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**Abstract**  
Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World* portrays a post-human totalitarian society namely “World State” which does not let humans be conceived in and born naturally from mothers’ wombs, rather it regards them as any creature which can be hatched, conditioned, fertilized, incubated and Bokanovskified to be manufactured in thousands. The system of power has thrown normality into exile while celebrating the procession of replicating humans in abnormal proliferation. I find this technological multiplication of humans identical to the march of simulacrum of any object or sign of today’s world, which Jean Baudrillard (1929-2007) elucidates in his *Simulacra and Simulation* (1981). This study intends to achieve a critical appraisal of the novel through Baudrillard’s illumination of simulation and simulacra.
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**INTRODUCTION**  
Vallverdú (2014) defines simulation as the best perceptive depiction of composite reality, which means people’s most profound notion of what reality stands for while White and Ingalls (2009) define it as experimentation with a framework which replicates some relevant aspects of the behavior of the system. On the other hand, according to Wolny (2017), simulacrum (its plural form is simulacra) refers to similarity or/and resemblance. When the term, simulacrum, was used in English language for the first time in around the 16th century, it, according to Wolny (2017), used to mean a replica of a loftier kind or a divine one; however, with time nearing 19th century, its meaning got worsened substantially to refer to something of much inferior standard. In the view of Wolfreys et al. (2006,
as cited in Wolny, 2017), the term “simulacrum” is basically related to “reality effect” offered by Baudrillard, which signifies the manners through which reality is very often recognized and gets substituted for some entities and beliefs via media exaggeration both in printed and electronic forms. Therefore, simulacrum stands for the duplicate, illustration or imitation of a reality, which itself lacks in retaining the least resemblance with reality (Wolny, 2017). In case of literature, Ramírez (2005) interprets Spanish writer, Miguel de Cervantes’ (1547-1616) novel *Don Quixote* as a text that presents a world constituted of the non-real. Ramírez (2005) argues that the protagonist, Don Quixote and other characters of the novel form reality by assuming pictures, signs and emblems which one finds in other imaginary narratives. Ramírez (2005) reviews the text through Baudrillard’s three orders of simulacra: imitation, production, and simulation, which illuminate the convoluted coatings of meaning coded in the book. Fernandes (2016) examines Margaret Atwood’s *The Year of the Flood* and Suzanne Collins’s *The Hunger Games*, through Baudrillard’s concept of simulacrum in parody of coded discourses. Fernandes (2016) argues that both novels present several instances of parody of coded discourses with emphasis on science fiction, mass media, religious discourses, and experiences of nostalgia by dint of the frequent use of the simulacrum, Baudrillard’s concept from *Simulacra and Simulation*.

As for Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World*, I find in it the same sort of exaggerated versions of reality having a rare semblance of reality itself. To one, the narrative, the entities, the state policy, and the overall illustration of the system presented in the story obviously go through an indiscriminate process of simulation engendering multi-layered simulacrum and simulacra. This study hinges upon the procedure of simulation and the overabundance of simulacrum creating untoward hyperreality demonstrated in the novel. *Brave New World* as a fiction propels us to imagine what the world could look like, how technology would manipulate humans and administrations in crucial aspects, such as biotechnology, genetics, health and upbringing, and whether such post-human practices match with or go against universal ethical considerations (Schermer, 2007).

Huxley receives inspiration for the narrative of the novel from a trip to California where modernity gets marked by mass production and the private pursuits of pleasure (Holzer, 2003). The narrative renders an imitating world called “World State” that reproduces the real-world races and names them Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta and Epsilon, who belong to disparate privileges as well as dissimilar statuses. Likewise, this echoing society adopts a mechanized production system that manufactures human babies in lieu of granting them biological birth, and the mechanically multiplied infants are processed to attain artificial and extravagant attributes in an unusual magnitude. In fact, every normal phenomenon of a normal human being is rampantly simulated in a ludicrous manner. This whole *Brave New World* saga vividly goes in conformity with Jean Baudrillard’s theory of “Simulacra and Simulations” where Baudrillard (1988) elaborates that, in today’s world; simulation means the production of a real by models without any source or authenticity, which he (Baudrillard) terms as a *hyperreal*. Kashi & Ladani (2017) expound Huxley’s *Brave New World* and Kazuo Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* in the light of Franchis Fukuyama’s *Our Posthuman Future* to posit that the technocratic societies the two novels depict wield a catastrophic future for humanity. Taking
into consideration Fukuyama’s warning that post-humanism is necessarily a threat to humanistic values, Kashi & Ladani (2017) explicate the vehement technological possession which overwhelms the characters of the novels and dehumanizes them constantly letting them be more of the used than the users.

