their own humanity. Huxley unfalteringly notes that “once the machine” has been given control one “must function not as they like, but as it likes.”[cdlxi]

At his novel’s end, Huxley uses the death of John Savage to make it clear that even an outside element, seemingly a catalyst of change, does little to alter the A.F. way of life. Though John’s suicide gives the novel a sense of finality, an instance emerges in the very middle of the work that emphasizes the success of the World State’s design. After John arrives in London, Lenina, day dreaming about him while working in a bottling center, forgets to immunize a fetus with African sleeping sickness. Huxley shifts to an omniscient point of view that immediately transports the reader into the future—"Twenty-two years, eight months, and four days from that moment" to be precise—where the fetus in question, "a promising young Alpha-Minus administrator,” dies of sleeping sickness.[cdlxii] While Huxley uses this instance to provide a macabre laugh highlighting the assembly line’s impact on A.F. citizens, he also uses this moment to demonstrate the continued proliferation, via a minor failure, of the World State. Granted, the World State benefits from Howard’s Garden City Design as it not only supports workers, but as it also creates an environmental equilibrium with the world at large. Though he creates an anti-utopian state free from hunger, rising seas, displaced peoples, and the other numerous ravages of climate change that our future holds, Huxley criticizes the banality of the mechanized age, As a social body, A.F. citizenry, literally made to suit Le Corbusier’s monolithic designs, derides the elements of individualism and intellectualism that Huxley actively supported. Ultimately, the success of Huxley’s urban design makes his future frightening. Unlike *1984*, with the suggested hope of a Prole uprising, or Jack London’s *The Iron Heel* (1908), where the Brotherhood eventually carries out a Socialist revolution, the World State keeps turning, turning, turning—a testament to its thought-out design.

[ccci] Dante Alighieri, *The Divine Comedy*, trans. Robert Kirkpatrick (New York: Penguin Classics, 2013), 14.

[cccii] Alighieri, *The Divine Comedy*, 230.

[ccciii] Even works that go beyond reading *Brave New World* alongside *Men Like Gods* still analyze Huxley's novel against Wellsian works. See: Gorman Beauchamp, "All's Well that Ends Wells: The Anti-Wellsian Satire of *Brave New World*," *Utopian Studies* 2 (1989): 14. Here, Beauchamp argues that since imagery found in *Brave New World* can also be found in the end of *Crome Yellow* (1921), Huxley most certainly must be subverting *A Modern Utopia* (1905) instead of *Men Like Gods* (1923); Gregory Claeys, "The Origins of Dystopia: Wells, Huxley, and Orwell," in *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*, ed. Gregory Claeys (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 107. Claeys notes that the horrors of World War I created an "age of confusion" among "the hopeful, dream-like state of Victorian optimism" found in Wells' novels; David Bradshaw, "Open Conspirators: Huxley and H.G. Wells 1927-35," in *The Hidden Huxley*, ed. David Bradshaw (London: Faber and Faber, 1994), 33; Here Huxley's use of Wells' link is expanded upon; Bradshaw argues that both Wells and Huxley actually paralleled each other in their belief that "the eventual rejection of failed democratic systems and the establishment of a world government to be managed by a scientifically trained elite."'

[ccciv] Aldous Huxley to G. Wilson Knight, 15 Sept 1931, in *The Letters of Aldous Huxley*, ed. Grover Smith (New York: Chatto & Windus, 1969), 348.

[cccv] George Woodcock, *Dawn and the Darkest Hour: A Study of Aldous Huxley* (New York: Viking, 1972), 173.

[cccvi] H.W. Richardson, "The Economic Significance of the Depression in Britain," *Journal of Contemporary History* 4.4 (1969): 10.

[cccvii] Huxley, *Brave New World*, 3.

[cccviiicccviii] "The motto of the New World State- COMMUNITY, IDENTITY, STABILITY- deliberately, and ironically, evokes the motto of the first French Republic" states Firchow; to Huxley, the French Revolution presented the "first of many democratic revolutions that will fail." See: Peter Firchow, "Utopian and the End of History: Huxley, Fukuyama, Marcuse," in *Modern Utopian Fictions from H.G. Wells to Iris Murdoch* (Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 2001) 77.

[cccix] Set in A.F. London, Huxley forms his principle characters from members of the upper castes. Bernard Marx acts as the initial protagonist who, though an Alpha, feels distance from his peers. Helmholtz Watson, an Alpha-Plus lecturer and Bernard's best friend, represents the ideal man except for the fact that he overachieves. Eventually the novel introduces its true protagonist John Savage, the unconditioned offspring of a Beta and an Alpha, who provides explicit commentary about the negative aspects of the future. Lenina Crown, a vivacious Beta, acts as a love interest and falls in love with John. Throughout the novel Mustapha Mond, the Resident World Controller of Western Europe, acts as a guide for the reader by detailing the nature of the A.F. world.

[cccx] John Chamberlain, "Aldous Huxley's Satirical Model T World," review of *Brave New World,* by Aldous Huxley, *The New York Times*, Feb 7 1932. Web. 5 Feb 2018.

[cccxi] Nicholas Murray*, Aldous Huxley* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2002), 135. Nevertheless, according to Murray, it sold a very respectable 13,000 copies in its first run.

[cccxii] Joseph Bentley characterizes Huxley's early novels as emotionally distant and declares that "the Savage's self-flagellations in *Brave New World,* like his suicide, are abstract events,

---

painless because lacking in specific detail." John Wain characterizes him as a "pseudo-novelist," not to slight him, "but merely to describe an author who finds himself" using overly simplified characters "to attack materialism." Francis Wyndham notes that while the work "may well prove to be Mr. Huxley's most lasting book," its "purely satirical and brilliantly prophetic" nature also constitutes his "last destructive work," that is a work without a constructive conclusion. Such criticism occurs in a collection of essays *honoring* the writer's memory. Here his admirers designate the work as a piece of simple social dystopian satire. See: *Aldous Huxley, 1894-1963: A Memorial Volume*, ed. Julian Huxley (New York: Harper & Row, 1965).

[cccxiii] Wain, "Tracts Against Materialism*,"* in *Aldous Huxley* 8.

[cccxiv] David Bradshaw, "Introduction," in *The Hidden Huxley*, ed. David Bradshaw (London: Faber and Faber, 1994), vi.

[cccxv] Theodor Adorno, "Aldous Huxley and Utopia," *Prisms* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1981), 97-98. To Adorno, Huxley's utopia is particularly problematic. He notes that Huxley saw a society at a point of decision in the 1930s: in the face of "calamity….humanity is placed before the choice between regression to a mythology questionable even to Huxley" (113-114). In such a view he mirrors Bradshaw in claiming that *Brave New World*, and its use of a mechanized caste system, represents a positive ideal for Huxley.

[cccxvi] Maartjen Schermer, "*Brave New World* versus *Island* — Utopian and Dystopian Views on Psychopharmacology." *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy* 10, no. 2 (2007): 119-28.

[cccxvii] Schermer, *"Brave New World* Versus *Island*," 127.

