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INTRODUCTION

George Orwell in his novels, essays, and journalistic writings brings before the mind of the reader the reaction of a man whose basic tendencies had been thwarted. It is the purpose of this study to show that as Orwell's characters are thwarted or denied these basic inclinations they react accordingly. Their different moods or reactions are the reactions of Orwell himself.

The first chapter deals with the mood of revulsion against totalitarianism and its effects upon humanity and literature. In his novel Nineteen Eighty-Four Orwell projects present day structures and policies of totalitarian rulers, predicated upon conditions of permanent war and the development of the technical means of espionage and surveillance, to the point of complete extinction of private life.

The mood against Fascism is developed in the second chapter. In 1937, Orwell went to Spain in the capacity of a journalist for the Independent Labour Party of England. Once he reached Spain, however, he joined the Party of Marxist Unification, (the Loyalist Party), which was against Franco who stood for Fascism. Orwell recorded the atmosphere, the dirt, the noise, the discomfort, the
ragged clothes, the feeling of privation, the lack of training, the lack of ammunition in a book entitled *Homage to Catalonia*.

In 1945, Orwell's *Animal Farm* was published. It is a famous parody of the Russian Revolution and its developments. Chapter III of this thesis transfers the allegory of *Animal Farm* into parallel political realities which it represents and Orwell's revolt against them.

After his graduation from Eton, Orwell served as a sub-divisional officer in Burma for five years. Here he received first hand information on the evils of imperialism which he portrayed in his book *Burmese Days* and two essays entitled, "A Hanging," and "Shooting an Elephant."

He returned to England in 1927, with a feeling of guilt and a strong desire to atone for his past actions. The late 'twenties and the early 'thirties were the days of world wide depression. Orwell went to Paris where unemployment was just as bad as everywhere else. The fact that he was a foreigner made job hunting extremely difficult. He finally obtained employment in a hotel restaurant as a dishwasher. When he could stand the
INTRODUCTION

conditions no longer, he went to London where he lived the life of a tramp. These experiences were recorded in Down and Out in Paris and London.

Victor Gollancz asked Orwell to investigate the working and living conditions of the coal miners at Wigan. Orwell again projected himself into the work of the people and lived in their lodgings. Being a middle-class man himself he was extremely incensed against a society which allowed such conditions to exist. The result of his investigation was a book called The Road to Wigan Pier.

After his experiences as a dishwasher, a tramp, a coalminer and bookseller, Orwell was ready to offer Socialism as a solution to the evils of the day. This he presented in a book called The Lion and the Unicorn. Chapter VI of this thesis brings out Orwell's six point program of Socialism.

The final chapter deals with the patriotism of the English people as portrayed by Orwell in the pamphlet The English People and in several of his essays. General characteristics of the English people, their moral and political outlook, the English class system, and the traits of the English language were developed.
INTRODUCTION

Orwell's outstanding quality as a writer was directness. He wasted no time in getting to the heart of the matter. This quality can be achieved only by constant vigilance and study of the best models. His models were Shaw, Gissing, Samuel Butler, Swift, and Wells. The latter dominated his fiction, but Shaw and Gissing provided tools from which he formed his style. In political writing, the thread runs back through Shaw to Cobbett, Swift and Defoe. In literary criticism the chief precursor was Walter Bagehot. Throughout his writings Orwell strove to create values we respect: decency, humanity and honesty.
CHAPTER I

REVULSION AGAINST TOTALITARIANISM

The initial chapter of this thesis will deal with Orwell's outstanding mood - that of revulsion against totalitarianism. First its nature and then its effects upon humanity and literature will be examined. This chapter will also include consideration of Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four which expounds the government and class structure of totalitarianism. Finally various opinions of critics in regard to this work will be brought forward.

The history of our time has been made by dictators of the past. Mussolini, Hitler and Stalin managed to enlist the support of solid masses of men. The wars they waged with one another and against free men were the sacrifices which the masses, degraded by totalitarianism, offered up in fanatical self-idolatry.

Respect for common life has given place to the servile need for a "mass" society in which one man violently imposes his own views and opinions on the whole collectivity. Men are not asked to contribute anything but servile conformity and applause.
Totalitarian society systematically dissolves the firm bonds which unite men in the basic social units, families and parochial communities. The totalitarian society does this in order to uproot the individual from spontaneous human attachments and transplant him into organizations focused upon the cult of totality embodied in the leader.

Every kind of pressure is brought to bear upon the individual to divest him of his true personality and of his normal social attachments. He is systematically made to distrust and fear other individuals, and to shift his confidence from those with whom he lives to a leader whom he never sees or hears at close range, but only on the radio or on the screen.

Totalitarian states ruthlessly manipulate human beings, degrading and destroying them at will, sacrificing bodies and minds on the altar of political opportunism without the slightest respect for the value of the human person. One might almost say that the modern dictatorships have displayed everywhere a deliberate and calculated hatred for human nature as such.

The techniques of degradation used in concentration camps and in staged trials are familiar to us. They all have one purpose: to defile the human person beyond recognition in order to manufacture evidence for a lie.
REVULSION AGAINST TOTALITARIANISM

Techniques of degradation systematically foment distrust, resentment, separation, and hatred. They keep men spiritually isolated from one another, while jamming them together physically on a superficial level, the plane of the mass meeting. They tend to corrode all man's personal relationships by fear and suspicion so that the neighbor, the co-worker, is not a friend and support but always a rival, a menace, a persecutor, a potential stool pigeon who, if we are not careful, will have us sent to prison.

Slavery has been restored in the Twentieth Century. The forced-labor camps all over Europe and North Africa are simple chattel slavery where Poles, Jews, Russians and the political prisoners toil at road-making or swamp-draining for their rations. The only difference between the early slave methods and the present is that the buying and selling of slaves by individuals is not yet permitted. When one recalls that slavery of the early empires lasted for four thousand years, one grasps the full implication of the fact.

A society becomes totalitarian when its ruling class has lost its function but succeeds in holding on to power by force or fraud. Such a society can never be tolerant or intellectually stable. Literary creation demands truthful recording of facts and emotional sincerity. This is not possible whenever there is an enforced orthodoxy.
REVULSION AGAINST TOTALITARIANISM

For example, in the Spanish Civil War many intellectuals were deeply moved by the experience but were not allowed to present it truthfully. When liberty of thought is endangered, literature is doomed. Any writer who adopts a totalitarian outlook, finds excuses for persecution, for falsification of reality, destroys himself as a writer. A bought mind is a spoiled mind.

Many people believe that a writer can outwardly comply with the totalitarian government and then secretly in his attic he can record his thoughts in perfect freedom. Orwell writes:

The secret freedom which you can supposedly enjoy under a despotic government is nonsense, because your thoughts are never entirely your own. Philosophers, writers, artists, even scientists, not only need encouragement and an audience, they need constant stimulation from the people. It is almost impossible to think without talking. Take away freedom of speech, and the creative faculties dry up.

In England there is very little literature which deals with the disillusionment of the totalitarian states. The special world created by secret police forces, censorship of opinion, torture and frame-up trials is known about and to some extent disapproved of, but it has made very little emotional impact.

George Orwell, however, presented to us in almost all his books and journalistic writings his revulsion against the totalitarian society in general, and against Fascism, Imperialism, and Communism in particular. In Nineteen Eighty-Four Orwell portrayed three totalitarian states: Oceania comprised the Americas, the Atlantic Islands including the British Isles, Australasia, and the southern portion of Africa. Europe was absorbed by Russia and therefore Eurasia comprised the whole of the northern part of the European and Asiatic land-mass, from Portugal to the Bering Strait. Eastasia, smaller than the others and with a less definite western frontier, comprised China and the countries to the south of it, the Japanese islands and a large but fluctuating portion of Manchuria, Mongolia, and Tibet.

The government of Oceania was vested in four agencies: the Ministry of Peace which concerned itself with war; the Ministry of Truth which propagated lies; the Ministry of Plenty which promoted starvation; and the Ministry of Love which tortured people just for the sake of torturing. The names of these agencies in Newspeak were Minipax, Minitrue, Miniplenty, and Miniluv.

The Ministry of Peace concerned itself with war. There was continual warfare going on between the three super states. The people all believed that Oceania was at war
with Eurasia when all of a sudden a broadcast told them that Oceania was at war with Eastasia and in peace with Eurasia. Posters were torn down; new ones replaced the old. Immediately all records had to be altered. Winston, the main character in Nineteen Eighty-Four, worked eighteen hours a day altering records. Mattresses were spread on the corridors. Sandwiches and victory coffee were served to meet the sudden demands.

The only aim of this war was to keep the population in subjection, to exert their energies in channels from which they themselves could not benefit. A Floating Fortress, for example, had locked up in it the labor that would build several hundred cargo ships. Ultimately it was scrapped as obsolete, never having brought any material benefit to anybody. Manufacturing war weapons would have the same effect.

Another means of destroying the products of human labor was sinking in the depths of the sea materials which might otherwise be used to make the masses too comfortable and too intelligent. Orwell stated that it would be just as easily possible to gather all the surplus goods and set fire to them but this would provide only the economic and not the emotional basis for a hierarchical society.

"War Is Peace" was one of the three slogans of the super state. In the past the ruling groups did fight one
another and the victors plundered the vanquished, but in Oceania war was waged by the rulers against the subjects in order to keep the structure of society intact, therefore, it was accurate to say that war being continuous ceased to exist hence "War Is Peace."

In order to condition the people to this continuous warfare Oceania had a two-minute-a-day hate program during which a telescreen image of Emmanuel Goldstein appeared. This telescreen was a kind of television set which could never be turned off and which picked up as well as received images. The members of the party learned from it what they were to do and what to believe. At the other end of the screen the Thought Police saw their reaction and heard everything they said.

Goldstein, whose image appeared on the telescreen, was to Ingsoc what Trotsky was to Communism. The inserted chapters from Goldstein's imaginary book on the "Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism," were imitations not only of Trotsky's rhetoric but also of his mode and manners as a Marxist theoretician.

When Goldstein appeared on the screen, the people worked themselves into a frenzy, even if they secretly rebelled against Ingsoc as Winston Smith did. Life magazine published an interesting description of this two minute hate program:

"When Goldstein appeared on the screen, the people worked themselves into a frenzy, even if they secretly rebelled against Ingsoc as Winston Smith did. Life magazine published an interesting description of this two minute hate program:"
The horrible thing about the Two Minute Hate was that it was impossible to avoid joining in. Within thirty seconds any pretense was always unnecessary. A hideous ecstasy of fear and vindictiveness, a desire to kill, to torture, to smash faces in with a sledge hammer, seemed to flow through the whole group of people like an electric current.  

Toward the end of the two minute hate the face of Big Brother was flashed. The people then returned to their normal self. Some stretched their hands out to him as to their deliverer and savior.

In connection with the two minute hate program Ingsoc had a hate week each year during which parades took place. Part of the economy drive in preparation for hate week was to cut off the electric current during daylight hours. Winston Smith, who lived on the seventh floor, was forced to climb the stairs, for the lifts did not operate.

The second agency of Oceania was the Ministry of Truth which propagated lies. Winston Smith worked for this ministry. His duty was to make corrections in the Times' paper. For example, the people were notified that chocolate rations would be reduced from thirty to twenty grams. Winston was told to make a correction to the effect that it would probably be necessary to reduce the rations at some

time in April. He clipped the correction to the appropriate copy of Times and returned it to the printer. As soon as all corrections had been made the paper would be reprinted, the original copy destroyed, and the corrected copy placed on the files in its stead.

This process was applied not only to newspapers but also to books, periodicals, pamphlets, posters, leaflets, films, cartoons, photographs, and to every type of literature or documentation which held any political significance.

Since Ingsoc demanded total obedience, it must always be right. To make this possible Winston had to alter the records of history. The fascinating process by which this was done was described by Orwell in the following scene, where a message in Newspeak arrived on Winston's office desk. Winston unrolled the message. It read:

```
times 3. 12. 83 reporting bb dayorder doubleplusungood refs unpersons rewrite fullwise upsub antefiling.
In Oldspeak (or standard English) this might be rendered:
The reporting of Big Brother's Order for the day in the Times of Dec. 3, 1983 is extremely unsatisfactory and makes reference to nonexistent persons. Rewrite it in full and submit your draft to higher authority before filing.3.
```

Now, what Big Brother did that was so unsatisfactory was that he praised the work of an organization known as FFCC which supplied cigarettes to sailors in the Floating Fortress. A certain Comrade Withers was also singled out for the Order of Conspicuous Merit, Second Class.

Three months later the FFCC organization was dissolved. The words "refs unpersons," indicated that Withers was already dead, he never existed. Winston was forced to fabricate a personage which he did in the person of Comrade Ogilvy. A few fake photographs and a few lines of print brought him into existence. The report on Comrade Ogilvy ran as follows:

At the age of three Comrade Ogilvy has refused all toys except a drum, submachine gun, and model helicopter. At eleven he had denounced his uncle to the Thought Police after overhearing a conversation which appeared to him to have criminal tendencies. At seventeen he had been a district organizer of the Anti-Sex League. At twenty-three he had perished in action. Pursued by enemy jet planes while flying over the Indian Ocean with important dispatches, he had weighted his body with his machine gun and leapt into deep water, dispatches and all - an end, said Big Brother which it was impossible to contemplate without feeling of envy.4.

Big Brother then made a few concluding remarks about Comrade Ogilvy. He was a non-smoker, a total abstainer,

4. Ibid., p.47.
took the vow of celibacy, and had no other subject of conversation except the welfare of Ingsoc, and no other aim in life except to hunt down the enemies of Eurasia.

Comrade Ogilvy, who had never existed in the present, now existed in the past, and once the forgery was forgotten he would exist just as authentically, and upon the same evidence as Charlemagne or Caesar.

That falsification of records occurred can be deduced from one of the biographers of Stalin who wrote:

I was in Moscow when Lenin died, and I remember very well who was present at his funeral and who took turns in carrying the coffin with his mortal remains. The procession was filmed, in spite of the fearful cold, and year after year on the anniversary of Lenin's death that film was one of the documentaries shown. During the great political trials of 1936 a man I knew well, employed in the film industry, told me that that 'documentary' film was being completely altered; all the men in the dock were being cut out of the film. I set that down as one of the many jokes current in the Literary Club. But my curiosity had been aroused, and I went to see the 'documentary.' To my astonishment, Rykov, who became head of the Government after Lenin; Zinoviev and Kamenev, who had taken over the leadership in the Party in succession to Lenin; and almost all other leaders present at the funeral had disappeared from the film. The coffin was shown as carried from the 'Union House' to the Red Square in turns by all those who in that year 1936 stood round Stalin, including some persons who at the time of Lenin's funeral were not in Moscow at all. I found at home a press photograph of the time of the funeral, and it confirmed that I had not been the victim of an illusion.5.
Another method of falsifying records was by omitting events which ought not to have happened. Orwell wrote:

An example is the Russo-German Pact which is being effaced as quickly as possible from public memory. A Russian correspondent informs me that mention of the Pact is already being omitted from Russian year books which table recent political events.\(^6\)

An important element of the Ministry of Truth was Doublethink. Orwell craftily presented it to us in Nineteen Eighty-Four:

To know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them; to use logic against logic, to repudiate morality while laying claim to it, to believe that democracy was impossible and that the Party was the guardian of democracy; to forget whatever it was necessary to forget, then to draw it back into memory again at the moment when it was needed, and then promptly to forget it again; and above all, to apply the same process to the process itself. That was the ultimate subtlety: consciously to induce unconsciousness, and then, once again, to become unconscious of the act of hypnosis you had just performed. Even to understand the word doublethink involved the use of doublethink.\(^7\)

---


Orwell pictured a society that had hit upon a system of propaganda able to destroy the political past. He argued that when the rulers succeeded in wiping out the past, the ruled must accept the present as Utopia, because they have no basis for judging it. Winston Smith vividly presented this idea to Julia:

Do you realize that the past, starting from yesterday, has been actually abolished? If it survives anywhere, it's in a few solid objects with no words attached to them, like the lump of glass here. Already we know almost literally nothing about the Revolution and the years before the Revolution. Every record has been destroyed or falsified, every book has been rewritten, every picture has been repainted, every statue and street and building has been renamed, every date has been altered. And that process is continuing day by day and minute by minute. History has stopped. Nothing exists except an endless present in which the Party is always right. I know, of course, that the past is falsified, but it would never be possible for me to prove it, even when I did the falsification myself. After the thing is done, no evidence ever remains. The only evidence is inside my own mind, and I don't know with any certainty that any other human being shares my memories.

The third agency of Oceania was the Ministry of Plenty which promoted starvation. In practice the needs of the population were always underestimated, with the result that there was a chronic shortage of half the necessities of life, but this was looked on as an advantage.

8. Ibid., p.156.
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It was deliberate policy to keep even the favored groups somewhere near the brink of hardship, because a general state of scarcity increased the importance of small privileges and this magnified the distinction between one group and another.

The last agency of Oceania was the Ministry of Love where confessions were obtained by means of torture, drugs, delicate instruments that registered one's nervous reaction, gradual wearing down by sleeplessness, solitude and persistent questioning.

When Smith and Julia were caught reading Goldstein's "The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism," they were brought to the Ministry of Love for a cure. Smith thought that he would please O'Brien by explaining to him the Party's desire for power according to Dostoevsky's way of thinking, namely, that the Party sought power for the good of the majority. They sought power because the masses were frail, weak, cowardly, who must be ruled by others stronger than themselves. O'Brien answered him with the following:

The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are not interested solely in power. Not wealth or luxury or long life or happiness; only power, pure power. What pure power means you will understand presently. We are different from all the oligarchies of the past in that we know what we are doing. All the others, even those who resembled ourselves, were cowards and
hypocrites. The German Nazis and the Russian Communists came very close to us in their methods, but they never had the courage to recognize their own motives. They pretended, perhaps they even believed, that they had seized power unwillingly and for a limited time, and that just round the corner there lay a paradise where human beings would be free and equal. We are not like that. We know that no one ever seizes power with the intention of relinquishing it. Power is not a means; it is an end. One does not establish a dictatorship in order to safeguard a revolution; one makes the revolution in order to establish the dictatorship. The object of persecution is persecution. The object of torture is torture. The object of power is power. Now do you begin to understand me?

O'Brien then instructed him with the following ideas, first that power was collective. It was here that the second slogan of Oceania, "Freedom Is Slavery," was explained. O'Brien told him that the slogan was reversible that "Slavery Is Freedom," but if he merged with the Party then he would be the Party, he would be all powerful and immortal. The second idea that O'Brien injected was that the power was not only the power over the body but also power over the mind. To the question, how does one man assert his power over another, O'Brien replied:

By making him suffer. Obedience is not enough. Unless he is suffering, how can you be sure that he is obeying your will and not his own? Power is in inflicting pain and humiliation. Power is in tearing minds to pieces and putting

---

them together again in new shapes of your own choosing. Do you begin to see, then, what kind of a world we are creating? ... There will be no loyalty, except loyalty toward the Party. There will be no love, except the love of Big Brother. There will be no laughter, except the laugh of triumph over a defeated enemy. There will be no art, no literature, no science. When we are omnipotent we shall have no more need of science. There will be no distinction between beauty and ugliness. There will be no curiosity, no enjoyment of the process of life. All competing pleasures will be destroyed. But always — do not forget this, Winston — always there will be the intoxication of power, constantly growing subtler. Always, at every moment, there will be the thrill of victory, the sensation of trampling on an enemy who is helpless. If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face — forever.10.

Their real weapon was the merciless questioning that went on and on hour after hour, tripping Winston up, laying traps for him, twisting everything that he said, convicting him at every step of lies and self-contradiction, until he began weeping as much from shame as from nervous fatigue. In the end the nagging voices broke him down more completely than the boots and fists of the guards. He became simply a mouth that uttered, a hand that signed whatever was demanded of him. His sole concern was to find out what they wanted him to confess, and then confess it quickly, before the bullying started anew. He confessed to the assassination of eminent Party members, the distribution of

10. Ibid., pp.269-71.
seditious pamphlets, embezzlement of public funds, sale of military secrets, and sabotage of every kind.

He confessed that he had been a spy in the pay of the Eastasian government as far back as 1968. He confessed that he was a religious believer, an admirer of Capitalism, and a sexual pervert.

He confessed that he had murdered his wife, although he knew, and his questioners must have known, that his wife was still alive. He confessed that for years he had been in personal touch with Goldstein and had been a member of an underground organization which had included almost every human being he had ever known.

It was easier to confess everything and implicate everybody. Besides, in a sense it was all true. It was true that he had been the enemy of the Party, and in the eyes of the Party there was no distinction between the thought and the deed.

The mind of Winston was cured. He was now getting better food, clothing and hot water. He believed that two plus two equals five, that freedom is slavery. But for one uncontrolled minute he called out, "Julia! Julia! Julia, my love!" Immediately O'Brien appeared in his room and told him that he made progress intellectually but not emotionally. O'Brien then asked him what is his attitude toward Big Brother. Winston answered, "I hate
him." O'Brien ordered him to room 101 where a guard strapped him to a chair. Another guard brought in a cage of two compartments each containing a huge rat. O'Brien explained that at the pressure of the first lever the mask will cover his face and the pressure of the second lever would release the rats. When the mask covered Winston's face, he knew that only some one person could stand between the mask and the rats so he screamed: "Do it to Julia! Do it to Julia! Not me! Julia! I don't care what you do to her. Tear her face off, strip her to the bones. Not me! Julia! Not me!" 11.

He was released. Later he glanced at the enormous face, two tears rolled down his cheeks. "But it was all right, everything was all right, the struggle was finished. He had won the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother."

This was how the suffering in the Ministry of Love converted one into the ineluctable means of surrender. The victim crawled before his torturer; he identified himself with him and grew to love him. That was the ultimate horror.

Winston and Julia met after their release from prison. They revealed their betrayals to each other.

Julia said:

Sometimes they threaten you with something - something you can't stand up to, can't even think about. And then you say, 'Don't do it to me, do it to somebody else, do it to so-and-so.' And perhaps you might pretend, afterwards, that it was only a trick and that you just said it to make them stop and didn't really mean it. But that isn't true. At the time when it happens you do mean it. You think there's no other way of saving yourself, and you're quite ready to save yourself that way. You want it to happen to the other person. You don't give a damn what they suffer. All you care about is yourself.

The two never felt the same toward each other after this gruesome experience.

Family life was on a decline in Oceania. Smith and Julia suffered in the Ministry of Love because of their furtive love affair. Children were trained at an early age to spy even on their parents. Parsons, who lived in the same tenement building with Smith, related to him how his seven year old daughter slipped off from the hike with two other girls and followed a strange man for two hours whom she handed over to the patrols because he was wearing shoes that she had never seen anyone wearing before, so she concluded that he was probably an enemy agent dropped by parachute.

Then again Parsons' son set the shirt of a market woman on fire because he saw her wrap sausages in a poster of Big Brother.

13. Ibid., pp.294-95.
Parsons himself landed in prison because his daughter gave him over to the Thought Police. His offense was that in his sleep he kept repeating, "Down with Big Brother!" Then what to the reader may seem incredulous Parsons said: "I don't bear her any grudge for it. It shows I brought her up in the right spirit, anyway."\(^{14}\)

The Oceanic society was divided into three groups: an Inner Party which was limited to six million or two percent of the population, the Outer Party which consisted of about thirteen percent, and finally the Proles who constituted the remaining eighty-five per cent of Oceania, all of whom were under the surveillance of Big Brother who was a Stalinlike character.

It was only on rare occasions that one saw inside the dwelling of the Inner Party. Winston Smith and Julia, the hero and heroine of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, had access to it once when O'Brien promised to give them the tenth edition of the Newspeak Dictionary. The whole atmosphere of the huge block of flats, the richness and spaciousness of everything, the unfamiliar smells of good food and good tobacco, the silent and incredibly rapid lifts sliding up and down, the white-jacketed servants hurrying to and fro, everything was intimidating.

\(^{14}\) Ibid., p. 84.
If the Inner Party was termed the brain of Oceania, the Outer Party was considered the hands. They lived in cheaper tenement dwellings. Party members were distinguished from the Proles by their uniform, a kind of suit of overalls. The uniform of the women was set off by the red sash of the Junior Anti-Sex League. Pleasure in sex was frowned on by Big Brother as was any form of human emotion which might make Party members less frustrated and thus less amenable to discipline.

The workers or the Proles were deprived of all political rights, but unlike the Party members were otherwise left alone and even permitted to lead private lives in accordance with their own choice. In regard to this last statement Philip Rahv made the following observation:

That is an idea that appears to me to run contrary to the basic tendencies of totalitarianism. All societies of our epoch, whether authoritarian or democratic in structure, are mass-societies; and an authoritarian state built on the foundation of a mass-society could scarcely afford the luxury of allowing any class or group to evade its demand for complete control. A totalitarian-collectivist state is rigidly organized along hierarchical lines, but that very fact, so damaging to its socialist claims, necessitates the domination of all citizens, of whatever class, in the attempt to 'abolish' the contradiction between its theory and practice by means of boundless demagogy and violence.  

———

Howe in the American Scholar also presented the same idea indicating that the Proles were capable of revolutions just as well as the Outer Party.

When the High fall from power, the Middle solicit the aid of the Low pretending that they are fighting for liberty and justice and once they get into power they thrust the Low in their old position of servitude and they themselves become the High. From the point of view of the Low, no historic change has ever meant much more than a change in the name of the masters. There are four ways in which a ruling group can fall from power:

Either it is conquered from without, or it governs so inefficiently that the masses are stirred to revolt, or it allows a strong and discontented Middle Group to come into being, or it loses its own self-confidence and willingness to govern. These causes do not operate singly, and as a rule all four of them are present in some degree. A ruling class which could guard against all of them would remain in power permanently. Ultimately the determining factor is the mental attitude of the ruling class itself.17

The official language of Oceania was Newspeak, a devastating jargon whose aim was to reduce the vocabulary to the minimum number of words so that ultimately there


would be no tools for thinking outside the concepts provided by the state. All the literary classics of the past together with all historical documents were in the process of being "translated" into the new language, lest the future be led to believe that there was some past before the gruesome, self-perpetuating present. Syme, the Party philologist, said that their chief job was destroying words:

It is a beautiful thing, the destruction of words. Of course, the great wastage is in the verbs and adjectives, but there are hundreds of nouns that can be got rid of as well. It isn't only the synonyms; there are also the antonyms. After all, what justification is there for a word which is simply the opposite of some other word? A word contains its opposite in itself. Take 'good' for instance. If you have a word like 'good' what need is there for a word like 'Bad'? 'Ungood' will do just as well - better, because it is the exact opposite which the other is not. Or, again, if you want a stronger version of good what sense is there in having a whole string of vague, useless words like 'excellent' and 'splendid' and all the rest of them. 'Plus good' covers the meaning. 18

Various critics presented different interpretations of Orwell's outstanding book Nineteen Eighty-Four. Some compared it to Swift's Gulliver's Travels. One critic saw parallel structures in Zamiatin's We. Anthony West saw it as an aggregation of facts from past experience, namely, that of Crossgates. Woodcock compared this work with the

18. Ibid., p.52.
works of other contemporary ex-Utopians and anti-Utopians. Still others saw in Nineteen Eighty-Four a projection of present day situations into the future.

A critic in Time magazine compared Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four to Swift's Gulliver's Travels. Swift pilloried commonplace human failings. Orwell projected with urgency the final shape of a modern political drift.

