

PART III

TOTALITARIANISM



CHAPTER I

Homage to Catalonia



In 1931, after Alphonso XII's abdication, forced by political unrest in the country, Spain entered into the period of the Second Republic (1931 - 1936). The establishment of the new regime without bloodshed did not bring peace as expected. The republic had to face political conflict between Right wing elements and Left wing elements. The Left wing political parties, the Anarcho-Syndicalists and the extreme socialists regarded the Republic as a step leading to the overthrow of the established order of society. The right wing elements, the army, the church and the land owners were in favour of the regime so long as it respected their old rights. In addition to this, there was movement for regional autonomy, extremely strong in the case of Catalonia, a North Eastern province. The fall of the monarchy made the proclamation of a Catalan State possible; Catalonia became an autonomous region within a Unitary Spain. In the midst of the internal difficulties, the whole life of the Republic was inevitably concerned with revolutionary strikes, anti-clerical acts and revolts against the regime, instigated by different political elements. The government proved entirely unable to cope with these disorders. In July 1936, an army mutiny

broke out in Spanish Morocco, led by General Franco. A wave of internal unrest rolled over Spain and the civil war (1936-1939) began.

At first, Franco's insurgents, calling themselves the nationalists, could not make any progress. They lost many outstanding officers. However, they had the bulk of the army, the armed police and the arsenals. The government, though it was able to quell mutinies in Madrid and Barcelona, relied chiefly on untrained volunteers to do its fighting. Also the government was handicapped by many factors such as indiscipline, shortage of food, poor and old weapons. The nationalists took advantage of these handicaps; they soon gained strength and got the better of the Republic.

By the end of July, 1936, foreign intervention started. Russia took sides with the Republicans, by giving the government financial aid, war materials and volunteers. Italy and Germany supported the nationalists. Britain and France, though they did not actively intervene, showed sympathy for the government. To outsiders, the struggle seemed to be one between the fascists and the Republicans only. The issue was not as simple as that, because the Republicans suffered very much from internal dissensions caused by the varying political aims of the many parties involved.

By the end of the first year of the war, General Franco had seized most of the important cities and demanded the unconditional surrender of the government. The Republicans,

realizing that defeat was inevitable, fled along the main roads to France. At the end of March, 1939, Franco's troops marched into Madrid without resistance. After this, the rest of the Republicans surrendered and the civil war was over.

Homage to Catalonia is divided into two parts. The first part begins with the description of the poor barracks in Barcelona and the trench warfare in various sectors of the front line. The author describes in detail his experiences at the front. To him, the fighting between the nationalists and the government was not the civil war in the real sense. Orwell discovered there was little real fighting at the front. Most volunteers had few chances of killing their enemies; most of the time, they remained in the trench in appalling conditions. They suffered mostly from shortage of clothes, lack of ammunition and poor weather. However, the author expresses his pleasure at being a member of the militia, enjoying equality, albeit in difficult circumstances.

The second part deals with his return on leave to Barcelona and the fighting in the streets between conflicting political parties and trade-unions. Orwell was displeased at the political changes in the city. When he first arrived in Barcelona, he found that the working class was in control of the city; every building had been seized by the workers; revolutionary posters were everywhere and everyone wore rough, working-class clothes. Later, when he returned from the

front, he realized that the former atmosphere had disappeared; the expensive restaurants and hotels were full of rich people, beggars were everywhere, waiting for scraps of food, and revolutionary aspects such as forms of speech and decoration were out of use. Orwell went to the front again, was wounded and taken back from hospital to hospital. Finally, he returned to Barcelona to join his wife. As he used to serve in the P.O.U.M. party which was at the time declared illegal and was subject to suppression, he and his wife fled to France and then to England.

Orwell arrived in Barcelona in December 1936, at first with the idea of writing newspaper articles. By the time his social piece, The Road to Wigan Pier, was published, he had already joined the militia to defend the Spanish Republic. He wrote,

I know there was a war on, but I had no notion what kind of a war. If you had asked me why I had joined the militia I would have answered, 'to fight against fascism', and if you had asked me what I was fighting for I should have answered, 'common' decency'.³⁰

This term, "common decency", has been mentioned from time to time, in connection with Burmese Days, Down and Out in Paris and London, and Keep the Aspidistra Flying. His comments dealing with the topic were later expanded in The Road to Wigan Pier in which he exposed the poor conditions of the coal-miners in the North of England and formed his own ideas of socialism based on justice and liberty, equality

and decent living for the poor. He is, therefore, opposed to all kinds of oppressions or regimes under which all these virtues are denied. When the Civil War broke out in Spain, Orwell, like most people, simply understood that it was the conflict between Fascism and the Republic or Democracy. The intervention by Italy and Germany on the side of General Franco made the purpose of the war very clear. Orwell felt his political commitment strongly and saw that to go to Spain immediately was the only thing he should do. He felt committed in two ways: first of all to take an active part in the war and then to write about his experiences and to give the world a true account of the situation in Spain. His commitment as a soldier was undoubtedly reinforced by the social atmosphere of Barcelona on his first arrival. He wrote,