[cccxviii] Importantly, both *Island* and *Brave New World* found their societies on utopian ideals. Like *Island*, *Brave New World* astutely explores issues faced by Huxley's own milieu: concerns of social and political stability, economy, population control, and the wellbeing of his fellow man. However, while each utilizes similar technology, the societies they produce distinguish the works. *Brave New World* mirrors the utopian *Island*: both works orient themselves around a similar point of origin, utopian beliefs, but produce opposing ends. In doing so, the resulting A.F. society represents, not a dystopia, but an anti-utopia.

[cccxix] In the future "all crosses had their tops cut and became T's" as Ford replaced Christ as a godhead. See: Huxley, *Brave New World*, 58.

[cccxx] *Brave New World* mentions Russia and England battling in particular, but the overall suggestion is that the Nine Years' War constitutes a total world war with all world powers involved.

[cccxxi] Huxley, *Brave New World*, 205.

[cccxxii] Ibid 202.

[cccxxiii] A.J.P. Taylor, *English History: 1914-1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 299.

[cccxxiv] Murray, *Aldous Huxley*, 169.

[cccxxv] *Brave New World* eradicates families and creates a caste system, answering population concerns brought up in Huxley's essays "A Note on Eugenics" (1932) and "What is Happening to Our Population?" (1934); mass consumerism replaces art as noted in "Boundaries of Utopia" (1931) and "The Outlook for American Culture: Some Reflections on a Machine Age" (1927); a technocratic society supplants democracy, answering concerns about the democratic system brought about in "Science and Civilisation" (1932) and "Forewarned is Not Forearmed" (1931).

[cccxxvi] Aldous Huxley, "Industrial Progress and Social Stability," *Between the Wars*, ed. David Bradshaw (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1994), 125.

[cccxxvii] Andrew Saint, "'Spread the People': The LCC's Dispersal Policy, 1889-1965," *Politics and People of London*, ed. Andrew Saint (Ronceverte WV: The Hambledon Press, 1989), 216.

[cccxxviii] Huxley, "Sight-seeing in Alien Englands," 66.
[cccxxix] Ibid.
[cccxxx] Ibid.
[cccxxxi] Aldous Huxley, "Sight-seeing in Alien Englands," *The Hidden Huxley*, ed. David Bradshaw (New York: Faber and Faber, 1994), 67.
[cccxxxii] Ibid.
[cccxxxiii] Robert Fishman, *Urban Utopias: Ebenezer Howard, Frank Lloyd Wright, and Le Corbusier* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982), 31.
[cccxxxiii] Ebenezer Howard, *Garden Cities of To-morrow* (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co, 1902), eBook, 28.
[cccxxxiv] Ebenezer Howard, "Spiritual Influences Toward Social Progress," *Light,* (1910): 196.
[cccxxxv] Huxley, "Sight-seeing in Alien Englands," 63.
[cccxxxvi] Thomas Pether, *View from Kersal Moor.* 1820. Oil on Canvas. Manchester: Greater Manchester Museum Group. 1820.
[cccxxxvii] William Wyld, *Manchester from Kersal Moor*. 1852. Watercolor. London: Royal Collection Trust.
[cccxxxviii] Robert Wilson, *The Life and Times of Queen Victoria*. Vol 1. (New York: Cassell & Company, 1891), eBook, 488.
[cccxxxix] Charles Dickens, *Hard Times* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2007), 24.
[cccxl] Ibid., 36.
[cccxli] Mumford, *The Story of Utopias*, 212.
[cccxlii] Ibid., 446.
[cccxliii] Ibid.; Huxley, *Brave New World* 136.
[cccxliv] Ibid., 47.
[cccxlv] Ibid., 147.
[cccxlvi] Ibid., 103.
[cccxlvii] Ibid., 105.
[cccxlviii] Ibid., 182.
[cccxlix] Ibid., 105.
[cccl] Ibid. 202.
[cccli] Peter Batchelor, "The Origin of the Garden City Concept of Urban Form," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*. 28.3 (1969): 185.
[ccclii] In *Brave New World* the lack of individual ownership in A.F. society prevents the consolidation of industry. Factory bosses are nowhere to be found since strong, uncompromising individuals represent a threat to stability. The future recognizes the dangers of the individual usurping the utilitarian good and, in part, the World State achieves stability by suppressing the ambitions of those individuals who rise above their peers. Here again lays a utopian concept, egalitarianism, producing an undesirable result. One must remember that the World Controller, Mustapha Mond, described his younger self as "a pretty good physicist, actually too good" as his scientific investigations attempted to break new ground; such work gave him a choice "to be sent to an island" to pursue a scientific career "or to be taken on to the Controller's Council." Huxley, no great supporter of democratic ideals, shows the negative ends that come from wrongly applied utilitarian ethics. Huxley, *Brave New World*, 203.
[cccliii] Fishman, *Urban Utopias,* 37.
[cccliv] Ebenezer Howard, *To-morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2010), 6.

[ccclv] Howard, *Garden Cities of To-morrow* 14.
[ccclvi] Erika Gottlieb, *Dystopian Fiction East and West: Universe of Terror and Trial* (New York: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001), 65.
[ccclvii] Huxley, *Brave New World*, 67.
[ccclviii] Huxley, *Brave New World,* 31.
[ccclix] Ibid.
[ccclx] Ibid., 76.
[ccclxi] Ibid., 75.
[ccclxii] Ibid., 76.
[ccclxiii] Robert H. Kargon and Arthur P. Molella, *Invented Edens: Techno-Cities of the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 2008), 16.
[ccclxiv] Howard, *Garden Cities of To-morrow* 22.
[ccclxv] Ibid.
[ccclxvi] Ibid. 148.
[ccclxvii] Georg Simmel, "Metropolis and Mental Life." *The Urban Sociology Reader,* ed. Jan Lin and Christopher Mele (New York: Routledge, 2005), 29.
[ccclxviii] Howard, *Garden Cities of To-morrow*, 15.
[ccclxix] Ibid.
[ccclxx] Ibid., 76.
[ccclxxi] Ibid.
[ccclxxii] Ibid.
[ccclxxiii] Ibid., 76-77.
[ccclxxiv] Huxley, *Brave New World*, 202.
[ccclxxv]Ibid.
[ccclxxvi]Howard, *Garden Cities of To-morrow*, 36.
[ccclxxvii] Ibid., 3; Huxley, *Brave New World*, 75.
[ccclxxviii] Howard, *Garden Cities of To-morrow*, 131.
[ccclxxix] Batchelor, "The Origin of the Garden City Concept of Urban Form." 185.
[ccclxxx] Huxley, *Brave New World*, 123.
[ccclxxxi] Stephen Ward, *Peaceful Path: Building Garden Cities and New Towns* (Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2016), Ebook, np.
[ccclxxxii] Ibid.
[ccclxxxiii] Lewis Mumford, "Introduction: The Garden City Idea and Modern Planning," *Garden Cites of To-morrow,* ed. F.J. Osborn (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1965), 35.
[ccclxxxiv] "Images and Voices of Greenbelt: Oral Histories." *Virtual Greenbelt* (College Park: University of Maryland Press, 2010) Accessed May 29 2018.
[ccclxxxv] Cathy Knepper, *Greenbelt, Maryland: A Living Legacy of the New Deal* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2001), 123.
[ccclxxxvi] "Census of Population and Housing". Census.gov. Accessed May 29, 2018.
[ccclxxxvii] Ibid.
[ccclxxxviii] Huxley, *Brave New World Revisited*, 11.
[ccclxxxix] Kerri Anne Renzulli and Sergei Klebnikov, "This Is the Best Place to Live in Every State," *Time*. Published January 19, 2018. Accessed May 29, 2018.
[cccxc] "Reston at 50: Planning, Designing and Marketing Reston." *George Mason University Archives*. Accessed May 15 2018.

