ISSN 1799-2591 (print); ISSN 2053-0692 (online)
Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 822-827, March 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1603.12

Manufactured Obedience: Ideological Control in the Dystopian Visions of Huxley, Orwell and Bradbury

Akram H. Shalghin
English Language and Literature, Jadara University, Irbid, Jordan

***Abstract*—This paper conducts a comparative literary analysis of three seminal dystopian novels—Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932), George Orwell's *1984* (1949), and Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451* (1953)—to examine how ideological control is exercised through pleasure, surveillance, and censorship, respectively. Drawing on theoretical frameworks from Michel Foucault (disciplinary power, biopower), Louis Althusser (ideological and repressive state apparatuses), Antonio Gramsci (cultural hegemony), and Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer (the culture industry), the study reveals how each novel portrays distinct yet interrelated mechanisms of social control that suppress individual freedom and manufacture consent. Through close textual analysis, the paper explores how these dystopian visions reflect and critique evolving forms of authoritarianism, particularly in relation to modern concerns about digital surveillance, algorithmic manipulation, and the erosion of intellectual freedom. The findings indicate that while the methods of control differ—Huxley's pleasure-based conditioning, Orwell's fear-driven repression, and Bradbury's censorship-driven ignorance—all three authors converge on a central warning: that true freedom is imperilled when ideology is internalised and resistance becomes unthinkable. The paper concludes by emphasising the enduring relevance of dystopian literature as a tool for critical consciousness and democratic vigilance.**

***Index Terms*—dystopian literature, ideological control, surveillance, censorship, Huxley and Orwell**

I. Introduction

Human beings have always been preoccupied with understanding the nature of existence (Frankl, 2006, p. 23), raising fundamental questions about our social, political, and economic status, as well as inquiries into the nature of justice in the world. In seeking to unravel the complexities of life, it becomes crucial to examine why, despite our potential for harmony and peaceful coexistence, societies often descend into states of control, repression, and inequality. Why do certain groups seize power, inflict suffering, and create a world of injustice instead of allowing peaceful and harmonious coexistence?

In light of the prevailing reality of a world dominated by inequality and suffering, intellectuals, thinkers and humanists have consistently aspired to create a society free from injustices—a utopia, as defined by Merriam-Webster, where all individuals are treated equally, enjoy a fair distribution of wealth, and possess the freedom to express themselves and participate in socio-political issues relevant to their lives (Plato, *Republic*, 1.1; More, *Utopia*; Asimov, *Foundation*). However, this ideal vision remains largely confined to the realm of imagination. Reality, as depicted in many literary works, often reveals a world shaped by dystopian forces rather than utopian ideals—a world where power is concentrated in the hands of a few, and social control is maintained through manipulation, censorship, and oppression.

Dystopian literature serves as a critical mirror to contemporary anxieties, offering cautionary tales about the erosion of autonomy and the rise of ideological domination. Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) presents a society governed not by fear, but by engineered pleasure and biological conditioning, producing passive citizens who willingly conform. George Orwell's *1984* (1949) depicts a totalitarian regime maintained through perpetual surveillance, historical revisionism, and psychological terror, where even thought is policed. Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451* (1953) explores a world where knowledge is extinguished through censorship and anti-intellectualism, resulting in a population indifferent to truth and critical inquiry.

This paper analyses these three novels through the theoretical lenses of Michel Foucault, Louis Althusser, Antonio Gramsci, and Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer. These frameworks help illuminate how power operates not merely through force, but through institutions, language, and culture—what Foucault (1977) called "disciplinary power," Althusser (1971) termed "ideological state apparatuses," Gramsci (1971) described as "hegemony," and Adorno and Horkheimer (2002) critiqued as the "culture industry".

The methodology is qualitative and comparative, involving close textual analysis of narrative structure, character development, and symbolic elements. By examining how each author represents control, conformity, and resistance, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How do *Brave New World, 1984,* and *Fahrenheit 451* portray ideological control and the suppression of individual freedom?

2. In what ways do the mechanisms of control differ across the three novels, and what do these differences reveal about evolving fears of authoritarianism?
3. How do these dystopian visions resonate with contemporary concerns about surveillance, censorship, and the erosion of intellectual freedom?