In the Yahoos Swift propounded the theory that men were essentially bad and that there was no hope for the world. There is a defense against the world of Nineteen Eighty-Four, against the dictators, the regimenters, the left-wing totalitarians, against all the ambitious men who wish to impose their will on others.

Smith wrote in his diary, "Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two makes four." If men continue to believe such facts, and to reverence the spirit of truth in seeking greater knowledge, they can never be fully enslaved. If in addition they will fight for their freedom to worship God, to love a woman, to cherish an ill child, to stand up for the dignity of man and man's humanity to man, then the evil world of Nineteen Eighty-Four can never come to pass.

Time magazine carried a comparison of Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four to Zamiatin's We. The points of comparison are the following:
In the Russian's novel the characters live in glass houses where state agents can watch them; in Nineteen Eighty-Four they are spied on by the 'telescreen.' Zamiatin's dictator, the Benefactor, is a counterpart of Orwell's Big Brother. In both, a love affair leads to the undoing of a hero. In both, he rebels against the state, is trapped, punished and spiritually crushed.\textsuperscript{19}

Orwell's is the better book in every way, but his debt to We is apparent.

Anthony West does not consider Nineteen Eighty-Four as an attempt to imagine a probable future, but rather as aggregate of all things Orwell had at the back of his mind. According to him most incidents described in Nineteen Eighty-Four are derived from Orwell's experience at Crossgates which he so vividly portrayed in the essay,"Such, Such Were the Joys."

At Crossgates the headmaster's wife spied on Orwell, and whenever she caught him doing anything wrong, she reported him to the "head" for corporal punishment. This idea was developed in Nineteen Eighty-Four when Smith mentioned in one place that he disliked all women and above all the young ones because they were the bigoted adherents of the Party.

\textsuperscript{19} Edmund Fuller, "To the Heart of Matters," Time, Vol.55, (February 6, 1950), p.50.
The real horror of Crossgates was that the master seemed to be omniscient. He knew what every boy did and what he thought. In Nineteen Eighty-Four this idea was developed in the telescreen which was capable of sending and receiving messages.

At Crossgates Orwell would be summoned to the headmaster's study. Room 101 in the Ministry of Love was a projection of that idea.

The critic culminated his analysis by saying that, "Whether he knew it or not, what he did in Nineteen Eighty-Four was to send everybody in England to an enormous Crossgates to be as miserable as he had been." 20

Woodcock in his article, "Five Who Fear the Future," brought out the idea that Shaw, Wells, Koestler, Huxley and Orwell criticized the world developments of the Twentieth Century, not for the changes that have been brought about, but because the old ideals of equality and freedom have been in peril.

The critic further divided the five into two categories: the anti-Utopians Huxley and Orwell, and the ex-Utopians Shaw and Wells in the past and Koestler in our own time. Shaw constructed future fantasies about long-

---

lived supermen; Wells wrote about well organized "ideal" societies. Koestler after being disillusioned by German liberalism accepted for a while the social order of the Communists. Wells and Koestler felt that for man progress had come to an end.

If the ex-Utopians represented the rejection of man, the anti-Utopians showed that the over development of social and political organization was man's tragedy. In both novels, in the *Brave New World* and in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*,

the Utopian society is so powerful that it can crush any spark of that spirit of freedom which the rulers recognize as the principal danger to their dominion, and so the rebellion against uniformity which provides the essential conflicts in both *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are efficiently defeated. Not only are they defeated, but they never have any real hope of success, since the work of conditioning has already grown so tight that only the sports and the freaks even think of resisting, and they can be dealt with easily by the forces of the all-molding state.21.

Yet, we must remember that what was presented in these novels was conditional. The anti-Utopians do not consider humanity as approaching the end of a tether, but rather they suggest that if we allow regimentation which appears throughout the world to develop without hindrance then we

may find ourselves in a future where freedom, and all the values that go with it, will no longer exist.

While their books implied a criticism of the Nineteenth Century idea that progress was inevitable and that all progress was good, they were not anti-progressive. Rather, they insisted that change in technology and in psychiatric methods must be subordinated to certain moral values which man had held for a long time, and that only by this perpetual ascendancy of the moral over the material will progress in human societies be real.

Critics like Rahv, Kennedy, Corcoran and Soskin believed that the totalitarian super-state was an extension into the near future of the present structure and policy of totalitarian rulers, predicated upon conditions of permanent war and the development of the technical means of espionage and surveillance to the point of complete extinction of private life. For those of us who live smugly under the democratic way of life, Orwell sounds a rational note of warning that we examine our motives.

Hopkinson in his pamphlet on George Orwell claimed that there was nothing new in Nineteen Eighty-Four. That the war-time world of Nineteen Eighty-Four is the same as that of 1914 only dirtier and more cruel, and the nobility of mankind is drained away. From the technical point of view the situations are the same. The world of 1984 is
REVULSION AGAINST TOTALITARIANISM

fighting its battles with the weapons of 1944, rockets and tommy-guns.

The most vehement criticisms of Nineteen Eighty-Four came from Robert Hatch who said that Orwell must make one very broad assumption: that men are a thoroughly contemptible race of beings incapable of holding their place in the world. He said that 1984 will be a difficult year that all presidential-election years are. But by New Year's 1985 Orwell's Utopia will be over on the fantastic fiction shelf where it belongs.

After examining Orwell's mood of revulsion against totalitarianism we can agree with the majority of the critics that Nineteen Eighty-Four is a projection of present day situations into the future. It turns a skeptic's gaze on all forms of regimentation, even though momentarily they may seem to be of social benefit. But most of all it makes us examine our own lives with a new eye.
CHAPTER II

REVULSION AGAINST FASCISM

Fascism is a word derived from the Italian word "fascio" which means a bank or club. Mussolini organized his first "fascio" in Milan in 1919. Political freedom disappeared during Mussolini's reign. The Grand Council of the Fascist party, under the thumb of Mussolini, was to submit to the voters four hundred candidates. The voters were to vote yes or no on the whole slate. No other candidates and no other party were permitted to run. Only property owners and those who paid fees to certain government organizations were given the right to vote. This diminished the number of voters from ten million to three million. Naturally, the Fascist candidates always won.

Economic freedom disappeared along with the political freedom. Both labor and capital were brought under the close supervision of the government. Labor lost both its right to form independent unions and to strike. Businessmen were told whom to hire, what and how much to produce, and what profits they were permitted to make.

Unlike the Nazis in Germany, Mussolini did not quarrel with the church. On the contrary, he took steps...
to bring an end to the long standing dispute between the Papacy and the Italian government which began (1870) with the Italian seizure of Rome.

After Mussolini came to power, Pope Pius XI came to believe that if the antagonism between the papacy and the Italian government could be replaced by a friendly understanding between himself and the Fascist government, Italy would benefit. The Pope and Mussolini signed a concordat in 1929 called the Lateran Accord in which Vatican City, consisting of one hundred and eight acres around the Vatican and Saint Peter's Church, was established an independent nation. The powers of the Pope as the ruler of the Vatican City included the power to send and to receive ambassadors, coin money, issue postage stamps and maintain a radio station. Mussolini recognized the Catholic as the state church and the teaching of the Catholic religion was made compulsory in all schools.

Germany also became a Fascist country on April 1, 1933, when Hitler was given dictatorial powers and the Third German Empire (Third Reich) was established. Hitler proclaimed that the Third Reich would last for a thousand years. The majority of the German people rallied around their new leader, Der Fuehrer, and committed themselves without reserve to Nazism.
The National Socialist Party of Germany is frequently referred to as the Nazi Party. It was called national because its leaders said it would defend the national interests of Germany against outside powers and socialist because it would place the interests of the poor above the interests of the rich.

According to Orwell, German Fascism was a form of capitalism that borrowed from Socialism just those points which made it efficient in war. Ownership had not been abolished, there were still capitalists and workers. However, the state controlled everything. It controlled investment, raw materials, rates of interest, working hours and wages. The factory owner still owned his factory, but he was for practical purposes reduced to the status of a manager.

Many industrialists who had backed Hitler's rise to power regretted having done so when they found that they were completely under his orders. They were heavily taxed. They saw much of their wealth pass into the possession of Hitler's followers, some of whom became enormously rich.

Orwell received his first impressions of Fascism while serving as a private in the Spanish militia during the civil war. A brief outline of the conditions in Spain three years prior to World War II is necessary in order to understand Orwell's revulsion against Fascism. In 1936,
Francisco Franco, a pro-fascist Spanish general, led a revolt against the legally elected, but Leftist, government of Spain. Immediate support to the rebels was given by Germany and Italy. They sent Franco troops, technical advisers and large quantities of military equipment. Russia and France extended limited aid to the Loyalist government of Spain, but it was not comparable to the foreign aid given to Franco.

Fear that the civil war might result in a world conflict led to the signing of a Non-Intervention Agreement by England, France, Russia, Germany and Italy. These nations agreed to stop sending aid to the warring factions in Spain. The agreement soon proved a failure as Germany and Italy openly violated it. By 1939, the rebels gained complete control of Spain. Franco established an absolute dictatorship and aligned his country on the side of Germany and Italy.

In 1937, Orwell went to Spain to observe the civil war and to write about it. He stayed to take part in it joining the militia as a private on the Loyalist side. Because his letters of introduction were from the Independent Labour Party in England, which had connections with the Partido Obrero de Unificacion Marxista, (Party of Marxist Unification), Orwell joined a unit of that party in Barcelona. He was hot at the time sympathetic to the views
of his comrades and their leaders. He joined to put an active resistance to the challenge of tyranny which was imposing itself on the world.

During the days of the inter-party strife, the P.O.U.M. was represented in Spain and abroad as being a Trotskyist party. In point of fact it was not, although it did join with the small Trotskyist party to oppose certain of the policies of the dominant Communist Party. On the surface the quarrel between the Communists and the P.O.U.M. was one of tactics. The P.O.U.M. was for immediate revolution. The Communist policy was to have the Loyalists first win the war against Franco and then have all of Spain join the Communist Party.

At the time of his enlistment, Orwell's own preference was for the Communist Party Line and because of this he looked forward to an eventual transfer to a Communist unit. But it did not take him long to come round to the view that any policy which ignored liberty and equality must fail in the long run.

Orwell captured the atmosphere, the dirt, the noise, the discomfort, the ragged clothes, the feeling of privation, the lack of training, the lack of ammunition and the endurance under fire both in Alcubierre and at Barcelona. He also showed the betrayal of the allies by the Communists. He captured the mood of a peculiar evil feeling in the air,
an atmosphere of suspicion, fear, uncertainty, hatred and of dismay when his comrades vanished into secret prisons.

Arriving at Barcelona Orwell noticed a complete absence of the wealthy classes. The people he met wore rough working clothes, overalls, or some form of militia uniform. He recognized Barcelona as a workers' state worth fighting for:

I had dropped more or less by chance into the only community of any size in Western Europe where political consciousness and disbelief in capitalism were more normal than their opposites. ... Many of the normal motives of civilized life - snobbishness, money-grubbing, fear of the boss, - had simply ceased to exist. The ordinary class divisions of society had disappeared to an extent that is almost unthinkable in the money-tainted air of England.... One had been in a community where hope was more normal than apathy and cynicism, and where the word 'comrade' stood for comradeship and not, as in most countries, for humbug. One had breathed the air of equality.¹

What Orwell did not know was that many of the well-to-do bourgeois were disguising themselves as proletarians for the time being.

The militia which Orwell joined received their uniform in piecemeal fashion. Some articles like belts and cartridge-boxes were not given until the last minute. All men wore knee-breeches and there the uniformity ended.

Each had different footwear. Each had zippered jackets, but the jackets were of different colors and materials.

The recruits in his division were sixteen and seventeen year old boys. Discipline did not exist. Whenever they did not like an order, they would step out of ranks to argue with the officer. Foreigners were asked not to attend the instructions for the Spanish felt that they knew more about warfare than they did. Orwell, however, attended all classes and learned to his dismay that they merely were drill lessons. The vital information that the boys needed: how to take cover, how to advance across open ground, how to mount guard and build a parapet, and how to use weapons was not given to them. Later Orwell found out that the reason why the boys were not taught how to use weapons was that there were no weapons to be had. The fresh troops reaching the lines had to take the rifles from the troops they relieved in the line.

When the rifles arrived, Orwell was shocked. He was given a German Mauser dated 1896. It was rusty, the bolt was stiff, the wooden barrel-guard was split, and the muzzle showed that it was corroded and past praying for. No attempt was made to give better rifles to men who knew how to use them. A half-witted fifteen year old boy got the best gun, a ten-year-old rifle. Five minute instructions were given on how to load the gun and how to take
the bolt to pieces. Fifty cartridges were given to each man.

Orwell described the march of his unit to the trenches. Kopp, the Belgian commandant, was at the head of the column:

You cannot possibly conceive what a rabble we looked. We struggled along with far less cohesion than a flock of sheep; before we had gone two miles the rear of the column was out of sight. And quite half of the so-called men were children — but I mean literally children, of sixteen years old at the very most. Yet they were all happy and excited at the prospect of getting to the front at last. As we neared the line the boys round the red flag in front began to utter shouts of 'Visca P.O.U.M.' 'Fascistas-mariconesi' and so forth — shouts which were meant to be war-like and menacing, but which, from those childish throats, sounded as pathetic as the cries of kittens. It seemed dreadful that the defenders of the Republic should be this mob of ragged children carrying worn-out rifles which they did not know how to use.2

In his essay, "Looking Back on the Spanish War," Orwell related an incident which will give the reader an insight to his character. While in the service a bundle of cigars disappeared from his bunk. He reported this to the office. Another soldier reported a loss of twenty-five pesetas from his bunk. They had a wild-looking boy from Barcelona whom they suspected of the theft. The boy was

called to the guardroom where he was searched, but no cigars nor pesetas were found. Orwell being the man he was took the boy to the pictures that evening and bought him brandy and chocolates. Orwell berated himself for trying to wipe out the injury with money. For a few minutes he had believed that the boy was a thief, and that could not be wiped out.

Later on Orwell was made a corporal in command of twelve men. One of the men refused to go on duty because that exposed him to enemy fire. Orwell seized the man and felt inclined to drag him to his post. The Spanish resent being touched. This caused a row from the remaining men. Just then the wild-looking boy took Orwell's side by saying that he was the best corporal they had. This same boy later asked to be exchanged into Orwell's section. Orwell was touched by this. Personally he felt that it was almost impossible to establish good feeling between the boy and himself after the boy was searched in his presence and accused by him of theft.

The situation at Alcubierre was not very dangerous. The Fascists were seven hundred meters away. They looked like dots from the Loyalist trenches. Orwell noticed that eleven-year-old boys were under his command. These were Fascist's refugees. They were employed to do light work in the rear, but they soon wormed their way into the front line.
They were difficult to handle on sentry duty. They would often lean against a wall and fall asleep in that position.

The Loyalists tried to convert their enemy instead of shooting them. The machine-gunners on the government side while on duty used a megaphone through which they voiced their sentiments to the Fascists. Usually the Fascists were told that they were nothing more than the hirelings of capitalism, that they were fighting against their own class, and they were urged to come to fight on the other side. At times the Fascists were told what good rations the Loyalists were getting, that they were at the very moment sitting down to buttered toast. The Loyalists did not see butter for weeks, but this idea set many a Fascist's mouth watering, and it did bring about results. Many Fascists crossed the lines and joined the Loyalist party. One day as many as fifteen deserters arrived. They were always ravenously hungry.

Firewood, food, tobacco, candles and the enemy were the five important things in trench warfare. Orwell was at Alcubierre between the months of January and April. They were two or three thousand feet above sea level. To keep warm was quite a problem. The militia were constantly gathering firewood or anything that would give any heat. The food was not bad and they did get plenty of wine. A package of cigarettes was their daily ration. Next to their
rifle they treasured the candles which they received. To own a candle was a matter of life or death.

As far as the enemy was concerned the ammunition of the Loyalists was in a bad way. They had one machine gun to every fifty men, one good rifle to every ten men, and a bomb to every five or ten men. Besides the lack of ammunition they lacked maps, charts, field glasses and telescopes.

They had a few casualties - all self-inflicted due to ineffective weapons. At times a raw recruit on sentry duty would fire at another. Orwell was aimed at once but missed by a yard. The Spanish standard of marksmanship had saved his life.

In April the Loyalists advanced their line one hundred and fifty to three hundred yards. Six hundred men within seven hours dug twelve hundred meters of trenches and built parapets without any noise, without being detected by the Fascists. In the morning, however, the Fascists fired but there were no casualties. Later a deserter reported to the Loyalists that five Fascist sentries were shot for negligence.

Orwell displayed his courage when he volunteered with fourteen other men to attack the Fascist lines at night. It was a rainy night; the traveling was bad. They approached the Fascist trenches within twenty yards. Each
man was provided with three bombs and one hundred cartridge-boxes. The first two bombs that Orwell threw missed the aim, but the third was successful. There was firing on both sides. Jorge and Middlestone, the leaders of the Loyalists, were wounded but both recovered.

After spending one hundred and fifteen days in the trenches at Alcubierre and after suffering from cold, hunger, fatigue due to sleeplessness and other difficulties, the entire unit was relieved by a new one on April 25. The following day Orwell arrived at Barcelona only to find the city in a siege of street warfare. The P.O.U.M. Executive building had to be guarded, so he spent the next few weeks on duty on the roof of the building going through the same privations as in the trenches.

Across from the P.O.U.M. building was an observatory. The men left six of their rifles on the roof. The police gave orders that anyone carrying ammunition would be subject to arrest. They could not afford to disregard the rifles, therefore, Orwell together with a Spanish boy managed to transfer the rifles by carrying them in their trouser leg and under the armpit. They could not bend their knees. Walking down the stairs was a real torture.

The police searched his wife's room in the hotel. They did it with totalitarian efficiency:
They sounded the walls, took up the mats, examined the floor, felt the curtains, probed under the bath and the radiator, emptied every drawer and suitcase and felt every garment and held it up to the light.... They were thrown into ecstasies of suspicion by finding that we possessed a French translation of Hitler's Mein Kampf. If that had been the only book they found our doom would have been sealed. It is obvious that a person who reads Mein Kampf must be a Fascist. The next moment, however, they came upon a copy of Stalin's pamphlet, Ways of Liquidating Trotskyists and other Double Dealers, which reassured them somewhat. In one drawer there was a number of packets of cigarette papers. They picked each packet to pieces and examined each paper separately, in case there should be messages written on them.3

But they never searched the bed! Orwell's wife was lying in it at the time and, as he said, there might have been half a dozen sub-machine-guns under the mattress and a library of Trotskyist documents under the pillow. The police were Communist members but they also were Spaniards and to turn a woman out of bed was a little too much for them.

One day an officer told Orwell that the government intended to outlaw the P.O.U.M. and declare a state of war upon it. The P.O.U.M. was the weakest party, therefore, the entire blame would be laid upon it.

Orwell tried to explain the rights and wrongs of

3. Ibid., p.224.
the Barcelona affair and also to establish who was guilty. The opening situation was as follows: the Spanish government seized the telephone exchange under the pretense that the wires were tapped, also, the government's order to surrender arms caused a provocation.

The Communist press laid the entire blame on the P.O.U.M. stating that it was a deliberate, planned insurrection against the government. Orwell discredited this statement. He claimed that the fighting was not deliberately planned either by the government or the P.O.U.M.: neither side had brought troops to Barcelona beforehand. The fighting was only between those who were in Barcelona already, mainly civilians and the police.

The food ran short almost immediately. Anyone who has served in Spain knows that the one operation of war that Spaniards perform really well is that of feeding their troops. It is most unlikely that if either side had contemplated a week or two of street-fighting and a general strike they would not have stored food beforehand. 4

The Communist press also accused the P.O.U.M. of acting under Fascist orders. Orwell stated that this party did not have the numbers or the influence to provoke such disorders. The leaders probably helped to prolong the fighting, but they did not originate it. Secondly, the Fascist plot rested only on bare assertion. The earlier

reference of the fifteen volunteers who attacked the Fascist trenches at Alcubierre seems to point the evidence in the other direction.

In general, newspaper reports were not accurate. Orwell noticed reports that had no connection with the facts. He read about great battles being fought when in reality none were fought. On the other hand, he noticed complete silence, when hundreds of men had been killed. He read about men being cowards and traitors, whereas in reality they fought bravely. Those who never saw a firing gun were hailed as victors. He saw all these lies reprinted in the London papers.

The Franco propagandists refused to admit the fact of German or Italian intervention, although both the German and Italian press at home were openly boasting about the exploits of their legionaries.

All this gave Orwell the feeling that the concept of objective truth is fading out of the world:

After all, the chances are that those lies, or at any rate similar lies, will pass into history. How will the history of the Spanish war be written? If Franco remains in power his nominees will write the history books, and that Russian army which never existed will become historical fact, and school children will learn about it generations hence. But suppose Fascism is finally defeated and some kind of democratic government restored in Spain in the fairly near future; even then, how is the history of the war to be written? What kind of records will Franco
have left behind him? Suppose even that the records kept on the Government side are recoverable - even so, how is a true history of the war to be written? For, as I have pointed out already, the Government also dealt extensively in lies. From the anti-Fascist angle one could write a broadly truthful history of the war, but it would be a partisan history, unreliable on every minor point. Yet, after all, some kind of history will be written, and after those who actually remember the war are dead, it will be universally accepted. So for all practical purposes the lie will have become the truth.5

On June 16, the P.O.U.M. was suppressed and declared an illegal organization. The leaders were arrested. The Spanish Communist paper accused these leaders of transmitting military secrets to General Franco by radio. If they had been Fascist spies, they would have been tried and shot immediately. But six months after imprisonment they still had no evidence against them.

Mayberry pinpoints the outcome of the Spanish civil war in these words:

In fairness to Orwell, and to recorded history the government's policy led to disaster, but only because of the active intervention of the Fascist nations and, the active non-intervention of the Western democracies.6


Orwell went to the front lines again at Huesca, this time in the capacity of second-lieutenant, in command of about thirty men, English and Spanish. Here he was shot through the neck by a Fascist. He described his being wounded as follows:

Roughly speaking it was the sensation of being at the centre of an explosion. There seemed to be a loud bang and a blinding flash of light all around me, and I felt a tremendous shock - no pain, only a violent shock, such as you get from an electric terminal; with it a sense of utter weakness, a feeling of being stricken and shrivelled up to nothing. The sand-bags in front of me receded into an immense distance... I knew immediately that I was hit, but because of the seeming bang and flash I thought it was a rifle nearby that had gone off accidentally and shot me. All this happened in a space of time much less than a second. The next moment my knees crumpled up and I was falling, my head hitting the ground with a violent bang, which to my relief, did not hurt. I had a numb, dazed feeling, a consciousness of being very badly hurt, but no pain in the ordinary sense.7

At the time he really thought he was dying. Later on he analyzed his thoughts. His first thought was for his wife. His second feeling was that of resentment at having to leave this world which suited him so well, bad though it was. He felt no resentment against the man who fired at him. He felt it was a Fascist and that if he had the chance,

he would have killed him first. If the man had been brought before him, he would have congratulated him on his good marksmanship.

Wounded men were usually brought to the hospital closest to the front lines: Sietamo, Barbastro, Morzon and Lerida. From there they would be transported within ten days or so to Barcelona or Tarragona. Orwell described the systems of Lerida where he was temporarily stationed. They had good doctors, plenty of medical aid and good food. But men who were brought in from the front lines received no aid except a clean bandage. Only men who were too badly wounded to be moved received care at these hospitals.

The second fault that he found with the Spanish hospitals was that they did not have competent nurses. This was probably due to the fact that this work was done by nuns before the war. The girls they had on duty were probably hospital aides who knew how to take temperatures and how to tie a bandage. The patients were dreadfully neglected. One man, Orwell said, did not have his face washed for three weeks.

In this regard he also revealed the Spanish tempo. Everything is Manana. The rifles will be distributed Manana; the fighting will begin Manana; the train with the wounded will leave Manana. The men were told that they would leave for Barcelona. Orwell sent a wire to his wife
who was stationed there. On the train they were told that they were going to Tarragona instead. The engineer held up the train so that Orwell could send his wife another wire. This could only happen in Spain. And what was more Spanish still the wire never got there.

After receiving his discharge Orwell planned to leave Spain together with his wife. When he was about to leave they checked the files in the office of the Chief-of-Police, but due to their inefficiency Orwell's name was not listed. When he showed his discharge papers, the officer did not know that the twenty-ninth Division was the P.O.U.M. Party. Orwell with his wife safely left Spain and arrived in their dear native country, England.
CHAPTER III

REVULSION AGAINST COMMUNISM

Orwell's moral and intellectual indignation before the concept of totalitarianism as localized in Russia is best expressed in Animal Farm. Any form of government which ignores liberty and equality must fail in the end.

Communism asserts that all means of production and distribution should be owned collectively by the people. But collective ownership does not necessarily apply to personal possessions. Theoretically Communism is based on the following premises. All people should work for the common good and be rewarded for their work in products distributed on the principle from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs. All forms of work, mental and physical, should be considered of equal importance in a classless society. With the disappearance of class distinction the state would wither away, that is, centralized authority would become unnecessary.

In the allegory of Animal Farm Orwell presented to us a typical Communist state. The purpose of this chapter is to transfer the allegory of Animal Farm into parallel political realities which it represents and Orwell's revolt
against them. First, the driving out of Mr. Jones was equivalent to the Bolshevik revolution. The open violence between Napoleon and Snowball typified the excommunication of Trotsky. Common labor represented the industrial five year plan. The seven commandments showed the revision of Marxist principles. The execution of the traitors on the farm brought to the mind the purges of the 1930's. The trade dealings with Frederick of Pinchfield stood for the Russo-German Pact and its breakdown. And finally we had the realization that the animals had only changed masters.

First, the driving out of Mr. Jones, (Tsar Nicholas II), was equivalent to the Bolshevik revolution. On the eve of the revolution Old Major Boar, (Karl Marx), addressed all the animals, (the Russian peasants), and commented sadly on the nature of their life. They do not know happiness after the age of one. They have to work hard, get just enough food to keep themselves alive, and when their usefulness comes to an end they are slaughtered. The source of all this evil was man, (Aristocracy-Capitalism). The solution that he offered was rebellion against man:

Why, work night and day, body and soul, for the overthrow of the human race! That is my message to you, comrades: Rebellion! I do not know when that Rebellion will come, it might be in a week or in a hundred years, but I know, as surely as I see this straw beneath my feet, that
sooner or later justice will be done. Fix your eyes on that comrades, throughout the short remainder of your lives! And above all, pass on this message of mine to those who come after you, so that future generations shall carry on the struggle until it is victorious.

And remember, comrades, your revolution must never falter. No argument must lead you astray. Never listen when they tell you that Man and the animals have a common interest, that the prosperity of the one is the prosperity of the others. It is all lies. Man serves the interests of no creature except himself. And among us animals let there be perfect unity, perfect comradeship in the struggle. All men are enemies. All animals are comrades.¹

Three nights after the meeting Old Major died peacefully in his sleep. Napoleon, Snowball and Squealer were the eminent pigs who took over. The rebellion went off smoothly. The charges against Mr. Jones were that his men were idle and dishonest, the country was neglected, and the animals were unfed.

