

## Literariness Journal

A Peer-Reviewed Quarterly  
Journal of Literature and Cultural  
Studies

P-ISSN: 3108-1614  
E-ISSN: 3108-172X

LiterarinessJournal.org

Vol. 1, Issue. 2  
March 2026

© 2026 by the author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC-BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. See <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

**Citation:** Khatun, Ruma. "From Hatchery to Hospital: *Brave New World* and the Rise of Techno-Eugenics in Contemporary India." *Literariness Journal*, vol. 1, no. 2, Mar. 2026, pp. 851–863.



A Literariness.org Project

## From Hatchery to Hospital: *Brave New World* and the Rise of Techno-Eugenics in Contemporary India

RUMA KHATUN

Guest Faculty

Department of English

Murshidabad University, West Bengal, India

**Abstract:** Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* published in 1932, presents a dystopian future in which biological reproduction is replaced by laboratory-controlled birth through the Bokanovsky Process, producing genetically stratified castes such as the intellectually superior Alphas and the conditioned lower orders (Gammas, Deltas, Epsilons). This paper argues that Huxley's fictional reproductive regime unsettlingly anticipates contemporary developments in India's rapidly expanding IVF industry, where affluent parents increasingly access preimplantation genetic testing (PGT) and gamete selection to optimize traits such as intelligence, health, and physical ability. The commodification of reproduction in modern India mirrors the World State's logic of engineered hierarchy, transforming childbirth into a market-driven, biopolitical process while marginalizing naturally conceived children. Drawing on Michel Foucault's concept of governmentality, the paper interprets the Hatchery and Conditioning Centres as precursors to contemporary Assisted Reproductive Technology (ART) frameworks that normalize genetic optimization under the guise of choice, while reproducing deep class and caste inequalities through differential access. Donna Haraway's cyborg posthumanism further illuminates IVF embryos as hybrid technobiological entities, blurring boundaries between nature and technology and reshaping kinship beyond biological lineage. Rosi Braidotti's vital materialism and posthuman ethics are employed to critique the emerging necropolitical implications of this system, where unenhanced or "natural" lives risk devaluation. Through close readings of the novel's early depictions of decanting and the tragic fate of John the Savage, alongside contemporary data on India's IVF surge, this paper reads *Brave New World* not merely as prophetic fiction but as a critical framework for understanding India's present condition toward techno-eugenic stratification. The study ultimately calls for urgent ethical reflection and regulation to resist a future where reproductive technology entrenches dystopian inequality.

**Keywords:** *IVF, biopolitics, techno eugenic, reproduction, dystopia, engineered hierarchy*

## Introduction: From Dystopian Fiction to Biopolitical Reality

When *Brave New World* was first published in 1932, it appeared as a disturbing projection of a mechanized future—an exaggerated dystopia in which human beings were no longer born but manufactured. But in the twenty first century, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* isn't just some dusty classic from 1932—it's a gut-punch warning that feels ripped from today's headlines. Huxley imagined a society where the “Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Centre” replaces the family, no moms in labor, no dads pacing—just lab techs tweaking genes and hormones to mass-produce Alphas (the brainy elite), Betas (solid managers), and down to Epsilons (stunted grunts who love their lot). Kids get sleep-taught slogans like “Ending is better than mending,” (Huxley) hooked on soma pills for endless bliss, and conditioned to see monogamy as nasty where the motto “Community, Identity, Stability” justifies the systematic control of reproduction (Huxley 15). For decades, the novel was read as satire or speculative warning. Yet in the twenty-first century, its vision no longer feels comfortably fictional. Developments in reproductive technologies—particularly in vitro fertilization (IVF), genetic screening, and embryo selection—invite renewed attention to Huxley’s unsettling blueprint.

In *Brave New World*, natural reproduction is not simply abandoned; it is delegitimized. Biological birth becomes associated with disorder, instability, and primitiveness. The terms “mother” and “father” are treated as embarrassing relics of an irrational past, while laboratory-controlled reproduction is celebrated as efficient and civilized. Human life is standardized, categorized, and biologically engineered into hierarchical castes—Alphas, Betas, Gammas, Deltas, and Epsilons—each designed for predetermined social functions. Inequality is no longer accidental; it is manufactured at the embryonic stage.