The objective is to demonstrate that while Huxley, Orwell, and Bradbury employ different strategies, pleasure, fear, and censorship, their works converge on a central warning: the internalisation of ideology renders resistance nearly impossible, and the preservation of freedom requires constant vigilance.

II. Discussion

Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) presents a dystopian society where control is not enforced through overt repression, but through engineered pleasure, biological conditioning, and the systematic erasure of individuality. In the World State, freedom is not taken away—it is made irrelevant. Citizens are decanted, not born; conditioned, not educated; pacified, not punished. As Huxley (1932, 2007, p. 13) writes, "We also predestine and condition. We decant our babies as socialised human beings, as Alphas or Epsilons..." This process reflects Althusser's (1971) concept of Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs)—institutions such as education, media, and family that shape consciousness to reproduce dominant ideology.

From infancy, citizens are subjected to hypnopaedia (sleep-teaching), a method of subconscious indoctrination that implants slogans like "Everyone belongs to everyone else" and "Ending is better than mending." This early psychological conditioning ensures that individuals internalise the values of the World State as natural and self-evident. As the Director of Hatcheries declares, "That is the secret of happiness and virtue, liking what you've got to do. All conditioning aims at that: making people like their unescapable social destiny" (Huxley, 1932, 2007, p. 16). This aligns with Foucault's (1977) notion of disciplinary power, where individuals regulate themselves because they have internalised norms. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault argues that the most effective power is invisible; it doesn't coerce, it shapes desire.

In the World State, citizens are not forced into obedience; they are engineered to love it. They are drugged with soma, a happiness-inducing drug that eliminates discontent. They are entertained by "feelies," immersive films that stimulate emotions without requiring thought. They are immersed in consumerism, which keeps them busy and distracted. This engineered happiness exemplifies what Adorno and Horkheimer (2002) critique in *Dialectic of Enlightenment* as the culture industry: mass entertainment that pacifies the public, discourages critical thinking, and promotes passive consumption.

Furthermore, Huxley's society embodies Gramsci's theory of hegemony, where the ruling class maintains power not through force, but by making its values appear universal and desirable (Gramsci, 1971). As Williams (1977, 1983, p. 206) observes, "Huxley's society reflects Gramsci's idea of hegemony through its ability to maintain control by making its values appear natural and desirable to its citizens." The state does not need to punish dissent because dissent does not exist—people have been taught to love their oppression.

Characters like Bernard Marx and Helmholtz Watson, who feel alienated and yearn for authenticity, highlight the cost of conformity. Bernard is described as "a bit of a misfit, a loner who preferred solitude over socialising with his peers" (Huxley, 1932, 2007, p. 54). Jameson (1991, p. 85) notes that "Bernard's marginalisation highlights the cost of individuality in a society that demands uniformity and consumption." Yet even their rebellion is contained and ultimately neutralised, reinforcing the novel's grim message: in a world where freedom is defined as the satisfaction of artificial desires, true autonomy is impossible. Huxley's vision is increasingly relevant today. As Thomson (2023) argues, modern consumerism and digital entertainment mirror the World State's use of pleasure to distract and pacify.

In stark contrast to Huxley's pleasure-driven dystopia, George Orwell's *1984* (1949) presents a world ruled by fear, surveillance and brute ideological enforcement. The Party maintains power through Repressive State Apparatuses (RSAs), the Thought Police, torture, public executions, and constant monitoring via telescreens. As Foucault's panopticon illustrates, the mere possibility of being watched leads individuals to self-regulate their behaviour. In Oceania, this is literal: "Big Brother is watching you." Citizens live in perpetual anxiety, knowing that any deviation, any unorthodox thought, will be punished.

Orwell's regime also employs ideological control through the manipulation of language and history. Newspeak is designed not to express ideas, but to eliminate them: "Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought?" (Orwell, 1949, 2008, p. 57). By shrinking the vocabulary, the Party ensures that rebellion becomes unthinkable. This aligns with Althusser's ISAs, where institutions like education and media reproduce ideology. In Oceania, the Ministry of Truth constantly rewrites the past, erasing facts and inventing realities, ensuring that the Party's version of truth is the only one that exists.