According to Holzer (2003), *Brave New World* makes us encounter the nightmarish implications of modern technology from various considerations including engineering the human race in the hatchery, producing them on an assembly line, manipulating them with clinical substances, and multiplying them by cell division. It is a horrible portrayal of a post-human world where humans are technologically manufactured in laboratories to serve production and consumption (Hamamra, 2017) as it depicts a post-human world where humans are cloned, mass-produced and preserved in absolute contentment through an unending display of sensuousness and gratification, in the failure of which, the “World State” always offers *soma*, the anti-depressive drug (Spierings & Houtum, 2018). The new world portrayed in the narrative is a duplicate state founded by Henry Ford to whom the cloned humans send their excitements and prayers as they very often utter, “Oh my Ford!”, and in Ford’s world, reality or nature is a taboo whereas technologically hybridized reality is true and welcome; therefore, anyone born naturally is labeled as *savage* and is thrown away to live in a reservation enclosed with barbed-wire (Spierings & Houtum, 2018).

Hamamra (2017) calls this an utter dystopian system which manipulates people’s mental and physical reactions through creating a feigned society modified by eugenic engineering, biological conditioning, coital endorsement, hypnopedia and narcotics so as to make the citizens remain oblivious of reality. It showcases a dehumanized society in which people, in exchange of being made artificially happy, unfeeling and unaging, lose the fundamental attributes of humans, like humanity, individuality, relationship, emotion, conscience, morality, sense of decency and artistic creativity (Zhamurashvili, 2014). In lieu of parental bonds, children are mechanically produced in labs, and likewise, love is replaced by sheer sex, beauty by pneumatism, God by Ford, religion by Fordism and high art by ‘feelies’ (Zhamurashvili, 2014). Panagopoulous (2016) explores Huxley’s elitist background, his eugenicist theories, and his personal preference in narcotics and extravagant copulations to be nothing against the day-to-day comfort of the god-like men who methodically arrange their own affairs, manufacture heaven on Earth and as such ensure social harmony and stability to go on. People who believe in individuality, and, due to one reason or another, fail to cope with community life, those who are dissatisfied with orthodoxy or “who’ve got independent ideas of their own” (Huxley, 1932, p. 200) are to be sent to an island filled with savages (this is what the “World State” calls humans from outside) devoid of basic human supplies. The Controller enlightens, “Our Ford himself did a great deal to shift the emphasis from truth and beauty to comfort and happiness. Mass production demanded the shift. Universal happiness keeps the wheels steadily running; truth and beauty can’t” (Huxley, 1932, p. 201). This can be matched with Kevin’s (2009) statement that human beings in the present world surrender to incalculable procedures of hyperreality.

Quoting from *Ecclesiastes*, Baudrillard (1981) wrote, “The simulacrum is never what hides the truth – it is truth that hides the fact that there is none. The
simulacrum is true.” Identical to the “World State” phenomena of *Brave New World*, Baudrillard (1981), to explain simulation and simulacra, cites Jorge Luis Borges’ “On Exactitude in Science”,

If once we were able to view the Borges fable in which the cartographers of the Empire draw up a map so detailed that it ends up covering the territory exactly (the decline of the Empire witnesses the fraying of this map, little by little, and its fall into ruins, though some shreds are still discernible in the deserts - the metaphysical beauty of this ruined abstraction testifying to a pride equal to the Empire and rotting like a carcass, returning to the substance of the soil, a bit as the double ends by being confused with the real through aging) - as the most beautiful allegory of simulation, this fable has now come full circle for us, and possesses nothing but the discrete charm of second-order simulacra (Baudrillard, 1981).


