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The term “security” comes from the word “Securitas”. Securitas was the Goddess of security and stability, in the Roman Empire. In modern times, security is often described as the absence of threat and fear. However, this conceptualization has perils of which Aldous Huxley’s novel Brave New World can be accepted as the most extreme example. In such a world there is no need for the security goddess Securitas anymore. Everything is automated from birth to death. There is no fear and nothing to be afraid of, but the price that is paid, is becoming robotic in a totalitarian society. That is why a new conceptualization and a new definition of security can help prevent and overcome this totalitarian problem. By analyzing the main themes of the BNW novel without going into the details of the events and characters; the main purpose of this paper is to examine the issue of security and its nature and to offer a new definition of security. Firstly, a very short plot of the novel will be given. Secondly, the themes and ideas of the BNW will be discussed in terms of why it is a dystopia rather than a utopia. Thirdly, BNW will be evaluated in juxtaposition with the concept of security. Finally, an alternative definition of the concept of security will be offered in order to enhance its meaning and also to be able to prevent the coming of a possible future like BNW.
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Introduction

Brave New World (BNW) written by Aldous Huxley in 1932, is probably one of the great philosophical theorizations about the future of the society, “depicting a world in which people are totally designed and shaped by their rulers, utterly lacking in individual creativity and where relationships and pleasures are shallow and superficial” (Yeung, 2011, p. 1).

BNW depicts a future where there is no fear or threat. People are conditioned even before their birth in terms of which socio-economic class they belong to, what their jobs will be, what their specific abilities and skills will be. There are no families and moreover family life is despised. Feelings are manufactured and there are no genuine personal emotions. By the help of the advanced technology, everything from birth to death is under control. Therefore, there is nothing to be afraid of. When the fact that the simplest definition of security is “being free from fear and threat” (Trager & Kronenberg, 1973) in BNW is considered, this ultimate goal of...
security is actually fulfilled. It is a situation in which Immanuel Kant’s (1903) “perpetual peace” is achieved¹.

In such a world, there is no need for the Roman security goddess “Securitas” anymore. “In Roman mythology, Securitas was the goddess of security and stability, especially the security of the Roman Empire” (definitions.net). Another definition of Securitas is “tranquility in terms of peace of mind, the state of not being worried” (http://www.hestories.info/greco-roman-world-glossary.html). In BNW, with the help of technology and mind conditioning techniques, this ultimate state of being carefree is achieved. Securitas is dead in that sense. But the question still remains, is this a desirable end?

Although BNW can be described as the perfect society, we should not forget that Huxley is a dystopian writer (Beauchamp, 1991, p. 61) and his novel is an example of satirical dystopia (Schmerl, 1962, p. 331):

“Satire, which characterizes the expressions of a Utopian dilemma in a Dystopia, has thus given way to ethical irony in works bearing intopian characteristics. Texts with intopian features apply ‘ethical irony’ in order to question the very plausibility of absolute answers (Gary J. Handwerk, Irony and Ethics in Narrative, New Haven and London: 1985, pp. 16-17, 53, 203). Irony in Intopia aims at the increase of self-awareness through the undermining of existing conventions, ultimately heading towards the formation of a future one. In intopian texts, ethical irony concerns not only abstract truth, but also truth which refers to a concrete situation. This irony does not comply with a static situation, but aspires to awaken the hero to a new understanding, and is concerned with a self-awareness related to a social reality. The ironical awareness is not only internal and personal, or confined to a social organization, but also open to interaction, and it maintains a dialogue with the other.” (Hadomi, 1991, p. 111)

BNW is said to be in between dystopia, “a bad place”, and utopia, a “good place that does not exist”, as noted in the introduction to the 2007 edition of the novel (Panagopoulos, 2016, p. 304). So why is that? Why is such a security conditioned society considered to be a “bad place” and why is it actually “insecure”?

This world has three fundamental components: society, equality, and stability. However, rather than being the maxims of a peaceful society, these can be accepted as the manifestation of a “mob psychology”: “By the end of the novel, all the efforts to free the individual from the grip of the World State have failed, destroyed by the power of convention induced by hypnopaedia and mob psychology” (Higgins, Regina, & Warren, 2000, p. 109). Including the author Huxley himself, the novel is accepted as a dystopia, “an imagined state or society in which there is great suffering or injustice, typically one that is totalitarian or post-apocalyptic” (The Oxford English Dictionary, 2020).