The Party's slogan, "War is Peace; Freedom is Slavery; Ignorance is Strength", epitomises Gramscian hegemony inverted: instead of winning consent through cultural leadership, the Party imposes ideology through terror and cognitive dissonance. As Jameson (1991, p. 89) notes, *1984* represents "the ultimate extension of power over the individual, where even thoughts are subjected to control and repression".

Winston Smith's doomed rebellion, his secret diary, his affair with Julia, and his quest for truth reveal the depth of the Party's psychological control. His final submission, declaring "I love Big Brother," demonstrates the terrifying success of

ideological domination. Orwell's warning is clear: when a state controls not only actions but thoughts, freedom is extinguished at its root.

Clark (2024) argues that Orwell's vision remains relevant in an era of mass surveillance, data mining, and facial recognition. Evans (2024, p. 45) notes that "dystopian fiction provides a vital lens for understanding modern digital control." Robinson (2023) observes an "incredible similarity between fiction and reality" in how dissent is managed today through algorithmic suppression and digital panopticism.

Orwell's depiction also resonates with contemporary concerns about deepfakes, disinformation, and the erosion of truth. In a world where AI can generate fake videos, edit historical records, and manipulate public perception, the Ministry of Truth no longer feels like fiction. The Party's method of "doublethink", holding two contradictory beliefs simultaneously, mirrors the cognitive dissonance many feel in today's polarised media landscape.

Moreover, the novel critiques not only state power but also the internalisation of surveillance. Citizens report each other; children spy on parents; even private thoughts are policed. This reflects Foucault's idea that power is not just top-down, but diffused throughout society. The telescreen is not just a tool of control; it becomes a mirror of the self, forcing individuals to police their own minds.

Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451* presents a third, yet equally terrifying, model of control: the systematic destruction of knowledge. Unlike Huxley's world of engineered pleasure or Orwell's regime of fear, Bradbury's dystopia emerges not from state-imposed terror, but from a society that willingly abandons books. As Captain Beatty explains, "We stand against the small tide of those who want to make everyone unhappy with conflicting theory and thought" (Bradbury, 1953, 2012, p. 56). Books are burned not because the state fears ideas, but because the public has come to reject them in favour of fast-paced entertainment and superficiality.

This dynamic reflects Foucault's disciplinary power operating through voluntary compliance: citizens internalise the ideology that books are dangerous or irrelevant. Simultaneously, Althusser's Ideological State Apparatuses function through media saturation, the wall-sized televisions, "parlour families," and relentless noise that replace critical thought with passive consumption. Guy Montag's transformation from book-burner to truth-seeker begins with Clarisse's simple yet disruptive question: "Are you happy?" That moment of cognitive rupture cracks the façade of contentment, awakening his awareness of societal emptiness. Bradbury's vision thus resonates with Adorno and Horkheimer's critique of the culture industry, while also illustrating Gramsci's concept of hegemony: the ruling ideology is not violently imposed, but passively accepted because it promises comfort and stability. The populace does not mourn the loss of books because they have been conditioned to forget their value entirely.

Montag's journey from obedience to rebellion is central to the novel's critique. Initially, he declares, "It was a pleasure to burn" (Bradbury, 1953, 2012, p. 1), but his encounter with Clarisse and his discovery of books awaken a desire for meaning. His internal conflict reflects the struggle between ideological conformity and individual awakening. As Jameson (1991, p. 112) notes, *Fahrenheit 451* is "a powerful condemnation of censorship and its consequences," highlighting how intellectual stagnation leads to the loss of personal liberty.

The novel's relevance today is undeniable. In an age of algorithmic filtering, book bans in schools, and declining reading habits, Bradbury's warning feels prophetic. Turner (2023) and Roberts (2022) argue that modern censorship is not always state-led, but often driven by public indifference and corporate control of information. Habermas (1989) notes the erosion of the public sphere, where rational discourse is replaced by spectacle.

Yet, Bradbury offers a glimmer of hope. Montag escapes to a community of "book people" who memorise literature to preserve it, a powerful metaphor for cultural resistance rooted in embodied knowledge. This suggests that resistance is possible through memory, education and solidarity. The novel ends with the promise of renewal: "We're going to start again..." (Bradbury, 1953, 2012, p. 158). This echoes the humanist belief in the resilience of knowledge and the possibility of liberation.