Today abstraction is no longer that of the map, the double, the mirror, or the concept. Simulation is no longer that of a territory, a referential being, or a substance. It is the generation by models of a real without origin or reality: a hyperreal. The territory no longer precedes the map, nor does it survive it. It is nevertheless the map that precedes the territory — *precession of simulacra* — that engenders the territory, and if one must return to the fable, today it is the territory whose shreds slowly rot across the extent of the map. It is the real, and not the map, whose vestiges persist here and there in the deserts that are no longer those of the Empire, but ours.

Baudrillard (1981) has doubted the relevance of the statement that we cannot reproduce reality in our representations. For him, the development of mass consumption requires a substantial alteration in the methods of sociological analysis. The privilege of Western society envelopes each and every citizen with materials that are not instantly accessible social phenomena. People no more attribute an exclusive affiliation between things and both their purposes and any specific setting. This engrossed atmosphere triggers shopping (both the fundamental necessity and its provocation on actions not formerly linked to consumption) to attain a novel fame; in such a prevalence, people react more to a grid of signs (connotations marketed by advertising, for instance) than to the usability of any material (Lodge & Wood, 2000). According to Baudrillard, there is an emblematic economy that is far detached from its productive self, that is, where a pertinent examination might be endeavored to focus on its ways of manufacturing associated labor affiliations. This change approximately creates an aesthetics of everyday life (Lodge & Wood, 2000).
Value, for instance, might itself be a commodity, which will be replaced by its own value. Therefore, there is no insurance that all value will continue to exist. Instead of an originating creative act, there are intertexts, assembled from the myriad of cultural texts. This is the freedom as well as the potential nightmare Baudrillard (1981) outlines in “Simulacra and Simulation”. To create in the new age is inevitably to re-cycle, or simulate, signs of past cultures. Instead of some prior reality, art actually now deals in 'myth of origin' and Baudrillard locates his own sign of this in Disneyland – an artifact that so obviously announces its own fictiveness that it would seem to imply some counterbalancing reality. Similarly, so entangled are our perceptions in pre-packaged media perspectives that we can only take any sense of the ‘real’ as a strategy, a means to ends decreed by apparently transparent media. According to Wolny (2017), what we witness at present is, basically, the dismissal and deletion of the real to the benefit of the imitation, the depiction, and the visible. The prevalence of technology, remote technology, and their supremacy over the psyche of the tech-defined people all through the world makes human life multi-layered in terms of both virtual reality and others as called hyper-realities, like enhanced and artificial realities (Wolny, 2017). Whatever it may be, some will go for reality while others will be there to vote for simulacrum and simulacra (Wolny, 2017).

In Cayir’s (2019) words, *Brave New World* opens with an account of the procedure of manufacturing human babies, including insemination, in “the Central London Hatchery Conditioning Centre”. At this point, Bokanovskification - the most operative process demonstrates itself. The Director defines it with the following words “Bokanovskification consists of a series of arrests of development...” (Huxley, 1932, p. 7). With the target of steadiness, a world conditioner plans everything for the sake of “COMMUNITY, IDENTITY, STABILITY” (The terrestrial dictum). This trio is labeled as “Grand words”. In such a designed (simulated) world, after being exposed to a number of operational phases such as incubation, codification, injection, and so on; how would it be possible to mention the archetypal concept of the world?

