

Brave New World and the Rationalization of Industry by James Sexton

Reprinted from *English Studies in Canada* 12 (1986): 424-36, with the permission of the author and publisher. [reprinted in Jerome Meckier, *Critical Essays on Aldous Huxley* New York: G.K. Hall 1996 pp. 88-102.)

Rationalization: "the methods of technique and of organisation designed to secure the minimum waste of either effort or material. They include the scientific organisation of labour, standardisation of both materials and products, simplification of processes, and improvements in the system of transport and marketing [T]he judicious and constant application of . . . rationalisation is calculated to secure . . . to the community greater stability and a higher standard of life."

—World Economic Conference, Geneva, sponsored by the League of Nations, 1927, defined in L. Urwick, *The Meaning of Rationalisation*, 1929.

Near the passage which Huxley took as an epigraph to *Brave New World*, Nicolas Berdyaev speaks of socialist Russia as a satanocracy where the individual is subordinated to the collectivity. He asserts that human and spiritual values are being sacrificed to the false god of materialism, that life's centre of gravity has shifted to economics, and that man has been converted to a mere economic category. 1

Much of Berdyaev's thought is a footnote to the Grand Inquisitor chapter of Dostoevski's *The Brothers Karamazov*, which sets in opposition two views of human nature: wholly materialistic man (*homo oeconomicus*) versus "soul-encumbered" man. But interestingly the Grand Inquisitor's materialist vision of man is congruent with that of Henry Ford, whose *My Life and Work* is the Bible of *Brave New World*. There Ford states, "The average worker . . . wants a job in which he does not have to put forth much physical exertion—above all, he wants a job in which he does not have to think." He then goes on to say that the minority of creative thinkers, those few who would be appalled by repetitive, routine work, should look for a more vital pastime than mere music or painting:

[H]igher laws than those of sound, or line, or colour; (apply in the field) of industrial relationship. We want masters in industrial method—both from [88]/ the standpoint of the producer and the product. We want those who can mould the political, social, industrial, and moral mass into a sound and shapely whole. We have limited the creative faculty . . . for too trivial ends. We want men who can create the working design for all that is right and good and desirable in our life It is possible to increase the well-being of the workingman . . . by aiding him to do more If he is the happier for using a machine to less than its capacity, is he happier for producing less than he might and consequently getting less than his share of the world's goods in exchange?3

Huxley saw that the common denominator between Fordism and socialism was uncritical veneration of rationalization. Mark Rampion in *Point Counter Point* (1928) points to the sameness of Bolshevik and Capitalist goals, and incidentally, he uses the same infernal imagery as does Berdyaev. The squabbling between Bolsheviks and Fascists, Radicals and Conservatives was really a fight

to decide whether we shall go to hell by communist express train or capitalist racing motor car, by individualist 'bus or collectivist tram running on the rails of state control. The destination's the same in every case They all believe in industrialism in one form or another, they all believe in Americanization. Think of the Bolshevik ideal. America but much more so. America with government departments taking the place of trusts and state officials instead of rich men. And then the ideal of the rest of Europe. The same thing, only with the rich men preserved. Machinery and government officials there. Machinery and Alfred Mond or Henry Ford here They're all equally in a hurry. In the name of science, progress and human happiness!

In the years 1928 and 1929 Huxley reveals the probable source and a later confirmation of Rampion's views, for two books influenced him enough to base three *Vanity Fair* essays on them. I refer to "The Cold-Blooded

Romantics," "Machinery, Psychology and Politics," and "This Community Business." The first essay refers lengthily to Rene Fülöp-Miller's *The Mind and Face of Bolshevism* (which is a rich source for *Brave New World*, including the orgy-porgy scene); the last two deal extensively with Alphonse Séché's *La morale de la machine* (1929), a book which Huxley says made his flesh creep. 5

Both books discuss the Bolsheviks' and the capitalists' fascination with rationalization and mechanization, and both discuss the materialist legacy left by F. W. Taylor and Ford: a legacy of scientific management and rationalization.

Summarizing the thesis of Fülöp-Miller's book, Huxley says that the communist revolution aimed to transform the individual into a component cell of the great Collective Man: /89/

that single mechanical monster who, in the Bolshevick millenium, is to take the place of the unregimented hordes of "soul-encumbered" individuals who now inhabit the earth . . . Individuals must be organized out of existence; the communist state requires, not men, but cogs and ratchets in the huge "collective mechanism." To the Bolshevick idealist, Utopia is indistinguishable from one of Mr. Henry Ford's factories . . . The condition of their entry into the Bolshevick's Earthly Paradise is that they shall have become like machines. 6

The problem with Taylor's time and motion efficiency schemes and Ford's rational and efficient systematizing is that Ford and Taylor approached the organization mechanistically, seeing the organization member as a mere instrument of production to be handled as easily as any other tool, and failing to consider the individual's emotions or aspirations.