[cccxci] Jeffrey Hadden, et al. *The Metropolis in Crisis: Social and Political Perspectives* (Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock, 1967), 276.
[cccxcii] Nicholas Bloom, *Suburban Alchemy: 1960s New Towns and the Transformation of the American Dream* (Columbus, Ohio State University Press, 2001), 93.
[cccxciii] "Census of Population and Housing". Census.gov. Accessed May 29, 2018.
[cccxciv] "Reston Sold to Mobil: Growth Plan Stirs Debate" *American Planning Association.* Published 1979. Accessed May 29, 2018.
[cccxcv] Willem Van Vliet, *Housing and Neighborhoods: Theoretical and Empirical Contributions* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1987), 147.
[cccxcvi] Reston at 50: Planning, Designing and Marketing Reston."
[cccxcvii] Ewa Dworakowski, "State of Air Report," *American Lung Association.* Published April 18, 2018. Accessed May 29, 2018.
[cccxcviii] Janet Rems, "City Planners Use Reston as a Model," *Washington Post*. Published March 3, 2011. Accessed May 29, 2018.
[cccxcix] Jerome Meckier, "Aldous Huxley: Dystopian Essayist of the 1930s," *Utopian Studies*. 7.2 (1996): 211.
[cd] Decio De Paula Machado, "Is Henry Ford a Genius?" *The Magazine of Business* (1928): 28.
[cdi] "With Ford on the Amazon." *India Rubber Journal* (1932): 15.
[cdii] After facing difficulties producing rubber in Fordlandia, Ford founded Belterra in 1934. While the site produced viable rubber trees by 1941 it was not profitable and closed in 1945.
[cdiii] Both sites functioned at a loss until Henry Ford's death after which Henry Ford II resold the land back to the Brazilian government in 1945 at a $20 million-dollar loss.
[cdiv] In *Brave New World* sleep teaching, or *hypnopædia,* is used for moral conditioning. During a tour of Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Centre the director shows his interns an example of sleep teaching used to instruct "*Elementary Class Consciousness."* Here, children have speakers whispering suggestions "under every pillow" so that, unconsciously, they will adopt the rhetoric of A.F. society and understand their place in society. See: Huxley, Brave New World, 35-36.
[cdv] John Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (New York: WIley & Halsted, 1857), 167.
[cdvi] Aldous Huxley, "Review of J.H. Whitehouse's Ruskin Addresses," *Athenæum.* (1919): 31-38.
[cdvii] Aldous Huxley, *Chrome Yellow* (New York: Penguin Classics, 2001). 29.
[cdviii] William S. Peterson, *The Kelmscott Press: A History of William Morris's Typographical Adventure* (London: Oxford University Press, 1991) 293.
[cdix] Ibid.
[cdx] Aldous Huxley, *After Many a Summer Dies the Swan* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1993), 25.
[cdxi] Huxley, *After Many a Summer Dies the Swan*. 27.
[cdxii] Mark A. Wilson, *Julia Morgan: Architect of Beauty* (New York: Gibbs Smith, 2007), 105.
[cdxiii] Ibid.
[cdxiv] Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 56.
[cdxv] Huxley, *After Many a Summer Dies the Swan*. 50.
[cdxvi] Robert Dorman, *Revolt of the Provinces: The Regionalist Movement in America, 1920-1945* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Books, 2003) 75.
[cdxvii] Marian Moffett, et. al. *World History of Architecture* (New York: Laurence King Publishing, 2003) 373.
[cdxviii] Henry Russell Hitchcock, *Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (New York: Penguin Art History Books, 1992) 369.

[cdxix] Hall 220.
[cdxx] Hall 224.
[cdxxi] Huxley, *Brave New World* 42.
[cdxxii] Michael Snyder, "Proto-postmodern Architecture in 1930s Los Angeles," *Aldous Huxley Annual.* 5 (2005): 172-192.
[cdxxiii] William McDonough, “Design, Ecology, Ethics, and the Making of Things,” *Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: An Anthology of Architectural Theory 1965 – 1995,* ed. Kate Nesbitt (Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996), 401.
[cdxxiv] Huxley, *Brave New World* 88.
[cdxxv] Le Corbusier, *Towards an Architecture* 250.
[cdxxvi] Le Corbusier, *Towards an Architecture* 74.
[cdxxvii] Fishman, *Urban Utopias in the Twentieth Century*. 241
[cdxxviii] Ibid.
[cdxxix] Huxley, *Brave New World* 49.
[cdxxx] Aldous Huxley, "The Making of America," *Harper's Magazine*. 155 (1927): 265-287.
[cdxxxi] *Brave New World* 108.
[cdxxxii] Annabel Wharton, *Building the Cold War: Hilton International Hotels and Modern Architecture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001) 22.
[cdxxxiii] Hall 223.
[cdxxxiv] Fredic Jameson, "Cultural Logic of Capitalism," *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*, ed. Neil Leach (London, Routledge, 1997) 41.
[cdxxxv] Huxley, *Brave New World* 57.
[cdxxxvi] Hall 224.
[cdxxxvii] Huxley, *Brave New World* 67.
[cdxxxviii] Huxley, *Brave New World* 68.
[cdxxxix] Huxley, *Brave New World* 67-68.
[cdxl] Huxley, *Brave New World* 79.
[cdxli] Le Corbusier, "Vertical City," *The Empire City: A Treasury of New York*, ed. Alexander Klein (New York: International Standard Publishing, 1971) 447.
[cdxlii] Ibid. 445.
[cdxliii] Ibid. 447.
[cdxliv] Hall 222.
[cdxlv] Huxley, *Brave New World* 5.
[cdxlvi] Huxley, *Brave New World* 83, 80, 72, 217.
[cdxlvii] Le Corbusier. *The City of To-morrow and its Planning* (New York: Dover, 1987) 231.
[cdxlviii] Huxley, *Brave New World* 160.
[cdxlix] Huxley, *Brave New World Revisited* 23.
[cdl] Huxley, *Brave New World*, 48.
[cdli] Snyder 175.
[cdlii] Snyder 175.
[cdliii] Aldous Huxley, “Love, Sex, and Physical Beauty,” *Collected Essays* (New York: Harper Collins, 1971). 70.
[cdliv] Huxley, *Brave New World.* 40.
[cdlv] Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, 47.
[cdlvi] Aldous Huxley, "Sight-seeing in Alien Englands,” 63.
[cdlvii] Aldous Huxley, *Science, Liberty and Peace* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1947), 14.