One day as the animals were unfed and Mr. Jones went to bed drunk, the animals broke in the door of the storeroom and helped themselves. Mr. Jones and four of his men came with whips in their hands, lashing out in all directions. This the animals could not take and as a result Mr. Jones and the four men were butted and kicked from all sides. They then disappeared in cart-trucks.

To tear religion out of their hearts was a more difficult task. The pigs had a hard struggle to counteract the "lies" circulated by Moses, the tame raven:

Moses, who was Mr. Jones's especial pet, was a spy and a talebearer, but he was also a clever talker. He claimed to know the existence of a mysterious country called Sugarcandy Mountain, to which all animals went when they died. It was situated somewhere up in the sky, a little distance beyond the clouds, Moses said. In Sugarcandy Mountain it was Sunday seven days a week, clover was in season all the year round, and lump sugar and linseed cake grew on the hedges. The animals hated Moses because he told tales and did no work, but some of them believed in Sugarcandy Mountain, and the pigs had to argue very hard to persuade them that there was no such place.2

In 1944, Stalin was eager to have the sympathy of Roman Catholics. He anticipated resistance in puppet Poland and thought popular support might be won by smiling on the Vatican:

Stalin accordingly gave an audience to Father Orlemanski, a Catholic parish priest of Polish origin from Springfield, Massachusetts, who, he vainly hoped, would sway Catholic opinion in Poland and Rome in favour of Russia.3

Where Communism has been able to assert its power, it has striven by every possible means to destroy Christian

---

2. Ibid., p.15.
civilization and the Christian religion by banishing every remembrance of them from the hearts of men, especially of the young. Bishops and priests were exiled, condemned to forced labor, or shot in inhuman fashion. Laymen suspected of defending their religion were persecuted, dragged off to trial, and thrown into prison.

The open violence between Napoleon and Snowball typified the excommunication of Trotsky. There were minor disagreements between Napoleon and Snowball but things came to a breaking point when Snowball introduced the windmill plan, (the Dnieper Dam, a symbol of Russia's industrialization), at one of their Sunday meetings. The animals were divided. One faction said, "Vote for Snowball and the three day week," and the other, "Vote for Napoleon and the full manger."

When Snowball presented the progress that would accompany the erection of the windmill, that it would operate threshing machines, ploughs, reapers and binders besides supplying every stall with its own electric light, hot and cold water and an electric heater, no one knew which way the vote would go. Just then Napoleon arose and gave such a whimper as had never been heard before. At that moment nine dogs dashed for Snowball and chased him until

---

he disappeared through a hole in the hedge and was seen no more.

Sometime after this Napoleon advocated the erection of the windmill. The animals could not see why he opposed Snowball. Squealer told them that Napoleon really had the plans first, and he called Snowball a criminal. The animals were dumbfounded. After all Snowball fought in the Battle of the Cowshed. Squealer answered that bravery was not enough; loyalty and obedience were more important.

The animals worked sixty hours a week. Their food was no less than what they received when Mr. Jones operated the farm. Napoleon announced that there would be work on Sunday afternoon, but that it would be voluntary. Anyone who would not work on Sunday would have his rations diminished to half.

The building of the windmill was slackened because they did not have enough oil and iron. Napoleon announced that he must trade with the neighboring farmers. He must exchange hay and wheat for the necessary products. The animals were disturbed. This was against their policy. But then they did not remember it ever being published.

One night the half-erected windmill was in ruins. Snowball was blamed for this. Napoleon issued a proclamation that any animal who would find Snowball would receive
"Animal Hero, Second Class," and a half a bushel of apples. A full bushel would be given to one who would capture Snowball alive.

The winter months were filled with snow and sleet yet the animals never tired of rebuilding the windmill. Starvation seemed to stare them in the face. It was important to conceal this from the outside world. Napoleon would fill the grain bins to the brim with sand and then cover the sand with grain, so that when Mr. Whymper came he saw how they had flourished under the new plan.

The political parallel of the above mentioned situation was as follows. Stalin and Trotsky were rivals for the leadership of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republic after the death of Lenin on January 21, 1924. Trotsky was on his way for a cure in the Caucasus when he received the news of Lenin's death. He immediately wired the Kremlin asking when the funeral would take place. He received a telegram from Stalin:

The funeral takes place on Saturday. You will not be able to return in time. The Politbureau thinks that because of the state of your health you must proceed to Sukhum.  

5. Ibid., p. 60.
The funeral actually took place on Sunday, January 27. Trotsky could have been there. Stalin wanted to weaken the association in the people's minds between Lenin and Trotsky.

Stalin was General Secretary of the Communist Party during Lenin's rule. This position enabled him to become a key man after Lenin's death. Stalin's leadership was bitterly opposed by Trotsky. Trotsky and his supporters clung to the policy of spreading Communism throughout the world, a policy which Stalin rejected at that particular time. Stalin proposed to concentrate on the socialization of industry and agriculture, and the development of the human and natural resources of Russia.

Trotsky and his followers continued their opposition to the New Economic Policy; Stalin and his followers favored it for the time being. In 1925, Stalin ousted Trotsky from his position as War Commissar. From then on until his exile in 1929, Trotsky lacked real power. He was assassinated in 1940, in Mexico City, Mexico.

The New Economic Policy mentioned above referred to a program set up by Lenin in 1921. After the revolution the rulers realized that it was impossible for the people to break with the past as completely as the leaders desired. The peasants wanted to own land and to sell their surplus farm products in the open market to make money, both of which were contrary to the principles of Communism. When
the government interfered with the sale of the peasants' surpluses, they produced less. The distribution of food and goods broke down. In these conditions hardships and famine were widespread. To revive industry, agriculture, and trade, Lenin adopted the New Economic Policy, a compromise with the Communistic ideal of public ownership of all means of production.

Under the New Economic Policy peasants were allowed to sell their surplus goods in the public market, but in return for the privilege they agreed to turn over to the government a part of the products they raised instead of paying a tax in money. The government retained its ownership of all banks, all large industries, all public utilities and control of foreign trade.

Conditions began to improve under the New Economic Policy. Nepmen (private capitalists), began to grow rich. As some peasants acquired more land, they hired other peasants to work for them and thereby became richer. The wealth of these men gave them great power as money-lenders and village bosses. This revival of capitalism could not be tolerated in a country whose government was Communistic and so it was brought to an end by Stalin.

Stalin who supported the New Economic Policy as a temporary measure, put the Five-Year Plan (1929-1933), into operation. The state planning agency worked out a
complete, detailed program for production in every category: farm products, consumer goods and heavy industry including such basic elements as coal, steel, oil, military supplies and weapons.

The Five-Year Plan was broken down into annual production quotas for the whole Soviet Union. It was also broken down into regional and district quotas within the union republics. At the local levels, towns, villages, hamlets, the individual factory and collective farms received the quotas from district authorities and were told the quantity of goods or farm products that must be delivered to the states' collection agencies by a given date.

The third Five-Year Plan was interrupted by the outbreak of World War II. However, it was renewed after the war and in 1956, Russia started its sixth Five-Year Plan.

In January, 1955, Nikita Krushchev disclosed the sorry state of Soviet agriculture. Although the Soviet Union's population had increased fifty per cent since 1916, he said, cattle declined 2.6 per cent since 1928, other animals showed only a slight increase, and farm output in general did not satisfy the country's food and industrial needs. There were fewer cows than in 1916, and the total number of cattle was less than in 1928.
Also on Krushchev's list of critical shortages were milk, poultry, eggs, potatoes, wool, fodder for cattle and pork. He reported a lag in the manufacture of agricultural equipment and machinery, inadequate farm buildings for animals and other serious agricultural deficiencies.

In November, 1956, the Soviet Government claimed that there had been a marked increase in the harvest of bread grains and potatoes over 1955 figures. The milk supply was also said to have improved, but the production of other agricultural items was passed over.

This was the record of more than twenty-five years of collectivization in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republic.

Our next point for consideration will be the principles of animalism. They were reduced to Seven Commandments which Snowball with the help of Squealer inscribed on the wall of the big barn. Snowball said the commandments were an unalterable law by which all the animals must live forever after. The commandments were the following:

1. Whatever goes upon two legs is an enemy.
2. Whatever goes upon four legs, or has wings, is a friend.
3. No animal shall wear clothes.
4. No animal shall sleep in a bed.
5. No animal shall drink alcohol.
6. No animal shall kill any other animal.
7. All animals are equal.

In no time the commandments were altered to suit the Party members, and so the first two commandments were changed to, "Four feet good, two feet better." This was necessary when the pigs decided to walk on their hind legs and carry a whip in their trotter.

The animals noticed that the pigs moved into Mr. Jones's house and what was more conspicuous they slept in beds. The animals definitely remembered the commandment. Clover went to the barn but she could not read so she asked Muriel to read it for her. Muriel spelled it out. It said, "No animal shall sleep in a bed with sheets." Clover had not remembered the commandment saying anything about sheets, but it must have been so since it was there on the wall. Just then Squealer attended by two or three dogs was able to put everything in its proper perspective.

One midnight the animals heard a terrible crash. They all rushed out of their stalls. At the foot of the barn where the Seven Commandments were written lay a ladder broken in two places, Squealer sprawling beside it, and a pot of paint overturned. This did not mean that there was any connection between alcohol and falling off a ladder, although Benjamin, the donkey, had a very knowing air about the whole affair. Muriel again read the Fifth Commandment.

8. Ibid., p.112. 9. Ibid., p.57.
which read, "No animal shall drink alcohol to excess." 10.

A few days after the execution the animals remembered or thought they remembered that the Sixth Commandment decreed, "No animal shall kill any other animal." 11. Clover again asked Muriel to read the commandment for her. Muriel read, "No animal shall kill any other animal without cause." 12.

And again when Clover wanted to verify the commandments, Benjamin read for her the single commandment that remained on the barn: "All animals are equal but some animals are more equal than others." 13.

The execution of the various animals brought to mind the purges of the 1930's. One day Napoleon ordered all the animals to assemble. After surveying the audience Napoleon gave a loud whimper, and immediately nine huge dogs attacked four pigs. The pigs were the ones who protested when Napoleon abolished the Sunday meetings. To everyone's surprise three of the dogs attacked Boxer, but he crushed one with his feet and the other two fled. Boxer then looked up at Napoleon to know whether he should kill the dog or let him go. Napoleon ordered Boxer to let the dog go.

10. Ibid., p.103. 11. Ibid., p.21.
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One day Squealer announced that the hens should lay four hundred eggs a week which would be sold to Whymper. The hens rebelled, for they wanted some of the eggs for spring hatching. At the assembly the hens were called upon to confess their crimes. They blamed Snowball for their rebellion. They were slaughtered. A goose confessed to hiding six ears of corn during last year's harvest. Sheep confessed that they killed a ram. They were also slain. The rest of the animals felt miserable. They did not know which was worse, the treachery of the animals who had leagued themselves with Snowball or the cruel retribution they had just witnessed.

The political parallel of the above mentioned incidents occurred between 1933 and 1938, when a number of Trotsky's supporters were gradually removed from office. General Muralov, commander of the Moscow garrison, a partisan of Trotsky, was transferred to a remote provincial post. Army Commander-in-Chief Serge S. Kamenev, an intimate co-worker of Trotsky, suffered a demotion. Petrovsky, a staunch friend, was dismissed from the war office. Other leading Trotskyists were ordered to distant posts: Ossinsky to Stockholm as Soviet commercial representative, Preobrazhensky to the London Anglo-Saxon negotiations, Sapronov to Vladivostok, and Antonov-Arsejynko to China. Zinoviev and
Kamenev, who were followers of Stalin after Lenin's death, joined Trotsky in 1925. In 1936, both were executed.

Napoleon wanted to sell timber either to Frederick or Pilkington. He finally decided to sell it to Frederick. Frederick wanted to write out a check, but Napoleon insisted upon five-pound notes. The timber was quickly removed. The following day a horrible scream was heard. The animals found out that the bank notes were forgeries.

The next morning Frederick and his followers attacked animal farm. They gained possession of the windmill. A hole was drilled in it and blasting powder packed in the hole. The explosion took place immediately and no sign of the windmill remained.

Eventually Frederick and his followers were driven out of animal farm. A great celebration took place. Napoleon instituted the Order of the Green Banner which he had conferred upon himself. Every animal received an apple; the birds were provided with two ounces of corn, and the dogs got three biscuits each.

The political parallel of the above description can be allied to the Russo-German Pact. Between the years 1939-41, Russia followed a policy of non-aggression toward Nazi Germany and signed a pact as a result. The Non-Aggression Pact with Germany gave Russia temporary protection
against a German attack and time to strengthen further her military defenses.

The timber incident was a reference to Russia selling strategic materials to Germany. In 1938, Russia sold Germany 33,154 tons of oil; in 1940, 700,000 tons.

In 1941, Germany attacked Russia, thus forcing her into World War II. Russia received considerable military equipment from the United States and, to some extent, from England. By 1945, Russia and her allies achieved complete military victory.

Our final point for consideration is the realization on the part of the animals that they have only exchanged masters. Step by step Orwell presented the injustices, the inequalities, which reached their climax in Clover's meditation. The meditation is an assertion that the revolution had failed in so far as the proletarians were concerned.

The first instance of inequality was evident when Squealer announced to the animals that the pigs with their superior knowledge should assume the leadership, and because of this they were entitled to certain privileges:

Comrades! You do not imagine, I hope, that we pigs are doing this in a spirit of selfishness and privilege? Many of us actually dislike milk and apples. I dislike them myself. Our sole object in taking these things is to preserve our health. Milk and apples (this has been proved
by science, Comrades) contain substances absolutely necessary to the well-being of a pig. We pigs are brainworkers. The whole management and organisation of this farm depends on us. Day and night we are watching over your welfare. It is for your sake that we drink that milk and eat those apples. Do you know what would happen if we pigs failed in our duty? Jones would come back. Yes, Jones would come back. Surely, Comrades, surely there is no one among you who wants to see Jones come back? 14.

Fischer in the biography of Stalin brought out the inequality that exists in Russia:

The new upper class is endlessly stratified into numerous castes. Instead of equal comrades in a party or equal citizens in a country, Stalin has established strict hierarchical gradations with barriers, titles, and differentiated pay and privileges. Factories have two, sometimes three or four restaurants; the worst is for workers, the best in food, spaciousness, service, and privacy is for the director and his immediate subordinates. In the remote Soviet past, officers and soldiers in the Red Army wore uniforms of the same material and were equal except in their duties. Today, the officers are decked in epaulets, braids, fine clothing, and all the accoutrements of a caste army, occupy the best apartments, and impose strictest discipline on shabby privates who no longer may mingle with officers. Officers have clubs, messes, and establishment barracks to which soldiers have no access. 15.

Their liberty was infringed upon when Napoleon announced that their Sunday meetings would be abolished

because there were too many debates. From now on Napoleon would make plans for the week and Squealer would deliver them to the animals on Sunday at ten o'clock after the singing of "Beasts of England." In April, Animal Farm was declared a Republic. The unanimous choice was the one and only candidate, Napoleon.

It is also interesting to note the submission of the animals as voiced by Boxer who was their spokesman. When the Sunday meetings were abolished, Boxer said, "Napoleon is always right." 16. When Napoleon announced that he had to trade hay and wheat with other farmers for oil and iron, the animals were disturbed. It was against their policy to have anything to do with humans, but Boxer once again reiterated, "Napoleon is always right." 17. Whenever Boxer was confronted with a problem, he would say, "I will work harder." 18.

When Squealer announced that Snowball was a traitor at the Battle of the Cowshed, it was a little too much for Boxer. After all both of them received "Animal Hero First Class" distinction. Squealer then said:

Our Leader, Comrade Napoleon, has stated categorically, comrade - that Snowball was

---
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Jones's agent from the very beginning - yes, and from long before the Rebellion was ever thought of.

'Ah that is different' said Boxer. 'If Napoleon says it, it must be right.'19.

The above mentioned examples prove that when too much power is concentrated in the hands of the few people, these few people are so protected from criticism of their conduct on any except Party lines, that neither they themselves nor anyone else is protected from their worst human vices: savagery, vindictiveness, envy, greed, and lust for power.

The sad realization of the animals' failure was voiced by Clover:

If she could have spoken her thoughts, it would have been to say that this was not what they had aimed at when they had set themselves years ago to work for the overthrow of the human race. These scenes of terror and slaughter were not what they had looked forward to on that night when Old Major first stirred them to rebellion. If she herself had had any picture of the future, it had been of a society of animals set free from hunger and the whip, all equal, each working according to his capacity, the strong protecting the weak, as she had protected the lost brood of ducklings with her foreleg on the night of Major's speech. Instead - she did not know why - they had come to a time where no one dared speak his mind, when fierce, growling dogs roamed everywhere, and when you had to watch your comrades torn to pieces after confessing to shocking crimes. There was no thought of rebellion or disobedience

19. Ibid., p.69.
in her mind. She knew that, even as things were, they were far better off than they had been in the days of Jones, and that before all else it was needful to prevent the return of human beings. Whatever happened she would remain faithful, work hard, carry out the orders that were given to her, and accept the leadership of Napoleon. But still, it was not for this that they had built the windmill and faced the bullets of Jones's gun. Such were her thoughts, though she lacked the words to express them.

One day Pilkington and Frederick visited Animal Farm. Napoleon was host. A burst of laughter issued from the manor which caused the other animals to draw near and look in through the window. What they saw amazed them. They looked from pig to man and from man to pig but they could not tell them apart. A key to that reference can be found in one of Pilkington's statements, "If you have your lower animals to contend with, we have our lower classes."

In connection with the above Voorhees has an interesting statement:

The early history of Animal Farm, then, is partly a satire of the Tory protesting against any sort of social change because he hates and fears it; the later history is partly a satire of the Tory wanting to get along well with dictatorships because it is 'good business.'

---


The essential quality of a successful animal fable is the capacity of ascribing to the animals idiotic but easily recognized qualities and dressing them in changed phraseology to suit the animal life. Orwell performed this to perfection:

When the laws of Animal Farm were first formulated, the retiring age had been fixed for horses and pigs at twelve, for cows at fourteen, for dogs at nine, for sheep at seven and for hens and geese at five. Liberal old-age pensions had been agreed upon. As yet no animal had actually retired on a pension, but of late the subject had been discussed more and more. Now that the small field beyond the orchard had been set aside for barley, it was rumoured that a corner of the large pasture was to be fenced off and turned into a grazing-ground for superannuated animals. For a horse, it was said, the pension would be five pounds of corn a day and, in winter, fifteen pounds of hay, with a carrot or possibly an apple on public holidays. 23

Another important quality of a successful animal fable is that the writer should have a genuine love of animals. In this Orwell also succeeded:

At one end of the big barn, on a sort of raised platform, Major was already ensconced on his bed of straw, under a lantern which hung from a beam. He was twelve years old and had lately grown rather stout, but he was still a majestic-looking pig, with a wise and benevolent appearance, in spite of the fact that his tushes had never been cut.... Boxer was an enormous beast, nearly eighteen hands high, and

so strong as any two ordinary horses put together. A white stripe down his nose gave him a somewhat stupid appearance, and in fact he was not of first-rate intelligence, but he was universally respected for his steadiness of character and tremendous powers of work. 24.

In this chapter the parallel political realities of the allegory of Animal Farm have been presented. In so far as Russia is concerned, Orwell felt that it was too early to say just how the regime would destroy itself. If he were to make a prophecy he would say that if Russia continued in her policy as she did in the past fifteen years, it would lead to an atomic war which would make the German invasion look like a tea party. He felt that Russia in the future will either democratize itself or it will perish.

24. Ibid., pp.9-10.
CHAPTER IV

REVULSION AGAINST IMPERIALISM

The aspects of imperialism are twofold. First, it is morally wrong. Imperialism is morally wrong for it is ever bent on acquiring more territory, more control of raw materials, more power and prestige, usually at the expense of other nations. Orwell expressed it very neatly when he said that in order that England may live in comparative comfort a hundred million Indians must live on the verge of starvation.

Imperialism is technically necessary. It is necessary if we accept technical progress as necessary. Just to look at a map of the world one can see the great difference that imperialism makes to the material progress of the backward countries.

Imperialism is not a new term in our language. According to recorded history, imperialism existed as far back as 3400 B.C. It was in that year that the king of Upper Egypt conquered the kingdom of Lower Egypt, united the two kingdoms, and thereby brought all Egypt under his control. Egypt in turn fell prey to the conquering Persians in 525 B.C. Egypt did not become an independent nation until after the First World War.
In ancient Greece the two most powerful city-states Athens and Sparta were warring with each other for supremacy. In 404 B.C. Athens was captured and its walls were torn down. In 371 it recovered its former prosperity and some of its power. However in 338 B.C. Philip of Macedon crushed the Greeks and established his power over them. With the Macedonian conquest of Greece the famous classical period of Greek history came to an inglorious end.

Rome began its imperialism by conquering Carthage, a great sea power, in 241 B.C. Within less than a century and a half Rome possessed almost every country bordering the Mediterranean.

The primary motives for Roman expansion were land-hunger, a desire for military glory, and the need to defend the everlengthening frontier.

This conquest had profound effects upon the lives of the Romans. First, there was a far-reaching change in the economic life of the Romans themselves. Most noticeable change was the decrease in the number of small farms, and the increase in the number of large estates.

Victories abroad increased the number of slaves in Rome. The demand for low priced labor on the great estates led to an increase in the number of slaves. In 146 B.C. the Romans shipped fifty thousand Carthaginians to Rome and sold them in Roman slave markets.
The third result of Roman conquests was the rise of three classes of people in Rome: an upper class (Aristocracy) composed of landowning, officeholding nobles; a middle class (Patricians) composed of businessmen; and the lowest class (Plebeians) composed of the owners of small farms and the landless who had come to the cities.

In time of great emergency a dictator was appointed by the consuls for six months. Parents loved to tell their children about one such dictator Cincinnatus who received the news of his appointment while he was plowing. He immediately left his plow, organized an army, defeated the enemy, resigned his post, and returned to his farm - all in sixteen days.

In 60 B.C. Rome had three such powerful men Caesar, Crassus, and Pompey who entered into an alliance known as the First Triumvirate. The Second Triumvirate was organized in 43 B.C. which consisted of Antony, Octavian and Lepidus.

A number of emperors ruled the Roman Empire. After the death of Constantine his two sons divided the empire into two the Eastern and Western Empires. The Western Empire fell in 476; the Eastern Empire lasted until 1453.

Modern imperialism is an outgrowth of the Industrial Revolution. The first motive for modern imperialism is economic. Modern industry requires a tremendous amount of raw materials, particularly raw cotton and crude rubber.
which are not produced in Europe, and also metals and oil which are produced in Europe, but not in quantities sufficient to meet the demands. Modern manufacturers produce a great deal more than they can sell at home and therefore they need markets abroad for their surplus goods. Profits from manufactures lead to the accumulation of surplus capital not needed in business at home, but which must be invested to avoid an economic loss. Large areas in South America, Africa, and Asia provided opportunities for the exercise of these motives; for in them were to be found large supplies of raw materials, ample markets, and a need for capital to develop natural resources and transportation.

The first step in imperialism was economic penetration of foreign lands. Permissions to do business were granted to foreign capitalists by native governments. Large sums of money were invested in lands, oil wells, mines, railroads, and other businesses. Backward regions were opened up to trade and European goods sold to their peoples.

The second step in economic imperialism was the establishment of political control. This was in part the result of a desire to protect economic interests and in part the product of an intense nationalism which had developed in European countries and expressed itself in a desire for colonies. Each nation wanted to be self-sufficient and so to control its sources of raw materials,
to protect its manufacturers by high tariffs on imports, and
to have a monopoly of the chief markets where its goods were
to be sold. National pride caused each country to wish to
transact its business in its own money and under its own
flag.

Apart from the economic motive for imperialism there
is also the humanitarian motive. Many people were sincerely
convinced that imperialism was beneficial, even necessary
for peoples in conquered lands. They talked of the duty of
the white man to carry his ways of life, his knowledge, and
medical skill to backward races. They pointed out that
imperial rule helped to prevent local wars, to wipe out
superstitious practices, to stamp out tropical diseases, and
to bring the blessings of Christian civilization.

Orwell's feelings about the imperial system can be
deduced from his novel *Burmese Days*, and his two essays,
"Shooting an Elephant," and "A Hanging." It is in these
writings that we learn about the racial prejudice, the
superstition of racial superiority and that imperialism is
an evil both to the governors and to the governed.

After his graduation from Eton, Orwell served as a
sub-divisional police officer in a town in India. He said
that it was part of his job to be hated:

In Moulmein, in Lower Burma, I was hated by
large numbers of people - the only time in my

life that I have been important enough for this to happen to me. I was a sub-divisional police officer of the town, and in an aimless, petty kind of way anti-European feeling was very bitter. No one had the guts to raise a riot, but if a European woman went through the bazaars alone somebody would probably spit betel juice over her dress. As a police officer I was an obvious target and was baited whenever it seemed safe to do so. When a nimble Burman tripped me up on the football field and the referee (another Burman) looked the other way, the crowd yelled with hideous laughter. This happened more than once. In the end the sneering yellow faces of the young men that met me everywhere, the insults hooted after me when I was at a safe distance, got badly on my nerves.  

His experiences are related through the character of Flory in the novel of *Burmese Days*. It is not that Orwell did all the things that Flory relates, but the feelings of Flory are those of Orwell himself. Of his service in Burma Orwell wrote:

At that time I had already made up my mind that imperialism was an evil thing and the sooner I chucked up my job and got out of it the better. Theoretically - and secretly, of course - I was all for the Burmese and all against their oppressors, the British. As for the job I was doing, I hated it more bitterly than I can perhaps make clear. In a job like that you see the dirty work of the Empire at close quarters. The wretched prisoners huddling in the stinking cages of the lock-ups, the grey, cowed faces of the long-term convicts, the scarred buttocks of the men who
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had been flogged with bamboos — all these oppressed me with an intolerable sense of guilt.2

One side of Orwell hated the inequality of human relationships which imperialism imposed. In Burma wherever the white men settled, they formed a club exclusive of natives. In Kyauktada the club consisted of only seven white men. One day the Deputy Commissioner placed a notice on the bulletin board that by June 1, a native should be elected to join their club. Flory was the only one in favor of this. In fact, he looked forward to having his friend Dr. Veraswami, an Indian Civil Surgeon and Superintendent of the jail, elected to the club.

There was another possible candidate, U Po Kyin, the Burman magistrate. He was determined to be elected and his machinations make the plot. With a sweeping satiric stroke Orwell described the villain:

He walked slowly, very upright to balance his vast belly, and holding a yellow silk umbrella over his head. His pink pawo glittered in the sun like a satin praline.... He was proud of his fatness, because he saw the accumulated flesh as the symbol of greatness. He who had once been obscure and hungry was now fat, rich and feared. He was swollen with the bodies of his enemies....3
U Po Kyin planned the downfall of his opponent, the Civil Surgeon, by sending anonymous letters to the Deputy Commissioner.