Ford states that the net result of the application of his principles of assembly is "the reduction of the necessity for thought on the part of the worker and the reduction of his movements to a minimum. He does as nearly as possible only one thing with only one movement." For Ford and Taylor, man has become a machine for whom any other end than increasing productivity is irrelevant. Ford boasts that his foundry worker "must be skilled in exactly one operation which the most stupid man can learn within two days."⁸ But it is in his description of "man-high" work that Ford sets the stage for Huxley's parody of the Laputan abuse of science in chapter 11 of *Brave New World*:

In the early part of 1914 we elevated the assembly line . . . ;we had one line twenty-six and three quarter inches and another twenty-four and one half inches from the floor-to suit squads of different heights. The waist-high arrangement and a further subdivision of work so that each man had fewer movements cut down the labour time per chassis to one hour thirty-three minutes . . . Our machines are placed very close together—every foot of floor space . . . carries the same overhead charge . . . We measure on each job the exact amount of room that a man needs . . . [I]f he and his machine occupy more space than is required, that . . . is waste. This brings our machines closer together than in probably any other factory in the world. To a stranger they may seem piled right on top of one another, but they are scientifically arranged, not only in the sequence of operations, but to give every man and every machine every square inch that he requires and, if possible, nor a square inch, and certainly not a square foot, more than he requires.⁹

By a *reductio ad absurdum*, Huxley satirizes this aspect of rationalization—the elimination of waste time and motion—literally not a centimetre of waste space being permitted in Huxley's helicopter lighting sets factory. Human tools are manufactured to fit snugly together over the conveyer belt: "forty-seven blond heads were confronted by forty-seven brown ones. Forty-/90/ seven snubs by forty-seven hooks; forty-seven receding by forty-seven prognathous chins."¹⁰ In Huxley's Laputan factory, man is deliberately moulded to fit the machine: "eighty-three almost noseless black brachycephalic Deltas were cold-pressing . . . One hundred and seven

heat-conditioned Epsilon Senegalese were working in the foundry. Thirty-three Delta females, longheaded . . . with narrow pelvises, and all within 20 millimetres of 1 metre 69 centimetres tall, were cutting screws" (188).

But Huxley had also been reading *La morale de la machine* (*The Machine Ethic*) shortly before working on *Brave New World* in the French Mediterranean village of Sanary. Séché makes the same point that Ford made above (and which Huxley makes often), that "[o]nce started the machine demands (under threat of economic ruin) that it shall never be unnecessarily stopped, never thrown out of its stride. Production and yet more production—that is the fundamental law of the machine's being. The necessary corollary to this law is consumption and yet more consumption."¹¹ (This is Mustapha Mond's main point in his justification of the rationalized world which he helps control.)

Séché's book is written from a right-wing perspective, and dedicated to certain heads of industry such as Ford, Citroën, Michelin, J. P. Morgan, as well as to Benito Mussolini "and to the unknown young men who tomorrow will have to take their responsibilities in a new world,"¹² where the imperatives of mechanization will dictate the eclipse of the individual by the collectivity. ¹³

Huxley gleans the same message from this work: the ineluctable triumph of the machine over human individualism. With the triumph of the machine ethic, man is reduced to a mere aspect of the productive process: his importance lies only in his relationship to increased productivity. Séché points approvingly to an American technique to increase productivity, which becomes a cornerstone of the Fordian *Brave New World*: making free films available at noon to the factory workers, "for management has calculated that the worker produces more when he is happy."¹⁴ Thus the worker's emotional state is simply a function of his productive capacity, to be manipulated by the paternalistic offerings of celluloid diversion. In *Brave New World*, the feelies serve a parallel function, only they are not provided free at lunch hour.

Oddly, Séché also dedicates *La morale de la machine* to Berdyaev, for Séché is not being ironic in his championing of the machine ethic. He speaks of two civilizations: one defending its sentimental ideal of individualism and the other fighting for its ideal mechanistic order of collective discipline—the order of the factory, the collective of the machine.¹⁵ He later reveals his penchant for the closed society when he ringingly affirms that the disorder of democracy necessitates a return to authority. Thus we see Mark Rampion's words borne out by the Bolshevik and Fascist-leaning mentalities. In both, the community—especially in its industrial role—takes precedence over the /91/ individual. And Séché's warm description of the unique spirit of emulation in the rationalized American factories, with their constant reference to production records, takes us to the threshold of Huxley's Central London Hatchery. He speaks approvingly of the American manager's mastery of technique: "Management has thought of everything: height of seats, orientation and price of lighting, selection of employees according to principles of natural aptitude (acuity of vision, selection by length of fingers, body mass, etc.)."¹⁶ Séché comments, "There one measures man as one calibrates a piston so that it may slide in the cylinder." ¹⁷