Flash to India in 2026, and Huxley's hatcheries look like IVF clinics with fancier brochures. It starts with baby Durga in 1978, Asia's first test-tube tot right here in Kolkata. Fast-forward, and the industry's exploding: over a million ART cycles a year, clinics from Mumbai high-rises to Delhi strips hawking “guaranteed” success. Basic IVF starts of ₹2.5-4 lakhs. Add preimplantation genetic testing (PGT)—scan embryos for smarts, stamina, no defects—and tack on another ₹2 lakhs easy. Parents pick the “winner” like ordering biryani strength. Urban pros, IT couples—they're building mini-Alphas. But step outside cities, and it's a different story. Rural moms birth at home, labeled “high-risk” by ads, shut out by costs and travel. The gap screams inequality: money buys designer genes; poverty gets nature's dice roll.

Contemporary India's rapidly expanding Assisted Reproductive Technology (ART) sector, though vastly different in intention and structure, nonetheless reflects a growing cultural valorization of technological reproduction. IVF clinics advertise genetic testing, embryo screening, and optimization of reproductive outcomes. Access to these technologies is largely structured by economic capacity, concentrated in urban and affluent populations. Reproduction increasingly enters the sphere of planning, selection, and investment. While the motivations are often rooted in hope and medical necessity, the broader shift signals a transformation in how life itself is imagined—not merely as a biological event, but as something that can be enhanced, optimized, and strategically managed.

This paper does not claim that contemporary IVF practices replicate Huxley's dystopia in literal terms. Rather, it argues that *Brave New World* anticipates a techno-biopolitical order in which reproduction becomes a regulated, market-driven process that risks reproducing class and caste hierarchies through biological means. By placing Huxley's fictional reproductive regime in dialogue with present-day developments in India, the study explores how the management of life—under the rhetoric of choice, stability, and progress—may subtly normalize new forms of stratification. In doing so, the novel emerges not as mere prophecy, but as a critical framework for interrogating the ethical and political stakes of reproductive technology in our time.

### **Theoretical Framework: Biopower, Capital, and Posthuman Life**

Michel Foucault's account of biopower provides the central conceptual framework for this study. In *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault traces a historical shift from sovereign power—the right “to take life or let live”—to modern forms of power that seek instead “to foster life or disallow it to the point of death” (Foucault 138). Earlier sovereign authority derived from the power to decide life and death, a juridical privilege rooted in the defense of the ruler's existence (135). Modern power, however, does not primarily manifest through spectacular execution or direct violence. Rather, it operates through the management, regulation, and optimization of life itself.

This transformation marks the emergence of what Foucault calls “bio-power”—a set of techniques through which life becomes an object of calculation, administration, and knowledge (143). Population replaces territory as the primary focus of governance. Birth rates, mortality, health, longevity, and reproduction become measurable phenomena subject to regulation. Power increasingly operates not by destroying life, but by shaping and directing it. As Foucault explains, bio-power was “an indispensable element in the development of capitalism,” since economic production required the controlled insertion of bodies into the machinery of labor and the adjustment of population processes to economic needs (141). Life itself becomes a productive force.

Reproduction occupies a central place within this transformation. Once a private or familial matter, it becomes a domain of political and economic concern. Fertility, heredity, health, and population growth are no longer natural givens; they are variables within administrative strategy. In this context, contemporary Assisted Reproductive Technology (ART) and IVF practices can be understood not merely as medical interventions, but as sites where life enters the realm of calculation. Genetic screening, embryo selection, and reproductive planning reflect a broader cultural condition in which biological existence is increasingly subject to evaluation and optimization.

IVF clinics thus function as micro-sites of biopolitical governance. Even when framed as individual choice, reproductive decisions are shaped by statistical risk, genetic probability, and medical recommendation. Embryos are evaluated for viability, health, and potential. The language of “success rates” and “quality” reveals how reproduction is integrated into measurable productivity. In Foucauldian terms, life is no longer simply born; it is assessed, managed, and enhanced within a network of knowledge-power relations.

While bio-power is often associated with improved health and extended longevity, Foucault emphasizes that it also produces differentiation and hierarchy. Modern techniques of governance do not eliminate inequality; they reorganize it. As he observes, biopolitical mechanisms “acted as factors of segregation and social hierarchization,” reinforcing domination even as they claimed to optimize life (Foucault 141). The management of populations involves classification—healthy and unhealthy, productive and unproductive, normal and abnormal.