This paper will try to analyze the main themes of the BNW novel in relation with the phenomenon of security in a conceptual way. By providing some basic information about the events and characters of the novel, the main purpose is to examine the concept of security in relation with the novel. Firstly, a very basic plot of the novel will be given. Secondly, the themes and ideas of the BNW will be discussed in terms of why it is a dystopia and why the society it depicts can be considered as tyrannical. Thirdly, BNW will be evaluated in the light of some characteristics of the security issue. And lastly, an alternative conceptualization of security will be offered in order to enhance its meaning and also to find a solution to prevent the coming of a possible future like BNW.

¹ In his essay “Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch”, Kant offered some conditions necessary for the establishment of peace among nations. If these conditions are fulfilled there will be an ultimate peace condition. The concept is especially important in idealism which is one of the main paradigms in international relations. Kant’s requirements for perpetual peace are: 1—“No Treaty of Peace Shall Be Held Valid in Which There Is Tacitly Reserved Matter for a Future War”, 2—“No Independent States, Large or Small, Shall Come under the Dominion of Another State by Inheritance, Exchange, Purchase, or Donation”; 3—“Standing Armies (miles perpetuus) Shall in Time Be Totally Abolished”, 4—“National Debts Shall Not Be Contracted with a View to the External Friction of States”, 5—“No State Shall by Force Interfere with the Constitution or Government of Another State”, 6—No State Shall, during War, Permit Such Acts of Hostility Which Would Make Mutual Confidence in the Subsequent Peace Impossible. For more information, see: https://www.classicosofstrategy.com/2016/01/kant-perpetual-peace-1795.html.
The Plot

The Brave New World (BNW) is a utopian and fantastic world that is created after a long war period and an economic crisis. The novel starts with the expressions of the manager of the “incubation and conditioning center” on how they educate children in this place. In the education process, they mainly focus on keeping the population constant for social and economic stability and by the help of “biochemical technology” (Higgins et al., 2000, p. 106), they train people who will accept and serve this world. BNW “depicts a society in which babies are grown in jars, each genetically designed for a particular purpose and social rank” (Evans, 2003, p. 20). There are no diseases, wars, or poverty in this world; on the contrary, everyone is “happy”, technology is advanced, and people are entertained all the time.

While the World State was founded on such an order, there is another society that continues its “old” way of living and lives outside the modern world. This place is called the “Wild Region” and it is an area separated from the World State by electric wires. Wild Region is the region where people who cannot adapt to the newly established system of BNW live. This “Indian reservation” in New Mexico continues its life in a primitive way. In this “savage” zone, certain crucial human values persist: “concepts of personal worth and honor and responsibility, belief in the efficacy of striving and suffering” (Beauchamp, 1991, p. 61). So, the Indian reservation is the total opposite of BNW’s Fordian civilization and functions as the analogous ideological contrast of it (Beauchamp, 1991, p. 60). It is a region where divergent people are exiled.

“Community”, “identity”, and “stability” are the main mottos of BNW. People don’t have the right and opportunity to become individuals in this world. The system puts a lot of emphasis on society rather than the individual however every person’s needs and happiness are fulfilled in a controlled way. They also give people a harmless drug called “soma” to prevent their thinking and getting depressed when people feel alone. In this way, people take a short break for 10-12-15 hours according to the dose taken. So, they revoke people’s right to think freely. That is why, BNW can be considered as a tyranny: “Control through reward poses a greater threat to human freedom because, unlike punishment, it can be introduced unconsciously and continued indefinitely, with the approval and support of the people being controlled” (Higgins et al., 2000, p. 111).

The psychological conditioning of characters in the novel is made by hypnopaedia which in fact is a subliminal persuasion (Higgins et al., 2000, p. 113). By the help of this method, people are automated, and they just fulfill the role which is determined by the system itself. The education process involves a wide range of tools and models, the aim of it is to train Alphas who are the intellectual leaders at the top of the social hierarchy; Epsilons who provide physical power and labor and in between three other groups named Beta, Delta, and Gama that will line up between Alphas and Epsilons. There are no limited resources, and everyone is “happy”.