In this context, one thinks of Henry Foster, the brainy organization man who devotes his working life to trying to match or even better the record yields of Bokanovsky babies from one ovary: sixteen thousand and twelve in Central London Hatchery; sixteen thousand five hundred in Singapore, and nearly seventeen thousand in Mombassa. 'Nothing like oxygen shortage for keeping an embryo below par.' Again he rubbed his hands 'The lower the caste . . . the shorter the oxygen.' The first organ affected was the brain. After that the skeleton. At seventy per cent of normal oxygen you got dwarfs. At less than seventy, eyeless monsters" (15). Foster, this artist of industrial relations, then concludes, "Who are no use at all". Huxley translates Séché:

The morality of the machine . . . is the most imperious of moralities, because it is more than a merely materialistic morality; it is . . . a morality of cogs and wheels, of driving belts and cranks and moving pistons, a

morality subjected automatically to the will to power of organized mechanical force The modern man does not work for himself, does not live for himself; he works for society (the mechanized society whose watchword is production) . . . he lives to insure the movement, the equilibrium, the . . . prosperity of the . . . community. 18

Thus one has a right to existence only insofar as one helps keep the assembly line moving smoothly. In November 1929, Huxley states that *La morale de la machine* is the best account of the effects of mechanization on politics and the behaviour of the individual. Huxley continues:

The ethic of the machine, as M. Séché points out, is an ethic of discipline, of regimentation, of the total sacrifice of individual interests to the interests of the mechanized community The modern industrialized State, according to M. Séché, should be organized (and in Italy already is organized) like a very efficient factory, or group of factories, with hierarchically graded experts in charge of every department and a single Henry Ford at the head to co-ordinate their activities and dictate the policy of the whole concern. 19

It is no accident that Huxley alludes to the figure of Alfred Mond as the single Henry Ford at the head of Western Europe. Huxley's description /92/

individual. And SechCs warm description of the unique spirit of emulation in the rationalized American factories, with their constant reference to production records, takes us to the threshold of Huxley's Central London Hatchery. He speaks approvingly of the American manager's mastery of technique: "Management has thought of everything: height of seats, orientation and price of lighting, selection of employees according to principles of natural aptitude (acuity of vision, selection by length of fingers, body mass, etc.)." 16 Séché comments, "There one measures man as one calibrates a piston so char it may slide in the cylinder." 17 In this contcxt, one thinks of Idenry Foster, tlic brainy organization man who devotes his working life to trying to match or even better the record yields of Bokanovsky babies from one ovary: sixteen thousand and twelve in Central London Hatchery; sixteen thousand five hundred in Singapore, and nearly seventeen thousand in Mombassa. " 'Nothing like oxygen shortage for keeping an embryo below par.' Again he rubbed his hands 'The lower the caste . . . the shorter the oxygen.' The first organ affected was the brain. After that the skeleton. At seventy per cent of normal oxygen you got dwarfs. At less than seventy, eyeless monsters" (15). Foster, this artist of industrial relations, then concludes, "Who are no use at all" (15). Huxley translates Séché:

The morality of the machine . . . is the most imperious of moralities, because it is more than a merely materialistic morality; it is . . . a morality of cogs and wheels, of driving belts and cranks and moving pistons, a morality subjected automatically to the will to power of organized mechanical force The modern man does not work for himself, does not live for himself; he works for society (the mechanized society whose watchword is production) . . . he lives to insure the movement, the equilibrium, the . . . prosperity of the . . . community. 's . Thus one has a right to existence only insofar as one helps keep the assembly line moving smoothly. In November 1929, Huxley states that *La morale de la machine* is the best account of the effects of mechanization on politics and the behaviour of the individual. Huxley continues:

The ethic of the machine, as M. Séché points out, is an ethic of discipline, of regimentation, of the total sacrifice of individual interests to the interests of the mechanized community The modern industrialized State, according to M. Séché, should be organized (and in Italy already is organized) like a very efficient factory, or group of factories, with hierarchically graded experts in charge of every department and a single Henry Ford at the head to co-ordinate their activities and dictate the policy of the whole concern. 19

It is no accident that Huxley alludes to the figure of Alfred Mond as the single Henry Ford at the head of Western Europe. Huxley's description /92/ of Mustapha Mond is consistent with that of Sir Alfred Mond. His voice is described as deep and resonant, and he is said to be "of middle height . . . with a hooked nose, full red lips, eyes very piercing and dark" (36). Such a description jibes perfectly with the portrait of Mond set out in the biography by Hector Bolitho: "He had rich, dark eyes, flaming with the power within him" 20 and a "harsh" voice; while in contemporary caricatures the hooked nose is evident.