This insight is crucial for understanding the stratifying potential of reproductive technologies. Access to IVF and advanced genetic screening is structured by economic capacity. In India, where ART services are largely concentrated in urban centers and private medical institutions, reproductive enhancement is not universally accessible. The rhetoric of “choice” therefore operates within unequal conditions. What appears as individual freedom may function as structured privilege.

Biopower, in this sense, does not democratize life; it differentiates it through subtle mechanisms of optimization. Genetic selection, even when used to prevent serious illness, raises broader questions about normalization. Which traits are preserved? Which are excluded? What counts as a desirable life? Such processes risk naturalizing social advantage by embedding it within biological frameworks. Class disparities may gradually acquire a biological dimension when enhancement technologies remain economically restricted.

In the Indian context, these dynamics intersect with pre-existing structures of class and caste. Although IVF is not designed as a eugenic instrument, its market-driven logic operates within a stratified society. Reproductive capacity, health security, and technological access become forms of

capital. Biopolitical governance thus produces not equality, but recalibrated hierarchy—one mediated through medical authority and economic power.

If Foucault helps illuminate how life becomes governed and optimized, posthumanist theory complicates the boundaries between the biological and the technological. Donna Haraway's influential figure of the "cyborg" challenges rigid distinctions between nature and machine. In a world shaped by biotechnology, information systems, and medical intervention, humans are no longer purely organic. The cyborg embodies hybridity—a fusion of organism and apparatus.

IVF embryos can be understood through this lens as technobiological entities. They are simultaneously biological life forms and products of laboratory mediation. Fertilization occurs not within the body, but in controlled environments; development is monitored, evaluated, and selected. The embryo becomes a site where technology and biology converge. Haraway's framework encourages us to see this not simply as loss of nature, but as transformation of kinship itself. Parenthood, lineage, and reproduction are no longer confined to traditional biological models.

However, posthumanism also demands ethical vigilance. Rosi Braidotti's posthuman ethics asks not merely how humans are transformed by technology, but whose lives are recognized as valuable within these transformations. If life is increasingly modifiable, then criteria of worth risk becoming technologically mediated. Which bodies are supported to flourish? Which are deemed less viable, less efficient, or less desirable?

Braidotti resists a nihilistic reading of posthumanism. For her, the posthuman condition calls for expanded responsibility rather than uncritical celebration of enhancement. The question is not whether technology should exist, but how it distributes vulnerability and opportunity. When applied to reproductive technology, this perspective compels scrutiny of systems that may unintentionally privilege certain forms of life over others.

Together, Foucault, Haraway, and Braidotti provide a layered framework. Foucault explains how reproduction becomes a domain of governance and capitalist optimization. Haraway reveals how technological mediation destabilizes conventional understandings of biological identity. Braidotti foregrounds the ethical stakes of these transformations. This combined theoretical foundation allows *Brave New World* to be read not simply as dystopian fiction, but as a meditation on the political management of life and the stratifying potential of engineered reproduction.

### **Manufacturing Hierarchy in *Brave New World***

In *Brave New World*, Aldous Huxley presents a society that claims to have eliminated war, poverty, and social unrest. Yet beneath its promise of "Community, Identity, Stability," the World State manufactures a deeply stratified order. Inequality is not an accident of birth or wealth; it is

scientifically engineered, biologically inscribed, and psychologically reinforced. The system does not abolish hierarchy—it perfects it. Through the erasure of biological reproduction, the industrialisation of life via the Bokanovsky Process, and the rigid Alpha-to-Epsilon caste system, Huxley demonstrates how technological rationality can naturalise inequality and make it appear inevitable.

The foundation of hierarchy in the World State begins with the destruction of natural reproduction. Human beings are no longer born; they are decanted. The Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Centre replaces the family, transforming reproduction into an industrial process. The very words “mother” and “father” provoke embarrassment and disgust. They are considered obscene relics of a primitive age. By eliminating biological birth, the state severs the most intimate human bond and substitutes institutional control in its place.

Reproduction is relocated from the private sphere to the laboratory. The Hatchery becomes both a womb and a factory. This shift is crucial: when life originates in a state-controlled environment, individuality can be manipulated from the start. The state determines not only how many individuals will exist but also what kind of individuals they will be. Reproduction becomes production.