Although he won in the end, Orwell does not let him get away with it. Three days after U Po Kyin won the election to the white man's club he was stricken with apoplexy and died. The wife of U Po Kyin frequently urged her husband to build pagodas as a retribution for his evils. She was heart broken as she thought of his fate:

She suffers greatly to think of U Po Kyin where must he be now - wandering in God knows what dreadful subterranean Hell of fire, and darkness, and serpents, and genii. Or even if he has escaped the worst, his other fear has been realized, and he has returned to the earth in the shape of a rat or a frog. Perhaps at this very moment a snake is devouring him.4

One day Mr. Maxwell was murdered by the relatives of the man whom he had shot in a rebellion. Although personally none of the members of the white club cared for Maxwell, yet they were highly incensed against the natives for committing the crime. Westfield and Ellis were bound to find the culprit or two and have them hanged. Westfield said, "Get somebody, anyhow. Much better hang the wrong fellow than no fellow."5

---

4. Ibid., p.286. 5. Ibid., p.240.
Atkins has an interesting observation on the incident:

To the pukka sahib Maxwell is dead because the natives have been given too much freedom. To Orwell it has happened because they have been shut out too long.*

A number of minor fallacies circulated in Burma. One of them was a conviction that the Europeans had thinner skulls, therefore they were more susceptible to sunstroke than the thick-skulled natives, the implication being that they were more delicately constructed creatures. Orwell was convinced that this was a British superstition. He himself marched bareheaded all day without ill effects. In one of his articles in the Tribune he discussed this situation:

But why should the British in India have built up this superstition about sunstroke? Because an endless emphasis on the differences between the 'natives' and yourself is one of the necessary props of imperialism. You can only rule over a subject race, especially when you are in a minority, if you honestly believe yourself to be racially superior, and it helps towards this if you can believe that the subject race is biologically different. There were quite a number of ways in which Europeans in India used to believe, without any evidence, that Asiatic bodies differed from their own. Even quite considerable anatomical differences were supposed to exist. But the nonsense about Europeans being subject to sunstroke, and

---
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Orientals not, was the most cherished superstition of all. The thin skull was the mark of racial superiority, and the pith topi was a sort of emblem of imperialism.  

What Orwell thought of imperialism can be easily deduced from what Flory had to say in Burmese Days after eight years of Eastern life, fever, loneliness, and drinking had set their mark upon him. His thoughts were poisoned with:

the ever bitterer hatred of the atmosphere of imperialism in which he lived. For as his brain developed... he had grasped the truth about the English and their Empire. The Indian Empire is a despotism - benevolent, no doubt, but still a despotism with theft as its final object.

Imperialism was an evil to the governors and to the governed. It was an evil to the governors for it subjected them to a life of lies and loneliness. It was a life of lies for each of them knew that the regime was an evil one and yet dared not to express his opinion. In addition it was a poor bargain to spend thirty years underpaid, in a foreign country, and then come home with a wrecked liver and a pineapple backside from sitting in cane chairs.

It was a life of loneliness. Continence was beyond the life of Flory in the East. He kept a Burmese mistress. However, when Mrs. Lackersteen's (she was the only married English woman in Burma) niece Elizabeth came to stay with them, Flory dismissed his mistress and fell deeply in love with Elizabeth. He courted her for several months. Elizabeth soon left him for Verrall, the newly arrived military policeman. Verrall was a bore and a cad:

He despised the entire non-military population of India, a few famous polo-players excepted. He despised the entire Army as well, except the cavalry. He despised all Indian regiments, infantry and cavalry alike. It was true that he himself belonged to a native regiment, but that was only for his own convenience.... His Military Policemen he looked on as no better than coolies.... Up and down India, wherever he was stationed, he left behind him a trail of insulted people, neglected duties and unpaid bills. Yet the disgraces that ought to have fallen on him never did. He bore a charmed life, and it was not only the handle to his name that saved him. There was something in his eye before which duns, burra memsahibs and even colonels quailed.... Spending, or rather owing, fabulous sums on clothes, he yet lived almost as ascetically as a monk. He exercised himself ceaselessly and brutally, rationed his drink and his cigarettes, slept on a camp-bed and bathed in cold water in the bitterest winter. Horsemanship and physical fitness were the only gods he knew. The stamp of hooves on the maiden, the strong, poised feeling of his body, wedded centaur-like to the saddle, the polo-stick springy in his hand - these were his religion, the breath of his life.  

Verrall had no intention of marrying Elizabeth; he was merely amusing himself so as to pass the time in this outlandish place of almost unbelievable boredom.

Shortly afterwards Verrall was recalled to his regiment. He did not even bother to say good-bye to Elizabeth. It is here that Orwell handles the farce with a skillful hand. Elizabeth and her aunt pursued Verrall to the railway station. Upon reaching the station they saw the tail end of the train.

Imperialism was an evil to the governed as we had seen in the Maxwell case where Westfield said it would be better to hang the wrong fellow than no fellow at all. Then again, when the white man's club was surrounded by the Burmans, and they were dispersed by the guns that were fired over their heads, Ellis complained that the police shot over the heads of the mob and not into them. Even if they had shot one of their own number, it would have been "only a nigger," so it would not have greatly mattered.

Yet, there is no suggestion in the book that there was more tyranny under the British rule than there would have been under Burmese self-government. Especially if we think of Burma as governed by U Po Kyin.

Brander made an interesting study of the two novels dealing with India, Forster's A Passage to India and Orwell's Burmese Days.
In *Burmese Days* the problem is loneliness, and in *A Passage to India* the problem is the imperfect relationships between English people and Indians. In *Burmese Days* it is not only Flory who is lonely. All the English people are lonely because they believe there is no possibility of friendship with the Burmese or Indians. They cling together as a group in the club because they are gregarious and they see no possibility of other companionship.  

Orwell realized that the futility of the white man's dominion became apparent when, by turning tyrant, he destroyed his own freedom. He gave an example of this from his own experience in his essay entitled, "Shooting an Elephant."

One day a sub inspector at a police station gave Orwell orders to take care of an elephant that was ravaging the bazaar. He took his rifle and his pony and went. The elephant destroyed somebody's hut, killed a cow, raided the fruit stalls, devoured the stock, and killed an Indian coolie. But at the moment when Orwell arrived the elephant was on his best behavior chewing some grass. Then and there he felt he had no right to kill the elephant because that would be tantamount to destroying machinery. Orwell related the incident as follows:
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Here was I, the white man with his gun, standing in front of the unarmed native crowd—seemingly the leading actor of the piece; but in reality I was only an absurd puppet pushed to and fro by the will of those yellow faces behind. I perceived in this moment that when the white man turns tyrant it is his own freedom that he destroys. He becomes a sort of hollow, posing dummy, the conventionalized figure of a sahib. For it is the condition of his rule that he shall spend his life in trying to impress the 'natives' and so in every crisis he has got to do what the 'natives' expect of him. He wears a mask, and his face grows to fit it. I had got to shoot the elephant. I had committed myself to doing it when I sent for the rifle. A sahib has got to act like a sahib; he has got to appear resolute, to know his own mind and do definite things. To come all that way, rifle in hand, with two thousand people marching at my heels, and then to trail feebly away, having done nothing—no, that was impossible. The crowd would laugh at me. And my whole life, every white man's life in the East, was one long struggle not to be laughed at.11.

Referring to the same incident Hollis made the following observation:

From this sorry story he derived the lesson that in an imperial system the masters are not really the masters. Their authority depends upon gesture and prestige and therefore they do not dare to disappoint their subjects, even when they know very well that what their subjects are demanding is barbaric and foolish.12.


While in Burma Orwell witnessed a hanging. He does not tell us the guilt of the prisoner. The prisoner was led out of the prison with two warders with rifles, and two more men clutching his arm as if at once pushing and supporting him. Behind the prisoner came the superintendent and the rest of the officials.

On the way to the gallows a dog appeared from somewhere and leaped up at the prisoner and licked his face. The prisoner continued walking in his bobbing manner, (he never straightened out his knees), and then all of a sudden he stepped slightly aside to avoid a puddle on the path:

but till that moment I had never realized what it means to destroy a healthy, conscious man. When I saw the prisoner step aside to avoid the puddle I saw the mystery, the unspeakable wrongness, of cutting a life short when it is in full tide.13.

Orwell realized that here is a man whose physical and intellectual functions were the same as all the others who accompanied him and yet in a minute there would be one mind less, one world less.

It was occurrences like that that compelled Orwell to leave Burma. Atkins commented on this incident in the following words:

The assault was on the nerves rather than the flesh. But it was indecent. If you carried on until finally you accepted this sort of thing, or at least pretended to yourself that you accepted it, your humanity would be gone. And in societies where power is the main goal it becomes quite natural to accept such things. At most they may be regarded as regrettable but always necessary.14.

In reference to Orwell's quotation Hollis felt that he did not really argue the case when he said, "I saw the mystery, the unspeakable wrongness of cutting a life short when it is in full tide." First, there was no hint as to what the man's crime had been, no discussion whether he had been certainly guilty of it, no consideration of the evidence whether capital punishment is an effective deterrent. His protest lies mainly in the fact:

Since man is destined to die anyway, nothing could well be less self-evident than the proposition that the preservation of life for a few more years is of enormous importance. Among secularists those who maintain that capital punishment should be inflicted whenever it is to the general convenience have the better of the argument. Orwell's position is only tenable if man has a destiny beyond this world. Here was one of a number of his opinions which only made sense on the assumption of an implicit acceptance of a future life.15.

Arthur Koestler in his novel *Darkness at Noon* also presented to us a meditation of a man who was about to be executed:

> So I shall be shot, thought Rubashov. Blinking, he watched the movement of his big toe, which stuck up vertically at the end of the bed. He felt warm, secure and very tired; he had no objection to dozing straight off into death, there and then, if only one let him remain lying under the warm blanket. 'So they are going to shoot you,' he told himself. He slowly moved his toes in the sock and a verse occurred to him which compared the feet of Christ to a white roebuck in a thornbush. He felt in the warmth of the blanket almost perfectly happy and feared only one thing, to have to get up and move. 'So you are going to be destroyed,' he said to himself half aloud and lit another cigarette. He was already in that peculiar state of excitement familiar to him from former experiences of the nearness of death. He knew at the same time that this condition was reprehensible and, from a certain point of view, impermissible, but at the moment he felt no inclination to have that point of view. Instead, he observed the play of his stockinged toes. He smiled. A warm wave of sympathy for his own body, for which usually he had no liking, played over him with a self-pitying delight.  

Rubashov was a party member. He was accused of crime of which he was innocent. He was not submitted to any great degree of physical torture to wring confessions out of him, yet he confessed everything because his loyalty to the party was such that there was no life for him outside the

party, that, even if the party required of him death and dishonor he must be prepared to offer it death and dishonor. "Honor is to be useful without a fuss," he said.

Orwell once reviewed a book of essays, Visions and Memories by H.W. Nevinson. In one of the essays Nevinson gave a personal experience of shooting a native because the native shot his carrier. As he was about to aim at the heart of the native three carriers rushed on him and implored him not to shoot. Nevinson was immensely relieved, all the more because he knew the rifles were hopelessly jammed and would rather fly than fire. Orwell said:

Nevinson likes to put in little touches, like that of the jammed rifle, which make him appear as slightly ineffectual person. But it was the combination of objecting to capital punishment, and yet habitually getting into the kind of situation where it is sometimes necessary to kill people, that lifted him above the ordinary run of journalists.17.

Toward the end of his stay in Burma Orwell worked out an anarchistic theory that all government is evil, that the punishment always does more harm than the crime and that people can be trusted to behave decently if only one will leave them alone. Later he realized that this was sentimental nonsense:

I see now as I did not see then, that it is always necessary to protect people from violence. In any state of society where crime can be profitable you have got to have a harsh criminal law and administer it ruthlessly.18

Orwell was irritated by the fact that what he did was in the capacity of an unwanted foreign invader. The Burmese did not consider themselves as criminals justly punished but as victims of a foreign conqueror.

While Britain controlled India, every Anglo-Indian was haunted by a sense of guilt which he usually concealed as best he could, because merely to be overheard making a seditious remark might damage his career. All over India there were Englishmen who secretly loathed the system of which they were a part; and just occasionally, when they were quite certain of being in the right company, their hidden bitterness overflowed. Orwell related the following incident:

I remember a night I spent on the train with a man in the Educational Service, a stranger to myself whose name I never discovered. It was too hot to sleep and we spent the night in talking. Half an hour’s cautious questioning decided each of us that the other was 'safe'; and then for hours, while the train jolted through the pitch-black night, sitting up in our bunks with bottles of beer handy, we damned the British Empire - damned it from the inside, intelligently and

intimately. It did us both good. But we had been speaking forbidden things, and in the haggard morning light when the train crawled into Mandalay, we parted as guiltily as any adulterous couple.19

In this chapter we have considered the twofold aspects of imperialism namely, that it is morally wrong yet technically necessary. We also realized that imperialism was not a new term and that ancient civilizations of Egypt, Greece, and Rome practiced imperialism. Modern imperialism is a result of the Industrial Revolution. Its motives are to penetrate foreign lands for economic reasons, to establish political control, and finally the humanitarian motives were considered. Orwell's feelings toward imperialism were deduced from his novel Burmese Days, two essays, "Shooting an Elephant," "A Hanging," and some of his other journalistic writing.

19. Ibid., pp.176-77.
CHAPTER V

ATONEMENT

After five years of duty as a sub-divisional officer in Burma Orwell came home on leave in 1927. For five years he had been part of an oppressive system, and it had left him with a bad conscience. He remembered faces of prisoners, of men waiting in condemned cells, of subordinates he had bullied, aged peasants he had snubbed, of servants and coolies he had hit with his fist in moments of rage. Those were the things that everyone did in the East; the Orientals can be very provoking. He was conscious of an immense guilt that he had to expiate. He had reduced everything to the simple theory that the oppressed are always right and that the oppressors are always wrong.

He wanted to get away not only from imperialism but from every form of man's power over another man. He wanted to be on the side of the oppressed against their tyrants. At that time failure was the only virtue for him. Success even to the extent of earning a few hundred pounds a year was a form of bullying. Once he could project himself into the masses, live with them, he would have touched bottom and in this way he felt that part of his guilt would
have dropped from him. In the first part of this chapter, Orwell's projection into the masses during the days of unemployment will be presented.

*Down and Out in Paris and London* is an indictment of a world that permits such destitution to exist. It is autobiographical in form since it presents eighteen months of his life first as a dish-washer in Paris and later as a tramp in England. During those months he got acquainted with two poverties, namely, hunger and sickness.

While in Paris, he lived in one of the cheapest hotels in a room which consisted of an iron bedstead, a chair, and a washstand. He paid two hundred francs for his monthly rent, and had two hundred francs left over for his meals. He lived on two francs a day. One day he was robbed and left with only sixty francs.

He met a Russian ex-captain, Boris, with whom he walked the streets of Paris trying to get employment. Anywhere they turned they were just a half hour late or they were rejected because they were foreigners. They came to such a pitch that they were without food for three days at a stretch. To one who was underfed long before that it caused excruciating pains. After two days without food, Orwell discovered that he had a mind to do nothing but lie in bed and read the *Memoirs of Sherlock Holmes*:
It was all that I felt equal to, without food. Hunger reduces one to an utterly spineless, brainless condition, more like the after-effects of influenza than anything else. It is as though one had been turned into a jellyfish, or as though all one's blood had been pumped out and luke-warm water substituted. Complete inertia is my chief memory of hunger.1.

Swindling was a common occurrence. One day Boris told him of a Russian secret society (Communists) in Paris who helped the Russian exiles if they promised to turn Bolshevik. Boris told his friend that if he would contribute an article to the Moscow Weekly he would be able to earn good money. Orwell said he knew nothing of English politics except what he read in the Daily Mail and that paper is conservative in tone. Boris suggested feebly that he should write just the opposite of what the paper stated.

The entrance to this secret society was through a laundry. Members were asked to carry parcels as if they were heading for the laundry because the Parisian police were very much against the Communists. From there they would climb several flights of stairs and find an office with a large picture of Lenin and other propaganda posters. Membership fee was twenty francs. Since they did not have that amount, they deposited whatever they had. The secret

society promised to give them the particulars in the next day's mail. They waited ten days and finally made another attempt to visit the office only to find out that the secret society had vanished.

The author commented that the secret society had nothing to do with Communism; they were swindlers who preyed upon Russian refugees by extracting entrance fees.

Boris and Orwell eventually did land a job in Hotel X. Their work consisted of scrubbing tables and floors, shining silverware and glasses, preparing trays in an underground cellar where the heat was always one hundred and ten degrees Fahrenheit:

> It was amusing to look around the filthy little scullery and think that only a double door was between us and the dining-room. There sat the customers in all their splendor - spotless tablecloths, bowls of flowers, mirrors and gilt cornices and painted cherubim; and here, just a few feet away, we in our disgusting filth.²

They worked for twelve hours a day six days a week and at times were called even on Sunday. They earned five hundred francs a month plus their food. The plongeurs endured a life which to most men would be impossible. Orwell's straightforward description was made up of cumulating detail:

The essence of the situation was that a hundred or two hundred people were demanding individually different meals of five or six courses, and that fifty or sixty people had to cook and serve them and clean up the mess afterwards;... And at this time when the work was doubled, the whole staff was tired out, and a number of them were drunk.... The charge to and fro in the narrow passages, the collisions, the yells, the struggling with crates and trays and blocks of ice, the heat, the darkness, the furious festering quarrels which there was no time to fight out - they pass description. Anyone coming into the basement for the first time would have thought himself in a den of maniacs.3.

Orwell discovered that the plongeurs had a pride of their own but it was a perverted pride in their drudgery. It lay in being equal to whatever demands were laid upon them, however unreasonable. The only attainable virtue was the power of working like an ox. It was the ambition of every plongeur to be a debrouillard, a man who did whatever he was told, even the seemingly impossible. This is surely what is meant by the phrase 'slave mentality.' The idea of freedom, of having the right to choose between reasonable alternatives, did not exist for them. Their work was servile and without art; they were paid just enough to keep them alive; their only holiday was the sack. They rarely married, but if they did their wives were also compelled to work. The only possible escape was into prison. It was

3. Ibid., pp. 64-65.
probably while working in Paris that Orwell first perceived the idea that was to become increasingly important to him in later years: that there was a rough equality among the plongeurs but that it was of no use to them at all without liberty.

Lack of money was also the theme of Orwell's book entitled Keep the Aspidistra Flying. Gordon, the hero of the book, worked in a second-hand bookshop. The pay was two pounds a week. Such poverty made living impossible:

He learned what it means to live for weeks on end on bread and margarine, to try to 'write' when you are half starved, to pawn your clothes, to sneak trembling up the stairs when you owe three weeks' rent and your landlady is listening for you. Moreover, in those seven months he wrote practically nothing. The first effect of poverty is that it kills thought.4

The description of Gordon's bedroom could be paralleled with the description given in Down and Out in Paris and London and in the Road to Wigan Pier:

As for the place where Gordon lived, in Brewer's Yard, parallel to Lambeth Cut on the south side, it was a filthy kip. His bed-sitting-room was eight shillings a week and was just under the roof. With its sloping ceiling - it was a room shaped like a wedge of cheese - and its sky-light window, it was the nearest thing

---

to the proverbial poet's garret that he had ever lived in. There was a large, low, broken-backed bed with a ragged patchwork quilt and sheets that were changed once fortnightly; a deal table ringed by dynasties of teapots; a rickety kitchen chair; a tin basin for washing in; a gas-ring in the fender. The bare floorboards had never been stained but were dark with dirt. In the cracks in the wallpaper dwelt multitudes of bugs; however, this was winter and they were torpid unless you overheated the room.\footnote{Ibid., p.253.}

Although poverty was not the theme of Orwell's novel, \textit{Coming Up for Air}, he did describe people living in a suburb who had to meet their monthly payments, and as a result lived in constant fear of losing their positions:

\ldots what is a road like Ellesmere Road? Just a prison with the cells all in a row. A line of semi-detached torture-chambers where the poor little five-to-ten-pound-a-weekers quake and shiver, everyone of them with the boss twisting his tail and the wife riding him like a nightmare and the kids sucking his blood like leeches.

As a matter of fact, in Ellesmere Road we don't own our houses, even when we've finished paying for them. They're not freehold, only leasehold. They're priced at five-fifty, payable over a period of sixteen years, and they're a class of houses which, if you bought them for cash down, would cost round about three-eighty.\footnote{George Orwell, \textit{Coming Up for Air}, New York: Harcourt Brace, 1939, pp.17-19.}

Orwell spent a year in Morocco. One day while visiting the public gardens, he stopped to feed a gazelle.
with bread. An Arab stopped his work and said to Orwell, "I could eat some of that bread." Orwell gave him the remainder. The Arab accepted it gratefully.

Once while passing through Jewish quarters, he took out a cigarette. Immediately there was a rush of Jews, even old grandfathers, clamoring for cigarettes. In a moment his whole packet was gone. Orwell concluded his observation with:

No one would think of running cheap trips to the Distressed Areas. But where the human beings have brown skins their poverty is simply not noticed. What does Morocco mean to a Frenchman? An orange-grove or a job in Government service. Or to an Englishman? Camels, castles, palm-trees, Foreign Legionnaires, brass trays and bandits. One could probably live here for years without noticing that for nine-tenths of the people the reality of life is an endless back-breaking struggle to wring a little food out of an eroded soil.7*

The poor are usually subjected to snobbery. Gordon, the main character in Keep the Aspidistra Flying, worked at McKennies book store. Thursday was early quitting time and Gordon had an invitation to spend the evening with the Darings. When he arrived at the residence, he noticed that they were out. They notified all the other guests about the change, but they failed to notify Gordon.

Even the relation between man and woman is based on money:

The only thing a woman ever wants is money, money for a house of her own and two babies and Drage furniture and an aspidistra. The only sin they can imagine is not wanting to grab money. No woman ever judges a man by anything except his income. Of course she doesn't put it to herself like that. She says he's such a nice man — meaning that he's got plenty of money. And if you haven't got money you aren't nice. You're dishonoured, somehow. You've sinned. Sinned against the aspidistra.

When his friend remonstrated with him that there must be something more important than money that a girl looks to in a man Gordon answered:

What other things? Don't you see that a man's whole personality is bound up with his income? His personality is his income. How can you be attractive to a girl when you've got no money? You can't wear decent clothes, you can't take her out to dinner or to the theatre, you can't carry a cheery, interesting atmosphere about with you. And it's rot to say that kind of thing doesn't matter. It does. If you haven't got money there isn't even anywhere you can meet. Rosemary and I never met except in the streets or in picture galleries... Wandering up and down beastly wet streets — that's what Rosemary associates me with. Don't you see how it takes the gilt off everything?

9. Ibid., pp.94-95.
Orwell does not fail to bring out the effects of poverty upon a child:

Probably the greatest cruelty one can inflict on a child is to send it to school among children richer than itself. A child conscious of poverty will suffer snobbish agonies such as a grownup person can scarcely even imagine. In those days, especially at his preparatory school, Gordon's life had been one long conspiracy to keep his end up and pretend that his parents were richer than they were. Ah, the humiliations of those days.¹⁰

Poverty can coarsen one's manners. While working in the kitchen, Orwell once placed the dustbin directly in the middle where it would be in the cook's way. She cried, and he jeered at her. He then sadly commented that this was the kind of effect that fatigue had upon one's manners.

Orwell also described a tramp as having a character of a jackal. It was malnutrition and not vice that had destroyed his manhood. He had lived for two years on bread and margarine until both his mind and body deteriorated. He was only half a man.

Another example that Orwell presented was that of a young stevedore who picked up a quarrel with an old-age pensioner. The cause of the quarrel was food. The pensioner lost his shilling as a result this deprived him of meals for three days.

¹⁰ Ibid., p.41.
In describing the slums of Paris he portrayed the people as those who had given up trying to be normal or decent: "Poverty frees them from ordinary standards of behaviour, just as money frees people from work." ¹¹.

Sickness is still another effect of poverty. Orwell had spent several weeks in Hospital X (Paris) in 1929. He was a pneumonia case. He had to answer questions for twenty minutes while his temperature was a hundred and three degrees. He was given a linen white shirt and a blue flannel dressing-gown. He received no slippers for they did not have his size. In this manner he had to walk to a ward which was two hundred yards away in cold February weather.

The ward consisted of sixty crowded beds. As Orwell entered, a doctor with medical students was cupping¹² one of the patients. As soon as Orwell was in bed the doctor and students turned to him and applied the same technique. The thing that angered Orwell was that the patient was just a specimen for the students. They were interested in his bronchial rattle. The doctor did not exchange a word with the patient not even a glance.


¹². Cupping is a process whereby tumblers resembling wine glasses had air taken out by burning a match in them and then applying the hot glass to a patient thereby drawing blood. Six such glasses were applied to Orwell.
What irritated Orwell most was that patients died without having anyone present at their bedside. The nurses took their leisure in removing the corpse. Orwell contrasted this with an incident that occurred in one of the hospitals in England. There were six of them at tea when a patient died. The nurse very adroitly had taken the corpse out and after tea they were informed about it.

When the author could bear the conditions of Paris no longer, he wrote to his friend in England asking for employment and financial aid. He received five pounds with which he bought a new suit, and paid his traveling expenses. Because his friend was unable to obtain employment for him immediately, Orwell had to go to a kip (sleeping place). In his book *The Road to Wigan Pier* Orwell recounted the perturbation with which he entered the new world. Fearing that he might be spotted as a 'gentleman' the moment he opened his mouth, Orwell had a hard-luck story ready in case he should be questioned. Having equipped himself with the ragged clothes of the tramp, he left Crossgates, Eton and the Burma Police behind him and made his way to a common lodging-house:

Heavens, how I had to screw up my courage before I went in! It seems ridiculous now, but you see I was still half afraid of the working-class. I wanted to get in touch with them, I even wanted to become one of them, but I still thought of them as alien and dangerous;
going into the dark doorway of that common lodging-house seemed to me like going down into some dreadful subterranean place - a sewer full of rats, for instance. I went in fully expecting a fight. The people would spot that I was not one of themselves and immediately infer that I had come to spy on them; and then they would set upon me and throw me out - that was what I expected. I felt that I had got to do it, but I did not enjoy the prospect.

As Orwell entered the kitchen, a drunken stevedore approached him. Orwell stiffened. He did not know what to expect. The stevedore threw his arms round his neck and said, "'Ave a cup of tea, chum, 'ave a cup of tea." The cup of tea was, as he said, a kind of baptism.

In the lodging-house fifteen or twenty men slept in one dormitory. Some of the lodgers were old-age pensioners who were receiving ten shillings a week as a pension. They managed to exist. Their food consisted of tea and two slices of bread and margarine.

In one workhouse Orwell had to do the kitchen chores. He had to throw good food into swill-tubs while in the spike the ration was bread and margarine. He discussed this with another young tramp. The tramp gave the reasons:

They have to do it. If they made these places too comfortable, you'd have all the scum of the country flocking into them. It's

The sleeping accommodations for the homeless person in the British capital deserve to be briefly noted:

First, there is the Embankment. You have to secure a bench by eight o'clock; it becomes too cold to sleep after midnight, and at four o'clock in the morning the policeman turns you away. According to London Law a man may sit down for the night, but he cannot sleep. Then there is the Two Penny Hangover. The lodgers sit in a long row on a bench and hang over a rope that is stretched before them. In the morning a man cuts this rope and all the down-and-outers fall to the floor. Then there is the Coffin which costs four pence a night. The itinerants sleep in wooden boxes with a tarpaulin for covering. It is cold, and the worst thing about it are the bugs, which being enclosed in a box, you cannot escape. Above the Coffin, the Two Penny Hangover, and the Embankment come the common lodging-houses in London at the present time.

Orwell probed deep into the hearts of men. He wanted to know what made a man lead a life of a tramp. It was not always the fault of the individual. For example, a certain tramp nicknamed Bozo told his story to the author as follows. He lived in France and was engaged to a French woman.  