Yet surprisingly, despite the Rampion reference to Mond quoted above, critics have been silent about the richly symbolic name Mustapha Mond, which Huxley gave to the world controller of the *Brave New World*. The name is probably a pun on French "monde"—world, although such a pun is avoided by the French translator of *Brave New World* (French translation: *Le meilleur des rmondes*), who assigns the name Mustapha Menier to the world controller. To do so, however, is to ignore an allusion to the eminent industrialist-politician Sir Alfred Mond, Lord Melchett. Moreover, to be unaware that Huxley alludes to Alfred Mond is to miss an important aspect of the satire on the rationalization of industry. For Alfred Mond was so closely associated with the modish concept of rationalization in the late nineteen-twenties that the editor of *Nuttall's Standard Dictionary* asked Mond to define the concept for a new edition of the work in May 1929. Mond obliged, and Nuttall printed his definition of rationalization: "The application of scientific organization to industry, by the unification of the processes of production and distribution with the object of approximating supply to demand. 21

Even the concepts within Mond's rather limited definition of rationalization are specifically satirized. For example, by employing electronic advances such as the loudspeaker and the hypnopaedic methods developed in psychological experimentation, the operatives of *Brave New World* follow one of the basic tenets of rationalization as defined by Alfred Mond: "In the nurseries, the Elementary Class Consciousness lesson was over, the voices were *adapting future demand to future industrial supply* . . . [emphasis mine]. 'I do love flying, I do love having new clothes' . . . 'the conscription of consumption' . . . 'Every man, woman, and child compelled to consume so much a year. In the interests of industry' " (56-57).

Then too, another related goal of rationalization, the invention of new wants which the business will be in a good position to supply, is parodied in the dictate that no new game can be officially approved unless it can be shown to require "at least as much apparatus as the most complicated of existing games" (34).

Further, as Leslie Hannah points out in *The Rise of the Corporate Economy*, post-World War I Britain experienced a brief inflationary boom followed by a fierce slump: /93/

Economic depression was, then, a central fact of the interwar experience: to the labourer it meant the dole, to the employer it meant overcapacity; for both it provoked a further re-evaluation of their political, social and economic beliefs and of the economic institutions they sustained . . . land] nothing [appeared] between the wars to reduce the tenacity of the belief that the market economy was failing, and that it was the process of rationalization . . . that offered the way out of the predicament which this posed.²³

No one in the inter-war period in England was more convinced of the value of rationalization than Alfred Mond. Indeed in the years from 1925 until his death in 1930, Mond campaigned for his program of rationalization. He elaborates on his program of rationalization in two books: *Industry and Politics* (1927) and *Imperial Economic Unity* (1930), as well as in numerous speeches. To Mond the solution to the failing market system was a growing rationalization of economic units—he hoped to see a kind of economic League of Nations, where industrialists could effectively and co-operatively shape the economic destiny of most of the world. With Beaverbrook he championed the idea of a kind of common market within the British Empire, a potentially larger market than the rest of Europe combined, and larger than the market which he envied, the United States.

He personally pushed through the amalgamation of the British chemical industries into one massive, multi-national corporation: Imperial Chemical Industries Limited (ICI), in 1926, and was a staunch advocate of increased scientific research for industry.

Indeed, a form of state capitalism is present in *Braze New World*. Although Huxley is rather silent as to the exact form the Fordian economy takes, it is clear that the world controllers are representatives of a world economy based upon rationalized, amalgamated economic units.

In *The Art of Being Ruled* (1926), Wyndham Lewis, not unlike Mark Rampion, describes such a possible scenario: "Giant Trusts and Cartels everywhere, at the present time, as they coalesce, approach the economic pattern of the socialist state. Whether the trust-king is a highly salaried servant (as Lenin said he should be, if proved to be the most efficient organizer), or a capitalist magnate (when these chiefs become fewer and fewer, as they do every day), does not particularly matter." 24