[cdlviii] Ibid.
[cdlix] *Brave New World* 40.
[cdlx] Aldo Rossi, *Architecture and the City* (New York: Opposition Books, 1982) 10.
[cdlxi] “The Making of America” 270.
[cdlxii] Huxley, *Brave New World*, 187.

Chapter Four Overview

In many ways, a reader cannot view Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) as anything other than an outright dystopia. Whereas Huxley incorporates the earlier utopian tradition of travelogue narratives—with John Savage venturing to the Brave New World—Orwell grounds his entire narrative in the city of London. Additionally, Huxley's future contains alternative spaces—islands for intellectual exiles and reservations—so that, even though the World State effectively controls the world's population, it does not eradicate political dissenters. Admittedly, London and Benson also create industrial super-states, situated in the near future, that dictate uniform political belief systems. However, in *The Iron Heel* the Brotherhood succeeds and, even though the Anti-Christ triumphs in *Lord of the World,* Benson's characters may still hope for heaven. In contrast Orwell creates a claustrophobic future where perpetual war keeps citizens from openly traveling and experiencing different political ideologies, resulting in the absolute standardization of belief.

The bleakness of his narrative owes much to the fact that Orwell wrote the entirety of his novel after the Second World War. While Huxley mentions a hypothetical second total war, the Nine Years' War, in *Brave New World* and explicitly references pre-war tensions in *After Many a Summer Dies the Swan* (1939), Orwell wrote *Nineteen Eighty-Four* with a full understanding of the enormous scale and monstrous brutality of the World War II. Unlike Huxley's frivolous, pleasure-oriented anti-utopia, Orwell's creates an outright merciless, callous, and hostile, government; whereas Huxley pivots between celebrating the ecological merits of his A.F. cityscape and condemning its empty materialism, Orwell illustrates the depravity of political, military, and social power. In this case, stability stems from controlling citizen's individual fears rather than increasing conspicuous consumption. *Brave New World* almost seems comically light—Huxley includes quite a few jokes and witticisms—when compared to the gloom of perpetual war in Orwell's post-war nightmare.

In this chapter, I contend that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* constitutes both a dystopia and an anti-utopia: on one hand, Orwell illustrates how orthodox totalitarianism, a system he abhorred, creates a terrifying bad place; however, he also details how socialism, a political movement he supported, can easily devolve into tyranny when it ignores the dignity of the individual. First, I provide a biographical overview charting the development of Orwell's political beliefs. Next, I argue that the war-time austerity of Orwell's future state mirrors the economic concerns in post-war Britain; I contend, therefore, that the architecture that emerges from both spaces share aesthetic similarities due to concerns regarding funding. Finally, I conclude that Orwell, in hyperbolizing post-WWI architectural forms, correctly anticipates the rise of high-modernism. Both Orwell's fictional Ministry buildings and actual public housing projects that come to fruition in post-war Britain and America illustrate the inhospitality of single-use, monolithic, modern high-rises. Therefore, I argue that by situating *Nineteen Eighty Four*'s political ideology around the power of the state and economic austerity (here, due to perpetual war) Orwell radicalizes the modern aesthetics of his government buildings and, in doing so, anticipates the rise of architectural Brutalism.

Orwell sets *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in Airstrip One (formerly Britain) in the providence of Oceania, one of three inter-continental, totalitarian super-states (the other two being Eurasia and Eastasia), some thirty years after a nuclear war fought between Europe, western Russia, and North America. His protagonist Winston Smith, a member of the middle-class Outer Party, works for the Ministry of Truth where he revises records to align with the Party's every-changing version of history. The Party advocates the ideology of Ingsoc (English Socialism), eradicates individuality, other than the cult of personality surrounding the Party leader Big Brother, and marks those who fall out of Party favor as “unpersons.” Winston secretly despises the Party, making him effectively a thoughtcriminal, an act that the Thought Police easily uncover with the aid of surveillance via Telescreens (two-way televisions). While visiting a proletarian neighborhood he buys a diary from Mr. Charrington’s antique shop. In a small act of rebellion, he uses it to record his sexual longing for his workmate Julia. He also details his suspicions that O’Brien, his boss and an Inner Party official, secretly works for the Brotherhood, a resistance movement headed by Big Brother’s rival Emmanuel Goldstein. Winston and Julia begin a forbidden affair—sex must only be used for procreation—and rent a room above Mr. Charrington’s antique shop for their rendezvous. As he continues to open up to Julia, O’Brien invites them both to swear allegiance to the Brotherhood and gives them a copy of Goldstein’s *The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism*. Mr. Charrington, an agent of the Thought Police, exposes them; state officials then capture and torture them in the Ministry of Love. O’Brien discloses that the party only cares for power and admits that, when brainwashed to love the party, Winton will be released back into society before being executed. He resists betraying Julia until O’Brien takes him to Room 101; here, he faces his greatest fear, rats (held in a wire cage that will be fitted to his face), and he breaks and betrays his lover. Upon being released, he meets Julia who admits that she too betrayed him. At the novel’s conclusion, Winston sits in café and, hearing news of a supposed Oceania victory, and finally grasps that “he loved Big Brother.”[cdlxiii]

Orwell and Socialism

Before returning to the novel in detail, I provide a brief biographical overview to situate his novel alongside the development of his political beliefs up to 1949. I do so to orient Orwell alongside his changing attitudes towards socialism. As noted above, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* does constitute a dystopia: Orwell shows the flaws of orthodox totalitarianism, a system he deplored, and illustrates the ways it creates a horrendous future. However, his work also constitutes an anti-utopia: Orwell himself supported socialism and, in his novel, he critiques wrongly applied socialism that, at its center, contains utopian merits. Therefore, though his work constitutes one of the first outright dystopias, it should not be read as a condemnation of socialism. Instead, he demonstrates how charismatic leaders, in their hunger for power, pervert socialism to the degree that it becomes completely unrecognizable.

Born to a “lower-upper-middle” family in Bengal in 1903, Orwell formed a distain for the falseness and banality of his own class, leading him to read texts sympathetic to socialism.[cdlxiv] During his time at St. Cyprian’s School he recalls “a continuous triumph of the strong over the weak,” and, due to this, he formed an early attachment to the works of Jack London. [cdlxv] Here he first read *The People of the Abyss* and heavily admired the work. Like the author, he disguised himself like a vagrant to explore improvised areas and these experiences, in particular, inspired *Down and Out in Paris and London* (1933) and *The Road to Wigan Pier* (1937). Though he described himself as “interested and happy” at Eton, his indifferent academic performance led him, on his family’s urging, to join the Imperial Police (India).[cdlxvi] Between 1922 and 1927 he served as a colonial policeman and became increasingly disillusioned and anti-imperialist. He expresses these sentiments in *Burmese Days* (1934)—here he denotes the British Empire as “simply a device for giving trade monopolies to the English”—and his famous, and possibly autobiographical, essay “Shooting an Elephant” (1936).[cdlxvii] During this time, not unlike when Huxley visited America, he became increasingly pessimistic of cultural uniformity. In *Burmese Days* his narrator envisions a future where the English will replace “forest, monasteries and pagodas" with "pink villas fifty years apart…[and] gramophones playing the same too."[cdlxviii] It comes as no surprise, therefore, that he goes on to describe colonial life as "a stifling stultifying world…in which every word and every thought is censored."[cdlxix]