In BNW, a basic social institution like the family is seen detrimental and obscene. There are no private relationships and everybody belongs to everybody. In this way, they prevent people from having feelings for each other. They remove the positive values like love, fidelity, and self-sacrifice from people’s life because these feelings are unnecessary and dangerous for the people and society. People who are bereft of emotions also become selfish and they are self-estranged without even realizing it.

Almost all of the characters in the novel have mixed feelings and ideas. Some of them think that some practices of the new world are wrong. These people who know that they are lonely, want to become individuals to protect their human feelings and they also want to love and to be loved. Other characters of the novel represent the people who admire the new world. They enjoy living in the new brave world. They use
special techniques to persuade people to accept and understand death. According to the *BNW*, “when the individual feels, society reels” (Higgins et al., 2000, p. 106). “All the fetal conditioning, hypnopœdic training, and the power of convention molds each individual into an interchangeable part in the society, valuable only for the purpose of making the whole run smoothly. In such a world, uniqueness is uselessness” (Higgins et al., 2000, p. 106).

The manager Alphas thinks that science should be used when it is necessary, and its use should be limited. Therefore, they defend the notion that science does not have to be in continuous development. The two main characters are Mustapha Mond, the Controller, one of the ten men who runs the World State; and Bernard Marx, an Alpha-Plus psychologist who constantly questions the social pressures for conformity. These two characters’ ideas are in constant conflict throughout the novel. They discuss whether all the system of BNW is necessary or not. While Mond argues that there is no more pain and so BNW is good for the humanity; Marx insists that pain is necessary and people have the right to be unhappy: “…a worthwhile human life requires suffering and danger, from which will spring nobility and heroism. The discomfort and the pain, John maintains, are an essential part of freedom…” (Higgins et al., 2000, p. 92).

It is obvious that the book is pointing out a very basic relation between security and freedom. According to this classical inverse relationship, freedom and security are contradictory in nature and societies should choose one of them or give priority to one over the other. Each option has its pros and cons: “Control means comfort at the loss of freedom. But freedom means the possibility of disease, starvation, and misery” (Higgins et al., 2000, p. 90). However, another question to be asked is whether that kind of a world is really desirable. In a situation of “being free from danger and threat”, how much security does this situation provide to the society? Or vice versa, does this kind of situation create a false or misleading sense of security? What is the reason that this kind of a future system can be described as “dictator behind the mask” (Gottlieb, 2001, p. 56)? To answer these questions, it is necessary to focus on the nature of the phenomenon of security. In the next section, the relation between security and freedom will be discussed in the context of the *BNW*.

**The Conflict**

If people let the government decide
what foods they eat and
what medicines they take
their bodies will soon be in as a sorry state
as the souls who live under tyranny.

Thomas Jefferson

---

2 Ironically enough there is an argument that in BNW, Mustapha Mond’s character is inspired by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk who was a prodigy and one of the greatest leaders of the world ever. Some claim that Mond’s early life when he was a free minded man represents Atatürk. At the end of the paper this issue will be highlighted once more. See: https://www.coursera.org/file/p7knuca/Waston-Mustapha-Mond-from-Mustapha-Kemal-Ataturk-founder-of-Turkey-after-Wor ld/, https://peutinger-gymnasium.de/html/lernen/brave_new_world/Mustapha_Kemal_Ataturk.html, https://huxleyswebblog.wordpress.com/category/characters/.