Mond's blueprint would have been consistent with an economy that blurred the demarcation line between Capitalism and Bolshevism, though doubtless as an arch-anti-communist, Mond would have preferred the post-liberal, centralized, and rationalized economy to remain safe for corporate rationalizers. There is an amusing cartoon in the *Glasgow Evening Times* (19 September 1927),⁵ entitled "Peeps into the Wonderful Future," which no doubt reflects a typical public response to Mond. The caption, "Mond Amalgamates Everything in Sight," runs below the depiction of a futuristic City of London with airships called Mond Meteors bound for Paris, Moscow, /94/ Tokyo; skyscrapers festooned with signs advertising Palmondolive Soap, The Mondy Wail—World's greatest newspaper, the Mond United Church, the Mondworth Sixpence Store, Mond Stout, Mond Soap, Paramond Pictures. Between two of the skyscrapers runs the Mond Electric Railway and at a less dizzying height, a tree-lined road—the *Champs du Monde*. From another skyscraper above the whole spectacle in an elevated theatre box sits Alfred Mond. Clearly the amalgamation of ICI and Mond's speeches on rationalization made not only Huxley view Mond as a forerunner of economic world controllers.

Séché, like Mond, saw the First World War as a deathblow to liberal capitalism.

Only the Machine won something from the war . . . her adversary, individualist, bourgeois democracy is ruined. As well, war gives a formidable push to industry, which constructs admirable factories and modernizes its equipment. Besides, war permits the Machine to demonstrate the superiority of the collective organization of her factories over individual anarchy. Finally, from the war arose the League of Nations, which although now only a debating society, constitutes, nevertheless, the primary base of a world society which will follow the laws and ethos of the Machine Already the League has created an international economic cooperation.²⁶

Remember that Huxley looked upon Séché's scenario as inevitable. In this context, Mond's speech of March 1927 resembles an implicit attitude of Wellsian "open conspiracy," that is, make government an enterprise run by experts. He states that international leaders of industry, "those who had to deal practically with the great affairs of daily life were more likely to help finally to the solution of international difficulties." ²⁷ He applauds the growing trend towards combination or grouping of industries in all countries—which, among other advantages, enabled the larger questions of industrial policy to be discussed by relatively few people and solved in a measurable distance of time. Moreover, Mond saw that with increased rationalization industrialists could speak with one voice through direct discussions of industrial chiefs.²⁸ Mond ended the speech by expressing the hope that he would see an economic arm of the League of Nations as powerful and authoritative as the League was in political affairs. Like Séché, Mond speaks in evolutionary terms about the inevitability of international consolidation of industry: "the amalgamation of units—the creation of enterprises of a greater size . . . of a coordinated character—was an absolute part of the evolution of modern industry and was entirely unavoidable."²⁹

But it is in "Research and the Future," a chapter from *Industry and Politics* where Alfred Mond so closely resembles his Fordian namesake. Indeed the speech amounts to the same thesis that Mustapha Mond outlines in chapter 3 of *Brave New World*: the inevitable choice between world control or chaos: /95/

We are entering on an economic and . . . coldly scientific war, which will lead to the extinction of the less strong and efficient industries, and perhaps even nations. The most effective methods of promoting scientific research and the application of scientific discoveries are the only things that can carry this country through Muddling through is fatal in these days of highly efficient research and highly specialized industries . . . ; we must cut our way through by a definite predetermined path to the final fully utilized triumph.

The welfare of the whole nation depends on this complete application of science to industry. The welfare . . . of the human race depends on the efficiency of its . . . scientists in every field. The amazing . . . progress made in recent years must not induce . . . complacency. We are not living on the apex of time . . . or civilisation. Rather are we at the foot of great ascent, which will take us to higher forms of civilisation than any that even we moderns can predict [The] final triumph is by no means certain. The welter of the Great War taught us that there are dangers inherent in our highly advanced . . . complex civilisation, and taught us . . . that a relapse into chaos is by no means an impossibility. There is only one possible policy. Rightly or wrongly, we must pin our faith to the scientists of this and of future generations. On their work and their discoveries the race must stand or fall. Research and more and more research must clear the only feasible path for the forward progress of mankind. 30

Alfred Mond thus aligned himself in 1927 with the attitude of Séché and Huxley: namely, that there is "no arguing with the machine; either you do not set the thing going, or else, if you do, you adapt yourself to its rhythm and obey the literally iron laws which it imposes [E]fficiency has become absolutely necessary [E]ven the owner class has now become subject to the ethic of the machine The result of this state of affairs is that the doctrines of political democracy . . . are rapidly falling into discredit. 31

Significantly, Alfred Mond, to use Huxley's phrase, was an apostle of "progress, production and efficiency." 32 He was also an admirer of Mussolini—he owned an Italian villa—and, according to his biographer, was remembered by Mussolini as "not a democrat." 33

Alfred Mond's utopian embracing of scientific research and rationalization as a safeguard against chaos, however, went far beyond mere lofty generalization. Indeed, I believe that at least three utopian scientific research schemes with which Alfred Mond was publicly associated are specifically alluded to in *Brave New World*: the elimination of world hunger through nitrogen fixation, the elimination of old age through the use of hormones, and the elimination of certain tropical diseases.