While Huxley, Orwell, and Bradbury differ in method, they converge on a central theme: obedience is manufactured, not forced. In Huxley's world, people obey because they are happy. In Orwell's work, they obey because they are afraid. In Bradbury's work, they obey because they are indifferent. Huxley warns that we may be controlled not by chains, but by pleasures so seductive that we forget we are unfree. Orwell warns that we may be crushed by a state that sees everything and punishes everything. Bradbury warns that we may stop caring about truth altogether. As Postman (1985, 2005, p. vii) observed, "Orwell feared that what we hate would ruin us. Huxley feared that what we love would ruin us." Bradbury feared that we would love neither, but simply forget. These visions are not mutually exclusive. Today, we see elements of all three:

- Mass surveillance (Orwell), data mining, facial recognition, government monitoring.
- Algorithmic entertainment (Huxley), social media, streaming platforms, dopamine-driven design.
- Erosion of public discourse (Bradbury), misinformation, book bans, and devaluation of reading.

Contemporary digital ecosystems exemplify this tripartite control: users are simultaneously monitored through data harvesting (Orwellian), pacified by personalised entertainment streams (Huxleyan), and gradually detached from complex ideas through information fragmentation (Bradburian). This integrated system operates so seamlessly that resistance often fails to materialise—not because it is crushed, but because it is never conceived.

Each novel uses a different mechanism to suppress freedom, but all rely on the internalisation of ideology:

In *Brave New World*, citizens are conditioned to love their servitude.

In *1984*, citizens are terrorised into submission.

In *Fahrenheit 451*, citizens are distracted into apathy. Yet, all three authors agree on one thing: freedom is not just the absence of restraint, but the presence of critical thought. When people stop questioning, when they stop reading, when they stop remembering, freedom dies, not with a bang, but with a whisper.

A comprehensive understanding of how power operates in dystopian societies emerges only when we compare the distinct yet interconnected methods of control employed in these three novels. As Butler (1997, p. 24) argues in The Psychic Life of Power, power is not only repressive but also productive—it shapes desires, identities, and perceptions through its discursive effects. This aligns with Foucault's (1977) view that power is not merely top-down, but diffused throughout society.

In *Brave New World*, Huxley presents a society where control is achieved through biopower and consumerist conditioning. Citizens are not oppressed; they are engineered to be happy. The World State uses genetic manipulation, hypnopaedia and soma to ensure that individuals never question their place in the hierarchy. This aligns with Foucault's concept of disciplinary power, where control is internalised and self-regulated. As the Director of Hatcheries declares, "All conditioning aims at that: making people like their unescapable social destiny" (Huxley, 1932, 2007, p. 16). The state does not need to punish dissent because dissent does not exist—people have been taught to love their servitude.

This form of control also reflects Louis Althusser's Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs), institutions like education, media, and family that reproduce dominant ideology. In the World State, ISAs operate seamlessly: children are decanted, not born; they are conditioned, not educated; they are entertained, not challenged. The "feelies" and soma function as tools of the culture industry, a term coined by Adorno and Horkheimer (2002) to describe how mass entertainment pacifies the public and discourages critical thinking.

In contrast, Orwell's *1984* depicts a regime of overt repression and psychological terror. The Party maintains power through Repressive State Apparatuses (RSAs)—the Thought Police, torture chambers, and public executions. Surveillance is omnipresent: "Big Brother is watching you." Citizens live in perpetual fear, knowing that even a thought can be a crime. This reflects Foucault's panopticon, where the mere possibility of being watched leads to self-censorship and self-discipline.

But Orwell's regime also employs ideological control through the manipulation of language and history. Newspeak is designed to narrow the range of thought: "Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought?" (Orwell, 1949, 2008, p. 57). By shrinking the vocabulary, the Party ensures that rebellion becomes linguistically impossible. This aligns with Althusser's ISAs: the Ministry of Truth rewrites the past, the media distorts reality, and schools teach lies as truth.