3 Whether Thomas Jefferson really said so is a controversial issue. However it is clear that Jefferson wrote: “The error seems not sufficiently eradicated, that the operations of the mind, as well as the acts of the body, are subject to the coercion of the laws. But our rulers can have authority over such natural rights only as we have submitted to them. The rights of conscience we never submitted, we could not submit. We are answerable for them to our God. The legitimate powers of government extend to such acts only as are injurious to others ... Was the government to prescribe to us our medicine and diet, our bodies would be in such keeping as our souls are now. Thus in France the emetic was once forbidden as a medicine, and the potato as an article of food.” (Notes on the State of Virginia, Query 17, 1781).
In *BNW*, it is assumed that happiness, order, freedom, and justice are all realized. In such a world a state of utopic security is achieved in a perfect way. However, in general, as noted before Huxley agrees *BNW* is a tyranny, it is a world that is not desired. Actually, it is a nightmare. Because, all things are automated even freedom, and these concepts became tools of a “dictator behind the mask” (Gottlieb, 2001, p. 56): “There is a static condition which is created by a biological ‘scientific dictatorship’ (BNWR 179) he [Huxley] foresaw ruling the world in 2540 AD” (Panagopoulos, 2016, p. 302).

It is possible to say that *BNW* is actually a reproduction of Plato’s cave in a science fiction movie set. Information is kept locked and access to knowledge is only available to certain people, to the Alpha managers. In this “antique future” only practical sciences or “problem solving theories” (Cox, 1981, pp. 128-129) are allowed in the name of totalitarianism. Therefore, independent science, research, and scientists are forbidden. Because there is no information, there is no progress. “Similarly, in spite of the technological development in *BNW*, human progress is missing” (Panagopoulos, 2016, p. 302). No one is trying to find what is right and what is wrong in such a world. Hence, this so called new world is against human nature. Once again, actually it is the mechanization of the whole society, even in arts:

“Huxley thinks of art, he is thinking of it primarily in terms of ‘techne’, the Greek word that also incorporates within it the idea of ‘craft’ and ‘technical skill’. And this is the underlying link he sees between the arts and sciences, that they are different means of controlling the environment—different types of power. The difference is that science is a far more powerful ‘techne’ than art, in this respect, whereas art is also seen to fall under the category of cultural illusion, very much like organized religion.” (Panagopoulos, 2016, p. 303)

Ironically, the only threats in this “secure” world are the “facts” and science, since they are the pursuit of the reality. That is why it can also be argued that this new world is not “brave” at all. It is founded on fear and its braveness is artificial and fragile depending on “hypnopedia” and the drug soma.

As pointed out before, in the main maxims of *BNW*, “community”, “identity” and “stability” evoke the ideals of French Revolution: liberty, equality, and fraternity. However, in such a world, it can be assumed that “community” becomes an ant clan; “identity” means everyone is typically the same in their classes; and “stability” means an eternally static situation. As the result, human beings become cognitively dehumanized and alienated to themselves: “Totalitarianism, real or fantastic, seems to engender two kinds of servility: the servility of fear, strikingly portrayed in Orwell’s 1984; and an unconscious, even a happy servility, perfected by the methods of population production in *Brave New World*” (Schmerl, 1962, p. 332).

In short, in the name of security and stability, *BNW* does not need the security goddess Securitas anymore. She is dead and everyone is happy in a hypnotized and drugged way. If security is defined to be fear and threat

---

4 Plato in his *Republic*, VII 514 a, 2 to 517 a, 7, narrates a cave allegory from Socrates’s speech to a small group. Actually this cave totally resembles to *BNW*. In Socrates words, “Imagine this: People live under the earth in a cavernlike dwelling. Stretching a long way up toward the daylight is its entrance, toward which the entire cave is gathered. The people have been in this dwelling since childhood, shackled by the legs and neck. Thus they stay in the same place so that there is only one thing for them to look at: whatever they encounter in front of their faces. But because they are shackled, they are unable to turn their heads around. Some light, of course, is allowed them, namely from a fire that casts its glow toward them from behind them, being above and at some distance. Between the fire and those who are shackled [i.e., behind their backs] there runs a walkway at a certain height. Imagine that a low wall has been built the length of the walkway, like the low curtain that puppeteers put up, over which they show their puppets… From the beginning people like this have never managed, whether on their own or with the help by others, to see anything besides the shadows that are [continually] projected on the wall opposite them by the glow of the fire… If all this were to happen to the prisoner, what do you think he would say if someone were to inform him that what he saw before were [mere] trifles but that now he was much nearer to beings; and that, as a consequence of now being turned toward what is more in being, he also saw more correctly?” (https://web.stanford.edu/class/ihum40/cave.pdf).
oriented, it is possible to say that in BNW an ultimate and perpetual security condition is reached. However, this is achieved at the expense of freedom and freewill: “As a result, built on a large foundation of identical, easily manipulated people, the society thrives. Stability lives, but individuality—the desire and/or ability to be different—is dead” (Higgins et al., 2000, p. 117). And so is the Securitas.