One notes that Mustapha Mond tells John Savage that the biologist of *Brave New World* had arrived at the point of synthesizing all the food needs of the world (265). Here the fictional Mond responds to one of his namesake's utopian hopes. In a story reporting Mond's 1928 speech to the United World /96/ Chemical Societies, Mond refers to Lord Salisbury's query why the air could not simply furnish all nitrogen required for fertilizers instead of going to Chile for it. Mond claimed that [i]n another 50 years synthetically-produced food might make the use of soil manures unnecessary [T]hey might be able to synthesize all the foodstuffs that they needed, so that in case of war there would be no necessity to starve . . . but only to put up a few more factories. "34

Another idea with which Mond was publicly associated is an important part of the satire in *Brave New World*: the utopian advocacy of hormones as the possible elixir of youth. In July 1926, Mond presided over a chemical congress which, as reported in the *Times*, dealt with the means by which the human body resisted the attacks of old age through the influence of hormones. 35 Mond opened the section and praised British pharmacologists' work with three most important hormones: adrenalin, pituitary, and insulin; praising at the same time the spirit of co-operation between lab and industry, saying that a "new trinity had been formed consisting of the physiologist, biochemist, and the manufacturer, and upon their joint efforts depended . . . the future progress of

medical knowledge and the alleviation of human suffering.”³⁶ At Mond's session the "papers presented dealt with the experimental study and use of hormones, the chemistry of the pituitary gland and of insulin, and the commercial production of hormones"³⁷; and claims were made that hormones could prolong human life and youthful vigour. One thinks here of Linda's jingle, "A, B, C, vitamin D," Benito Hoover's sex hormone chewing gum, the compulsory "Violent Passion Surrogate"—compulsory flooding of the whole system with adrenalin once a month as a condition of perfect health, compulsory pregnancy substitutes, pituitary doses, and the subsidy of two thousand pharmacologists and biochemists in A.F. 178.

Yet another link between Sir Alfred Mond and the *Brave New World* was Mond's close association with research in tropical medicine. As Minister of Health in the Lloyd George government, Mond was chairman of the Board of Management of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine to which two million pounds had been offered by the Rockefeller Foundation. According to the report in the *Times*, the building was destined to house the greatest centre in the world for research into tropical medicine." The importance of research in tropical medicine for the *Brave New World* economy (and for that of the British Empire) is evident when one remembers the loss to sleeping sickness of the promising young Alpha-Minus administrator at Mwanza-Mwanza (in then-Tanganyika). One also thinks of Henry Foster's references to the hatcheries at Mombassa and the routine injection of embryos with typhoid and sleeping sickness organisms at the Central London Hatchery. ("We immunize the fish against the future man's diseases"[18].) Obviously the tropical centres represent a prodigious investment in production. /97/

Perhaps yet another reason why Huxley considered Alfred Mond such a fitting prototype of the world controller of the rationalized society of *Brave New World* is that he was so publicly associated with the allied ideas of paternalism, industrial co-operation, team spirit, loyalty, and tractability of the worker. Mond was a highly visible delegate to a conference devoted to rationalization in December 1927. There, Sir Arthur Balfour pointed out that post-war conditions made rationalization more necessary, stating also that "by means of co-ordination boys and girls and men of no skill could be transformed into useful units of production."³⁹ There is a disturbing similarity between Balfour's utterance, the Human Element Manager's declaration that he hardly ever has any trouble with his workers (129), and Mond's speech, "Commerce," in which he said that British workers were "the most easily handled of any people he knew."⁴⁰

Another parody of extreme rationalization takes on further ironic overtones in connection with Mond's career in industry. Huxley mordantly parodies a key element of rationalization—the scientific elimination of waste in industry—as Henry Foster praises the wonders of the phosphorus recovery plant at the Slough Crematorium: "On their way up the chimney the gases go through four separate treatments. P205 used to go right out of circulation every time they cremated some one. Now they recover over ninety-eight percent. of it. More than a kilo and a half per adult corpse. Which makes the best part of four hundred tons of phosphorus every year from England alone . . . Fine to think we can go on being socially useful even after we're dead. Making plants grow" (85-86). This is rationalization with a vengeance. Significantly, the Mond name was associated with the sulphur-recovery process. Moreover, in 1929, shortly after Mond realized the merger of the four chemical giants in Britain, his newly-formed Imperial Chemicals Industries pressed ahead with a grandiose and fully-reported scheme—building a huge fertilizer plant at Billingham. It was hoped that with this plant "ICI would be able to supply all the nitrogenous fertiliser needed by farmers, not merely in the United Kingdom, but everywhere in the British Empire." ⁴¹

Benito Mussolini twice called Mond "a great man" in an interview with Mond's biographer. ⁴² No doubt Mond's autocratic, rational approach to economic problems appealed to Mussolini, for Mond too was impatient with labour strife and offered a blueprint for industrial harmony based on industrial co-operation.