---

girl. He had money, but then the girl got killed under the wheels of an omnibus. Bozo went on a week's drinking spree. When he returned to work, he fell from a stage forty feet on to the pavement and smashed his right foot to a pulp. He received sixty pounds compensation. He came to England, tried to earn his living decently, but finally settled down as a screever.

Some screevers were artists. There was one whose line was copies of old Masters. He told his story. His wife and children were starving. One day as he was returning home with his drawings, he was trying to figure out how to earn a few shillings. In the Strand he saw a screever kneeling on the pavement drawing, and people gave him pennies. Then and there he decided to do likewise. He earned a pound a week and his wife helped by taking in sewing.

Perhaps the best man, after all, is the Downrighter who makes no pretense of selling or singing, and goes in for straight-forward begging. This man only makes a shilling or two a day, and his food as extra. But his life is a real joy to him, because he is a student of humanity, and a great artist. He eyes his prospective victims as they come along, as a squirrel selects the sweetest nuts, or a robin chooses the whitest crumbs. He fits his story to the special case, and success comes to him time after time. If he begs from
a young man who has only just left boyhood, he keeps on calling him "Sir," and the boy eventually surrenders his last and only penny.

Orwell gave some practical suggestions for alleviating poverty. The wards had a tract of land adjoining it. The men could put in several hours of labor in exchange for their food and lodging. Of course, some would object to the idea saying that men were allowed only one day at each ward. Orwell suggested why not keep them for a week, a month, or year. In that way they would gain their self-respect knowing that they earned their food.

As for the lodging he too suggested that the large rooms be turned into cubicles so that each one could sleep alone. He contrasted the men in a large dormitory and the soldiers in a barrack. The latter were healthy specimen while the former were mostly sick with coughs and other ailments. It was next to impossible to get more than five hours of sleep at night.

Braybrooke\(^\text{16}\) made a comparison between Bloy's *Le Desesperi* and Orwell's *Down and Out in Paris and London* and Bloy's *La Femme Pauvre* and Orwell's "How the Poor Die." In *La Femme Pauvre* Bloy brought out the point that the poor

---

do not even own their bodies. As soon as the soul left it, it was used as a carcass for the profanation of the culture of human science.

In his essay, "How the Poor Die," Orwell wrote:

This poor old wretch who had just flickered out like a candle-end was not even important enough to have anyone watching by his bedside. He was merely a number, then a 'subject' for the students' scalpels.  

Both men wrote from experience; they had both suffered from such treatment; they had both lived as down and out in Paris. Yet, although on a purely material plane their attitude to hospitals from the point of view of non-paying patients was the same, their attitude to medicine was different. For Bloy the death of the poor meant that carcasses were provided for the "cultures of human sciences," for Orwell that corpses were provided for "the students' scalpels."

Now, in both cases there was indignation at this, but with Orwell it was more tempered, less fanatical: it is right that medical science should advance as long as it is not allowed to do so at the expense of human dignity.

With Bloy it was otherwise. On principle he was against progress and he tended to think of medical science

---

in terms of progress. This did not mean that he was lacking in feeling for his fellow men since, had he so been charged, he would have been the first to protest most vehemently against the slander. He had been blind to the fact that these indignities could only be abolished provided that medical science was permitted to experiment and so advance.

In both extracts one can notice a similarity of attitude. In the case of Orwell it was less fanatical. So often with Bloy his cries were like those of someone floundering in the dark; he had the honesty to admit that he was genuinely perplexed by the problem of life:

Orwell saw as clearly the social evils of this century as Bloy had seen those of the Nineteenth Century; both, taking upon themselves the robes of prophecy, pointed to where those evils would lead. They had both known despair, but because death was not final for Bloy but meant life everlasting, he passed through despair to hope. He might be splenetic, impatient and quick tempered in good faith; if he was to go to God, rather than go empty-handed, he preferred to take with him his spleen, impatience and quick temper so that they might be employed in ministering to His Will. That was his way of stripping his soul bare, of becoming a Pilgrim of the Absolute; since his two-fold aim was to bear witness to the Truth and to denounce the Lie - a two-fold aim, which, in another context was also Orwell's.18

That Orwell's account of a Paris hospital was based on his experience during the thirties did not invalidate the argument; rather it emphasized how overdue were such reforms, how if science had progressed then it had done so at the expense of human dignity.

Ippolit, one of the characters in Dostoevsky's The Idiot, can be compared to Orwell in Down and Out in Paris and London. Ippolit had only four weeks to live. He was consumptive. In one part he said:

Oh, now I don't care, now I've no time to be angry, but then, then I repent, I literally gnawed my pillow at night and tore my quilt with rage. Oh, how I used to dream then, how I longed to be turned out into the street at eighteen, almost without clothing, almost without covering, to be deserted and utterly alone, without lodging, without work, without crust of bread, without relations, without one friend, in a great town, hungry, beaten, but healthy - and then I would show them.19.

The difference in the two being that Dostoevsky's Ippolit would touch bottom in exchange for health, while Orwell did it for the sole purpose of expiation.

Any reader of Orwell's Down and Out in Paris and London will always have one question in his subconscious mind: why did Orwell do it? Why did he seek out misery?

Why did he embrace poverty instead of Bohemia? One unanimous answer of all his critics, of course, is expiation. He wanted to atone for his five years in Burma as a subdivisional officer. Orwell referred to that idea when he wrote:

When I came home on leave in 1927 I was already half determined to throw up my job, and one sniff of English air decided me. I was not going back to be a part of that evil despotism. But I wanted much more than merely to escape from my job. For five years I had been part of an oppressive system, and it had left me with a bad conscience. Innumerable remembered faces — faces of prisoners in the dock, of men waiting in the condemned cells, of subordinates I had bullied and aged peasants I had snubbed, of servants and coolies I had hit with my fist in moments of rage... haunted me intolerably. I was conscious of an immense weight of guilt that I had got to expiate.... I felt that I had got to escape not merely from imperialism but from every form of man's dominion over man. I wanted to submerge myself, to get right down among the oppressed, to be one of them and on their side against their tyrants. And, chiefly because I had had to think everything out in solitude, I had carried my hatred of oppression to extraordinary lengths. At that time failure seemed to me to be the only virtue. Every suspicion of self-advancement, even to 'succeed' in life to the extent of making a few hundred a year, seemed to me spiritually ugly, a species of bullying.20.

In the same chapter Orwell continued in the same mood:

What I profoundly wanted, at that time, was to find some way of getting out of the respectable world altogether. I meditated upon it a great deal, I even planned parts of it in detail; how one could sell everything - give everything away, change one's name and start out with no money and nothing but the clothes one stood up in. But in real life nobody ever does that kind of thing; apart from the relatives and friends who have to be considered, it is doubtful whether an educated man could do it if there were any other course open to him. But at least I could go among these people, see what their lives were like and feel myself temporarily part of their world. Once I had been among them and accepted by them, I should have touched bottom, and - this is what I felt; I was aware even then that it was irrational - yet part of my guilt would drop from me.21.

Another reason for his miserable life might have been unemployment. Those were the depression years, and it was difficult to get a position especially for one who returned from a foreign country. Hopkinson thinks that Orwell could have received a paid employment but he preferred, "to identify himself with the underdogs of every given moment and deliberately equate the suffering of his life with theirs."22. We may agree with Hopkinson on this point because we know that Orwell eventually borrowed money from a friend and left Paris. He also had a sister who probably would have aided him financially.

21. Ibid., pp.181-82.
As any other writer he might have done that to gain experience out of which a book could be written.

It may have been a test, a preliminary trial for a life dedication. He held the opinion that a writer must be independent. As he had no private means, it might well be necessary to endure poverty for long periods if he was to retain his independence.

The fact remains that he had tramped the streets of English cities, starved, slept with thieves and beggars, and yet neither robbed nor begged. He retained his soul, wrote an illuminating social document of men damned by society through no fault of their own.

The second part of this chapter will deal with Orwell's projection into the masses in normal times. In 1937, *The Road to Wigan Pier* was published. It was a result of Orwell's experience again, this time with the miners in the North of England. For months he shared the lives of the most poverty-stricken miners, recording their evil working conditions, foul housing, wretched pay, and hopeless unemployment, because he felt a moral obligation to learn how they lived in the only way that he could thoroughly learn.

He described the work of the miners. They were taken down by an elevator shaft twelve hundred feet below ground level sometimes at the speed of sixty miles. Once out of the elevator the tough job of walking to the excavating
area began. The distance depended upon the location. It usually was one to five miles away from the elevator shaft. The problem was that one could not walk upright. The ceiling allowed only four feet. The passage was about eight feet wide. Orwell being six feet and two and a half inches tall had a very difficult time walking half bent, sometimes on all fours. It took him an hour to get to his destination while the workers performed this in twenty minutes.

Orwell’s picture of the mine was that of hell. Most of the things one imagines in hell were there – heat, noise, confusion, darkness, foul air, and above all, unbearably cramped space.

The laborers had to work on their knees. Their arm and stomach muscles played an important part. They shoveled on the average two tons of coal per hour. Orwell gave a vivid description of miners at work:

...the fillers look and work as though they were made of iron. They really do look like iron – hammered iron statues – under the smooth coat of coal dust which clings to them from head to foot... nearly all of them have the most noble bodies; with shoulders tapering to slender, supple waists, sinewy thighs, with not an ounce of waste flesh anywhere... You can never forget that spectacle once you have seen it – the line of bowed, kneeling figures, sooty black all over, driving their huge shovels under the coal with stupendous force and speed.\(^23\).

The mining was done in three operations: cutting, blasting, and excavating. An electric hand drill was used for cutting the coal. This was usually done in the afternoon. Then the miner inserted dynamite into the holes and stood back twenty-five yards before he pressed the switch. This was usually done at night when no one was around. Sometimes the blast was too powerful, and the ceiling collapsed. The third part of the work was the excavation or the loading of the coal into conveyer belts.

According to Orwell's statistics every year one out of nine hundred miners was killed; one of every six was injured. Some of these injuries were light; others brought about permanent disablement.

Accidents were caused by gas explosions. Although Davy lamps detected gas, yet at times gas accumulated in crevices and cracks and was difficult to be traced.

The majority of the accidents were due to the caving of ceilings. Wooden props were used which creaked before the ceiling caved in and in this way gave the worker a fair warning but not all mines had these. Some used iron girders which collapsed without warning.

The houses of the miners were built back to back with a twelve by twelve living room on the average and one or two bedrooms on the upper floor. There were no sanitary
conditions at home. The places were damp. Windows did not open. Bugs were plentiful.

Some miners lived in caravans which were one decker buses or wagons covered with canvas. Orwell described the caravans as follows:

Inside, these places are usually about five feet wide by six high and anything from six to fifteen feet long. Some are inhabited by only one person, but I did not see any that held less than two persons, and some of them contained large families. One, for instance, measuring fourteen feet long, had seven people in it.24.

They had to walk two hundred yards for every bucket of water they used. In spite of all the inconveniences the rents were quite high.

New houses had been built by corporations. They were neat looking, more expensive and the corporations placed greater restrictions on those living there. They had to keep their gardens in a set pattern. They were not allowed to keep pigeons. Before they moved in all their furniture was fumigated. It was a wise thing, yet it was humiliating.

Then, too, the new sections were not allowed to have pub houses. To the miners a pub house was equivalent to a club.

24. Ibid., p. 62.
The industrial towns of the North were ugly because they happened to have been built at a time when modern methods of steel construction were unknown. They go on being ugly largely because the Northerners have got used to that kind of thing and do not notice it.

The typical post-war factory is not a gaunt barracks or an awful chaos of blackness and belching chimneys; it is a glittering white structure of concrete, glass and steel, surrounded by green lawns and beds of tulips.

As to their remuneration Orwell examined five pay checks. On the average they represented a weekly wage of two pounds, fifteen shillings, and two pence. That meant that one shift averaged nine shillings, and two and a half pence. These checks represented the wages of miners during the winter when all mines operated on full time. As spring advanced the coal trade slacked off, men were laid off. Others, while not permanently laid off, were technically cut off one or two days a week. As a result an average yearly income of a miner in Great Britain was only one hundred fifteen pounds and six pence.

The wages mentioned above were not net wages. There were certain deductions from the pay such as insurance, lamp rental, sharpening of tools, infirmary, hospital, benevolent funds and union fees. These averaged from one to nine pence and amount to four shillings and five pence.
a week. Against this the workers received allowances on their coal purchases. The rate was reduced to eight or nine shillings a ton.

Most of the families of the unemployed got their coal by thieving. It was a common sight to see the unemployed gather near the colliery and hitch a train from which they threw down coal to their wives and children who were below picking it up. The unemployed had an agreement that the car belonged to the one who hitched it first. As a matter of form the Company arrested one or two of the pickers once in a while. The miners made nothing of it. They all pitched in to pay his fine. This practice of hitching cars was very dangerous. One unemployed man lost both of his legs. Another lost a few of his fingers.

Orwell also brought out the effects of the Means Test:

The most cruel and evil effect of the Means Test is the way in which it breaks up families. Old people, sometimes bedridden, are driven out of their homes by it. An old age pensioner, for instance, if a widower, would normally live with one or other of his children; his weekly ten shillings go towards the household expenses, and probably he is not badly cared for. Under the Means Test, however, he counts as a "lodger" and if he stays at home his children's dole will be docked. So, perhaps at seventy or seventy-five years of age, he has to turn out into lodgings, handing his pension over to the lodging-house keeper and existing on the verge of starvation.
I have seen several cases of this myself. It is happening all over England at this moment, thanks to the Means Test.25.

Working people often have a vague reverence for learning in others, but where education touches their own lives they see through it and reject it. In his early days Orwell used to lament over quite imaginary pictures of lads of fourteen dragged protesting from their lessons and set to work at dismal jobs. It seemed dreadful to him that the doom of a job should descend upon anyone at fourteen. Later he realized that there was not one working-class boy in a thousand who did not pine for the day when he would leave school. Orwell said that:

To the working class, the notion of staying at school till you are nearly grown-up seems merely contemptible and unmanly. The idea of a great big boy of eighteen, who ought to be bringing a pay a week home to his parents, going to school in a ridiculous uniform and even being caned for not doing his lessons! Just fancy a working-class boy of eighteen allowing himself to be caned. He is a man when the other is still a baby.26.

So far we have seen Orwell's attitude toward the unemployed in days of inflation, and also his attitude toward people in normal times but living under abnormal

25. Ibid., p.79.
conditions. We will now examine Orwell's impatience with man because of his inadequacy and irresponsibility in time of war.

At the beginning of World War II Orwell was very much depressed because he was turned down by the medical board and classified C. Orwell made the following observation:

What is appalling is the unimaginativeness of a system which can find no use for a man who is below the average level of fitness but at least is not an invalid. An army needs an immense amount of clerical work, most of which is done by people who are perfectly healthy and only half-literate.27.

In the novel Coming Up for Air the hero, George Bowling, enlisted in the first World War, was wounded and sent to a hospital camp. Later there was a demand for a young officer with knowledge of the grocery trade, to act as a secretary to Sir Joseph Cheam. Sir Joseph sent Bowling to check over the stores at the Twelve Mile Dump on the North Cornish Coast. When he arrived, he discovered that the stores consisted of eleven tins of bully beef. Later a message came from the War Office informing him that he should take charge of stores until further notice. He wired

that there were no stores at the Twelve Mile Dump. Next
day came the official letter informing him that he was the
official checker of the Twelve Mile Dump. He remained in
that position from 1917-19.

From time to time he would receive a questionnaire
to fill out about the condition of pickaxes, tools, barbed
wire, blankets, groundsheets, first-aid outfits, and tins
of plum and apple jam. Naturally he answered nil for each
item. In London someone was quietly filing the forms, and
sending out more forms and filing those, and so on.

There were two army huts there. One contained a
shelf of books worth reading. This was the first time he
did worth-while reading. He was being paid for something
he enjoyed doing.

In this chapter on Atonement we have seen Orwell
mingle with the unemployed. We have noticed the physical
and social effects of poverty upon man. We have also
studied Orwell as he associated with the employed miners of
Wigan. In the next chapter we shall consider Orwell's
solution to the above mentioned evils.
CHAPTER VI

ADVOCACY OF SOCIALISM

Orwell had a solution for the evils of his day. The answer was Socialism. Socialism was one of the passions of his life. It was not just a theory of politics; it was a feeling for the common people. Socialism rests upon two basic principles: first, that human calamities call for immediate human aid; second, that such aid must almost always be collectively organized.

Socialism to Orwell meant common ownership of the means of production. The State owns everything, and everyone is a State employee. People are not stripped of private ownership such as clothing and furniture, but it does mean that all productive goods, such as land, mines, ships and machinery are the property of the State.

It does not mean that Socialism is superior to capitalism, but unlike capitalism it can solve the problem of production and consumption. In normal times capitalism cannot consume all that it produces; as a result there is wasted surplus and unemployment. In war time capitalism has difficulty in producing all that it needs. The Socialist State simply calculates what goods will be needed and does
its best to produce them. Money becomes a ration-ticket issued in sufficient quantities to buy up such consumption goods as may be available at the moment.

It is interesting to note the difference between Communism and Socialism. Modern Socialism to a considerable degree is based, like Communism, on the theories of Marx and Engels, but socialistic parties reject most Marxist tenets, such as the use of force and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In some countries the influence of Marxist theory on present-day socialist programs is negligible. Socialists universally disclaim all form of dictatorship and work for socialistic aims through constitutional processes. They advocate free elections and varying degrees of private enterprise, but favor state ownership of a country's basic resources and state control of major public services and productive facilities.

Wherever Communists are in control, they permit only one party (their own) or pseudo-parties or groups they nominate, to offer candidates for election. At the polls there is a single list of candidates, all of whom must be endorsed or selected by the Communist Party. The Communists seek to keep themselves in power by force; the Socialists do not.

There is a vast difference between Socialism and Fascism. Socialism aims at a world of free and equal human
The driving force behind the Nazi movement is the belief in human inequality, the superiority of Germans to all other races, the right of Germany to rule the world. Outside the German Reich it does not recognize any obligations. Eminent Nazi professors have 'proved' over and over again that only Nordic man is fully human... Therefore, while a species of war-Socialism exists within the German state, its attitude towards conquered nations is frankly that of an exploiter. The function of Czechs, Poles, French, etc., is simply to produce such goods as Germany may need, and get in return just as little as will keep them from open rebellion. If we are conquered, our job will probably be to manufacture weapons for Hitler's forthcoming wars with Russia and America.  

The Nazi's aim was to set up a caste system consisting of four castes corresponding to the Hindu religion. In India the Brahmans, who studied and interpreted the Veda, were looked up to by the rest of the people and thereby became the highest class. Below them in order were the nobles (warriors), the farmers, and the serfs. The castes were hereditary. A son belonged to the same caste as his father and followed his father's occupation. One who has been expelled from his caste, or one who had no caste by birth was known as a pariah. He was in a hopeless and pitiable

condition. There were at one time sixty million pariahs in India.

A person may not rise into a higher caste than the one into which he was born. Their belief is that anyone born into a lower caste, or an untouchable, is being punished for the sins committed in his past life. If such a person is calmly resigned to his fate and lives rightly, he will be elevated in caste in his next life. (They believe in the transmigration of souls, that is, when a person dies his soul enters the body of a newborn child or even the body of an animal). This resignation to fate tends to make the members of the lower castes and the untouchables submissive to the terrible economic and social conditions under which they live. The machine age, however, is tending to undermine the caste system. In factories, or trains, in commercial establishments, schools, universities, and political parties, persons belonging to different castes are thrown together more than formerly.

The four castes in Germany which corresponded to the above mentioned Hindu castes were first, the Nazi party at the top; second, the mass of German people; third, the conquered European populations; and fourth, the colored people.

British capitalism was unequal to the strain of preparing for war. In order to prepare for war on the
modern scale the greater part of the national income has to be diverted to armaments which means cutting down on the consumption goods.

A bombing plane is equivalent in price to fifty small motor cars, or eighty thousand pairs of silk stockings, or a million loaves of bread. One cannot have many bombing planes without lowering the national standard of life. It is guns or butter. In England the transition could not be made. The rich would not face the necessary taxation, and while the rich are still visibly rich it is not possible to tax the poor very heavily either. So long as profit was the main object the manufacturer had no incentive to change over from consumption goods to armaments. Orwell noted the sad state of affairs when:

at the end of August, 1939, the British dealers were tumbling over one another in their eagerness to sell Germany tin, rubber, copper and shellac and this in the clear, certain knowledge that war was going to break out in a week or two. It was about as sensible as selling somebody a razor to cut your throat with. But it was 'good business.'

Eight months after the outbreak of World War II England discovered that, so far as equipment went, the British army was barely beyond the standard of 1918. The soldiers were fighting their way desperately to the coast,

2. Ibid., p.66.
with one aeroplane against three, with rifles against tanks, with bayonets against tommy-guns. There were not even enough revolvers to supply all the officers. After a year of war the regular army was still short of three hundred thousand tin hats. There had even been a shortage of uniforms.

How can the change in government be brought about? Orwell answered the question with:

It is only by revolution that the native genius of the English people can be set free. Revolution does not mean red flags and street fighting, it means a fundamental shift of power. Whether it happens with or without bloodshed is largely an accident of time and place. Nor does it mean the dictatorship of a single class.

What is wanted is a conscious open revolt by ordinary people against inefficiency, class privilege and the rule of the old. It is not primarily a question of change of government. British governments do, broadly speaking, represent the will of the people, and if we alter one structure from below we shall get the government we need. Ambassadors, generals, official and colonial administrators who are senile or pro-Fascist are more dangerous than Cabinet ministers whose follies have to be committed in public. Right through our national life we have got to fight against privilege, against the notion that a half-witted public-schoolboy is better fitted for command than an intelligent mechanic. Although there are gifted and honest individuals among them, England has got to break the grip of the monied class as a whole. England has got to assume its real shape.  

3. Ibid., pp.74-76.
ADVOCACY OF SOCIALISM

Orwell pointed out that the reason why the Spanish Republic was able to hold out for two and a half years in spite of all odds was that there were no gross contrasts of wealth. The people suffered horribly, but they all suffered alike. When the private soldier had no cigarette, the general did not have one either.

Orwell suggested the following six point program for England. The first three points deal with England’s internal policy, and the other three with the Empire and the world.

I. Nationalization of land, mines, railways, banks and major industries.
II. Limitation of incomes, on such a scale that the highest tax-free income in Britain does not exceed the lowest by more than ten to one.
III. Reform of the educational system along democratic lines.
IV. Immediate Dominion status for India, with power to secede when the war is over.
V. Formation of an Imperial General Council, in which the coloured peoples are to be represented.
VI. Declaration of formal alliance with China, Abyssinia and all other victims of the Fascist powers.4

Taking the first point under consideration, nationalization would mean that the ownership of all major industry would be formally vested in the State, representing the common people. It then becomes possible to eliminate the

4. Ibid., pp.99-100.
class of mere owners who live not by virtue of anything they produce but by the possession of title deeds and share certificates. State ownership implies that nobody shall live without working.

This sudden change cannot be brought about immediately. The majority of industrial concerns will continue with much the same personnel as before, the one-time owners or managing directors carrying on with their jobs as State employees. Many of the smaller capitalists would welcome some such arrangement. The resistance will come from the capitalists, the bankers, the landlords and the idle rich, the class with over two thousand pounds a year.

Nationalization of agricultural land implies cutting out the landlord and the tithe drawer, but not necessarily interfering with the farmer. The farmer will continue as a salaried manager. He is virtually that already, with the added disadvantage of having to make a profit and being permanently in debt to the bank.

With trading and even the small scale ownership of land, the State will not interfere at all. Orwell said:

It would be a great mistake to start by victimizing the smallholder class. These people are necessary, on the whole they are competent, and the amount of work they do depends on the feeling that they are their own masters. But the State will impose an upward limit to the ownership of land (fifteen acres at the very most), and will not permit any ownership of land in the town area.
From the moment that all productive goods have been declared the property of the State, the common people will feel that the State is themselves. They will be ready then to endure the sacrifices that are ahead of us, war or no war. And even if the face of England hardly seems to change, on the day that the main industries are formally nationalized the dominance of a single class will have been broken. The emphasis will then be shifted from ownership to management, from privilege to competence.

It is quite possible that State ownership will in itself bring about less social change than will be forced upon the people by the common hardships of war. But it is the necessary first step without which any real reconstruction is impossible.

The second point under consideration is the limitation of incomes. It implies the fixing of a minimum wage, which in turn implies a managed internal currency based simply on the amount of consumption goods available.

It is not feasible that all human beings should have exactly equal incomes. It has been shown over and over again that without some kind of money reward there is no incentive to undertake certain jobs. On the other hand the money rewards need not be very large. In practice it is impossible that earnings should be limited quite as rigidly as suggested.

---

5. Ibid., pp.101-102.
But there is no reason why ten to one should not be the maximum normal variation and within those limits some sense of equality is possible. In his pamphlet, The Lion and the Unicorn, Orwell brought out the fact that:

A man with three pounds a week and a man with fifteen hundred pounds a year can feel themselves fellow creatures, which the Duke of Westminster and the sleepers on the embankment benches cannot. 6.

In regard to the reform in the educational system Orwell had a few suggestions to offer. He believed that the state-aided pupils should be accepted, and only pupils of ability should be registered.

He accused the present educational public system of training its pupils in class prejudice:

When I was fourteen or fifteen I was an odious little snob, but no worse than other boys of my own age and class. I suppose there is no place in the world where snobbery is quite so ever-present or where it is cultivated in such refined and subtle forms as in an English public school. Here at least one cannot say that English 'education' fails to do its job. You forget your Latin and Greek within a few months of leaving school - I studied Greek for eight or ten years, and now, at thirty-three, I cannot even repeat the Greek alphabet - but your snobbishness, unless you persistently root it out like the bindweed it is, sticks by you till your grave. 7.

6. Ibid., p.103.
Then, again, in his essay, "Such, Such Were the Joys," Orwell wrote that there were two levels of treatment, depending on the income and background of the boy:

Sim always gave these boys their titles when mentioning them to a third person, and for their first few days he actually addressed them to their face as 'Lord So-and-So'. Needless to say he found ways of drawing attention to them when any visitor was being shown round the school.

The rich boys had milk and biscuits in the middle of the morning, they were given riding lessons once or twice a week. Bingo mothered them and called them by their Christian names, and above all they were never caned. Apart from the South Americans, whose parents were safely distant, I doubt whether Sim ever caned any boy whose father's income was much above two thousand pounds a year.8.

Orwell had no use for the private schools. He suggested that all should be suppressed. Their educational level was lower than that of the elementary school. They existed only because the prevalent opinion was that it was disgraceful to be educated in a public school. He felt that the State should quell this idea by declaring itself responsible for all education.

His antagonism for private schools dates back to his own schooldays at Crossgates which he so well described in the essay, "Such, Such Were the Joys." The interest and

---

value of this sketch lie not in any influence it might have in correcting the condition described, for it is assumed that they have long since been corrected; nor in merely depicting for the record a fantastic and outmoded type of educational procedure, for that story has been well told many times; but rather in the fresh analysis in the working of a boy's mind in response to that situation. A large part of the essay is a catalogue of faults imputed to the preparatory school which Orwell attended.