In the 1930s he established himself as a writer with other works including the novels *A Clergyman's Daughter* (1935)—which, like the works discussed above, deals with themes of poverty and exploitation—and *Keep the Aspidistra Flying* (1936)—in which he satirizes socialism as "four hours a day in a model factory" and "free abortion clinics on all corners."[cdlxx] After joining the Spanish resistance in 1936 he not only condemned Fascism in *In Homage to Catalonia* (1938), but also began to reevaluate socialism. While he condemned socialist intellectuals for creating "a kind of religion" he attested that socialism, if "wholeheartedly applied," could provide subsistence for the world population.[cdlxxi] Importantly, Gregory Claeys argues that, at this time, Orwell became increasing hostile towards modernity, especially in regard to "mass-production techniques" that could produce "mass propaganda" and destroy the "ideal of the autonomous individual."[cdlxxii] He goes on to claim that he did not so much disagree with social egalitarianism, but feared that "socialists might so blindly worship at the altar of industrial progress that they would forgo democracy and any other but mass-produced goods."[cdlxxiii] Though Orwell biographer Bernard Crick denotes these fears as an apprehension of "Fordification," with the advent of WWII he became increasing concerned that European fascism and Russian communism moved "towards a form of oligarchical collectivism."[cdlxxiv]

Even then Orwell did not abandon socialism in full as, instead, attempted to mitigate an English version that balanced government support with basic human rights. In "The Lion and the Unicorn: Socialism and the English Genius" (1941) he expressed the need for a socialist revolution in Britain, arguing that citizens must abandon the archaic British class system to guarantee victory over Nazi Germany. He argues for a new kind of socialism, one that rejects American materialism, British imperialism, and Soviet totalitarian communism. He warns against "the persistent effort to chip away English morale and spread a hedonistic, what-do-I-get-out-of-it attitude to life" and, in the essay's final section, he advocates socialism while celebrating English nationalism.[cdlxxv] In the essay's final section, "England Your England" (often anthologized as a separate essay entirely), he condemns English gentry who tolerated Nazism as a check to growing Soviet influences. Instead, he argues that class divisions, rather than simply outside forces, can decimate Britain. He attests that, though "patriotism is usually stronger than class-hatred," England, problematically, can be divided "economically" into "two nations, if not three or four."[cdlxxvi] He goes on to attest that "some very great disaster" can "destroy a national culture"; even when "the country houses will be turned into children's holiday camps…England will still be England…, having the power to change out of recognition and yet remain the same."[cdlxxvii] Here, Orwell proposes a form of British socialism that will balance a centralized economy with human rights, thereby avoiding the homogenization of individuals of intellect and distinction.

However, due to the sustained popularity of *Animal Farm* (1945), Orwell's confident advocation of British socialism seems ersatz to the casual reader today. Yet this work, like *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, should not be read as an outright condemnation of socialism, but a denunciation socialism perverted by the powerful. In 1946, he admitted that while "I intended it primarily as a satire on the Russian revolution" that he also desired "a wider application" to denounce "that *that kind* of revolution (violent conspiratorial revolution, led by unconsciously power-hungry people) can only lead to a change of masters."[cdlxxviii] Consequently, Orwell intends for Old Major's original Seven Commandments (as transcribed by Snowball) to contain utopian undertones.

The novella's dystopian outlook stems, instead, from Napoleon and Squealer's alterations to Animalism; here, through the revision of the commandments, Orwell illustrates how leaders can turn ideological dogma into pliable propaganda. Though he focuses his critique on Napoleon's Stalinist Five Year Plans, show trials, and secret police, Orwell also stresses Napoleon's ability to consolidate rule during wartime. In *Modern Utopian Fictions from H.G. Wells to Iris Murdoch* (2008) Peter Firchow argues that Orwell uses the Battle of the Windmill as a stand in for the Great Patriotic War (the Eastern Front of World War II).[cdlxxix] Orwell's text edits bolster his claim: he first wrote "All the animals, including Napoleon" took cover, but changed this to "All the animals, except Napoleon," alluding to Stalin's refusal to leave Moscow in the face of the German advance.[cdlxxx] Even though Orwell orients his narrative to satirize Stalinism, not socialism, nonetheless critics often view his fiction an intrinsically anti-socialist–especially in the case of *Nineteen Eighty-Four.*

Due to the prominence of anti-communist interpretations of the work, in no way aided by the fact that Stalin banned the work in 1950, Orwell himself clarified his intentions:

> My recent novel is NOT intended as an attack on Socialism or on the British Labour Party (of which I am a supporter) but as a show-up of the perversions to which a centralized economy is liable and which have already partly been realized in Communism and Fascism….I believe also that totalitarian ideas have taken root in the minds of intellectuals everywhere, and I have tried to draw these ideas out to their logical consequences.[cdlxxxi]

In particular, Orwell censures intellectuals for their inclination towards totalitarianism in two regards. First, he condemns the way in which they subjugate language ("doublethink," "newspeak," "thoughtcrime," "crimestop," "goodsex," etc.) to alienate nonconformist rhetoric and "make all other modes of thought impossible."[cdlxxxii] Secondly, and most important to my claim, he finds the state's omnipresence both oppressive and repulsive and expresses this in the architecture of Airstrip One. While the Thought Police and the worship of Big Brother persecute individuals, he also describes modern architecture that functions in the same regard. Though architects do not formally introduce Brutalism until the year of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*'s publication, Orwell nonetheless took inspiration from post-WWI modernist buildings and anticipated the movement's rise in the 1950s.

Orwell's Anticipation of Brutalism

Other than the Four Ministry Buildings—the Ministries of Peace, Prosperity, Truth, and Love—Orwell emphasizes that construction has ceased in the British capital. He notes that the so-called "Victory Mansions" that house the middle-class "were old flats, built in 1930 or thereabout and were falling to pieces."[cdlxxxiii] Here, in apartments like Winston's, "pipes burst," roofs leak "whenever there was a snow," and only a "remote committee" can sanction repairs. He describes the same state of decrepitude in proletarian neighborhoods. Instead, he stresses that all funds go to the state and, as a result, only the Ministry buildings tower over London. In particular, Orwell modeled certain Ministries from pre-existing towers. In the case of the Ministry of Love, however, he hyperbolized these modern forms and, in doing so, anticipated the rise of the Brutalist Movement, a movement that flourished from the 1950s to the mid-1970s.