Resolution

At this point one can pose the question, if the future has a totalitarian potential, is there anything to prevent it? What can the antidote to the technologically backed up society by totalitarian tendencies be? Maybe the answer lies in defining security in a new way. An alternative conceptualization to a fear- and threat-oriented one can be manipulative and become a leverage for an anti-democratic and totalitarian control.

First, it may be helpful to look some basic definitions and dimensions of the concept of “security”. As noted before, “security” is defined as being free from fear and threat. However, a broader definition can be made as the action of states and/or societies to protect their integrity in terms of land, people, and sovereignty. Integrity and sovereignty can be seen as the main criteria to decide what constitutes a threat; internal or external (Dedeoğlu, 2003, p. 52). Adding to these, in order to talk about security, three components are needed. First, there should be a “unit” (a state, a firm, an individual) that has an ability for perception; second, an environment that is perceived; and third, the process of the perception itself (Baysoy, 2011, p. 104). As can be noticed, perception has a critical role and a place in the issue of security. Without perception; without a unit that can perceive; and lastly without an environment that is perceived, one cannot talk about the concept of “security”. In short, if there is no perception then there is no security. Therefore, as a solution to BNW the act of perception may help to provide an alternate conceptualization of “security”, while keeping in mind Huxley’s proposition that “the only hope lies in the active mind”.

Here and now it is necessary to mention and remember one of the main characters of the novel, Mustapha Mond. An Alpha Plus, gifted with an exceptional mind, he was a free minded scientist in his youth but later became the highest controller of the BNW. It can be claimed that, especially Mond in his youth (as he tells in a dialogue) was inspired by the leader of the Turkish Independence War and the founder of the modern Turkish Republic Mustafa Kemal Atatürk who was ahead of his time and made a lot of reforms in the Turkish social system. However, unlike the inquiring scientist days of his past, Mond’s ideas and actions are actually just the opposite of Atatürk’s. Maybe this ironic contradiction may provide a starting point for a new concept of “security”.

Atatürk, has a saying that depicts and defines on which principles a society should operate “Türk; Öğün, Çalış, Güven!” which can be translated as “Turk; learn, work and be confident!”5. The main proposition of this article is that, the saying of Atatürk can be the foundation of a new definition of security. By applying this definition, a dynamic and progressive concept of security can be obtained rather than a fear-oriented and manipulative one.

In order to do so, it is important to highlight the word “Öğün” in a detailed way. Since it is a very old word, although there is an ongoing debate about the meaning of the word, some argue that it means “to praise”;

---

5 It should be noted that, there is a controversy about the meaning of “öğün”. Some scholars claim that it means “övün”; “to be proud”. The author does not an expert on Turkish etymology and the main aim is to find a starting point in terms of the security issue. The argument about the root of the word “öğün” is out of the scope of this work. Still some examples and references will be given in the text in support of “öğün” meaning.
“to boast” while some argue that it means “to learn”, the meaning in which it was used by Atatürk is not the former, but the latter. Still, whether “oğün” means “to praise oneself” or “to learn”, it can be claimed that they are related in meaning. In order to boast, learning and training to some level is required. In fact, both meanings are complementary especially for the aimed new security concept. Since the main aim of this paper is to found a new base for a new conceptualization of security, some etymological information will be given to clarify the starting point within a limited context.