The erasure of family ties ensures that loyalty flows only toward the World State. Intimacy is destabilizing because it creates exclusive attachments. Emotional bonds threaten collective uniformity. Thus, the state promotes promiscuity while condemning permanence. “Everyone belongs to everyone else” becomes a moral imperative. Stability is valued over intimacy. Love, grief, and deep attachment are dangerous because they generate suffering and unpredictability—both incompatible with social order.

John, “the Savage,” functions as the excluded biological subject. Born naturally to Linda outside the World State, he embodies everything the system rejects: maternal attachment, religious feeling, and tragic emotion. His existence exposes the artificiality of the World State’s “civilization.” When he enters London, he becomes a spectacle precisely because he represents the forbidden origin of humanity. His suffering reveals that biological reproduction carries the possibility of authentic individuality, something the state cannot tolerate.

Thus, by abolishing biological reproduction, the World State eliminates randomness. Birth becomes calculated. Human variation becomes programmable. In doing so, hierarchy begins at conception, not as a social outcome but as a biological design.

If the Hatchery represents the mechanization of reproduction, the Bokanovsky Process represents the industrialization of inequality. Huxley borrows directly from early twentieth-century industrial models—especially Fordist mass production. Just as identical cars roll off assembly lines,

identical humans are manufactured in batches. One fertilized egg buds and divides into up to ninety-six identical embryos. Individuality is sacrificed for efficiency.

The industrial logic applied to biology ensures standardisation. Uniform groups of Gammas, Deltas, and Epsilons are produced to perform repetitive labor. Their sameness guarantees predictability. The state values quantity and uniformity over uniqueness. Biological diversity, which might produce unexpected talents or dissent, is replaced by controlled sameness.

Oxygen deprivation becomes a key tool in this system. During embryonic development, lower-caste embryos are deliberately deprived of oxygen and nutrients. This manipulation stunts intellectual growth. Inferiority is chemically engineered. Intelligence is not a natural gift; it is regulated to fit economic needs. Epsilons are made physically robust but intellectually limited so that they will be satisfied performing menial labor. Alphas, by contrast, receive optimal conditions to ensure high cognitive function.

This scientific manipulation is reinforced through hypnopaedia, or sleep-teaching. From infancy, children absorb caste-specific slogans: “I’m really awfully glad I’m a Beta,” or “Epsilons are better at working in hot places.” Conditioning ensures that individuals internalize their biological limitations as preferences. Desire is engineered to align with social function. People do not resent their position because they have been programmed to love it.

The result is bodies optimized for economic roles. Human beings are reduced to instruments. Biology becomes destiny—but a destiny crafted in a laboratory. The horrifying brilliance of the system lies in its seamless fusion of science, economics, and psychology. No coercion appears necessary because consent has been pre-manufactured.

The Bokanovsky Process thus transforms inequality into efficiency. Instead of struggling against class conflict, the World State eliminates its possibility by ensuring that no one can transcend their assigned role. Hierarchy is stabilized through genetic engineering rather than force.

The caste structure of the World State—Alphas, Betas, Gammas, Deltas, and Epsilons—resembles a rigid, biologically determined class system. Unlike traditional hierarchies based on wealth or inheritance, this structure is embedded in the body itself. Intelligence, height, strength, and temperament are pre-designed. Inequality is naturalized through biology.

Alphas occupy positions of authority and intellectual labor. They are tall, attractive, and cognitively superior. Lower castes are progressively diminished in capacity. Gammas and Deltas perform semi-skilled labor, while Epsilons undertake the most degrading tasks. The gradation is precise and deliberate. Each caste is conditioned to despise the one below and admire the one above, preventing solidarity across classes.

This structure echoes caste-like rigidity. Mobility is impossible because biology fixes identity. The system removes the illusion of meritocracy; there is no opportunity for advancement. Yet paradoxically, individuals experience satisfaction because their desires have been shaped to match their roles. Inequality becomes invisible because it feels natural.

Huxley's critique extends beyond fiction. The novel anticipates modern anxieties about reproductive technologies and genetic selection. In contemporary societies, access to advanced reproductive technologies such as IVF often depends on wealth. The possibility that genetic enhancement could become available primarily to elites suggests a future where inequality may once again be biologically reinforced. Huxley's dystopia exaggerates this logic to reveal its dangers: when science serves market efficiency rather than human dignity, hierarchy becomes embedded in flesh.