Huxley’s characters in the novel are vividly presented to possess as well as demonstrate unique characteristic features. Although Alphas and Betas have been conditioned to an equal standard, they are in no way similar, as while Benito Hoover seems easygoing, his friend Henry Foster is a kind of “go-getter”, while Lenina Crowne seems to be unconventional and more “pneumatic”, Fanny Crowne proves moralistic and less pneumatic while Bernard Marx appears resentful and ugly, and Helmholtz Watson behaves in a handsome and intelligent way. As a matter of fact, Huxley seems to have worked with a consistent and conscious poise to create contrastive/complementary pairs to offer disparate possibilities of reactions to identical circumstances (Firchow, 1984). According to Diken (2011), Huxley’s dystopian novel is continually relevant in the contemporary, post-political contexts which take for granted “freedom” and nurture a passive nihilist version of “happiness” to the height of a political and ethical ideal. The mottos of *Brave New World*, if considered differently, can be construed in light of bio-politics, nihilism and network society; and thereby, the readers may come across remarkable homology between the novel and the contemporary world we are living in (Diken, 2011). As to the names of the characters in *Brave New World*, Huxley has made a
cognizant choice that precisely bolsters the novel’s concept as all the names he has used can be related to real or fictional eponyms (McGiveron, 1998). With sardonic irreconcilability, insinuations, and dual connotations underscoring exasperated perspective, the use of names Huxley makes echoes his caution against the obliteration each and every human undergoes in the contemporary world (McGiveron, 1998). Even though each of the names like Marx, Engels, Trotsky, Bakunin, Ford, Benito Mussolini, Diesel, Rothschild, and Hoover could reflect an affirmative attribute, in Huxley’s society, each refers to a deleterious one just as easily. Likewise, the “World State” depreciates candid uncomplicatedness, scientific innovation or advancement, ideal thoughts or ground-breaking notions, and political judiciousness while appreciating self-indulging debauchery, ironclad domination, despotism, and sheer gratification (McGiveron, 1998).

Merrin (2001) estimates that the simulacrum that Baudrillard spoke of, has proved itself, with the aggravating plethora of simulation processes, too diabolically powerful and outdone the symbolic, which may surprise its founder himself. Merrin (2001) quotes Baudrillard, “The universe and all of us have entered live into simulation”. Baudrillard (1994) suggests that in a simulated reality, the original becomes insignificant and the presented existence or model prevails without origin or reality (Sameshima, 2017). Sameshima (2017) explains that a simulacrum means a representation of something that becomes the perceived real which is not original, or the original has ceased to be over time. In his essay, “The Precession of Simulacra” Baudrillard elucidates the growing indiscernibility of reality from what he terms as *simulation* through a sort of thought exercise (Weiss, 2011). Baudrilard (Weiss, 2011) views that power, or the established order, is allied with the reality principle and what they have in common is their firmness, or their impermeable existence, which he (Baudrillard) explains as “speech without the possibility of reply,” i.e. as something indisputably agreed upon. Simulation is, as one experiences usually, affiliated to consumerism which engrosses humans into so huge a cycle of unnecessary abundance that it seemingly carries death in all aspects of life in the postmodern society (Habib, 2018). Humans’ identities have gone through total refurbishment since working identities mean identities no more, rather, consumer identities have replaced original identities; individuality does not count anymore, rather only group identities work; and satisfaction means, not gratification, but conformity. Similarly, workers are not made to work by the system, rather they participate in the system; and a worker is not regarded as a workforce, rather as a consumption force (Thiry-Cherques, 2010). Baudrillard explicates that the magic of the system is to offer an apparently flawless clarification isolated from the flawed reality (Thiry-Cherques, 2010). He contends that any structured system continues performing because people have an enforced belief that there is an integral reasonableness in it, and the system regards each individual not as a human, but as a sign. In such a system, time is manipulatively harmonized, space is eliminated and, thus, both are epitomized in the same framework, which provides us with widespread cells to deal with and a cloned world to live in (Thiry-Cherques, 2010).

In an obvious conformity, *Brave New World* depicts a world which radically limits individual freedoms in exchange of a balanced, methodical and steady society. Huxley’s world is predetermined in all severities, and there practically
nothing occurs instinctively; since the quantity and talent of the newborn are strictly controlled, disorderly class systems are transformed into caste systems, and the upper caste (alpha-pluses) are as inflexibly controlled as the lower-caste (epsilon sub-morons). Literally, the birth-to-death survival of the population of the “World State” is abnormally repressed by unbending rules and orders fixed and effectuated by the new system (Roberts, 2012). According to Sampson (2017), the severest dystopia is often clothed in apparently the best utopia; Huxley’s society, albeit dystopian in the strictest manner, is not controlled by apprehension or threatening, but made and stabilized as compliant as possible by engineered happiness. Huxley delineates a world which conditions its citizens emotionally reflecting a dystopian neuroculture which manipulates people’s willpower and placates individualism. Accordingly, for attaining its target, the “World State” joins two major mechanisms of domination – on the one hand, the wholesale consumption of the ecstasy-propelling drug Soma, and on the other hand, an entrancing media publicity device that works not on reason but through “feely” arrangements (Sampson, 2017). The morals and aspirations of the society of the “World State” are not family, love, and human relations but unparalleled achievements in industrial, economic, and technological growth (Miller, 2011). The citizens in the “World State” do not have any individual identity and they have surrendered their basic human facets and necessities to the weird and overt supremacy of technology (Miller, 2011). Huxley’s message in the novel reveals that our attempts and initiatives to attain unmitigated self-satisfaction will lead us to some sort of existence inhuman and impossible to live (Farag, 2016). The question of enslavement and freedom is obvious in the texture of the novel where Huxley vividly portrays the fact that over-dependence on rules and craving for development limits the basic tenets of humanity (Farag, 2016).