His first objection was to corporal punishment. Upon receiving his first beating he boasted that it did not hurt. He was called a second time and beaten with a riding crop till he cried and till the crop was broken over him. Even then he said he cried more from remorse than from pain. Orwell objected to corporal punishment not because it gave pain, but because it gave pleasure to the master.

The peculiarity of Orwell's position at Crossgates was that he was of poorer parents than the majority of the other boys. He was taken in by the master, Mr. Simpson, in order that he might give the school an advertisement by winning a scholarship.

The curriculum was designed for this one and only purpose. At eight years of age the boys studied Latin; at ten they took up Greek. They did not read the book from
cover to cover but merely certain passages were pointed out to them as probable translation which would appear in the scholarship quiz.

Each year the school competed for the Harrow History prize. In preparation for this contest the boys' minds were crammed with dates and names without any association of the facts. They relied to a certain extent on mnemonic devices. The initial letters of, "A black Negress was my aunt; there's her house behind the barn," are the initial letters in the War of the Roses.

The squalor and neglect of the pupils at Crossgates can best be expressed in three words: overcrowded, underfed, and underwashed. The boys were repeatedly told at Crossgates that it was healthy to get up from a meal feeling as hungry as when they sat down. The food was abominable, and the dishes and utensils were not sanitary. The boys were supposed to take a plunge bath each morning, but a nine year old boy will not take a bath unless there is someone to check on him. Many of the boys went unwashed for days. Orwell once related that the first thing he noticed about a new boy who entered school was his pearly white teeth. At the end of the term his teeth were an extraordinary shade of green.

---

When Orwell was twelve years old a terrible row occurred at Crossgates. Boys were questioned, flogged, and expelled from school. The school accepted boys from South America. These boys matured earlier than the English boys. It leaked out that the boys practiced homosexuality. They were called in a group, lectured on the beauty of their body, and about the body being the temple which they had desecrated. Now, Orwell was not aware of what was going on, but whatever it was he felt guilty just the same. The incident showed that the directors were not capable of handling a situation of this nature. The steps they had taken tended to have a derogatory psychological effect upon the boys.

There was a great deal of snobbishness. The boys would question each other with, What is your family's income? Do you own a car? Do you have a butler? Who makes your clothes? How much money did you bring with yourself? That was the pattern of social life:

School life was a continuous triumph of the strong over the weak. Virtue consisting in winning: it consisted in being bigger, stronger, handsomer, richer, more popular, more elegant, more unscrupulous than other people in dominating them, bullying them, making them suffer pain, making them look foolish, getting the better of them in every way. Life was hierarchical and whatever happened was right. There were the
strong, who deserved to win and always did win, and there were the weak, who deserved to lose and always did lose, everlastingly.\textsuperscript{10}

Very little is known about Orwell's stay at Eton. In one of his articles in The Observer he paid tribute to the spirit of Eton which had allowed him sufficient freedom to develop his critical sense:

\begin{quote}
It has one great virtue and that is a tolerant and civilised atmosphere which gives each boy a fair chance of developing his own individuality. The reason is perhaps that, being a very rich school, it can afford a large staff, which means that the masters are not overworked; and also that Eton partly escaped the reforms of public schools set on foot by Dr. Arnold and retained certain characteristics belonging to the eighteenth century and even to the Middle Ages. At any rate, whatever its future history, some of its traditions deserve to be remembered.\textsuperscript{11}
\end{quote}

In A Clergyman's Daughter Orwell presented to us an educational system no better than the one at Crossgates. Dorothy, the main character in the novel, left her father, a clergyman, because he demanded an unusual amount of work from her. She lost her memory, joined a hop-picking crew, and later joined the down and outers of Trafalgar Square. Finally when she was rescued by her cousin, a solicitor was

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{10} Ibid., p.50.
\item \textsuperscript{11} George Orwell, "Forever Eton," The Observer, (August, 1948), p.3.
\end{itemize}
asked what jobs were open to a totally unqualified girl, he
gave an unhesitating advice for teaching. Dorothy got a
position in Mrs. Creevy's school which was nothing else but
a money-making concern. Mrs. Creevy instructed Dorothy:

"After all the fees are what matter aren't they? As for all this stuff about developing the children's minds as you call it, it's neither here nor there. It's the fees I'm after, not developing the children's minds. After all it's no more than common sense. It's not to be supposed as anyone'd go to all the trouble of keeping school and having the house turned upside down by a pack of brats, if it wasn't that there's a bit of money to be made out of it. The fees come first, and everything else comes afterwards."12.

Mrs. Creever then showed Dorothy three different lists of pupils. The first list consisted of what she called good payers. Dorothy was not to punish any of these children under any circumstances. The second list consisted of medium payers. Those she could punish, but she must be careful not to leave any marks. Mrs. Creevy advocated the twist of the ear because it was painful and yet did not leave a mark. The third list consisted of three pupils who were bad payers. These Dorothy might treat as she wished short of a police court case.

The pupils learned next to nothing. Their whole time was given to handwriting and arithmetic. Those were the only two subjects which the parents appreciated. When Dorothy tried to make class interesting by teaching the children *Macbeth*, the parents objected to the passage where Macduff is described as not being born of woman and denounced it as indecent. A meeting was called and Mr. Paynder presented the parents' point of view:

> To my mind it's a disgrace that school-books can be printed with such words in them. I'm sure if any of us had ever known that Shakespeare was that kind of stuff we'd have put our foot down at the start. It surprises me, I must say. Only the other morning I was reading a piece in my *News Chronicle* about Shakespeare being the father of *English Literature*; well, if that's Literature let's have a bit less Literature, say I! 13.

Dorothy lost her position at the end of the term. Mrs. Creevy made a nefarious deal with another school-mistress who had stolen a few pupils from a rival school and transferred them to Mrs. Creevy.

The second part of Orwell's program dealt with an immediate dominion status for India. Orwell wrote the six point program in 1941. Since then India received its independence. In the spring of 1946, the British government offered the Indians a plan for a unified, independent

13. Ibid., p.288.
India. It called for a central government to control defense, foreign affairs, and communications, and for strong regional governments to control economic and social developments. To establish this central government the plan called for the viceroy to set up an all-Indian cabinet and for an assembly, representing the provincial assemblies and the princes, to draw up a permanent constitution. Gandhi accepted the plan.

The Mohammedans who desired a separate independent state (Pakistan), led by Mohammed Ali Jinnah, hesitated. In July, 1946, they agreed to accept it, but Jinnah announced his determination to work for strong local governments to protect the rights of the Mohammedans. They later withdrew their acceptance and great public disorder followed as Hindus and Mohammedans fought each other.

On February 20, 1947, Prime Minister Attlee announced the intention of the British government to transfer power to responsible Indian hands not later than June, 1948. The announcement was followed by positive action when the Indian Independent Act received Royal Assent on July 18. This Act which took effect on August 15, provided for a complete revision of the government of India. The King of England ceased to be called Emperor of India.

British India was divided into two dominions, India (Hindu) and Pakistan (Moslem). Provision was made for constituent assemblies in each dominion to draw up
constitutions. Each was later to decide whether it desired complete independence or membership in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Boundary Commissions were to determine the limits of each dominion and public properties and debts were to be divided between them by decision of courts. The native states were given the right to choose between independence and joining one or the other of the dominions. All the treaties between them and Great Britain were ended by the Act.

On August 14, Lord Mountbatten formally surrendered British rights and the following day the new dominions were launched. This act was followed by terrible riots between fanatical Hindus and Moslems even in Delhi itself. On January 30, 1948, Gandhi was murdered by a fanatical Hindu.

The problem of Indian unity and independence was complicated not only by the religious difficulties, but also by the social and economic conditions of the country. About ninety per cent of the people are illiterate and earn less than twenty dollars a year. Most of them are peasants. They have little interest in who governs them or how they are governed.

In summary, Orwell indicated in a general way what the Socialist policy would be like:
It will not be doctrinaire. It will abolish the House of Lords, but quite probably will not abolish the Monarchy.... It will not set up any explicit class dictatorship. It will group itself round the old Labour Party and its mass following will be in the Trade Unions, but it will draw into it most of the middle class and many of the younger sons of the bourgeoisie. Most of its directing brains will come from the new indeterminate class of skilled workers, technical experts, airmen, scientists, architects and journalists, the people who feel at home in the radio and ferro-concrete age. But it will never lose touch with the tradition of compromise and the belief in a law that is above the State. It will shoot traitors, but it will give them a solemn trial beforehand, and occasionally it will acquit them. It will crush any open revolt promptly and cruelly, but it will interfere very little with the spoken and written word. Political parties with different names will still exist, revolutionary sects will still be publishing their newspapers and making as little impression as ever. It will disestablish the Church, but it will not persecute religion. It will have nationalized industry, scaled down incomes, set up a classless educational system.... It will aim not at disintegrating the Empire but at turning it into a federation of Socialist states, freed not so much from the British flag as from the moneylenders, the dividend-drawer and the wooded-headed British official.... It will fight in such a way that even if it is beaten its memory will be dangerous to the victor. The dictators will fear it as they could not fear the existing British regime, even if its military strength were ten times what it is.14.

Although Orwell felt that Socialism would solve the problems both in peace and war time, yet he found fault with the Socialists. His complaints can be numbered:

First, people differ in their habits as the result of upbringing... Socialists do their cause great harm by insistent and insincere demands that everyone should behave exactly alike. Secondly, all too many Socialists are cranks and tie up Socialism with absurd and unattractive causes which are in no way connected with it. Thirdly, Socialist planners often have no love for the working man; what they like is tidiness and order, and in the name of Socialists 'we, the clever ones' intend to impose this tidiness on 'them, the lower classes,' whether they want it or not, by violence if necessary. Fourthly, not content with accepting the fact of industrialism... the Socialist is all too often blind to the dangers of industrialism and recommends Socialism on the ground that it will bring a more rapid and total industrialization.

Orwell thought that there was a certain amount of insincerity in the Socialists of his day. They denounced imperialism and privilege, yet England owes its high standard of living to imperialism. The Socialists would rant against imperialism, yet they had no intention of abandoning their standard of living.

The "cranks" that Orwell disliked were the vegetarians, teetotallers, and birth-controllers. Against the last mentioned he really raved. It was society's business to provide housing so that people could have normal families, and not the families' business to limit their number to fit into the houses.

The Socialists were blind to the dangers of

industrialization. One of these dangers was inequality. The simplest solution was to have widely distributed property of roughly equal shares, so that everybody had something and nobody had much more than his neighbor. This same process was applicable to the agricultural group.

The second evil that Orwell noticed was that for generations the English population has been crowded into towns, worked in factories, and created an economy where they can only live by exchanging their manufactured goods for the food of other nations. Hence, industrialism is inevitable.

In the foregoing chapter we have seen a society in time of inflation confronted with the two poverties of hunger and sickness. We have also examined Orwell's solution to the problem. Whether it works or not is for posterity to decide.
CHAPTER VII

PATRIOTISM

Patriotism might be defined as love of and devotion to one's country; the spirit that originating in love of country, prompts to obedience to its laws, to the support and defense of its existence, rights, and institutions, and to the promotion of its welfare.

Orwell loved England. He hated to see England humiliated or humiliating anyone else. He wanted to see England win the war but he hoped post-war England would not be stained by the class distinctions and imperialist exploitations that had existed before the war.

In one of his essays, "England Your England," and in a pamphlet entitled The English People, Orwell gave us the characteristics of the English people. This final chapter will deal with those characteristics, the moral and political outlook of the English people, the English class system, the English language and the future of England.

In cartoons in Continental papers England is personified by an aristocrat with a monocle, a sinister capitalist in a top hat, or a spinster in a Burberry. All the generalizations that are made about England are based
on the property-owning class and ignore the other forty-five million.

Chances of war brought to England soldiers, refugees and thousands of foreigners and forced them into intimate contact with ordinary people. These foreign observers found the salient characteristics of the English common people to be artistic insensitivity, gentleness, respect for legality, sentimentality about animals and an obsession with sport.

As for the artistic insensitivity, stretches of beautiful countryside are ruined by planless building. Heavy industries convert whole counties into blackened deserts. Ancient monuments are pulled down. Attractive views are blocked by hideous statues. Music is the only art which has universal appeal. Poetry, the art in which above all others England has excelled, has for more than a century had no appeal whatever for the common people. The word poetry arouses embarrassment in ninety-eight people out of a hundred.

The most marked characteristic of the English people is their gentleness. They are ready to await their turn in line. The blind can always count on being led to and from the bus, and across the street. Their busdrivers are good-tempered. Their policemen carry no revolvers.
The English people have respect for the law. During the war the officers were trying to prevent the people from using the tube stations as shelters. The people did not react violently. They just paid their fare, and no one could do them harm, because as passengers they had a full right to be there. They do not feel that only the rich can win a case:

Everyone takes it for granted that the law, such as it is, will be respected, and feels a sense of outrage when it is not. Remarks like 'they can't run me in; I haven't done anything wrong,' or 'They can't do that; it's against the law,' are part of the atmosphere of England.... Everyone believes in his heart that the law can be, ought to be, and, on the whole, will be impartially administered. The totalitarian idea that there is no such thing as law, there is only power, has never taken root.

The people feel that their judge will not take a bribe. He abides by the book. He is one of the symbolic figures of England even if he is clothed, 'in scarlet robe and horsehair wig, whom nothing short of dynamite will ever teach what century he is living in,...'1

The dogs' cemeteries in Kensington Gardens are the most degrading spots. They adjoin the churchyard where Gray wrote his famous elegy. They have animal hospitals with miniature cat stretchers. During war time they even celebrated an Animal Day in the midst of the evacuation

at Dunkirk. "Although its worst follies are committed by the upperclass women, the animal cult runs right through the nation and is probably bound up with the decay of agriculture and the dwindled birthrate."²

The English themselves are not outstandingly good at all games, but they enjoy playing them. During the war years the football game did more than any other one thing to make life bearable for the unemployed. Professional football players, boxers, jockeys and even cricketers enjoy a popularity that no scientist or artist could hope to rival.

The moral outlook of the English people in regard to religion can be summed up in Orwell's words: "For perhaps a hundred and fifty years, organized religion, or conscious religious belief of any kind, has had very little hold on the mass of English People."³ About ten per cent of them go to church and then only to be married or buried. Christianity to them means unselfishness and love of neighbor. Some of them possess an intermittent belief in life after death. Within the last generation Bible-reading which used to be traditional in England has lapsed. Young people do not know the Bible stories even as stories.

The whole nation would unite against gangsterism, kidnapping and open shooting in the street. On the other hand England tolerates cruel and out-of-date punishments such as flogging:

Our criminal law is as out of date as the muskets in the Tower. In England until recently people were still hanged by the neck and flogged with the cat o' nine tails. Both of these punishments are obscene as well as cruel, but there has never been any genuinely popular outcry against them. People accept them almost as they accept the weather. They are part of the 'law' which is assumed to be unalterable.

Military punishments are not taken for granted in England as they are in most countries:

Public opinion is almost certainly opposed to the death penalty for cowardice and desertion, though there is no strong feeling against hanging murderers. In general the English attitude to crime is ignorant and old-fashioned, and humane treatment even of child offenders is a recent thing.

The practical disappearance of drunkenness as an English vice has not been due to the anti-drink fanatics, but to competing amusements, education, the improvement in industrial conditions, and the expensiveness of drink itself. The pub, one of the basic institutions of English

life, carries on in spite of the harassing tactics of local authorities. Most forms of gambling are illegal according to the letter of the law, but they all happen on an enormous scale.

The political views of the English people can be gathered from numerous examples of past history. In wartime England took sides with the weaker nations. In the American Civil War they sided with the North because that side stood for the abolition of slavery. No one expected the Greeks to win the war of 1939-45, yet the British troops in co-operation with the Greek underground forces pursued the fleeing Germans northward until by the middle of November, 1944, all German forces had been driven from Greece. British mass sentiment was for the Abyssinians against the Italians, and for the Spanish Republicans against Franco. It was friendly to Germany during the period when Germany was weak and disarmed.

The feeling that one ought always to side with the weaker party probably derives from the balance-of-power policy which Britain has followed from the eighteenth century onwards.

The freedom of the British press is theoretical rather than actual. Orwell said, "The centralised ownership of the press means in practice that unpopular opinions can only be printed in books or newspapers with a small
circulation." For the last twenty years the British people were not aware of the different hamperings with the press, therefore there has been no public protest.

In Gollancz’s book, in the editor’s Foreword there is an exchange of letters between Victor Gollancz and Hewlitt Johnson, dean of Canterbury. Johnson in his letter dated January 29, 1941, mentioned England fighting a double front against Hitler and,

such Fascist tendencies as Mr. Duff Cooper’s attempted suppression of the press last June, or Mr. Morrison's achieved suppression of the 'Week' and 'Daily Worker' at the present moment, without any process of law, thereby violating a fundamental charter of our liberty. The value of criticism was shown in the successful replacement of Mr. Chamberlain by Mr. Churchill as Prime Minister.7

On the other hand, freedom of speech is vital to the English people. They not only voice their opinions freely but also allow others to voice their objections. In general,

the English people are not good haters, their memory is very short, their patriotism is largely unconscious, they have no love of military glory and not much admiration for

---

6. Ibid., p.18.
great men. They have the virtues and the vices of an old-fashioned people. To Twentieth Century political theories they oppose not another theory of their own, but a moral quality which must be vaguely described as decency. 8.

The English people are more inclined to individual loyalty than to a political party. They focus their attention on individuals like Chamberlain, Churchill, Cripps, Beveridge, and Bevin.

During the war years, owing to the failure to renew the registers, the young had no votes (At one time no one under twenty-nine had a vote), and did not seem much troubled by the fact.

The Conservative and the Labour Parties broadly represent the main interests of the nation. For the last twenty years they have resembled each other more and more. The blurring of party distinctions is happening because the drift is toward a planned economy, and partly because in an age of power politics national survival is felt to be more important than class warfare.

There are about a half dozen minor political parties of which Communism is the strongest. But even the number of the members of the Communist Party fluctuates according to Russia's foreign policy. The numbers are up

when the Russian foreign policy is on good terms with England. Then the British Communists follow a "moderate" line which hardly distinguishes them from the Labour Party. When the Russian policy diverges, the drop in the British Communists is immediately noticeable, and the members then revert to a "revolutionary" line. Orwell in his essay, "Inside the Whale," said:

Every time Stalin swaps partners, 'Marxism' has to be hammered into a new shape. This entails sudden and violent changes of 'line,' purges, denunciations, systematic destruction of party literature, etc. etc. Every Communist is in fact liable at any moment to have to alter his most fundamental convictions, or leave the party. The unquestionable dogma of Monday may become the damnable heresy of Tuesday, and so on. This has happened at least three times during the past ten years. It follows that in any Western country a Communist Party is always unstable and usually very small. Its long-term membership really consists of an inner ring of intellectuals who have identified with the Russian bureaucracy, and a slightly larger body of working-class people who feel a loyalty towards Soviet Russia without necessarily understanding its policies. Otherwise there is only a shifting membership, one lot coming and another going with each change of 'line.'

Many of the English people would not be able to give a satisfactory definition for such terms as Capitalism, Fascism, Trotskyism, Communism, Socialism, Anarchism; yet

---

they all understand the abstract term Democracy. They feel that they live in a democratic country, but not in the literary sense of the word:

If democracy means either popular rule or social equality, it is clear that Britain is not democratic. It is, however, democratic in the secondary sense which had attached itself to that word since the rise of Hitler. To begin with, minorities have some power of making themselves heard.... Public opinion cannot be disregarded when it chooses to express itself. It may have to work in indirect ways, by strikes, demonstrations and letters to the newspapers, but it can and visibly does affect government policy. A British government may be unjust, but it cannot be quite arbitrary. It cannot do the kind of thing that a totalitarian government does as a matter of fact.10.

Orwell gave an example of the Germans attacking without a propaganda build-up beforehand. The English government would not do a thing like that:

English political thinking is much governed by the word 'they.' 'They' are the higher-ups, the mysterious powers who do things to you against your will. But there is a widespread feeling that 'they' though tyrannical, are not omnipotent. 'They' will respond to pressure if you take the trouble to apply it: 'they' are even removable. And with all their political ignorance the English people will often show surprising sensitiveness when some small incident seems to show that 'they' are overstepping the

---
mark. Hence, in the midst of seeming apathy, the sudden fuss every now and then over a rigged by-election or a too-Cromwellian handling of Parliament.\footnote{Ibid., P.21+}

The war had leveled the class distinction to some extent. Physically the upper classes are a few inches taller. They can be easily spotted by their clothes, manners, and general appearance. The main distinction can be found in the language and accent. Wealth and poverty are much more taken for granted than in any other country. In 1940, it had been proven that British national solidarity was greater than class antagonism, but as soon as the danger of war was over class distinction reappeared.

Class consciousness is fostered at home. Orwell became aware of it at the age of six. Up to that time he played with the laborers' children. Their fathers did such interesting work as fishing, farming, bricklaying and being blacksmiths. They would sometimes catch an ewe and milk it in order to give him a drink. The builders would allow him to play with the mortar. With the plumber's children he used to go birdnesting. In time he was forbidden to play with them; they were common and he was told to keep away from them.

\footnote{Ibid., p.24.}
The English people can be classified into three categories: the upper or the bourgeoisie, the middle or the petite bourgeoisie, and the working class or the proletariat. The ruling class still holds on to the outward form of feudalism. It is the ambition of every gentleman to own land, and to draw his income from the rents.

The middle classes too aim for a week-end cottage, or a suburban villa with its lawn and herbaceous border, which is their form of a manor house. The main distinction in the middle class is rank and not financial status. A man with a thousand pound a year income may have more prestige than one who earns two thousand pounds:

Middle-class people are really graded according to their degree of resemblance to the aristocracy; professional men, senior officials, officers in the fighting services, university lecturers, clergymen, even the literary and scientific intelligentsia, rank higher than business men, though on the whole they earn less.\(^{12}\)

There is still another distinction to be found in the middle class. There has been a need within the last thirty years for radio engineers, industrial chemists and the Royal Air Force. Many from the working class origin graduated into the technical middle class in this way.

\(^{12}\) Ibid., p.28.
There are several major contrasts between the bourgeois life and the working-class life. A worker who became half blind as a result of his work received twenty-nine shillings a week in compensation. Orwell made the following observation as to the manner in which the man was able to obtain his compensation:

Watching this man go to the colliery to draw his compensation, I was struck by the profound differences that are still made by status. Here was a man who had been blinded in one of the most useful of all jobs and was drawing a pension to which he had a perfect right, if anybody has a right to anything. Yet he could not, so to speak, demand this pension - he could not, for instance, draw it when and how he wanted it. He had to go to the colliery once a week at a time named by the company, and when he got there he was kept waiting for hours in the cold wind. For all I know he was also expected to touch his cap and show gratitude to whomever paid him; at any rate he had to waste an afternoon and spend sixpence in bus fare.\(^3\)

Orwell said he had certain rights attaching to his bourgeois status. He was able to draw his money out when he chose to do so and even when his account was exhausted the bank people were polite.

The working man has a longer middle age compared with the bourgeois. It extends from thirty to sixty years.

The working-class man is always the master of his home which is not usually the case in the middle-class life. There the woman or the child is the master. One will never see a working-class man do any housework. Not even unemployment changes this. This would seem a little unfair, yet the wife does not protest. Both feel that a husband who does housework loses some of his manhood.

Orwell believed that there was more happiness, a warmer and more human atmosphere in the home of a laborer. In the bourgeois home there is too often a looking-over-the-shoulder for comfort. In *The Road to Wigan Pier* he gave us a glimpse into the laborer's home:

I have often been struck by the peculiar easy completeness, the perfect symmetry as it were, of a working-class interior at its best. Especially on winter evenings after tea, when the fire glows in the open range and dances mirrored in the steel fender, when Father, in shirt-sleeves, sits in the rocking chair at one side of the fire reading the racing finals, and Mother sits on the other with her sewing, and the children are happy with a pennorth of mint humbugs, and the dog lolls roasting himself on the rag mat - it is a good place to be in, provided that you can be not only in it but sufficiently of it to be taken for granted. ¹⁴.

A working man has not that deadly weight of family prestige hanging round his neck like a millstone.

A middle-class man goes to pieces under the strain of poverty. He is being nagged on by his wife to get the other man's job.

In his novel Coming Up for Air Orwell contrasted the fate of a laborer who finds himself on the dole and that of a shopkeeper whose loss is gradual:

A small shopkeeper going down the hill is a dreadful thing to watch, but it isn't sudden and obvious like the fate of a working man who gets the sack and promptly finds himself on the dole. It's just a gradual chipping away of trade, with little ups and downs, a few shillings to the bad here, a few sixpences to the good there. Somebody who's dealt with you for years suddenly deserts you and goes to Sarazin's. Somebody else buys a dozen hens and gives you a weekly order for corn. You can still keep going. You're still 'your own master,' always a little more worried and a little shabbier, with your capital shrinking all the time.  

Plain-spokenness is another characteristic of the working man. If one offers him something he has no use for, he refuses. A middle-class man accepts it to avoid giving offence.

Since the 1850's every war in which England participated met with a series of disasters, and the situation had been saved by people of the lower class. The commanders, who were drawn from the aristocracy, could not prepare for

a modern war, for they would then have to admit that the world was changing:

They have always clung to obsolete methods and weapons, because they inevitably saw each war as a repetition of the last. Before the Boer War they prepared for the Zulu War, before 1914 for the Boer War, and before the present war for 1914. Even at this moment hundreds of thousands of men in England are being trained with the bayonet, a weapon entirely useless except for opening tins. It is worth noticing that the navy and, latterly, the Air Force, have always been more efficient than the regular army. But the navy is only partially, and the Air Force hardly at all, within the ruling-class orbit.16.

There have been several influences which tend to level the class distinctions in England. Certain technical advances are bound to benefit the whole community. A millionaire cannot very well light the streets for himself while darkening them for others. The same can be said of good roads, germ-free water, police protection, free libraries and free education.

To an increasing extent the rich and the poor read the same books, newspapers and magazines. They listen to the same radio programs, and watch the same television programs and films. All this tends to merge the working class with the middle class.

The mass production of cheap clothes has diminished somewhat the differences in their way of life. The clothes of the rich and the poor differ less than they did fifteen or thirty years ago. That is, the styles are the same, the grade of the material is different, but in general appearance they are the same.

The modern Council housing estate has greatly improved the living conditions. Except for size, it can be compared to a stockbroker's villa.

The improvement of industrial technique lessens the manual labor and gives the laborer more time for relaxation. The proletarian with muscles warped by heavy labor still exists, but he is constantly decreasing in numbers. He only predominates in the heavy-industry areas of the north of England.

Orwell loathed the class system but he knew that it would be a tremendously difficult job getting rid of it. Spain demonstrated this in practice. But he had known for some time that the mere assertion of class abolition was meaningless. It had been vigorously proclaimed in Russia but the claim merely masked the reality of a new hierarchy. In various of his writings he had criticized the new regime in Russia, but it was in Animal Farm that he gave the strongest expression to his disappointment. The revolution of Manor Farm had not long been stabilized before the
bourgeois conception of titles and awards, so heartily con­
demned a short time before, was introduced. This idea has
been dealt with in more detail in chapter III.

The main character in *Keep the Aspidistra Flying*
 fought the class system throughout, but in the end he con­
formed to it. Orwell in this manner revealed to us that
perfect levelling of society is not possible.