The World State claims to have solved social conflict, but it has merely relocated inequality into the biological foundation of life. The poor are not oppressed; they are engineered. The elite are not privileged by chance; they are designed for superiority. Hierarchy is no longer justified through religion or tradition—it is justified through science. The most disturbing insight of *Brave New World* is that the World State does not eliminate inequality; it perfects it. By integrating biotechnology, psychological conditioning, and economic planning, the regime produces a society where hierarchy is unquestioned because it appears natural and necessary.

In traditional societies, inequality produces resentment because individuals believe they might have been otherwise. In the World State, no such belief exists. One's limits are pre-programmed. The possibility of alternative identity is erased before consciousness emerges. Freedom is not violently suppressed; it is biologically prevented. John's tragic rebellion underscores this truth. He demands the right to suffer, to choose, to be imperfect. His resistance reveals what the World State has sacrificed: the unpredictable richness of human individuality. Stability has been achieved at the cost of humanity itself.

Huxley's warning remains urgent. When technological power combines with political authority, inequality can move from the social sphere into the biological core of existence. The novel suggests that the greatest danger of modernity is not overt tyranny but the quiet normalization of engineered hierarchy. Thus, the World State stands as a chilling example of a system that has transcended oppression by embedding it into life itself. Inequality is no longer a problem to be solved—it is a product to be manufactured.

### **IVF, Market Reproduction, and Emerging Techno-Stratification in India**

The dystopian architecture of reproduction imagined in *Brave New World* finds an unsettling echo in contemporary developments within India's assisted reproductive technologies (ART) sector. While it

would be analytically irresponsible to equate present-day IVF practices with the totalitarian biopolitics of Huxley's World State, it is equally reductive to dismiss the structural parallels altogether. The rapid expansion of IVF clinics, the growing normalization of preimplantation genetic testing (PGT), and the framing of reproduction as a matter of individualized consumer choice collectively signal a transformation in how life is imagined, regulated, and valued. What emerges is not biological determinism in the Huxleyan sense, but a market-mediated stratification that raises important ethical and political concerns.

Over the past two decades, India has witnessed a substantial rise in fertility clinics, particularly in metropolitan and semi-urban centers. Assisted reproduction is no longer an exceptional medical intervention but increasingly part of an expanding healthcare marketplace. IVF services are advertised with promises of technological precision, reproductive control, and optimized outcomes. This shift marks an important transformation: reproduction becomes not only a biological process but also a managed, technologically mediated service. In Foucauldian terms, life enters more visibly into the domain of calculation—monitored, selected, enhanced, and increasingly embedded within economic exchange.

Preimplantation genetic testing further complicates this terrain. Originally developed to prevent serious hereditary disorders, PGT allows embryos created through IVF to be screened before implantation. In principle, such technologies serve therapeutic and preventative aims. Yet their broader social implications cannot be ignored. When selection criteria extend beyond disease prevention toward preferred traits—whether explicitly or implicitly—the line between medical necessity and enhancement begins to blur. Even where regulatory frameworks prohibit overt “designer” selection, the possibility of stratified access remains significant. The technology itself may be neutral, but its distribution is not.

This is where economic access becomes crucial. IVF remains expensive relative to average income levels in India. Even when clinics offer installment plans or “package” deals, the cumulative cost of multiple cycles, genetic screening, and associated medical procedures often restricts access to upper-middle-class and affluent populations. The geography of IVF also reflects urban concentration; major clinics are clustered in metropolitan regions, reinforcing spatial inequalities. Consequently, reproductive choice, while rhetorically framed as universal empowerment, is materially structured by class location.

Such conditions raise the possibility of what might cautiously be termed emerging techno-stratification. This does not imply a formalized genetic caste system, nor does it suggest deliberate state-engineered hierarchy. Rather, it signals a scenario in which those with economic capital may increasingly exercise greater reproductive control—over timing, embryo selection, and potentially risk

minimization—while economically marginalized populations remain subject to more precarious reproductive circumstances. The disparity lies not in inherent biological worth but in differential access to technological mediation.