RESEARCH METHOD

The study adopts a qualitative research method comprising combined, comparative, and contrastive analyses among the selected narrative, theoretical framework, and available scholarly contents on them.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

“A SQUAT GREY building of only thirty-four storeys. Over the main entrance the words, CENTRAL LONDON HATCHERY AND CONDITIONING CENTRE, and, in a shield, the World State’s motto, COMMUNITY, IDENTITY, STABILITY” (Huxley, 1932; p. 1). Thus, begins Aldous Huxley’s Brave New World and the hatchery mentioned here is, in no way, related to birds or poultry as the term basically refers to. Rather, to one’s utter surprise, it is meant for humans to be hatched or “bokanovskified” (Huxley, 1932; p. 3). Each and every aspect of the “Bokanovsky’s Process” (Huxley, 1932; p. 3) has been a replication of the hatching process of the real world and, as a matter of fact, has surpassed the system that people apply to hatch eggs. Thus, there are the “Fertilizing Room” (Huxley, 1932; p. 1), the “Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning (DHC)” (Huxley, 1932; p. 1), “the incubator, racks upon racks of numbered test tubes, and the week’s supply of ova”
(Huxley, 1932; p. 2), concurring with, and in many regards, outshining the elements of usual hatching procedure.

In Brave New World, the citizens of the “World State” do not have any use for old things there specifically when they are beautiful, for beauty is attractive and the world state controllers do not want people to be charmed by old things, rather they program them to like the new ones. For their defined stability, they are ready to sacrifice everything. Their assumed happiness comes out of stability, and for that, they are to pay. They have chosen between happiness and high art by sacrificing the latter. Instead of literature, they have “the feelies and the scent organ” (Huxley, 1932, p. 194) which “mean a lot of agreeable sensations to the audience” (Huxley, 1932, p. 194). Fundamental human biological, as well as psychological aspects, are replaced by artificial pretensions which the denizens of the “World State” are to wear constantly to the utmost level of seeming reality, and if they feel otherwise, which is only normal for any living creature, they are provided with a specific amount of *soma*, obviously, a sort of supplementary drug, to retain the temperament designated by the Government. After any long-time labor and exhaustion, the “World State” inhabitants are retrieved with the help of *soma*, games, feelies, and wild sex. In Mustapha Mond’s (one of the World State controllers) words, “Seven and a half hours of mild, unexhausting labor, and then the *soma* ration and games and unrestricted copulation and the feelies. What more can they ask for?” (Huxley, 1932, p. 197).

Dehumanization, in Brave New World, occurs in the interest of the “World State” whose motto is “Community, Identity, Solidarity” (Al-Barznji & Rasheed, 2008). The novel prescribes that the loss of individuality and freedom is inevitable for a state of stability albeit at the expense of the normalcy of nature (al-Barznji & Rasheed, 2008). They offer flowers and books to the newborn babies only to frighten them subsequently so as to make them hate those natural and intellectual items perpetually. As the babies crawl to the flowers and books, the Director gives the signal to the Head Nurse to press down a little lever to make a violent explosion which lets a siren shriek, “shriller and ever shriller” (Huxley, 1932, p. 16) and the alarm bells sound maddeningly. Consequently, the children start and scream, and their faces get distorted with terror, and the lesson is exacerbated by a mild electric shock. Eventually, the explosions cease, the bells stop ringing and the shriek of the siren dies down to ensure a silence when the nurses are commanded to offer the babies flowers and books again. This time, at the approach of roses and pages of books, the infants shriek in horror and howl in an increasing volume. Thus, the lesson is repeated around two hundred times to make sure that the babies grow an instinct to hate books and flowers rest of their lives, which the Director emphasizes, “They’ll grow up with what the psychologists used to call an “instinctive” hatred of books and flowers. Reflexes unalterably conditioned. They’ll be safe from books and botany all their lives” (Huxley, 1932, p. 17). The “World State” does not allow the produced children to read books, for they apprehend that the “lower-caste people” will waste “Community’s time over books” and there remains the risk that these enlightened readers might “undesirably decondition one of their reflexes” (Huxley, 1932, p. 18). However, one of the students, not understanding the reason for keeping the newborn babies aloof from flowers, asked for an explanation which the DHC provides through the fact that the World
State’s motto is exclusively mercenary and product-oriented. As it does not see any love of nature keeping any factory busy, it decides to abolish the love of nature at any rate. Incidents and activities are fundamentally tailored and they do not occur naturally, like the Director concludes,