It was typical of Alfred Mond, Fellow of the Royal Society, the "grand dreamer,"⁴³ the Utopian, that he should hold the first meeting of the Melchett-Turner conferences in the rooms of the Royal Society at Burlington House. Bolitho notes the Utopian quality of Mond's goals, saying, however, that "the Utopia was not easily born."⁴⁴ Mond, however, was able partly to overcome opposition there to rationalization, which the Trades Union Council saw as the science of the big combines of America,⁴⁵ so that Mond, reflecting on the accomplishments of the Melchett-Turner conference, was /98/ able to state: "on the subject of rationalization . . . The conference determined that this tendency should be welcomed and encouraged insofar as it leads to improvements in the efficiency of industrial production, services and distribution, and to the raising of the standard of . . . living of the people The new industrial revolution, upon the threshold of which we already are, will be the age of the machinery of organisation. Machinery has already been organised. 46

Mond's career justifies to some extent Huxley's view of Mond as the embodiment of what he called "consumptionists," "prosperity-mongers" and believers in "Progress."⁴⁷ He says, however, that political reform and industrial rationalization are necessary and valuable. But do not let us make the mistake of supposing that they automatically create happiness. The only people who derive happiness directly from them are the reformers and rationalizers themselves. Absorbed as they are in occupations which are felt to be valuable, they lose themselves in their work and consequently are happy. But the people for whom they work do not share this happiness. All that reform and rationalization can do for them is to provide . . . an environment propitious to the kind of working and living that brings self-forgetful happiness.

One admires the wisdom of the Russian revolutionary leaders who so organized society that a large proportion of the population came to be actively engaged in the work of reform and rationalization. 48

Obviously he groups Mond in the school that sees the "Ideal Man" as "a kind of de-individualized worker-bee, whose sole duty is towards society," not the school that sees him as "an improved and more gentlemanly version of the Free Individual of the Renaissance." ⁴⁹

The germ of *Brave New World* is contained in Mark Rampion's dialogue with Philip Quarles in *Point Counter Point* (1928) where he positively identifies Mond as a proponent of the hypothetical world *Brave New World* will later flesh out. The satanocracy would be endorsed by Mond, Wells, and also Lenin, Mussolini, MacDonald, and Baldwin—that is, by Bolsheviks, Fascists, social democrats, and Tories, "All equally anxious to take us to hell and only squabbling about the means of taking us" (*Point Counter Point*, 415).

By late 1929 Huxley had the economic, esthetic blueprint for *Brave New World* filed for future reference. All the *bêtes-noires* are being assembled and placed ready for toppling: H. G. Wells, Alfred Mond, progress, consumerism, cubism, rationalization.

Philip Quarles says that neo-Luddism would be impossible, that "given our existing world, you can't go back, you can't scrap the machine . . . unless you're prepared to kill off about half the human race. Industrialism made possible the doubling of the world's population in a hundred years" (*PCP*, 416). /99/

Rampion then states that the next war will make [the slaughter of half the world's population] "only too practical," and goes on to speculate on the inevitability of war, since industrial progress means "over-production . . . [and] the need for getting new markets . . . international rivalry . . . war" (*PCP*, 416).

So far, Rampion anticipates Mond's history lesson in *Brave New World*. "And mechanical progress means more specialization and standardization of work . . . more ready-made and unindividual amusements . . . diminution of initiative and creativeness . . . means finally a kind of individual madness that can only result in social

revolution . . . Wars and revolutions are inevitable, if things are allowed to go on as they are at present" (*PCP*, 416-17).

And Quarles and Rampion take us speculatively to the threshold of *Brave New World*, when they agree, "So the problem will solve itself. Only by destroying itself" (*PCP*, 417). Then with an unconscious irony, Rampion provides the solution—not for amelioration as he thought, but for the entry into *Brave New World*: "The root of the evil's in the individual psychology; so it's there . . . you'd have to begin. The first step would be to make people live dualistically, in two compartments. In one compartment as industrialized workers, in the other as human beings. As idiots and machines for eight hours out of every twenty-four and real human beings for the rest" (*PCP*, 417).