The commodification of embryos further intensifies this dynamic. Within IVF clinics, embryos are graded, frozen, stored, transferred, or discarded based on viability assessments. Clinical language often describes embryos in terms of “quality,” “success rates,” and “optimization.” While such terminology reflects biomedical pragmatism, it also subtly reframes embryonic life within evaluative and economic logics. Embryos become units within a success-driven system structured by measurable outcomes. This does not necessarily negate ethical care; however, it does situate potential life within market rationality.

Importantly, contemporary India’s regulatory landscape attempts to address some of these concerns. Policies governing assisted reproductive technologies aim to prevent exploitative practices and restrict unethical interventions. Nevertheless, regulation alone does not eliminate structural inequality. Even within ethically compliant frameworks, reproductive technologies may reproduce broader socioeconomic hierarchies. The issue, therefore, is less about dystopian control and more about patterned privilege.

The discourse surrounding IVF often emphasizes empowerment—particularly for women facing infertility stigma. In many contexts, assisted reproduction provides relief from intense social pressure and expands reproductive autonomy. Any critical analysis must acknowledge this emancipatory dimension. At the same time, empowerment operates within a neoliberal marketplace where choice is meaningful only when affordable. The language of freedom can obscure the economic stratifications that shape who may exercise that freedom fully.

In this sense, the Indian IVF landscape reflects a biopolitical transformation rather than a dystopian rupture. Reproduction becomes increasingly visible as a site of management, optimization, and investment. Genetic screening technologies introduce selective capacities that, while medically justified in many cases, also carry stratifying potential. Urban concentration and high costs structure access along class lines. Embryos circulate within clinical economies where viability intersects with valuation. Together, these factors do not replicate the engineered caste hierarchy of Huxley’s fiction; however, they suggest a subtle reconfiguration of reproductive inequality.

What is at stake is not the condemnation of technology but the ethical interrogation of its social embedding. If certain populations are better positioned to minimize genetic risk, delay childbirth strategically, and access advanced screening, then reproductive futures may become unevenly distributed. Such unevenness may not immediately translate into visible hierarchy, yet it signals a possible shift toward differentiated biological security.

So, India is moving towards assisted reproductive technologies which raise questions about how life is valued within market structures. They highlight how economic capital intersects with biological possibility. They invite scrutiny of whether technological mediation inadvertently consolidates privilege.

Braidotti demands affirmative ethics: nurture bonds across differences, not hierarchies (Braidotti 60). Huxley's soma-world fails this hard, conditioning Epsilons to grin at drudgery while Alphas sip coffee. IVF echoes: PGT discards "minus" embryos, valuing only enhanced futures. Braidotti calls for "generosity"—extend care beyond kin, to the unenhanced. Posthuman responsibility means cherishing all life, enhanced or not. And for that, Braidotti urges posthuman ethics: value all sparks, regulate tech for equity. India's ART Act nods, but market gaps let hierarchies grow. Huxley's mob killing John warns—ignore vital underclass, and soma mobs rule. Responsibility means flattening castes, cyborgs or not.

Thus, the rise of IVF and genetic screening in India does not amount to a dystopian replication of Huxley's World State. However, it does mark a significant transformation in the governance and commodification of reproduction. As life becomes increasingly subject to technological selection and market distribution, the contours of reproductive inequality may shift from purely social determinants to techno-economic ones. The ethical challenge lies in ensuring that such technologies expand care and equity rather than deepen stratification. The future of reproduction, therefore, depends not only on scientific advancement but also on how societies choose to regulate, distribute, and ethically interpret these advancements.

### **Conclusion: Preventing a Stratified Biopolitical Future**

This study suggests India's trajectory mirrors Huxley's warning: market-driven reproduction breeds invisible castes unless checked. Clinics as mini-Hatcheries optimize for profit, not people. John's cry—"I want poetry, danger, free will!"—echoes rural voices drowned by metro hype (Huxley 240). Posthuman ethics demands more than tech cheers; it calls for justice.

This paper has argued that Brave New World anticipates a techno-biopolitical order in which reproduction becomes regulated, optimized, and gradually aligned with economic logic. Huxley's imagined World State does not merely control citizens through overt coercion; it manages life itself—designing intelligence, calibrating bodies, and naturalizing hierarchy at the level of biology. What appears to be stability is in fact a perfected system of stratification. Inequality is not abolished; it is engineered.