We condition the masses to hate the country. But simultaneously we condition them to love all country sports. At the same time, we see to it that all the country sports shall entail the use of elaborate apparatus. So that they consume manufactured articles as well as transport. Hence those electric shocks. (Huxley, 1932, pp. 18-19)

The “World State” consists of overabundance in everything especially in human engendering as to which the narrator presents, “OUTSIDE, IN THE garden, it was playtime. Naked in the warm June sunshine, six or seven hundred little boys and girls were running with shrill yells over the lawns” (Huxley, 1932, p. 25). Sex and sexual activities in the “World State” are performed in a seemingly wholesale manner among the denizens there regardless of their age or maturity since children are endorsed in mere “rudimentary sexual game” (Huxley, 1932, p. 26). If any of the little children shows the slightest reluctance to join the erotic dealings, he or she is regarded as abnormal and must be brought to proper medical attention. This happens when a nurse leads by the hand a small boy “to see the Assistant Superintendent of Psychology” just “to see if anything’s at all abnormal” because this little boy “seems rather reluctant to join in the ordinary erotic play” (Huxley, 1932, p. 26). In the “World State”, things happen in the name of Ford who is the Lord Almighty there. Time is counted not as BC or AD, rather as AF, and in the time of Ford everything takes place in a way opposite to nature and normality.

The Director apprises, “For a very long period before the time of Our Ford, and even for some generations afterward, erotic play between children had been regarded abnormal” (Huxley, 1932, p. 27). However, nowadays, in the time of Ford, sex between a male child and a female one is considered mere amusement which they should not be deprived of. Here, family life is abominable; it is, therefore, completely forbidden. To them, family life is appallingly dangerous, and when there was family life, “The world was full of fathers – was therefore full of misery; full of mothers – therefore of every kind of perversion from sadism to chastity; full of brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts – full of madness and suicide” (Huxley, 1932, p. 33). Having sexual relations with one single man or woman is simply intolerable in the “World State” where sex is as promiscuous as any other issue of everyday life. When Lenina reveals that she continues having Henry Foster for about four months, Fanny becomes utterly surprised and says, “But seriously I really do think you ought to be careful. It’s such horribly bad form to go on and on like this with one man” (Huxley, 1932, p. 34). It’s like, promiscuity is an art to practice and a right to enjoy for which one is “to make the effort” and “play the game” after all. In Fanny’s tone, “everybody belongs to everyone else” (Huxley, 1932, p. 37). On one occasion when Lenina enters the lift which is crowded with men from the Alphas Changing Rooms, she is greeted by many friendly gestures and smiles, for she is a popular girl as she “at one time or another, had spent a night with almost all of them” (Huxley, 1932, p. 49). Emotional attributes are dehydrated from the people.
so that they, in no possible way, can give vent to any sentiment. The incubated children of the “World State” are made to go through procedures which desiccate them of their last drop of emotion or emotional feeling, which the Controller asserts, “Fortunate boys! No pains have been spared to make your life emotionally easy – to preserves you, so far as that is possible, from having emotions at all” (Huxley, 1932, p. 37).