For instance, the University of London's administrative center, the Senate House (1937), directly inspired Orwell's Ministry of Truth. His wife Eileen, who worked there for the

Censorship Department of the Ministry of Information, described it as dismal and her thoughts mirror many of Orwell's contemporaries. In particular, Evelyn Waugh in *Put Out More Flags* (1942) denotes it as "the vast bulk of London University insulting the autumnal sky."[cdlxxxiv] Designed by Charles Holden, the original plan called for an even larger design, taking up almost 1,200 feet and intended to be topped with two towers. Orwell captures its original monumentality in his fictional building, describing a tower of "three thousand" "air-conditioned rooms."[cdlxxxv] Ultimately, due to a lack of funds, Holden scaled down the tower. The end result, a smaller, but imposing nineteen floor, 210 feet high Art Deco tower of grey concrete, received a mixed reception once completed. Though Holden adorned its exterior with minimalist friezes to soften the structure, nestled among smaller brick university buildings, it appears to jut upwards like a grand pyramid or monolith. In this way, the structure mirrors the Ministries which, "similar [in] appearance and size…dwarf the surrounding architecture."[cdlxxxvi]

Following the Second World War, Cold War politics encouraged distain for Marxist theory and, as a result, critics also began to attack architectural modernism's final major movement, New Brutalism (also simply known as Brutalism). Brutalists aimed to create a uniform visual order contrasting the decentralized, spontaneous approach to neighborhood building. Though it extends from previous movements, in *The New Brutalism: Ethic or Aesthetic?* (1966) Reyner Banham argues that the term Brutalism developed in the 1950s mainly to distinguish it from movements like the International Style of the 1920s.[cdlxxxvii] Brutalism shares many similarities with its modern predecessor (discussed in detail the previous chapter): namely architects abandon historical revival styles, embrace concrete as a material, repudiate ornament, and emphasize repetitive geometric forms in their designs. Furthermore, the movements share a common history—not only does the term stem from Le Corbusier's preferred material, raw concrete (*béton brut),* but the former leader of the International Style also designed proto-Brutalist buildings like Unité d'habitation (Marseille, 1952) and Palace of Assembly (Chandigarh, 1953). In designing one monumental concrete structure for residential use and another for government work, Le Corbusier anticipates the Brutalist buildings that follow: single-use, monolithic structures made of exposed concrete (or brick) and surrounded by flat lawns or plazas, elements utilized in the buildings mentioned, typify Brutalism. Therefore, Brutalism not only alludes to the roughness of unfinished concrete, but also to how such structures starkly stand out in their urban environments. Whereas Howard placed vernacular style homes amid curved, forested drives—creating a false sense of tucked away rural privacy—Brutalist structures boldly project themselves as landmarks.

Yet, more than an aesthetic development, Brutalism, especially in Britain, evolves in reaction to the post-war economy. Though the Swedish architect Hans Asplund first used the term "Brutalism" to describe Bengt Edman and Lennart Holm's bricked, flat-roofed Villa Göth (1950), the term gained traction in 1955 with Banham's essay "The New Brutalism," published in *The Architectural Review*. In his manifesto, he argues that "the New Brutalism needs to be seen in a double historical context—that of post-war architectural thought, and that of post-war historical writing on architecture."[cdlxxxviii] His emphasis on England's post-war period should not be downplayed, as the movement in itself formed in response to the social and political changes transpiring as the war came to an end. Brutalism, as an architectural movement, evolved due to 1) British citizens' expectations of a Welfare State after the conclusion of WWII and 2) the political establishment's recognition of that desire, but their hesitancy, especially after the Labour Party lost their majority in 1951, to pay for such a vision.

Brutalism owes its rise, in part, to the Labour Government's landslide victory in the 1945 general election, marking the first time that Conservatives lost the popular vote since 1906 (as discussed in Chapter Two). The Labour Party's 1945 election manifesto stated plainly that "The Labour Party is a Socialist Party, and proud of it" and, with its legislative majority, it presented as audacious plan to construct a new, modern Welfare State.[cdlxxxix] In particular, the Labour Party wished to centralize government departments, nationalize the economy, offer universal social security, and, most pressing after years of Nazi bombardment, reconstruct Britain's decimated housing infrastructure. The Labour Party, in fact, owed much of their success to the war itself. During WWII, British citizens became accustomed to consolidated state control, thus removing the stigma of centralized services for many. Indeed, numerous citizens viewed expanded and publicly funded education, health and housing systems as downright utopian after years of public funds being diverted towards fighting a total war. Indeed, consolidated design appeared to be the solution to many of the country's ills. In 1946, art historian Herbert Read noted that "in Great Britain there is a growing awareness of the importance of design: it is perhaps a reflection of the more general realization that some sort of order must be introduced into our chaotic civilization."[cdxc]

Yet with the rise of the Cold War, many bristled against notions of centralized designs and utilitarian politics, viewing such ideals as innately Marxist. For instance, after reading Austrian-British economist Friedrich Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom* (1944)—which argues that tyranny ensues when a government controls economic decision making through centralized plans—Winston Churchill lambasted the Labour Party's agenda. In his 1945 election broadcast he argued that socialism would naturally "have to fall back on some form of Gestapo."[cdxci] In his rebuttal, Labour Party Leader Clement Attlee argued that his opponent's point of view merely represented a “second-hand version of the academic views of an Austrian professor, Friedrich August von Hayek.”[cdxcii] Knowledgeable of the opposition to their plans, the 1945 *Labour Party Election Manifesto* spurned the notion that their platform would create a dystopia akin to Soviet Russia:

> They accuse the Labour Party of wishing to impose controls for the sake of control. That is not true, and they know it. What is true is that the anti-controllers and anti-planners desire to sweep away public controls, simply in order to give the profiteering interests and the privileged rich an entirely free hand to plunder the rest. The Labour Party stands for order as against the chaos which would follow the end of all public control. We stand for order, for positive constructive progress as against the chaos of economic do-as-they-please anarchy.[cdxciii]

Here, the Labour Party designates “anti-controllers” and “anti-planners” as maneuvering capitalists and elites who desire to disenfranchise the common people. Rather than oppressive, the Party contextualizes the concept of “public control” as egalitarian rather than authoritarian. However, the Labour Party did not hold power long as, after years of escalating political attacks, the Tory Party won the 1951 general election and Churchill became Prime Minister once again.

Banham explains that the intense “polarization—Communist versus the Rest—” of post-war British politics deeply influenced the development of Brutalism.[cdxciv] Though he does not describe “the Rest” in detail, at the very least he means to allude to the Conservative Party. In particular, he attests that the conservative English establishment consolidated “Swedes, Communists, and the Town and Country Planning Association…together as different isotopes of the common ‘Adversary.’”[cdxcv] He notes that the adversarial connection between modern architecture’s “flat roofs, glass, [and] exposed structure[s]” brought about an interest in historical styles (today better known as Neo-Historicism). The movement emphasized “brickwork, segmental arches, pitched roofs, small windows (or small panes at any rate)” so that it, in essence, mirrored “the so-called ‘William Morris Revival’” style popular in the late nineteenth century.[cdxcvi] However, John Nixon notes that Brutalist designs did attract government officials, including Conservatives, in one specific regard, their low cost:

> New Brutalism was a 1950s’, mainly British, architectural movement that asserted the primacy of the functionalist principles in services, materials, and structure. Anything that distracted from or disguised these was rejected. In its austere and inelegant rectilinearity, with plumbing, electric and other services exposed, and ‘cosmetic’ treatments eschewed, New Brutalism probably represents the extreme case of functionalism. Immediately following the destruction of World War II, it undoubtedly had a certain attractiveness to public authorities looking for economical means of rebuilding–New Brutalist buildings were very basic.[cdxcvii]