When read alongside contemporary developments in assisted reproductive technologies and genetic screening, Huxley's vision acquires renewed relevance. Modern IVF practices are primarily therapeutic, aimed at addressing infertility or preventing severe genetic disorders. Yet they also operate within market systems, rely on differential access, and increasingly intersect with aspirations toward optimization. Reproduction, once considered a private or purely biological process, has entered the realm of planning, calculation, and consumer choice. In this sense, life itself becomes entangled with economic capacity.

The argument here is not that contemporary societies have replicated the World State, nor that biologically born children face present marginalization. Rather, the concern is structural and anticipatory. When technologies of selection and enhancement develop within unequal social frameworks, they may amplify existing class and caste hierarchies. Access to genetic screening, safer procedures, and advanced fertility treatments is already uneven. If left unexamined, such disparities could gradually align biological narratives with socio-economic privilege.

Technology, therefore, cannot be understood as neutral. It is shaped by the institutions, markets, and power structures within which it operates. As Foucault's account of biopower suggests, once life becomes an object of calculation, it becomes susceptible to optimisation, regulation, and hierarchy. The crucial question is not whether reproductive technologies should exist, but how they are governed, distributed, and ethically framed. Without vigilance, systems designed to reduce suffering may unintentionally reinforce stratification.

Huxley's novel should not be read as prophecy but as warning. His dystopia dramatizes what happens when efficiency eclipses plurality and when stability overrides freedom. The Hatchery's logic—mass production, uniformity, engineered caste—represents an extreme endpoint of tendencies that remain latent within modern technocratic societies. By exaggerating them, Huxley compels readers to confront their ethical implications before they solidify into structure.

Preventing a stratified biopolitical future requires more than technological innovation; it requires critical responsibility. Policymakers, medical practitioners, scholars, and citizens must engage in sustained dialogue about access, equity, and the value of diverse forms of life. Ethical frameworks must prioritize not only safety and success rates but also justice and inclusivity. Reproductive autonomy should not become a reproductive advantage.

The enduring power of *Brave New World* lies in its insistence that human dignity cannot be reduced to design. A society that manages life must also safeguard freedom, unpredictability, and plurality. The challenge before us is not to reject technology, but to ensure that it serves a vision of shared flourishing rather than engineered division.

## Works Cited

Braidotti, Rosi. *The Posthuman*. Polity Press, 2013.

Fieldfisher. "Baby Conceived through IVF Is Left Permanently Disabled." *Fieldfisher*, <https://www.fieldfisher.com/en/injury-claims/case-studies/baby-conceived-through-ivf-is-left-permanently-dis>

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Vintage Books, 1990.

Foucault, Michel. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976*. Translated by David Macey, Picador, 2003.

Haraway, Donna J. "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century." *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*, Routledge, 1991, pp. 149–181.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. Penguin Books, 2007.

India Pharma Outlook. "Why Is the IVF Industry Rising in India?" *India Pharma Outlook*, [www.indiapharmaoutlook.com/industry-experts/why-is-the-ivf-industry-rising-in-india-nwid-1737.html](http://www.indiapharmaoutlook.com/industry-experts/why-is-the-ivf-industry-rising-in-india-nwid-1737.html).

NAPGO (National Association for Patient and Public Involvement in Gynecology and Obstetrics). "Legal Case Study of Severe IVF Incidents Worldwide." *NAPGO*, [www.napgo.org/article/118936-legal-case-study-of-severe-ivf-incidents-worldwide-causes-consequences-and-high-emotional-financial-and-reputational-costs-to-patients-and-providers](http://www.napgo.org/article/118936-legal-case-study-of-severe-ivf-incidents-worldwide-causes-consequences-and-high-emotional-financial-and-reputational-costs-to-patients-and-providers).

Oasis Fertility. "Pre-Implantation Genetic Screening (PGS)." *Oasis India*, [oasisindia.in/advanced-fertility-treatments/pgs-pre-implantation-genetic-screening/](http://oasisindia.in/advanced-fertility-treatments/pgs-pre-implantation-genetic-screening/).

Sumathi Hospital. "IVF Trend in Indian Market." *Sumathi Hospital*, [sumathihospital.com/ivf-trend-in-indian-market/](http://sumathihospital.com/ivf-trend-in-indian-market/).