Anything old and traditional is to be only thrown away because the regulations of the “World State” do not support mending or repairing; they always desert old ones and embrace new. To them, “Old Clothes are beastly” and they maintain that they always throw away old clothes, for they believe, “Ending is better than mending” (Huxley, 1932, p. 42). Anything excessive is welcome to them, which is why they love to consume extravagantly and, in some cases, people are forced to consume much for the greater sake of industries to flourish. Artificial enormity is a regular facet of people in the Ford’s era when people have and do things far more than normal necessity, like someone considered an indefatigable lover commendably has “six hundred and forty different girls in under four years” (Huxley, 1932, p. 58). In such a weird way, drug means progress to them given that they have been able to engender a panacea narcotic called “Soma” that solves all of their negative attributes and provides them with pleasures of all kinds. The progress is so majestic that even

...the old men work, the old men copulate, the old men have no time, no leisure from pleasure, not a moment to sit down and think – or if ever by some unlucky chance such a crevice of time should yawn in the solid substance of their distractions, there is always soma, delicious soma.

(Huxley, 1932, p. 47)

Similarly, the “World State” is devoid of any sort of sentiment or alternating existence of pleasure and pain, or turns of comedy and tragedy. The Controller says,

Because our world is not the same as Othello’s world. You can’t flivvers without steel – and you can’t tragedies without social instability. The world’s stable now. People are happy; they get what they want, and they want what they can’t get. They’re well off; they’re safe; they’re never ill; they’re not afraid of death; there are blissfully ignorant of passion and old age; they’re plagued with no mothers or fathers; they’ve got no wives, or children, or lovers to feel strongly about; they’re so conditioned that they practically can’t help behaving as they ought to behave (Huxley, 1932, p. 193-94).

“And if anything should go wrong, there’s soma (Huxley, 1932, p. 194). The ration of soma is “half a gramme for a half holiday, a gramme for a weekend, two grammes for a trip to the gorgeous East, three for a dark eternity on the moon” (Huxley, 1932, p. 47). Anybody looking gloomy for any silly or serious reason needs “a gramme of soma” of which “One cubic centimeter cures ten gloomy” (Huxley, 1932, p. 52) souls. Soma remains at the hub of everything from relieving
from pain to celebrating ecstasy. Partying and having sex are the two most appropriate occasions to take *soma* to heart's content and get lost in the pure indulgence of pleasure. Both Henry and Lenina have their second dose of *soma* that rises "a quite impenetrable wall between the actual universe and their minds". The narrator apprises, "Bottled, they crossed the street; bottled they took the lift up to Henry's room on the twenty-eight floor. And yet, bottled as she was" (Huxley, 1932, p. 67). At Ford's Day Celebration, they sit around the table to make their solidarity circle and are served with dedicated *soma* tablets. Then, "the loving cup of strawberry-ice cream *soma* was passed from hand to hand and, with the formula 'I drink to my annihilation', twelve times quaffed" (Huxley, 1932, p. 70). For every gloomy sentiment raspberry sundae is the cure that not just eradicates the unwitting feeling but more robustly brings ecstasy to the brim. Lenina says, "A gramme in time saves nine" (Huxley, 1932, p. 77) and says to Bernard who wishes to be himself and not to indulge in challenging pursuit, “Now don't lose your temper. Remember, one cubic centimeter cures ten gloomy sentiments” (Huxley, 1932, p. 77).

In a bid to be different from the real world, Huxley’s World State in *Brave New World* nurtures more severe racism than it is found anywhere. There prevail various castes, like Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, Epsilon, and the like, some of who are superior while others are inferior and servile. The citizens in the World State do not have their individual life marked by distinguished identity and existence. Their existence is connected and conditioned in the same manner, and there everybody is for everybody else, which, as a matter of fact, they effectuate not because they feel its essence deep in their heart, rather they are conditioned to feel as such by the state policy. This kind of tailored collectiveness does not give true happiness to radical people like Bernard anymore and he wants to be more *him* and more on his own, “not so completely a part of something else. Not just a cell in the social body” (Huxley, 1932, p. 78). Hearing what Bernard expresses, Lenina cries out loud, “It’s horrible, it’s horrible; and how can you talk like that about not wanting to be a part of the social body?” (Huxley, 1932, p. 78). She calls this sort of wish from Bernard's mouth "blasphemy" (Huxley, 1932, p. 78), as she believes that they are free and there is no need to be wanting to become different from others. However, Bernard knows out and out that they are not free, rather simply enslaved by conditioning, and are to be happy in everybody else's way.