As previously discussed, Bradbury's model centres on voluntary cultural abandonment rather than state coercion. This reflects Foucault's disciplinary power and Althusser's ISAs operating through cultural acquiescence: the Firemen function as ideological agents enforcing a worldview that citizens have already internalised. The omnipresent media—giant wall-sized televisions, "parlor families," and constant noise—replaces critical thought with passive consumption. Guy Montag's transformation begins when Clarisse's question, "Are you happy?", disrupts his ideological complacency, revealing the spiritual void beneath societal contentment. Bradbury's vision thus synthesises Adorno and Horkheimer's culture industry critique with Gramsci's hegemony: the ruling ideology requires no force because it is embraced as natural. Citizens no longer miss books because their capacity to desire complexity has been systematically eroded.

The relevance of these novels today is undeniable. Digital surveillance, data mining, and AI-driven content curation echo Orwell's telescreens and Huxley's soma. Book bans, censorship in education, and the decline of reading reflect Bradbury's warnings. The culture industry—now global and algorithmic—mirrors Adorno and Horkheimer's fears of mass manipulation.

As Evans (2024) argues, dystopian fiction provides a vital lens for understanding modern digital control. Robinson (2023) notes the "incredible similarity between fiction and reality" in how dissent is managed today. Consider the following real-world parallels:

- China's Social Credit System — a real-world version of Orwellian surveillance, where citizens are rated and punished for "untrustworthy" behaviour.
- TikTok's algorithm — a Huxleyan pleasure machine that shapes desires, promotes passive consumption, and discourages deep thinking.
- Book bans in US schools — a Bradburian erasure of challenging ideas, often targeting works on race, gender, and sexuality.
- Deepfakes and AI-generated disinformation — a direct echo of Orwell's Ministry of Truth, where reality is rewritten in real time.
- Corporate surveillance capitalism — where Google, Meta, and Amazon collect vast amounts of personal data, not to harm us, but to predict and shape our desires, much like the World State.

These are not isolated phenomena — they are interconnected systems of control that operate through ideology, not just force. Moreover, the rise of cancel culture, echo chambers, and algorithmic filtering shows how truth itself is under attack. The Party's slogan — "War is Peace; Freedom is Slavery; Ignorance is Strength" — now appears in the form of political spin, media bias, and cognitive dissonance. In this context, education becomes an act of resistance. Reading, critical thinking and open dialogue are not luxuries; they are necessities.

As Habermas (1989) warned, the public sphere is shrinking. But as Bradbury's "book people" show, it can be rebuilt, one memory, one text, one conversation at a time.

III. Conclusion: Lessons From Dystopian Fiction

Huxley, Orwell and Bradbury offer three distinct yet interconnected visions of how freedom is suppressed in dystopian societies. Huxley reveals how pleasure and consumerism can numb critical thought; Orwell shows how fear and surveillance can crush the spirit; Bradbury demonstrates how censorship and anti-intellectualism can erase memory and meaning.

Together, they teach us that totalitarianism does not always arrive with boots and guns; it can come with smiles, screens, and silence. The most dangerous control is that which we do not notice, because we have been taught to desire it.

The theoretical frameworks of Foucault, Althusser, Gramsci, and Adorno and Horkheimer help us see beyond the surface, revealing how ideology operates through institutions, language and culture. These novels are not just stories; they are tools for critical consciousness.

In *Brave New World*, Huxley warns that we may be controlled not by chains, but by pleasures so seductive that we forget we are unfree. The World State uses conditioning, soma and entertainment to produce citizens who love their servitude. This reflects Foucault's disciplinary power, Althusser's Ideological State Apparatuses and Gramsci's hegemony—all working to make oppression feel natural.

In *1984*, Orwell warns that we may be crushed by a state that sees everything and punishes everything. The Party uses surveillance, Newspeak, and historical revisionism to dominate not only actions but thoughts. As Winston Smith is broken in Room 101 and finally declares, "I love Big Brother," we see the ultimate victory of ideological control.

In *Fahrenheit 451*, Bradbury warns that we may stop caring about truth altogether. Books are burned not because the state fears ideas, but because the public has rejected them in favour of distraction. Montag's journey from book-burner to truth-seeker shows that awakening is possible, but only through memory, education and solidarity.