This is close to the utopian solution of *Island*. But the *Brave New World* will take the easier path by tripling the duration of idiotic-machinelike existence, from eight hours to twenty-four hours per day. The starting point for the *Brave New World* is a war caused by the imperatives of *laissez-faire* industrialism, and a permanent solution to all future wars is the same industrialism—only rationalized. The individual psychology is made consistent with a rationalized world system with the individual scientifically engineered to serve production and consumption—in short, to serve the ethic of the machine. Rampion's fear that the "industrialists who purvey standardized . . . amusements to the masses . . . to make you as much of a mechanical imbecile in your leisure as in your hours of work . . . standardizing and specializing every trace of genuine manhood or womanhood out of the human race" (*PCP*, 418-19) comes to fruition in the rationalized *Brave New World*.

Notes

1. Nicolas Berdyaev, *The End of Our Time*, trans. Donald Atwater (London: Sheed and Ward, 1933). French edition published 1927.
2. Henry Ford, *My Life and Work* (London: Heinemann, 1922), p. 103. Peter Firchow's interesting study, *Brave New World, The End of Utopia* (1984), came to my attention after this essay had been accepted. He, too, quotes extensively from Ford's biography and also refers to Fülöp-Miller's *The Mind and Face of Bolshevism*.
3. Ford, pp. 104-05.
4. Aldous Huxley, *Point Counter Point* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1928), pp. 414-15. Subsequent references to the first edition are included in the text by page numbers in parentheses.
5. Aldous Huxley, "This Community Business," *Vanity Fair*, New York, 33 (December 1929), 62.
6. Aldous Huxley, "The Cold-Blooded Romantics," *Vanity Fair*, New York, 30 (March 1929), 64.
7. Ford, p. 80.
8. Ford, p. 87.
9. Ford, pp. 82, 113.
10. Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1932), p. 188. Subsequent references to the first edition are included in the text by page numbers in parentheses.
11. Huxley, "This Community Business," p. 62.
12. Alphonse Séché, *La morale de la machine* (Paris: Grasset, 1929), p. iii. Except where Huxley translates a passage from Séché in his review article, "This Community Business" (see n. 18), the translations from Séché are mine. The book has never been translated into English.
13. Séché, p. 71.
14. Séché, p. 32.
15. Séché, p. 69.
16. Séché, p. 34.
17. Séché
18. Huxley, "This Community Business," p. 62.

19. Aldous Huxley, "Machinery, Psychology and Politics," *The Spectator*, 143 (23 November 1929), 749.
20. Hector Bolitho, *Alfred Mond, First Lord Melchett* (London: Secker, 1933), p. 71.
21. Bolitho, p. 290.
22. Lyndall Urwick, *The Meaning of Rationalisation* (London: Nisbet, 1929), p. 108.
23. Leslie Hannah, *The Rise of the Corporate Economy*, second edition (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 31-32.
24. P. Wyndham Lewis, *The Art of Being Ruled* (New York: Harper, 1926), p. 111.
25. W. J. Reader, *Imperial Chemical Industries: A History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), plate 38.
26. Séché, pp. 79, 80.
27. Alfred Mond, quoted in *Times*, "International Aspect of Industry," 9 March 1927, 11d.
28. *Times*, "International."
29. *Times*, "U.S. Finance and the Empire. Sir Alfred Mond on Cooperation," 18 April 1928, 11c.
30. Alfred Mond, *Industry and Politics* (London: Macmillan, 1927), pp. 169-70.
31. Huxley, paraphrasing Séché, "Machinery, Psychology and Politics," p. 750.
32. Huxley, "Machinery."
33. Bolitho, p. 306.
34. Mond, quoted in *Times*, "Synthetic Foods of the Future. Sir Alfred Mond's prediction," 23 March 1928, 9e.
35. *Times*, "Chemical Congress. Sir A. Mond and Supply of Insulin," 21 July 1926, 1 le.
36. *Times*, "Chemical." 37. *Times*, "Chemical."
38. *Times*, "London School of Hygiene," 8 July 1926, 18d.
39. *Times*, "Trade Barriers," 15 December 1927, 1 lc.
40. *Times*, "Britain's Advantages. Sir A. Mond on Outlook for Industry," 18 April 1928, 18e.
41. Reader, "Personality, Strategy and Structure: Some Consequences of Strong Minds," in Leslie Hannah, *Management Strategy and Business Development: An Historical and Comparative Study* (London: Macmillan, 1976), p. 122.
42. Bolitho, p. 381.
43. Bolitho, quoting Lord Beaverbrook, p. 378.
44. Bolitho, p. 315.
45. Bolitho, p. 311.
46. Mond, in Bolitho, p. 317.
47. Huxley, "The Problem of Faith," *Harper's*, 166 (January 1933), p. 213.
48. Huxley, "Problem," p. 214.
49. Huxley, "Problem," p. 215.