Orwell in his pamphlet, *The English People*, and in
his numerous essays gave us the characteristics of the Eng­
ish language, motives for writing, duty of a writer in a
political age, function of a writer in contemporary society
and the advantages, disadvantages and function of a pamphlet
in the contemporary world.

The outstanding characteristics of the English
language are a large vocabulary and simplicity of grammar.
The language itself is derived from Anglo-Saxon and Norman-
French, and has been reinforced with Latin and Greek roots.
It is comparatively easy to change one part of speech into
another. For example, a verb can be changed into an adjec­
tive by adding ful - y - like. Verbs and adjectives can be
turned into their opposites by prefixing un. Adjectives can
be made more emphatic by attaching a noun to it for example,
lily-white, sky-blue, coal-black, iron-hard. Nouns can be
changed into verbs. One can knife as well as stab, school
as well as teach, fire as well as burn.
The regular verb has three inflections that of third person singular, present participle and the past participle. One can conjugate the verb in all its tenses with a minimum of forty words. Some languages require as much as two hundred words.

More words have been borrowed from America, while America showed no tendency of borrowing English terms. Orwell attributed this fact to the anti-British feeling in America which he said is stronger than the anti-American feeling in England. The English borrowed the formation of verbs from nouns by adding "ise" to them. Other words that were introduced to the English vocabulary were car for tram, escalator for moving staircase, automobiles for motor-cars.

Orwell's campaign was for a language that should be pure and subtle, flexible and simple. He considered language as an instrument for expressing thought and not for concealing or preventing it.

Vagueness and sheer incompetence are the most marked characteristics of modern prose, and especially of political writing. Writers use worn-out metaphors which have lost all power and are merely used because they save people the trouble of inventing phrases for themselves. Orwell cited some of the phrases which are frequently in use:
Ring the charges on, take up the cudgels for, toe the line, ride roughshod over, stand shoulder to shoulder with, play into the hands of, - no axe to grind, grist to the mill, fishing in troubled waters, on the order of the day, Achilles' heel, swansong, hotbed.

Operators or verbal false limbs save the trouble of picking out appropriate verbs and nouns, and at the same time pad each sentence with extra syllables, which give it an appearance of symmetry. Characteristic phrases are render inoperative, militate against, make contact with, be subjected to, give rise to....

Words like phenomenon, element, individual, objective, categorical, effective, virtual, basic, primary, promote, constitute, exhibit, exploit, utilize, eliminate, liquidate, are used to dress up simple statements and give an air of scientific impartiality to biased judgment.

In certain kinds of writing particularly in art criticism and literary criticism, it is normal to come across long passages which are almost completely lacking in meaning. Words like romantic, plastic, values, human, dead, sentimental, natural, vitality, as used in art criticism, are strictly meaningless, in the sense that they not only do not point to any discoverable object, but are hardly ever expected to do so by the reader.17

Events such as the former British rule in India, the Russian purges and deportations, and the dropping of the atom bomb on Japan are too brutal to face. Political language, therefore, evades the issue by using euphemisms, question-begging and sheer cloudy vagueness. Orwell quoted some examples:

Defenceless villages are bombarded from the air, the inhabitants driven out into the countryside, the cattle machine-gunned, the huts set on fire with incendiary bullets: this is called pacification. Millions of peasants are robbed of their farms and sent trudging along the roads with no more than they can carry: this is called transfer of population or rectification of frontiers. People are imprisoned for years without trial, or shot in the back of the neck or sent to die of scurvy in Arctic lumber camps: this is called elimination of unreliable elements.¹⁸

Perhaps some professor in sympathy with Communism would avoid easily recognizable words. His lecture would probably contain the following statement:

While freely conceding that the Soviet regime exhibits certain features which the humanitarian may be inclined to deplore, we must, I think, agree that a certain curtailment of the right to political opposition is an unavoidable concomitant of transitional periods, and that the rigors which the Russian people have been called upon to undergo have been amply justified in the sphere of concrete achievement.¹⁹

Dying metaphors, operators or verbal limbs, pretentious diction, and meaningless words are causes of vague writing. To avoid stale or mixed images, prefabricated phrases, needless repetition and vagueness Orwell offered us six simple rules:

---

¹⁸ Ibid., p.88.
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(1) Never use a metaphor, simile or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print.
(ii) Never use a long word where a short one will do.
(iii) If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out.
(iv) Never use a passive voice where you can use the active.
(v) Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent.
(vi) Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous.20

Orwell presented four motives for writing prose. They exist in different degrees in every writer, and in any one writer the proportion will vary from time to time, according to the atmosphere in which he is living. The first motive is egoism. It is a desire to seem clever, to be talked about, to be remembered after death.

Esthetic enthusiasm is the second motive. Perception of beauty in the external world, or in words and their right arrangement, pleasure in the impact of one sound on another, are considerations of an esthetic writer.

Desire to see things as they are, to find out facts and store them up for the use of posterity, hence the historical impulse is the third motive.

The political purpose, which is a desire to push the world in a certain direction to alter other people's
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idea of the kind of society that they should strive after, is the final motive of a writer.

Speaking of himself Orwell wrote:

Every line of serious work that I have written since 1936 has been written, directly or indirectly, against totalitarianism and for democratic socialism, as I understand it. It seems to me nonsense, in a period like our own, to think that one can avoid writing of such subjects. Everyone writes of them in one guise or another. It is simply a question of which side one takes and what approach one follows. And the more one is conscious of one's political bias, the more chance one has of acting politically without sacrificing one's esthetic and intellectual integrity.

Orwell knew that a writer going in for politics either retained his values and lost the confidence of the politicians, or he became a hack. He also knew what a difficult task it was to keep one's political principles unsullied. But the solution was not to keep out of politics. He tried to find a compromise:

I only suggest that we should draw a sharper distinction between our political and our literary loyalties, and should recognise that a willingness to do certain distasteful but necessary things does not carry with it any obligation to swallow the beliefs that usually go with them. When a writer engages in politics he should do so as a citizen, as a human being, but not as a writer. I do not think that he has the right,

merely on the score of his sensibilities, to shirk the ordinary dirty work of politics. Just as much as anyone else, he should be prepared to deliver lectures in draughty halls, to chalk pavements, to canvass voters, to distribute leaflets, even to fight in civil war if it seems necessary. But whatever else he does in the service of his party, he should never write for it. He should make it clear that his writing is a thing apart. And he should be able to act co-operatively while, if he chooses, completely rejecting the official ideology. He should never turn back from a train of thought because it may lead to a heresy, and he should not mind very much if his unorthodoxy is smelt out, as it probably will be. Perhaps it is even a bad sign in a writer if he is not suspected of reactionary tendencies today, just as it was a bad sign if he was not suspected of Communist sympathies twenty years ago.

Brander stated two ways in which a writer can free himself from party affiliations:

Orwell, while he waited for success, accepted real poverty - the only way for a writer, unless he is rich, to keep his freedom. Freedom, in his case, to observe, record and seek to influence the evolution of English society in his time, an evolution which was rapidly achieving a revolutionary impetus. This freedom, which was so precious to him, was freedom from party affiliations, so that he could think out social and political problems for himself. It was freedom from any regular employment except his writing, so that he had time to think and so that he was free to give his whole attention to whatever problem seemed to him urgent. There are two ways of being rich enough to be free:

to have enough or to require very little. All his life, Orwell followed the second way. It gave him the freedom of the preacher and the pamphleteer. It allowed him to be an individual. 23.

Orwell's life was dedicated to the defense of liberty, and this he felt was the whole duty of a writer in a political age. A writer was best equipped to understand the importance of defending liberty. Some writers helped to destroy liberty by spreading Communist opinions:

The conscious enemies of liberty are those to whom liberty ought to mean most. The big public do not care about the matter one way or the other. They are not in favour of prosecuting the heretic, and they will not exert themselves to defend him. They are at once too sane and too stupid to acquire the totalitarian outlook. The direct, conscious attack on intellectual decency comes from the intellectuals themselves. 24.

In the essay, "Inside the Whale," Orwell presented the function of the writer in contemporary society. Henry Miller wrote a book entitled The Tropic of Cancer. It was about people living the expatriate life, people drinking, talking, meditating and fornicating. Orwell praised the book because the whole atmosphere was deeply familiar.


Miller was neither pushing the world-process forward nor trying to drag it back, but on the other hand he did not ignore it. In his further comment on the book Orwell stated:

When *Tropic of Cancer* was published the Italians were marching into Abyssinia and Hitler's concentration-camps were already bulging. The international foci of the world were Rome, Moscow, and Berlin. It did not seem a moment at which a novel of outstanding value was likely to be written about American dead-beats cadging drinks in the Latin Quarter. Of course a novelist is not obliged to write directly about contemporary history, but a novelist who simply disregards the major public events of the moment is a plain idiot. 25.

According to Orwell the keynote of the writers in the 'twenties was a 'tragic sense of life,' and the keynote of the new writers is 'serious purpose.' Orwell listed Joyce, Eliot, Pound, Lawrence, Wyndham Lewis, Aldous Huxley and Lytton Strachey as the writers of the 'twenties, and Auden and Spender as the writers of the 'thirties. Referring to the writers of the 'twenties Orwell wrote:

But what is noticeable about all these writers is that what 'purpose' they have is very much in the air. There is no attention to the urgent problems of the moment, above all no politics in the narrower sense. Our eyes are directed to Rome, to Byzantium, to Montparnasse, to Mexico, to the Etruscans, to the Subconscious, to the solar plexus - to everywhere except the places where things are

---

actually happening. When one looks back at the 'twenties, nothing is queerer than the way in which every important event in Europe escaped the notice of the English intelligentsia. The Russian Revolution, for instance, all but vanishes from the English consciousness between the death of Lenin and the Ukraine famine - about ten years. Throughout these years Russia means Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and exiled counts driving taxi-cabs. Italy means picture-galleries, ruins, churches, and museums - but not Blackshirts. Germany means films, nudism, and psycho-analysis - but not Hitler, of whom hardly anyone had heard till 1931. In 'cultured' circles art-for-art's-sake extended practically to a worship of the meaningless. Literature was supposed to consist solely in the manipulation of words. To judge a book by its subject matter was looked on as a lapse of taste.26.

Orwell then related an anecdote that appeared in Punch in 1928. A youth informed his aunt that he intended to write. The aunt asked him what he would write about, and he answered her, "My dear aunt, one doesn't write about anything, one just writes." Orwell then added that the best writers of the 'twenties did not subscribe to this doctrine, their purpose was usually a purpose along moral-religious-cultural lines. The tendency of most writers in the group was conservative.

Mr. Forster praised Eliot's poem "Prufrock."

Orwell said:
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I should have felt, like Mr. Forster, that by simply standing aloof and keeping touch with pre-war emotions, Eliot was carrying on the human heritage. What a relief it would have been at such a time, to read about the hesitations of a middle-aged highbrow with a bald spot! So different from bayonet-drill! After the bombs and the food queues and the recruiting-posters, a human voice! What a relief!

In the essay, "Politics vs. Literature," Orwell brought out Swift's contribution to political thought in Part III of *Gulliver's Travels*. Orwell considered it an attack on what would now be called totalitarianism. Swift had a clear vision of the spy-haunted 'police State,' with its endless heresy-hunts and treason trials. For example, there was the professor at the School of Political Projectors who 'shewed me a large Paper of Instructions for discovering Plots and Conspiracies.' Later in the same chapter we seem to be positively in the middle of the Russian purges:

In the Kingdom of Tribnia, by the Natives called Langdon... the Bulk of the People consist, in a Manner, wholly of Discoverers, Witnesses, Informers, Accusers, Prosecutors, Evidences, Swearers.... It is first agreed, and settled among them, what suspected Persons shall be accused of a Plot: Then, effectual Care is taken to secure all their Letters and Papers, and put the Owners in Chains. These papers are delivered to a sett of Artists, very dexterous in finding out the mysterious Meanings of Words, Syllables, and Letters.... Where this method fails, they have two others more

effectual, which the Learned among them call Acrostics and Anagrams. First, they can decipher all initial letters into political meanings: Thus: N shall signify a Plot, B a Regiment of Horses, L a Fleet at Sea: Or Secondly, by transposing the letters of the Alphabet in any suspected paper, they can lay open the deepest designs of a discontented Party. So, for example if I should say in a letter to a Friend, Our Brother Tom has just got the Piles, a skilful decipherer would discover that the same letters, which compose the sentence, may be analysed in the following words: Resist - a Plot is brought Home - the Tour (Tower).

Orwell also pointed out that Swift was not interested in increasing social equality:

The Houyhnhnms are organized upon a sort of caste system which is racial in character, the horses which do the menial work being of different colors from their masters and not inter-breeding with them. The educational system which Swift admires in the Lilliputians takes hereditary class distinctions for granted, and the children of the poorest classes do not go to school, because 'their Business being only to till and cultivate the Earth... therefore their Education is of little Consequence to the Public.'

The atmosphere of totalitarianism is deadly to any kind of prose writer. Its doctrines are unchallengeable and unstable. They have to be accepted on pain of damnation, but on the other hand, they are always liable to be altered
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at a moment’s notice. Writing about totalitarianism Orwell said:

Such a society, no matter how long it persists, can never afford to become either tolerant or intellectually stable. It can never permit either the truthful recording of facts, or the emotional sincerity, that literary creation demands.30.

Fischer in his biography of Stalin told how a Soviet playwright Alexander Afigenov wrote a play entitled *The Lie* and submitted it to the theater. For months he waited for an answer. He was put off by the director, the manager and finally one day he received a call. Comrade Stalin wanted to see him. Stalin was very friendly:

You are our greatest playwright.... You are young and will be even more successful than you have been. I always enjoy your work. I enjoyed your play *The Lie*. It is a good script. But the people are not ready for it. Would you do me a favor and withdraw the manuscript for the time being.31.

Fischer added that Afigenov did Stalin the favor. "The time being" still continues. Afigenov was killed in 1941, in Moscow by a Nazi bomb.


In the same book Fischer pointed out how difficult a task a Russian novelist has:

The dilemma of the Soviet novelist is simple yet fatal. A novel gains interest by depicting conflict. Soviet novels, or plays, which must be political or risk condemnation as 'divorced from reality,' might show a conflict between a Communist and anti-Communist, or between a peasant who likes collectives and one who hates them. In portraying the anti-Communist or anti-collectivist, the author would have to make him convincing, and this might be interpreted as reflecting the author's sympathies. The anti-Communist is accordingly depicted as a weak, repulsive, doomed character, and the conflict with the wise, sturdy, attractive, righteous Communist consequently never comes alive. If, on the other hand, the writer eschews a clash of characters and paints Soviet life as an Arcadia of agreement the result is dishwater dullness.32.

Orwell and Reginald Reynolds edited a volume of twenty-five pamphlets. These pamphlets were chosen for their representativeness as well as for their literary merit. They covered the two centuries between the Reformation and the War of American Independence. Orwell wrote the introduction to the first volume in which he gave a definition of a pamphlet:

A pamphlet is a short piece of polemical writing, printed in the form of a booklet and aimed at a large public.... Probably a true pamphlet will always be somewhere between five
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hundred and ten thousand words, and it will always be unbound and obtainable for a few pence. A pamphlet is never written primarily to give entertainment or to make money. It is written because there is something that one wants to say now, and because one believes there is no other way of getting a hearing. Pamphlets may turn on points of ethics or theology, but they always have a clear political implication. A pamphlet 'for' or 'against' somebody or something, but in essence it is always a protest.33

Reynolds pointed out that between 1640-1660, twenty-two thousand pamphlets circulated in London. Orwell questioned why our own age has not been to the same extent an age of pamphleteering. His answer was that where there is genuine freedom of speech and all points of view are represented in the press, part of the reason for pamphleteering disappears.

Then he continued that this is a pamphleteering age, in so far as bulk of output goes. During the fifteen years or so since Hitler came to power the number has been enormous. In spite of the bad paper situation Conservatives, Socialists, Communists, Trotskyists, trade unions, employers' associations and political parties were pouring forth pamphlets in an unending stream.

Orwell also brought out the fact that pamphlets have a tendency to deteriorate the English language. Pamphlets are intended as propaganda and are not normally produced by people who are writers first and foremost. To prove his point he presented two paragraphs. One was from a recent pamphlet and the other from a sixteenth century pamphlet. The subject matter was similar. Both writers pointed out that the people of England are better off than those of Germany. One is immediately struck by the precise balanced structure of sentences of the sixteenth century writer.

One disadvantage of the pamphlet is that it is difficult to keep track of the whole output. They are nowhere listed in any comprehensive way. It can be seen that a pamphlet is always liable to miss its potential public. It has less effect and receives less attention than it would if it were published as an article in a monthly magazine.

Orwell brought out the advantages of a pamphlet:

The pity is that in a pamphlet one can do things that are possible in no other medium. The pamphlet is a one-man show. One has complete freedom of expression, including, if one chooses, the freedom to be scurrilous, abusive and seditious; or, on the other hand, to be more detailed, serious and 'highbrow' than is ever possible in a newspaper or in most kinds of periodicals. At the same time, since the pamphlet is always short and unbound, it can be produced much more quickly than a book, and in principle, at any rate can reach a bigger public. Above all, the pamphlet
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does not have to follow any prescribed pattern. It can be in prose or in verse, it can consist largely of maps or statistics or quotations, it can take the form of a story, a fable, a letter, an essay, a dialogue or a piece of reportage. All that is required of it is that it shall be topical, polemical and short.34.

The function of a pamphlet is to act as a sort of foot-note or marginal comment on official history. It not only keeps unpopular viewpoints alive, but supplies documentation on events that the authorities of the day have reason to falsify. All minor controversial events, such as plots, real or imaginary, riots, massacres and assassinations are likely to be documented in pamphlet form or not at all.

As to the future of England Orwell said that it can only keep on going as long as the rest of the world is not industrialized. Britain, therefore, can only survive as an "advanced" and populous country if it is integrated into a much larger area. This may happen in one of four ways:

One is by the formation of a union of Western Europe plus Africa; another is by tightening the links of the commonwealth and transferring perhaps half the population of Britain to the English-speaking dominion; a third is by allowing Britain, with the rest
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of Europe, to become part of the Russian system; and the final possibility is by accession of Britain to the United States.35.

The objection in every case is obvious. The first alternative faces enormous difficulties and dangers of which Russian hostility is only the most immediate. The second, could only be carried out by a despotic government which was accustomed to transporting human beings like shiploads of cattle. The third, though it may happen as a result of defeat in war, can be ruled out as a possibility, since no one except a handful of Communists desire it. The fourth is quite likely to happen, but it is unacceptable from a British point of view, since it would mean becoming very definitely a junior partner and being tied to a country which everyone except a few Tories regards as politically backward.

As an internal weapon Orwell advocated a rising birthrate. He suggested that taxes be graded so as to encourage child-bearing and to save women with young children from being obliged to work outside the home. Looking at the problem from the family's point of view Orwell said that the English people have small families because they are too fond of children:

They feel that it is wrong to bring a child into the world unless you are completely certain of being able to provide for him, and at a level not lower than your own. For the last fifty years, to have a big family has meant that your children must wear poorer clothes than others in the same group, must have less food and less attention, and probably must go to work earlier.  

The immediate necessities of the English people according to Orwell are:

They must propagate faster, work harder, and probably live more simply, think more deeply, get rid of their snobbishness and their anachronistic class distinctions, and pay more attention to the world and less to their own backyards. Nearly all of them love their country, but they must learn to love it intelligently. They must have a clear notion of their own destiny and not listen to those who tell them that the England of the past can return.  

Nicolson does not agree with all the statements that Orwell made about the English people. The accusation of artistic insensibility of the English people is greatly exaggerated. Nicolson claims that the French and the American people are far more indifferent than the English to the defacement of rural amenities.

That the word "poetry" arouses either derision or embarrassment in ninety-eight people out of a hundred,
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is a hard saying but Nicolson regrets to admit that it is true. He supports the statement by saying that the excellent poetry readings recorded by the British Broadcasting Corporation attract an audience as small as that which listens to chamber music.

As to the people being ignorant of terms such as Communism, Trotskyism, Fascism, Capitalism, and Anarchism, Nicolson explains that, "No one who has taken part in a parliamentary election would contend that this cruel commentary is lacking in force."38.

Nicolson believes in the pronouncement of Orwell in regard to political instinct:

The English are probably more capable than most peoples of making revolutionary changes without bloodshed. In England, if anywhere, it would be possible to abolish poverty without destroying liberty. If the English people took the trouble to make their own democracy work, they would become the political leaders of Western Europe, and probably of some other parts of the world as well. They would provide the much needed alternative to Russian authoritarianism on the one hand and American materialism on the other.39.

---
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Nicolson admits that England is subject to change as much as the surrounding countries have changed. The moral and religious sanctions which were operative in the Nineteenth Century have now lost their force; the respect for legality may undergo a change. A new class of technicians is arising which will be impervious to the tradition, and immune to the "instincts" both of the bourgeoisie and of the old working classes:

But if we can retain the virtues and moderate the defects which Mr. Orwell has catalogued, we may well be able to surmount our present material and spiritual impoverishment, and succeed by our energies and our example in rescuing the world from the chaos which is sweeping towards it with the speed and darkness of a typhoon.  

In this final chapter we have examined Orwell's views of the characteristics of the English people. The moral attitude in regard to religion, crime, drinking, freedom of press and freedom of speech were presented. The political views of the major and minor political parties were brought forward. The English class system with its present day influences which tend to level the class division somewhat was indicated. The characteristics of the English language, motives and purpose for writing, duty and
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function of a writer, and the function of the pamphlet in a contemporary world were explained. And finally the future of the English people was suggested. All these things were seen through the writings of George Orwell.
CONCLUSION

The major emphasis of this study has been on the literary moods of George Orwell. The moods of revulsion against totalitarianism, Fascism, Communism, and imperialism have been analyzed. The moods of atonement and advocacy of Socialism have also been considered.

After examining Orwell's mood of revulsion against totalitarianism it was agreed with the majority of the critics that Orwell's outstanding book, Nineteen Eighty-Four, is a projection of present day situations into the future. It forced us to examine our own lives with a new eye.

Orwell joined the Spanish militia on the Loyalist side during the Spanish civil war. He was filled with disgust at the inadequacy of man in time of war. The complete lack of preparation, in so far as clothing, training and ammunition are concerned, was discussed in chapter II.

In chapter III the allegory of Animal Farm was transferred into its parallel political realities. Orwell's prophecy in regard to Russia was that if Russia continued in her policy as she has in the past fifteen years, it would lead to an atomic war. He felt that Russia in the future will either democratize itself or it will perish.
Revulsion against imperialism was the subject of the fourth chapter. The moral and technical aspects of imperialism were discussed. Effort was made to show that imperialism existed as far back as 3400 B.C. The ancient civilizations of Egypt, Greece and Rome practiced it. Modern imperialism has many points in common with imperial Rome in so far as the motives and effects are concerned.

After five years of service as a sub-divisional officer in Burma, Orwell returned to England with a feeling of guilt which he tried to extricate by projecting himself into the masses of the unemployed and later with the employed who tried to make a living in unjust working conditions.

Orwell's answer to the above mentioned evils was Socialism. Whether his six point program succeeds is for posterity to decide.

The final chapter dealt with patriotism. England's moral, economic, political and social aspects were considered. Favorable and unfavorable characteristics of the English people were revealed.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary material:

Books:

Orwell, George, Animal Farm, New York: Harcourt Brace, 1946, pp.118.

As the title indicates the story is about animals, with satirical intent applied to Russia at one level, to all revolutions at another, and to human government in general. Each animal character is a caricature of a human type, and everything the animals do caricatures human actions. Gradually the Utopian stage passes and dictatorship seeps in. The situation is no better than it was before.


In the introduction to this book Orwell gives a definition of a pamphlet, its advantages and disadvantages, and contrasts the Sixteenth Century pamphleteer writing with that of the present.


This novel portrays the life of the English ruling class in Burma. It is also the story of a corrupt native politician who tries to get into the white man's club by blackmailing innocent victims.


George Bowling, the central character of this novel, visits Lower Binfield the village in which he was born. Through his recollections Orwell displays a panorama of the years between the middle 1890's and the years just before the World War II.


This volume contains the literary essays on Dickens, Kipling, Yeats, Koestler, and an essay in defense of P.G. Wodehouse.


In addition to the above mentioned essays this volume contains essays on Wells, Donald McGill, Benefit of Clergy, Raffles and Miss Blandish.
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This work reveals the experiences of a penniless man in Paris who struggles to make a living in that city and in London. The story contains many sociological details about the hotel and restaurant kitchens in which the hero worked.

The favorable and unfavorable characteristics of the English people are depicted in this work. The moral and political outlook on life is presented with clarity and conciseness.

Orwell points out the assets of democratic countries such as England and America in contrast with the countries whose government is that of Fascism.

This book is an account of the chaos of the Spanish Civil War as witnessed by Orwell who served as a journalist and militiaman in war-torn Barcelona.

The essays of this book were later reprinted in other collections.

The book is a collection of short stories by Jack London who was a Socialist. In the introduction Orwell analyzes the short stories pointing out the Socialist tendencies of London.

The novel is a criticism of a commercial civilization that has ever been made, and it is a detailed demonstration of the bitter and virtually hopeless plight of the lower-middle-class man.

The book consists of three parts: Part I deals with general topics; Part II gives the distinction between Socialism and Fascism; Part III contains a six-point program which England needs. The first three points deal with England's internal policy, the other three with the Empire and the world.


Orwell concentrated his energies on making people more conscious of danger. As long as totalitarianism exists free government is under threat and every free man is in danger. The world Orwell foresaw was one where two and two would make whatever its ruler desired it to make.


Sections from Orwell's novels, autobiographical volumes, and prophetic satire are arranged in chronological order in this book.


Orwell shows in this essay why Democratic Socialism could not establish itself in England.


The above named article is a British broadcast to India given by Orwell. The topic dealt with contemporary English writers with stress on Joyce's *Ulysses* and Galsworthy's *Forsyte Saga*.


The book is divided into two parts: the first half is a study of misery in an exploitative social order; the second is an examination of Socialism as a remedy.


In this book of eighteen essays autobiographical reminiscences, literary criticism, political ideas, and incidental journalism are presented.
Orwell, George, *Such, Such Were the Joys*, New York: Harcourt Brace, 1953, pp. 230. Previously uncollected essays were gathered in a posthumous edition. These essays are of political, critical and journalistic nature. In England these essays were published under the title of *England Your England*.

Periodicals:

Orwell, George, "Bayonet in War," *Spectator*, Vol. 166, (March 21, 1941), p. 309. The article is an answer to R.C. Taylor who raised the question of the value of bayonets. Orwell said that bayonet training is a waste of time which could be utilized in training for things the infantryman will actually have to do.

"British General Election," *Commentary*, Vol. 1, (November, 1945), pp. 65-70. The Labor Party had won three hundred and ninety-two seats as against one hundred and ninety-five won by the Conservatives. The issue was mostly a domestic one as Orwell points out in this article.


"Confessions of a Book Reviewer," *New Republic*, Vol. 115, (August 5, 1946), pp. 144-45. Orwell believes that there should be less reviews but lengthier ones say a thousand words or more. The six hundred word reviews should not be written. A sentence or two notices of new books should be given.

"English Writing in Total War," *New Republic*, Vol. 105, (July 14, 1941), p. 57. Orwell gives an account of writing in England at this time. A great deal of poetry has been written but the quality is not commensurate to the output.