These visions are not mutually exclusive. Today, we see elements of all three:

- Orwellian surveillance: facial recognition, data mining, social credit systems.
- Huxleyan distraction: social media algorithms, streaming culture, dopamine-driven design.
- Bradburian censorship: book bans, algorithmic filtering, deplatforming of dissent.

Social media platforms epitomise this convergence: they harvest personal data for surveillance (Orwell), deliver addictive content for pacification (Huxley), and suppress dissenting voices through opaque moderation (Bradbury)—all while users perceive themselves as free agents. This seamless fusion of control mechanisms makes contemporary ideological domination particularly insidious, as it operates beneath conscious awareness.

Yet, all three authors agree on one thing: freedom is not just the absence of restraint, but the presence of critical thought. When people stop questioning, stop reading, stop remembering, freedom dies, not with a bang, but with a whisper.

This paper has shown that while the methods of control differ, their goal is the same: to manufacture obedience. And the most effective obedience is voluntary. Future research could explore how emerging technologies, AI, deepfakes, and predictive policing intensify these dynamics. But the core lesson remains: freedom must be actively defended. Education, open discourse, and literary engagement are not luxuries—they are necessities. As we navigate an increasingly complex world, the dystopian imagination remains one of our most powerful resources for resistance.

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to the Deanship of Research at Jadara University for providing financial support for this publication.

References

[1] Adorno, T. W., & Horkheimer, M. (2002). *Dialectic of enlightenment* (E. Jephcott, Trans.; original work published 1947). Stanford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781503620827

[2] Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses: Notes towards an investigation. In *Lenin and philosophy and other essays* (B. Brewster, Trans.). Monthly Review Press.

[3] Asimov, I. (2004). *Foundation* (Original work published 1951). Bantam Books.

[4] Bradbury, R. (1953, 2012). *Fahrenheit 451*. Simon & Schuster.

[5] Butler, J. (1997). *The psychic life of power: Theories in subjection*. Stanford University Press.

[6] Clark, E. (2024). *Surveillance and privacy: Orwell's 1984 revisited*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226830151.001.0001

[7] Evans, J. (2024). *Surveillance in the digital age: Lessons from dystopian literature*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003456789

[8] Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.; original work published 1975). Vintage Books. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-15779-8

[9] Frankl, V. E. (2006). *Man's search for meaning* (I. Lasch, Trans.; original work published 1946). Beacon Press.

[10] Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. International Publishers.

[11] Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (T. Burger, Trans.). MIT Press.
[12] Huxley, A. (2007). *Brave new world* (Original work published 1932). Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
[13] Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, the cultural logic of late capitalism*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822382221
[14] More, T. (2003). *Utopia* (P. Turner, Trans.; 2nd ed., revised by L. Logan; original work published 1516). Penguin Classics.
[15] Orwell, G. (2008). *1984* (Original work published 1949). Harvill Secker.
[16] Plato. (2004). *Republic* (C. D. C. Reeve, Trans.; original work published ca. 380 BCE). Hackett Publishing.
[17] Postman, N. (1985, 2005). *Amusing ourselves to death: Public discourse in the age of show business*. Penguin Books.
[18] Roberts, J. (2022). *Censorship in literature: Historical and contemporary perspectives*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198854321.001.0001
[19] Robinson, N. (2023). *Censorship and freedom of expression: A contemporary analysis*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226830151.001.0001
[20] Thomson, L. (2023). *Modern consumerism and Huxley's Brave New World*. Academic Press.
[21] Turner, S. (2023). *Censorship in the digital age: Revisiting Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198854321.001.0001
[22] Williams, R. (1977, 1983). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford University Press.
[23] Wright, J. C. (2020). Conditioning and control in Huxley's *Brave New World*. *Modern Literature Review*, *14*(2), 135–150.

Akram H. Shalghin received his Ph.D. in English Literature (16th-Century Theatre). He is an Associate Professor at Jadara University, Irbid, Jordan. His research focuses on Renaissance drama, modern theatre and cultural criticism. He is the author of *Marlowe Reshaped* (2012) and recent articles on Shakespeare, Pinter and Arab cultural narratives (ORCID iD: 0000-0002-9093-168X).