Nobody can have a wish or desire to live a life and enjoy freedom in a way different from what the World State permits to its denizens. Otherwise, there is the provision of unimaginable punishment of transference to some “Sub Centers” where one feels wishing for death more than life. After discovering Bernard’s mental rebellion, the Director becomes almost furious and lets him know,

And I like to take this opportunity, Mr. Marx, of saying that I’m not at all pleased with the reports I receive of your behavior outside working ours. You may say that this is not my business. But it is. I have the good name of the center to think of. My workers must be above suspicion, particularly those of the highest castes. (Huxley, 1932, p. 84)
The Director’s threatening continues, “If ever I hear again of any lapse from a proper standard of infantile decorum, I shall, ask for your transference to a Sub-Center – to Iceland” (Huxley, 1932, p. 85).

The kind of post-humanistic hyperreality delineated in Brave New World goes hand in hand with Baudrillard’s thoughts centering on post-humanism. Guignon (2018) studies the relationship between Baudrillard’s views and theories of post-humanism and argues that Baudrillard’s work is fundamentally post-human, although his notion stands in opposition to the principal currents of modern-day post-human theory. Most present-day post-human theories, Guignon (2018) reasons, focus on the indulgence of a liberal humanist subject—and celebrate its loss while Baudrillard’s thought suggests that the post-human figure only arrives in the age of hyperreality and is, therefore, interwoven with the tyrannical logic of the simulacrum. Barton (2016) finds a nightmarish link between contemporary dystopian literary works and the world we are heading to. The shadow of the modern, industrial and post-industrial eras is manifest as the dystopian nightmare of popular fiction. The disturbing world described in George Orwell’s novel 1984, points to an innate fear of our own “progress.” Our obsession with the post-apocalyptic and dystopian in contemporary fiction is an indication of a larger need to acknowledge the shadow of all this “advancement” and to consider the tremendous environmental, psychological, and sociological destruction that it has caused over the last few centuries. The dystopian landscape is one where the virtues of the individual and the family are trampled upon and destroyed in the name of development and control. We have paid a heavy price for our technologies and conveniences, and like Dr. Frankenstein, we unconsciously fear that we will not be able to control the monster of our own creation.

Dystopian fantasies allow us to recognize the combined obscurities in space and temporality securely beyond our day-to-day life. They demonstrate our shared apprehensions and let us shape them in a horrendous fiction (Barton, 2016). Dystopian imaginations, as well as prophetic conjectures, often accompany hefty cultural and technological transformations and provide a fictional voice to anything, which is too petrifying or perplexing for the community to express ostensibly. According to Jungian Psychologist Edward Edinger (Barton, 2016) in his book Archetype of the Apocalypse, dystopian and apocalyptic illusions act to re-establish humanity far from the issues of civilization, which have become outdated and unfitting in order to endorse new and more feasible ways of joint functioning. Nevertheless, regrettably, the wholesale shifts for the development of unnatural sorts in unusual paces bring more unnecessary replicas than originality. In Symbolic Exchange and Death (1976), Baudrillard argues that any ideology has been replaced by simulacra, and in the consumption-based society, artificial health, beautified beauty, and augmented eroticism collectively form the salvation of the body (Thiry-Cherques, 2010). Bodily appearance or what a physique stands for works as a trick for being sold.

CONCLUSION

Baudrillard’s concept of the simulacrum has been historically, even before the term came into existence, pervading the world with its consuming efficacy, its
nihilistic debasement of certain epistemological foundations, and its succeeding
demonization in human civilization. However, Baudrillard himself is overwhelmed
with simulacrum's ever-permeating diabolical sinew which is excessively greater
for the symbolic (Merrin, 2001). Nothing the “World State” of *Brave New World*
makes a display of is original or an archetype of anything real; it is rather a
simulated reality which is nothing but an overrated as well as an exaggerated
proliferation of the real we experience in practice. Huxley's simulation in the novel
and that of Baudrillard offer identical effects on the world and the people
belonging to it.
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