Expanding from architectural modernism’s distain for ornament, Brutalism fetishized a simple approach to design—architects did little to mediate the coldness of its concrete or the harshness of the geometric form. Anthony Vidler concludes that Brutalism “was born out of the postwar culture of 'austerity Britain'” and that, its preferred material, concrete, allowed the government to cheaply construct public buildings.[cdxcviii]

Discontent that critics viewed the movement’s proliferation as only a testament to its cost-effectiveness, proponents of Brutalism described such designs as innately sincere. The “new aesthetic of [these] materials,” Vilder claims, came to be seen as expressing a directness and honesty that became, in itself, “the ethical side of New Brutalism.”[cdxcix] Alison and Peter Smithson, who built numerous educational buildings in England, argued that Brutalism "attempt[s] to be objective about 'reality'" and "face up to a mass-production society," thereby producing "a rough poetry out of the confused and powerful forces" of modern industrialism."[d] Yet one of their first designs, Hunstanton School (1955, today known as Smithdon High School) puts form over function. Inspired by the glass structures of Miles van der Rohe, the Smithsons enclosed their concrete and brick structure in glass. While Peter Smithson describes the large skylights in the two-story central hall as "heart and expression of the scholastic community and its relationship with the city," the incorporation of these windows, as well as the glass paneled façade, created a greenhouse effect in the summer and chilly classrooms in the winter.[di] Regardless, architects replicated its design not only in British, but also American, public schools, from the 1950s to the late 1970s. Due to the movement's cost-effectiveness, the Smithsons designated the movement as "an ethic, not an aesthetic."[dii] Though Orwell does not depict Oceania as a world of shining glass like Yevgeny Zamyatin's Le Corbusier inspired *We* (1921), nonetheless the state's investment in continual war impacts the built environments that Winston comes in contact with.

As a building, the Ministry of Truth exists only for bureaucratic function—Winston notes little of the interior of his office other than the "tens of thousands" pneumatic tubes and slits, or "memory holes," that workers use to dispose of documents.[diii] In no way does the building create a sense of community and Orwell makes particular note of that fact when describing the Ministry's canteen. When Winston eats at the Ministry of Truth's cafeteria, he ponders if "food always tasted like this?" but he could easily ask the question "did the world always look like this?" While he emphasizes the low quality of the food— "a sourish, composite smell of bad gin and bad coffee and metallic stew"—Orwell also calls attention to the room itself. He describes a "low-ceilinged, crowded room" designed not around social use, but simply as a part of a larger government complex. He describes the acoustics as “deafeningly noisy” and the only bar as “a mere hold in the wall” to deliver synthetic gin. The dank, unlivable quality of the room mirrors the inhospitable public housing structures build in the post-war era.

Consider, for instance, Sir Basil Spence’s Queen Elizabeth Square flats (also known as Hutchesontown C, 1962) in Glasgow, Scotland. Glasgow’s rapid post-war population and industrial boom necessitated the construction of residential high-rises, however Spence’s design failed to create a livable community. Aided by Povl Ahm, an engineer, Spense designed units that shared two story balconies or “drying greens” intended as small-scale community green spaces.[div]When creating the balcony forms Spence took inspiration from the giant square concrete blocks that adorned Le Corbusier’s Unité d'habitation. He charmed the Glasglow Housing Committee with the design by hypothesizing its use: "on Tuesdays, when all the washing's out, it'll be like a great ship in full sail.”[dv] Yet, though he imagined a space akin to suburban backyards, the end result proved Orwellian. The enclosed, concrete balconies created an ever-present dampness that not only attracted fungus and moss, but also an invasion of water beetles that burrowed into apartments. Less than fifteen years after opening, tenements became so fed up with persistent water damage that many went on a rent strike in 1976. Ultimately, Queen Elizabeth Square became a byline for poorly designed public housing and, in 1993, the City Council decided to demolish the site rather than fund a multi-million-dollar project to make the site livable. Though both the Ministry of Truth and the Elizabeth Square flats mirror each other in their dismal qualities, Orwell emphasizes that the worst structure in his future London orients space in a manner that distinguishes it from the other Ministries.

Specifically, Orwell positions the Ministry of Love as the most inhuman structure or, as Winston describes it, as “the really frightening one”—not only due to the horrors of interrogation that take place within, but also because of its purposely disorienting plan.[dvi] He describes the building as one with “no windows at all,” a space that segregates itself from the surrounding area “within half a kilometer” with “outer barriers” of “barbed-wire entanglements, steel doors, and hidden machine-gun nests.” Though high modernist structures do not incorporate the elaborate security apparatus that Winston describes, nonetheless they, like Orwell’s buildings, do isolate themselves from surrounding areas through the use of green spaces and plazas. In *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961), Jane Jacob faults modern architects for their continued use of green spaces when building residential units, spaces that she attests contain little purpose and actually disembody such structures from their surrounding communities.

Jacobs notes that modern architecture emphasizes the separation of buildings by functional use. In particular, she notes the belief that “commerce should be segregated from residences” and, to do so, high-rises often use expansive green spaces to segregate residential areas from commercial areas.[dvii] She attests that this may work well in suburban environments, but in urban areas she argues that “generous yards or greens” will not “generate city liveliness of public life.”[dviii] In a city, she claims, such spaces become unusable “gray areas.”[dix] She goes on to say that gray areas “do little good…and can do harm.” Since the uselessness of gray areas decrease natural pedestrian traffic such areas “are unequipped to handle strangers” and become hotbeds of crime and vandalism.[dx] Upon further analysis, Jacobs’ claim rings true when applied to British and American housing projects.

Oscar Newman makes particular mention of such areas in his analysis of the Aylesbury Estate (1963-1977) in *Defensible Space: People and Design in the Violent City* (1972). Hans Peter Trenton designed the over 900,000 square foot complex with the intention of clearing out slums and housing nearly 10,000 residents.[dxi] Newman concluded that the large, rectangular grids of high-rises faced problems on the outside as well as on the inside. Each individual building was separated by either a large lawn or plaza, spaces of little functional use other than guaranteeing sunlight for corresponding structures. Finally admitting the architectural failings of the sight, the Southwark Council began, in 2009, to demolish what the London *Times* designated as “one of the most notorious estates in the United Kingdom.”[dxii] Yet no other housing structure mirrors the coldness and hostility of Orwell’s Ministry of Truth like the Aylesbury Estate’s American cousin, The Wendell O. Pruitt Homes and William Igoe Apartments (1954-1956, commonly known as Pruitt-Igoe).