Orwell, George, "From the Notebooks of George Orwell," World Review, (June 1950), pp.21-44.
Orwell kept a diary from May 25, 1940, until August 28, 1941. Resumed it again in March, 1942, until the middle of that year. The notes deal mostly on the bombing of London and the German invasion of Russia.

The article is a review of four short story collections: The Beauty of the Dead by H.E. Bates, Welsh Short Stories by Glyn Jones, The Parents Left Alone by T.O. Beachcroft, and a novel The Battler by Kylie Tennant. Orwell comments that people do not like short stories out of sheer mental laziness. It is too much trouble to make an acquaintance of a fresh set of characters with each story.

Orwell classifies all pamphlets into two categories: The Party Line and Astrology. For plugging the holes in history the pamphlet is the ideal form. The writer has something to say now and he wants it to reach a great number of readers. At times he is afraid it will not reach the men he wishes it to reach, therefore, he frequently pads it into a book or waters it down to a newspaper article.

The article is a review of The British Way in Warfare by B.H. Liddell Hart. The traditional strategy of England is explained here by Orwell.

Orwell blames Kipling for lending his literary genius to distasteful imperialism.

Orwell gives a detailed account of the toad in springtime which he ties up with the world situations of today. The earth is still revolving around the sun and neither dictator nor bureaucrat is capable to prevent it. There are other things to be admired besides steel and concrete.
Newspaper Articles:

Orwell, George, "As I Please," Tribune, No.366, (December 31, 1943), p.11.
In this article he brings out two ideas. First, he shows how difficult it is to place the war guilt on any one individual. Secondly, he enlarges upon the lack of world authority with individual power to transcend national frontiers.

Orwell, George, "As I Please," Tribune, No.368, (January 14, 1944), p.11.
Orwell found fault with Burnham's book The Managerial Revolution which was a prophecy. The test of a political theory is its power to foretell the future, and Burnham's predictions were falsified as soon as made.

Orwell revolted against Pound's B.B.C. broadcasts which he read in the Monitoring Report, especially the ones dealing with anti-Semitism.

People base their anti-Semitic feelings on various charges brought against the Jews. Orwell said that the economic system must be so arranged that crooks cannot prosper.

This article is a reply to a statement made in Commonwealth, in reference to the falling birthrate in England.

Orwell contends that the B.B.C. is a better news source than the newspaper.

One cannot be free inside under a totalitarian government. Once freedom of speech is taken away, the creative faculties dry up.
Orwell, George, "As I Please," Tribune, No.386, (May 19, 1944), p.11.
This article deals with the ethical problem of indiscriminate bombing of civilians in war time.

This item deals with one aspect of imperialism namely, the feeling of racial superiority of the English over the Indians in Burma.

Capital punishment is accepted as necessary, yet instinctively felt to be wrong. Orwell brings out instances from literature where capital punishment is dealt with.

"Going Down," The Observer, (January 14, 1945), p.3.
The article is a review on Palinurus' book, The Unquiet Grave: A World Cycle. The central character in the book, a capitalist, feels he has no right to exist, yet on the other hand, he feels that he is a better animal than the proletariat.

Capital punishment is one of the elements in Sean O'Casey's book, Drums Under the Windows. The article is an appraisal of the book.

"Indian Ink," The Observer, (October 29, 1944), p.3.
Because Orwell himself spent five years in Burma, he knew the conditions well, therefore, he found many loopholes in the book, Verdict on India, by Beverley Nichol. An average reader would not be aware of the omissions and commissions in the book.

In this letter Orwell points out to Mulk Raj Amand the difficulties that lie in the way of a just and saner relationship between Britain and India.

"Man from the Sea," The Observer, (January 24, 1945), p.3.
Only a foreigner can admire the English the way Conrad does. This article is a review of Conrad's book.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


John Plamenatz wrote a book entitled What Is Communism. Orwell elaborates on the idea that the Russian Communists threw the Marxist ideas overboard. The type of Communism they are living is one that has been modified by the followers of Lenin.


The idea that Christianity and Democracy are compatible and necessary to each other is presented in Maritain's book. The article is a review of the book.

________, "Pen and Sword," The Observer, (January 28, 1945), p.3.

Objection to capital punishment is stressed in this article which is a review of H.W. Nevinson's book Visions and Memories.


Orwell states two reasons why some countries adopt a totalitarian form of government. The article is a review on Hugh Kingmill's book The Poisoned Crown.

________, "So Runs the World," The Observer, (July 22, 1945), p.3.

Erich Kohler's book Man the Measure evoked many criticisms. The book was written at a time when it was uncertain whether Germany would be defeated.

________, "Spanish Prison" The Observer, (December 24, 1944), p.3.

This article is a review of Charles d'Ydevalle's book, An Interlude in Spain. D'Ydevalle was a Belgian journalist in Spain during the civil war. He could not figure out why he was imprisoned. Orwell brings out the totalitarian tactics of which d'Ydevalle was not aware of.

________, "Who Are the War Criminals?" Tribune, No.356, (October 22, 1943), pp.6-7.

Orwell presents the instability and inconsistency of those in authority who at one time acclaim the actions of a ruler, and a decade later condemn them.
Secondary material:

Books:

Atkin's book is a comprehensive study for it includes Orwell's newspaper and magazine articles. His analysis of Animal Farm is particularly good. His discussion of Orwell's integrity and Socialism are revealing.

The pamphlet is a comprehensive study of the novelist as a political instrument in the United States, Great Britain, and the continent.

Brander, just as the author whom he interprets, goes straight to the mark. He makes clear the conflict that any life when viewed from the inside is simply a series of defeats, and the feeling that this world when all is said and done, suits us so well. He makes clear how this conflict produced the tension that enabled Orwell to write books that continue to be relevant.

This essay is mostly a tribute to Nineteen Eighty-Four.

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce George Orwell to the general reader. Orwell's literary work is presented as a result of his life experience.

The book is a well-documented study of Orwell's life and writings. Orwell's books are taken in order and his development of thought is traced through them. Hollis attended Eton with Orwell and several times had personal contact with Orwell.
This critical evaluation of the works of Orwell is very deftly incorporated with biographical data of the author. The criticisms, not only, consist of the formal character, plot, and setting elements, but also, concern themselves with the "why" problem.

Koestler recalls the life of Orwell and the books which correspond with it.

Lewis divides the works of Orwell into the pre-war and post-war periods. He said that the books written before 1939, do not provide many openings for politeness. He particularly could not see how a talented man like Orwell could write books such as *Coming Up for Air*, and *Keep the Aspidistra Flying*.
Lewis has a very high regard for *Road to Wigan Pier*, *Homage to Catalonia*, and *Animal Farm*, and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The last mentioned would be of a greater standard if the "prole" part would be omitted.

The chapter on Orwell deals mostly with Orwell as a man. His works are briefly summarized in paragraph lengths.

The article is the same as the introduction to Orwell's *Homage to Catalonia*.

Periodicals:

The reviewer states the theme and a few general statements about the book.

Ashe, Geoffrey, "The Bell Tolled," Commonweal, Vol.56, (June 20, 1952), p.277. A few general statements about Homage to Catalonia were made in this review.

Ashe, Geoffrey, "Note on George Orwell," Commonweal, Vol.54, (June 1, 1951), pp.191-3. The critic tries to classify Orwell as to his political beliefs. It contains brief critical evaluations on six of his books.


Beavan, John, "The Road to Wigan Pier," World Review, (June 1950), pp.48-51. Beavan treats of The Road to Wigan Pier as Orwell's continuous desire of expiation for his guilt.

Bentley, Eric, "Young Man Out of His Time," Saturday Review, Vol.29, (May 11, 1946), p.11. This article is a review on Dickens, Dali and Others. The reviewer presents Orwell as a man who is extremely conscious of the complications which resulted from the revolution which has taken place in his own day.

Braybrooke, Neville, "George Orwell," Catholic World, Vol.178, (December, 1953), pp.178-84. Well's Things to Come was compared to Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four. Five other books were briefly reviewed.

Braybrooke's only contention in this article is that Orwell's writings are documentary. He writes as an observer rather than a reformer.

The subject of this article is a comparison of Bloy's _Le Desespoir_ and Orwell's _Down and Out in Paris and London_, and again Bloy's _La Femme Pauvre_ and Orwell's "How the Poor Die." The two poverties of course, are sickness and hunger.


This article is written against the New York's film critics who failed to associate _Animal Farm_ with the Russian Revolution.


The themes of the three books were briefly stated.


A synopsis and a brief critical paragraph on the emotional element of the novel are presented in this article.


The article is a page evaluation of five works of Orwell. As a result it is brief and no one point has been developed.


The theme of the novel is stated, but the criticisms are general and not substantiated by facts.


The sentiments of George Bowling, the main character of this novel, are dealt with briefly.


The theme of _Nineteen Eighty-Four_ is summarized in this article.


Cosman portrays the fate of an autonomous individual in the works of Orwell.

Propaganda is defined according to Orwell's view. His contemporaries are grouped into Right-wing intellectuals and those that represented the Left wing.


The critic appreciates the portrayal of real life in *Down and Out in Paris and London*. He also offers a few good suggestions that could have been included.


The political problem is more important than the economic problem in Orwell's *Animal Farm* according to De Hegedus.


The review is a favorable critical evaluation of Orwell's *Animal Farm* including a few comments on Orwell's essays which were first printed in the *Horizon*.


The critic uses a number of quotations to substantiate his facts.


Along with the political problems of the day, Downes reports on the B.B.C.'s courageous pre-Christmas television production of the unfestive message of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The production brought about protests from some and discussion by others whether it could or could not happen here.


The article is an appraisal of *Down and Out in Paris and London*. The main stress is on poverty impersonal and otherwise.

Fuller, Edmund, "No Middle Stool," Saturday Review, Vol.35, (July 12, 1952), p.17. The double irony of the Spanish revolution is brought out in this article.

"To the Heart of Matters," Time, Vol.55, (February 6, 1950), p.50. The occasion of this review was the reissuing of the three works of Orwell: Down and Out in Paris and London, Burmese Days, and Coming Up for Air. The reviewer makes an interesting comparison of Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four with that of Zamiatin's We.

"What Happened to Spain," Time, Vol.59, (May 19, 1952), p.94. The critic comments on the outmoded weapons used in the civil war as described by Orwell in Homage to Catalonia.

Fyvel, T.R. "A Case for George Orwell?" Twentieth Century, Vol.160, (September, 1956), pp.254-7. The article is an evaluation of Hollis' Study of George Orwell. The biographical element is praiseworthy, but Hollis was trying to read into Orwell's works ideas that were not there.

"Investigating Orwell," Spectator, Vol.197, (September 14, 1956), p.351. This letter is a reply to Mr. Amis who in the August issue suggested that certain perceptions of Orwell need investigation. Fyvel contends that a similar comparison between some aspects of Nineteen Eighty-Four and prep school dormitory talk was actually made, not too solemnly, by Malcolm Muggeridge and Fyvel in B.B.C. discussion in 1949, when the novel was first published. Orwell himself, who had listened, admitted that the point had made him laugh and that there was perhaps something in it.

In this article Fyvel reminiscences his friendship with two English writers who were sympathetic to the Jews and their cause in Palestine.

Fyvel knew Orwell personally. The article is biographical.

The critic divides the essays in Shooting an Elephant into three categories: autobiographical reminiscences, literary criticism, and incidental journalism.

The article is an evaluation of Orwell's book entitled Critical Essays. The evaluation consists mainly in generalizations which do not ring true. The only essays the author gives credit to are "Dickens" and "Kipling."

The following points of Nineteen Eighty-Four are reviewed in this article: the ruler of Oceania (Big Brother); the hero of the novel (Winston Smith); and the purpose of the novel.

The article is a personal recollection of Heppenstall's meetings with Orwell for a period of fifteen years.

This is a continuation of Heppenstall's recollections of Orwell.

Hollis comments on capitalism, power, and family life as portrayed in Nineteen Eighty-Four.

The critic gives an evaluation of the above.

The book of essays entitled *Such, Such Were the Joys* is the subject matter of this review.


A brief evaluation of the essays *Dickens, Dali and Others* is here presented.


Three levels of approach to *Animal Farm* are here presented. First, the animals attain unity by the commandments. Secondly, the open violence between Napoleon and Snowball are presented. Thirdly, the animals to their chagrin find out that victories over human enemies bring no better conditions.


Mr. John Wain previously brought charges against Hopkinson's pamphlet stating that he dealt only with Orwell's novels and devoted less than a page to his three volumes of essays. Hopkinson explained that he was trying to give a balanced survey and not a post-mortem advertisement.


Ian Willison criticized Hopkinson for saying that Orwell was weak in his treatment of personal relationship. Hopkinson answered that he had seen the outline of the novel that Orwell did not live to write but which his wife showed to him with exactly the same comments about the weakness of human relationship.


This letter is an answer to Mayne's attack of the previous week. Hopkinson answered that he did not say Orwell's *Animal Farm* was charming but that it was his finest book.


*Burmese Days* is compared with Forster's *A Passage to India*. *Down and Out* the critic considers best after *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. 
Howe raises several objections in regard to Nineteen Eighty-Four. Some of them he justifies and others he leaves unsolved.

Given the present state of the world and the social and political tendencies of the time, Nineteen Eighty-Four may be considered prophetic in the tenants of Kennedy in this review.

According to Ker, satire should shock and surprise and Nineteen Eighty-Four does not do either. The episodes which are brought out are not new.

The article is a review on Such, Such Were the Joys. Mr. Krutch considers Orwell as a spokesman par excellence for the doomed generation.

The author makes general statements on the critical essays found in Dickens, Dali and Others. He could not see why Orwell defended Wodehouse and accused Yeats of Fascism.

The author contends that anyone reading Homage to Catalonia for its literary value will have a rewarding experience, but reading it as history he will be either misled or confused.

Mayberry praises Homage to Catalonia in so far as description of trenches and general warfare is concerned, but considers the politics of the book its main weakness.

Mayne found fault with Hopkinson for deploring Nineteen Eighty-Four as a sick man's fantasy.
The article is a reply to a previous evaluation of Nineteen Eighty-Four by Irving Howe. Miller discredits Howe's assumptions.

Muggeridge was teaching in an Indian college in Travancore and its community was similar to Kyauktada. He said that Orwell's picture is tremendously exaggerated.

The pamphlet The English People is evaluated in this article. The author does not agree with all of Orwell's particular definitions.

The critic lists the solutions found in The Orwell Reader. The items chosen demonstrate the "reporter" part of Orwell.

The essence of each essay found in Dickens, Dali and Others is brought out in this review.

The editors of Partisan Review announced their first annual Partisan Review Award of one thousand dollars for a significant contribution to literature. The recipient of this particular year was George Orwell.

Pickrel believes that Nineteen Eighty-Four was accepted enthusiastically because human nature delights in being scared. He pries the question: does it flatter our ego to suppose that we are the last to walk upon this beach before the inundating waves?

Pritchett makes a comparison of Koestler's Darkness at Noon and Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four.

The summary of this novel is given. Orwell's satire is a whip for vicarages; he is out to make the flesh of vicars' daughters creep and to show the sheltered middle-class women that only a small turn of the wheel of fortune is needed for them to be thrown helpless among the dregs of society.


The article is an evaluation of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* with emphasis on doublethink and newspeak.


The book of essays entitled *Shooting an Elephant* is evaluated in this article. The three that Pritchett considers excellent are "Shooting an Elephant," "A Hanging," and "How the Poor Die," which is a description of his appalling experience in the public ward of a Parisian hospital.


Critical Essays are evaluated in this article. Stress is laid on the essays about Wodehouse and Kipling.


Purcell's main contention is that neither Hopkinson nor Pritchett is especially interested in Orwell as a novelist of West-East relations.


This is an excellent interpretation of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* including a comparison of that novel with Koestler's *Darkness at Noon*.


Raymond praises Hollis' analysis of the novels and essays but finds fault with him for trying to make Orwell a natural Christian.
The critic claims that there is a direct comparison between The Road to Wigan Pier and Defoe's Journal of the Plague Year, and an indirect comparison between Nineteen Eighty-Four and Robinson Crusoe. His statements are not substantiated by facts.

The double purpose of Animal Farm according to Ridenour is to amuse by transposing human actions and attitudes into the antics of animals and to satirize the Communist state.

First he compares the work of Orwell to that of Simone Weil's The Need for Roots from the point of view of liberalism. The greater part of the work refers to poverty and Mr. Miller. Both Miller and Orwell were down and out. The main characters in Orwell's books fight against the world, the established order, but at the end they succumb to it.

Orwell's style is appraised in Burmese Days, Coming Up for Air, and Down and Out in Paris and London.

The two elements of "Newspeak" and "Doublethink" are stressed in this review.

Such, Such Were the Joys is evaluated in this article. The best essays are summed up. The intellectual honesty of the author is appraised.

The critic feels that the book should have been published years before.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Rovere, Richard H. "George Orwell," New Republic, Vol.135, (September 10, 1956), pp.11-5. This article is a reprint of the introduction to The Orwell Reader which Rovere edited. It is an over all appreciation of the works of Orwell including comments on style and characterization.


Scott, J.D. "Orwell," Spectator, Vol.191, (August 28, 1953), p.224. Hopkinson's pamphlet on George Orwell is evaluated in this article. Mr. Scott considers Coming Up for Air Orwell's finest book while Hopkinson maintains that Animal Farm is the finest.


Siepmann, E.O. "Farewell to Orwell," Nineteenth Century, Vol.147, (March, 1950), pp.141-7. Animal Farm is considered as a work of love and Nineteen Eighty-Four as the work of despair. Siepmann said that Communism offers to take care of the disinherited of the world, not only in its own country.


Sosken, William, "What Can Be Done?" Saturday Review, Vol.32, (June 11, 1949), p.12. Nineteen Eighty-Four is reviewed in this article. The critic points out that power is a disease of today's world for which there is no cure.
My humble opinion is that this critic thoroughly misunderstood the message behind Animal Farm. He called it a dull book. He said it lacked clarity. He took Napoleon for Lenin. He could not see why Boxer was slaughtered and what part of Soviet history corresponded with the novel. He concluded that Orwell should try again, and this time on something nearer home.

Spender considers Orwell's condemnation of the methods used to suppress the P.O.U.M. as one of the most serious indictments of Communism which he has written.

Spender points out the resemblance of the world of Orwell's preparatory school to that of Nineteen Eighty-Four. He also brings out Orwell's plea that a writer have two compartments: the artist who recognizes objective truth, and the political partisan.

The Etonian background made it possible for Orwell to write works like Burmese Days, Coming Up for Air, and Down and Out in Paris and London.

The reviewer analyzes Nineteen Eighty-Four and uses a number of excerpts to prove his point. The illustrations by Abner Dean vividly bring to mind the different aspects of the novel.

The article is an evaluation of the essays. The honesty of the writer is commended.

Shooting an Elephant is evaluated in this article. Sykes, a British novelist, compares Orwell to Hamlet in a sense that he was able to see both sides of many questions with equal and therefore puzzling sympathy.

"Thirty-five Years Hence," *Life*, (July 4, 1949), In this editorial the writer points out that although this book will be understandable in Germany, Italy, England, and behind the iron curtain if it ever gets there, yet in our own country there are tendencies which are not to be overlooked.


Trilling, Diana, "Fiction in Review," *Nation*, Vol.168, (June 25, 1949), p.716. The critic said of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* that "The nature of its fantasy is so absolutely final and relentless that I can recommend it only with a certain reservation."


"Orwell on the Future," *New Yorker*, Vol.25, (June 10, 1949), pp.78-83. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is evaluated in this article with special emphasis on power as the heart and essence of this book.

"Was Orwell Shrewd...." *Nation*, vol.176, (January 24, 1953), p.88. Herbert L. Matthews attacked Trilling's introduction to *Homage to Catalonia*. This article is Trilling's reply.

Turner, W.J. "How It Happened," *Spectator*, Vol.175, (August 17, 1945), p.156. Turner said that Stalin could have read this terrible indictment with a smile and a clear conscience for the Russian Revolution was not the complete deception Orwell presented it to be in *Animal Farm*. 
In this book Orwell has given us two very extreme pictures: the worst type of an English clergyman and the lowest depths of slum squalor, both are entirely authentic extremes and by no means rare.

The article is an appraisal of Orwell's novels. The stress is more on individual responsibility than on rebellion.

*Burmese Days* is analyzed according to character and setting.

*Keep the Aspidistra Flying* and *Coming Up for Air* are reviewed in this issue.

Wain apologized to Hopkinson for attacking him in print, yet he clung to his statement that Hopkinson did not review Orwell thoroughly in the pamphlet and that the three volumes of essays which are Orwell's best works received less than a page of evaluation.
Wain feels that Brander's book on Orwell consists only of the summaries of the plots and arguments of the essays with liberal quotations and a few routine comments. Mr. Brander's real aim might have been to get the book translated into Turkish or Korean and use it to spread the knowledge of Orwell's work and doctrines among the peoples of those countries.

The essays are classified into three categories: the modern spirit, humanity, and Eighteenth Century essayists.

The critic considers Nineteen Eighty-Four as a logical conclusion of tendencies now aggressively at work in the world.

This article in addition to being a review of Atkin's and Brander's books on Orwell, is also a plea for the reading of Orwell's less popular books which deserve to be read for their many good passages.

Weeks catalogues the main historical facts of Russia as depicted in the allegory of Animal Farm.

Poverty as portrayed in several of Orwell's works is dealt with in this article. A parallel study of Nineteen Eighty-Four and Such, Such Were the Joys is made.

Mr. West argues that Airstrip One, the setting of Nineteen Eighty-Four is actually a paranoid version of Orwell's preparatory school. A string of parallels, culminating in the bracketing of the headmaster's study with Room 101 in the Ministry of Love, suggests that Orwell's unconscious purpose was to send everybody in England to an enormous Crossgates to be as miserable as he had been.
The tragic love element of the story, the absolutely super states, and Big Brother are dealt with in this review.

A comparison of the two writers as to their beliefs, ideas, and journalistic work is made.

Orwell's theme in *Animal Farm* is that dictatorship is evil and that tyranny follows.

The article is a consideration of Orwell's *Animal Farm*, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, and *The Road to Wigan Pier*.

Wilson describes *Animal Farm* as a satirical animal fable about the progress - or backsliding - of the Russian Revolution.

The style and subject matter of Dickens, Dali and Others are brought out in this issue.

In *Shooting an Elephant* Orwell is interested in scrutinizing his own motives and deducing social implications.
Such, Such Were the Joys is reviewed in this article with special emphasis on the title essay.

The five who fear the future, Woodcock divides into two categories: the anti-Utopians Huxley and Orwell, and ex-Utopians Wells and Shaw in the recent past and Koestler in our own day.

Newspaper articles:

The critic regrets that Homage to Catalonia has not been published earlier in the United States because it would have helped to create a sound foundation for anti-Communism as his Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-Four did.

The occasion of this review is the reissuing of three works of Orwell: Coming Up for Air, Burmese Days, and Down and Out in Paris and London.

"Burmese Days," Boston Transcript, (December 1, 1934), p.3.
The author contends that the title of this book is unintentionally deceptive. To a tourist it brings visions of languorous tropical loveliness, the sound of tinkling pagoda bells, and the gleam of sluggish rivers.

This is a review of Shooting an Elephant with special emphasis on the following essays: "Lear, Tolstoy and the Fool," "Politics and the English Language," and "The Prevention of Literature."

Davis finds Orwell's positive political program a little hard to make out and finds in him some of the naggings and evasions that Orwell criticized in others.
"George Orwell, Author, 46, Dead," New York Times, (January 22, 1950), p.4. As the title indicates the article is an obituary wherein the biographical data, as well as, the literary career of George Orwell is neatly summed up.


Guilfoil, Kilsey, "Three Early Orwell Tales Are Exhumed," Chicago Sunday Tribune, (January 22, 1950), p.4. The critic feels that only Burmese Days was worthy of being republished. Coming Up for Air reads like a monologue in which the author is talking to himself rather to an audience. It is dull inspite of the fact that Orwell views the damage done to mankind by the encroachment of industrial revolution on the simple pleasures and pastimes of former days. Down and Out contains many sociological details about the hotel and restaurant kitchens in which he worked, and the life of a tramp in England.


Hilton, James, "George Orwell: the Sources of His Savage Satire," New York Herald Tribune, (January 22, 1950), p.1. The subtitle for Down and Out might have been "A Rage to Die" (with apologies to Mr. O'Hara). The London part of the book is no more impressive than the facts and figures in Charles Booth's "Life and Labor of the People." The source for Burmese Days probably was Forster's Passage to India. Coming Up for Air can be traced to Well's and John Strachey's Digging for Mrs. Miller.

"The Last Work of Orwell Reveals Orwell Himself," New York Herald Tribune, (December 3, 1950), p.9. Orwell is the modern hero who knows he is not one and will bend over backward to deprive you of any chance to idealize him.
Hilton, James, "Mr. Orwell's Nightmare of Totalitarianism," New York Herald Tribune, (June 12, 1949), p.3. After summarizing the main issues of Nineteen Eighty-Four Hilton stated that the spying, debasement of word-currency, the spread of slogans, thought avoidance, regimentation of children, and the debauching of history—all these symptoms have been seen in one country or another during our own generation. Orwell has not invented too much; mostly he has orchestrated tunes already heard.

"Orwell, Acute and Fearless as He Observed the World of His Time," New York Herald Tribune, (March 1, 1953), p.3. Such, Such Were the Joys is the subject of this review. The critic brings out the autobiographical element, the epigram, and quotes a statement from Orwell and Hemingway which shows the two men as having the same credos.

Marsh, Fred, "Sahibs in Burma," New York Times, (October 28, 1934), p.7. To the summary of the theme the author adds a sentence or two on the style of Burmese Days namely that Orwell handles with distinction that traditional English prose which is no less effective in conveying its meaning, even its messages, because of his ironic wit.

"Mr. Orwell's Essays," Manchester Guardian, (February 20, 1946), p.3. The critic considers Dali, Raffles, and Wodehouse as ephemeral essays and regrets that the essays about Yeats, Dickens, and Kipling were not longer.

"Power and Corruption," Times (London) Literary Supplement, (June 10, 1949), p.380. The critic shows Orwell's journey of the mind from Burmese Days to Nineteen Eighty-Four by way of Catalonia and Wigan. He also brings about the distinction between novelists who are interested primarily in the emotional element of their characters and novelists for whom characters are interesting chiefly as a means of conveying ideas about life and society.

Schlesinger, Arthur, "Mr. Orwell and the Communists," New York Times, (August 25, 1946), p.1. The critic stated that Orwell has been associated with the left wing of the Labor Party which regarded Bevan as its leader and the Tribune as its organ. The appreciation of the precision and bite of the satire of Animal Farm increases with the knowledge of events in Russia.
The reviewer analyzes Nineteen Eighty-Four from the political, physical, and geographical point of view.

The critic found The Clergyman's Daughter a better satire than Burmese Days and Down and Out in Paris and London.

The integrity of Orwell is brought out in this article. Orwell takes little or nothing from anyone else in his writing. As a result there are advantages and disadvantages.

This article is a synopsis of A Clergyman's Daughter and the critic gives a comment on Orwell saying that he is an admirable portrayer of conditions in contemporary England.

Wolfe sees a direct line of connection between Homage to Catalonia and the novel which established Orwell's reputation Nineteen Eighty-Four. It was in Spain that he received the first glimpses of "Newthink" and "Newspeak."
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