“مبادئ” comes from the word root “öğ-” and “öğ-ünk” and means “to learn”, “to think”, “to get informed”, and “to gather information” in Turkish (Eyüboğlu, 1989, p. 110). Also in Sir Gerard Clauson’s (1972) respected dictionary An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish, “öğ-” means “to think” (p. 2) and “öğ-” is described as “intelligence, mind” (p. 117). “Ŏğ-süz” means (-süz, being a negative suffix) “witless, incapable of rational thought” (Clauson, 1972, p. 162). “Ŏğ-retmen” (teacher), “Ŏğ-renci” (student), “ŏğ-retmek” (to teach) all come from the same root “Ŏğ-” (Clauson, 1972, p. 114). Furthermore it has meanings like “to educate”, “to train”, “to aggrandize”, “to institutionalize”, and “to give a form” (Eyüboğlu, 1989, p. 110). Moreover, the two word roots “ok-”, “oğ-” both mean “security” (Clauson, 1972, p. 1). More examples can be given as “oğ-üt”: “to advise”; “to counsel” (Clauson, 1972, p. 102); “öğren”: “to learn something”; “öğretim”: “to teach” (Clauson, 1972, p. 114) etc. However, the main aim is not to start an etymological discussion but to find the leverage for a new security notion. As it can be seen, the word “oğün” has really rich meanings and each of these meanings has a great potential to redefine and enrich the concept of “security”.

In the light of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk’s saying and its meanings, instead of a fear- and threat-oriented security conceptualization, it is possible to offer a multidimensional and dynamic security concept. This new security concept depends on learning, training, elevating, analyzing, and creating concrete institutional bodies while giving a distinct form to the security issues and phenomenon. Rather than a drugged and hypnotized perception, only with a vigorous mind, a rational security notion can be achieved. Only with a vigorous mind, the perceptive abilities of which are not drugged and hypnotized, can a rational security concept be conceived. This new notion can help not only to prevent a totalitarian world but also to overcome any problems and/or threats to states in particular and humanity in general.

Huxley, too, proposes a similar solution in order to prevent such “subliminal persuasion” (Higgins et al., 2000, p. 113) which leads to a totalitarian world. Human intellect is the main solution:

“Still, Huxley insists, the only hope lies in the active mind, able and willing to make its own judgments. Individual freedom, compassion, and intelligence—the very qualities missing in the dystopia of Brave New World—can guide the fully conscious, fully human mind into a truly free, truly human future.” (Higgins et al., 2000, p. 114)

It is necessary to keep “one’s mind active and free... and individual freedoms must be exercised constantly, or be lost” (Higgins et al., 2000, p. 109). Otherwise there will be a total slavery in the name of an illusional security perception. This is the solution Huxley offers to his own pessimistic future world.

Atatürk’s saying underlines the fact that the search for security is never ending since the new problems will inevitably arise in accordance with the human progress. That is why in Huxley’s words, “an active mind” is needed to learn, study, take action and then the security can be achieved. Not just simply by defeating the enemies or defeating fear which is very manipulative as can be seen in BNW. Finally, this way, security can be secured in the name of humanity.
Conclusion

Being free of concerns and protected is impossible because reality is much too complicated, and it changes constantly and steadily. Actors change in terms of quality and quantity, actors’ objectives diversify, and continuous risks, dangers and threats are transformed. For this reason, the term “security” has had a paradoxical meaning since Ancient times. In the modern world, uncertainty increased even more. However, overcoming uncertainty, whatever its cost may be in the name of security is maybe the biggest threat. The outcome may be a disaster and it can lead to a dictatorship. Therefore, the fear- and threat-oriented concept of security has the potential to undermine the freedom and intellectual development of humanity. Such a conceptualization of security may become a god that controls every aspect of not only the political but also social, economic, and even romantic life. That’s why although it is a futuristic novel, Brave New World is accepted as a dystopia and not a utopia. Such a world is not desirable or eligible but unfortunately due to the technological advancements, it is feasible. This situation poses a brave new threat not only to the states but to the humanity as well.

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk’s saying, “Türk; Öğün, Çalış, Güven!”: (first) “learn, analyze, study”, (then) “work” and (finally) you can “be confident”, has a potential to ensure that the Latin word ‘Securitas’-Security notion is safe from fear and threat. Since, fear and threat oriented security can be manipulative, this new security notion can be an antidote. Rather than a hedonistic and conformist understanding of security, an approach which is based on being ready for the threats all the time with a proactive mind based on learning and examining can help to preempt totalitarian tendencies. Not fearing the threats but instead, facing them with human intelligence can be possible. As a result, any futuristic Platonic cave can be enlightened and a notion based on knowledge and progress can secure the world. So all world societies can Learn, Work, and Be Confident.
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