Planned by Minoru Yamasaki, known as the architect of the first World Trade Center, Pruitt-Igoe remains a lesson in poor design. While Orwell’s Oceanic state intends for the Ministry of Truth to be unapproachable to its citizens, Colin Gordon argues that the “Pruitt-Igoe towers became a case study of the social, economic, and aesthetic failures” of monumental modernist public buildings.[dxiii] St. Lois authorities demolished 57 acres of so-called slums—in reality low to medium density working class homes—and built, in its place, 33 11-story residential buildings totaling 2,870 apartments.[dxiv] Like Aylesburg, large, flat green spaces surrounded each building and such areas became even more crime-ridden that its British counterpart; on Le Corbusier and the International Congresses of Modern Architects’ directive, ground floors did not contain apartment units. As a consequence, at night, such areas became rife with crime. Yet the inside became equally dangerous as well since “skip-stop” elevators—stopping only on the first, fourth, seventh, and tenth floors—encouraged predators to accost lone individuals in stairways.[dxv] Though the apartments achieved 91% occupancy in 1957 by 1971 only six hundred people resided in seventeen buildings; the other sixteen buildings fell into disrepair, home to only urban wildlife like raccoons and rats. [dxvi] Beginning in 1971, less than twenty years after opening, the city of St. Louis began to demolish the structures until, by 1976, the last building fell into dust.

The true tragedy of the modern housing structures like Aylesbury Estate and Pruitt-Igoe stems from the fact some of the worst thought out designs developed during a time in which both the American and British governments recognized public housing as a necessity. While Orwell hyperbolizes IngSoc to the degree that the political party devolves from socialism to totalitarianism, he also illustrates how monolithic modern structures suppress those who work inside them. In doing so, Orwell anticipates the failings of high modernists structures that flourish, not only in American and Britain, but also in South America, India, and Africa in the post-war era. While his future constitutes a dystopia—a bad place based on the ills of totalitarianism—it also represents an anti-utopia—where public funds and communal effort, utopian in origin, are wrongly utilized by those in power. While his oppressive Ministry buildings effectively serve their purpose to suppress the citizens of Airstrip One, equally colossal housing structures in the post-war era unintentionally do the same to their residents. Therefore, by hyperbolizing modern structures to their fullest and most oppressive extent, Orwell anticipates the rise of Brutalism—a movement that, unconcerned about functionality and aesthetic delight, proclaims its practically through its cost-effectiveness and efficient use of materials. In essence, Orwell foresees post-war architecture by imagining war-time architecture at its worst as, in both cases, governments do not invest in designs to aid the people.

[cdlxiii] George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (New York: Penguin, 2001), np. Accessed September 17, 2017. http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks01/0100021.txt.
[cdlxiv] Robert Colls, *George Orwell: English Rebel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 35
[cdlxv] Michael Sheldon, *Orwell: The Authorized Biography* (New York: HarperCollins, 2001), 62.
[cdlxvi] George Orwell, *The Complete Works of George Orwell* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1998), 45.
[cdlxvii] George Orwell, *Burmese Days* (New York: Penguin Modern Classics, 2009), 95.
[cdlxviii] Ibid. 195.
[cdlxix] Ibid. 105.
[cdlxx] George Orwell, *The Complete Novels of George Orwell* (New York: Penguin, 1986), 632.
[cdlxxi] Scott Lucas, *Orwell* (London: Haus Publishing, 2003), 39.
[cdlxxii] Gregory Claeys, "The Origins of Dystopia: Wells, Huxley and Orwell" in *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*, ed. Gregory Claeys (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 122.
[cdlxxiii] Ibid.
[cdlxxiv] Ibid.
[cdlxxv] George Orwell, "The Lion and the Unicorn: Socialism and the English Genius" in *The Complete Works of George Orwell: A Patriot After All, 1940-1941*, ed. Ian Angus, Sheila Davison (London: Secker & Warburg, 1998): 428.
[cdlxxvi] Ibid. 399.
[cdlxxvii] Ibid. 409.
[cdlxxviii] George Orwell, "Letter to Dwight Macdonald," in *George Orwell: A Life in Letters,* ed. Peter Davison (New York: Norton, 2013), 334.
[cdlxxix] Peter Firchow, "Orwell's Dystopias," in *Modern Utopian Fictions from H.G. Wells to Iris Murdoch* (Washingston D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2008).
[cdlxxx] George Orwell, *Animal Farm* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1987), fn 69 202.
[cdlxxxi] John Rodden and John Rossi, "Nineteen Eighty-Four" in *The Cambridge Introduction to George Orwell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 85.
[cdlxxxii] George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, np.
[cdlxxxiii] Ibid.
[cdlxxxiv] Evelyn Waugh, *Put Out More Flags* (Boston: Chapman and Hall, 1967), 72.
[cdlxxxv] George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, np.
[cdlxxxvi] Ibid.
[cdlxxxvii] Reyner Banham, *The New Brutalism: Ethic or Aesthetic?* (New York: Reinhold, 1966): 20.
[cdlxxxviii] Reyner Banham, "The New Brutalism," *The Architectural Review* 118 (1955): 355.
[cdlxxxix] Noel W. Thompson, *Political Economy and the Labour Party: The Economics of Democratic Socialism, 1884-2005* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 137.
[cdxc] Herbert Read, "Foreword" to Nikolaus Pevsner, *Visual Pleasures from Everyday Things* (London: The Council for Visual Education, 1946), 2.
[cdxci] Harold Macmillan, *Tides of Fortune, 1945-1955* (New York, Harper & Row, 1969), 32.
[cdxcii] Ibid.
[cdxciii] Labour Party, *Labour Party Election Manifesto* (1945) in Labour Party General Election Manifestos, 1900-1997 (London: Routledge, 2000) 2:52.
[cdxciv] Reyner Banham, "The New Brutalism," 356.

[cdxcv] Ibid.
[cdxcvi] Ibid.
[cdxcvii] John Nixon, *New Brutalism* (Belfast: CCEA, 2007), 2.
[cdxcviii] Anthony Vidler, "Another Brick in the Wall," *October* 136 (2011): 108.
[cdxcix] Ibid.: 117
[d] Alison Smithson and Peter Smithson, "The New Brutalism," *October* 136 (2011): 37.
[di] Ibid, 40.
[dii] Ibid. 37.
[diii] George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, np.
[div] Charles McKean, "The Scottishness of Scottish Architecture" in *Companion to Contemporary Architectural Thought* ed. Ben Farmer and Hentie Louw (London: Routledge, 1993), 149.
[dv] Gavin Stamp, *Anti-Ugly: Excursions in English Architecture and Design* (London: Aurum Press, 2013), 102.
[dvi] George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, np.
[dvii] Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (New York: Random House, 1961), 20.
[dviii] Ibid. 209.
[dix] Ibid. 231.
[dx] Ibid.
[dxi] Oscar Newman, *Defensible Space: People and Design in the Violent City* (London: Architectural Press, 1972), 10.
[dxii] Martin Fletcher, "Demolition of the Aylesbury Estate: A New Dawn for Hells Waiting Room". *The Times* London. Accessed April 19, 2018.
[dxiii] Colin Gordon, *Mapping Decline: St. Lois and the Fate of the American City* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 12.
[dxiv] Ted Kitchen and Richard Schneider, *Crime Prevention and the Built Environment* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 43.
[dxv] Ibid, 56.
[dxvi] Lawrence Larsen and Richard Steward, *A History of Missouri: 1953 to 2003* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2004), 62.