In outward appearance, it was a town in which the wealthy class had practically ceased to exist. Except for a small number of women and foreigners, there were no 'well-dressed' people at all. Practically, everyone wore rough working-class clothes, or blue overalls, or some variant of the militia uniform. All this was queer and moving.³¹

It seemed to be the only event that impressed Orwell, a man who finds consolation from identifying with the unfortunate people in a poor situation or "the lowest of the low". His sympathy was immediately stimulated by the situation. Consequently, his commitment to crush Fascism was decisive and firmly grounded. He said,

If we could drive Franco and his foreign mercenaries into the sea, it might make an immense improvement in the world situation, even if Spain itself emerged with

a stifling dictatorship and all its best men in jail. For that alone the war would have been worth winning.³²

His political commitment against Fascism was much weakened at the front. The trench warfare consisted of being on duty, remaining in the trench most of the time, facing only dirt, unpleasant smells, mud, lice and shortage of all necessary things. He considered this as the most futile period of his whole life. His ideal was considerably weakened when he saw the real political motive of which he had been previously unaware. He was disillusioned after seeing with his own eyes the struggle between different political elements in Barcelona and his commitment was diverted to an effort to expose by writing the real issues behind the political situation.

In Orwell's view, Franco's revolt was merely a military mutiny aided by the middle class people and the Church. He wrote in the essay, Looking Back on the Spanish Civil War: "The Spanish bourgeoisie saw their chance of crushing the labour movement, and took it, aided by the Nazis and by the forces of reaction all over the world."³³ The Nazis and the Fascists posed as Christian patriots, saving Spain from a Russian dictatorship. Their purpose was announced, presumably in line with their propaganda to the effect that there were a million Russian soldiers on the side of the Spanish government. Orwell explained that Fascism was only another name for capitalism, and the Fascists had sufficient reason to back

Franco and his middle class supporters.

The resistance against Franco came chiefly from the Spanish working classes. As soon as Franco's revolt broke out, all workers were united through trade-unions. Orwell said that the Spanish people rose against Franco, not for the sake of the democratic Republic but for a revolution; a revolution which, they hoped, might lead to a better future for them. This aspect of the working class revolution was distorted by most countries, particularly Britain; most countries concerned were against the revolution because they had invested a great deal of capital in Spain. If the revolution was successful, they would not get any compensation. As far as Russia was concerned, Orwell admitted, that he could not get a clear picture of the Russian policy in this matter. Therefore, the Spanish civil war, to Orwell, was fighting between the middle class and the lower class, in other words, between capitalism and socialism. In Looking Back on the Spanish Civil War, he concluded,

In essence, it was a class war. If it had been won, the cause of the common people everywhere would have been strengthened. It was lost and the dividend drawers all over the world rubbed their hands. That was the real issue; all else was froth on its surface.³³

Orwell also stated that it was not true to say that the internal political conflicts between Government factions were entirely responsible for the Republican's defeat; the Fascists won because they had better arms than the Republicans.

As a man of honesty, Orwell was deeply affected by the distortion of facts in reports on the Spanish civil war. Disillusionment committed him to write about the complexities behind the war and he believed that he saw it in its true perspective. People were given false reports, particularly by newspapers. He wrote, "I saw, in fact, history being written not in terms of what happened, but of what ought to have happened according to various party lines."³⁴ He develops this point in his later book, 1984.

Homage to Catalonia is a frankly written book and in many ways a gay one. It has in places, a note of optimism which shows for the first time Orwell's belief in man, especially the Spanish militia and the Spanish people. Spain left him more faith in the decency of human being. Ten years after Homage to Catalonia, Orwell makes Winston Smith, the hero of 1984 write in his diary: "If there is hope, it lies in the proles". The author shows his pleasure in the company of the Spanish people and the militia. He may describe the poor conditions in the Lenin barracks at Barcelona, the tiresome activities at the front and political dissension on the side of the government but he had some happy memories of the war. What impressed him most was his contact with an Italian militiaman in the barracks:

As we went out, he stepped across the room and gripped my hand very hard. Queer, the affection you can feel for a stranger. It was as though his spirit and mine had momentarily succeeded in bridging the gulf of language and tradition and meeting in utter intimacy.

I hoped he liked me as well as I liked him. 35

Again in his essay, Looking Back on the Spanish Civil War, he mentioned this Italian and composed a poem in his memory; the last stanza runs:

But the thing I saw in you face,
No power can disinherit;
No bomb that ever burst:
Shatters the crystal spirit. 36

He expressed his affection for the Spanish people;

How easy to make friends in Spain! Within a day or two, there was a score of militiamen who called me by my Christian name, showed me the ropes, and overwhelmed me with hospitality... And beyond this there is generosity in a deeper sense, a real largeness of spirit which I have met with again and again in the most unpromising circumstances. 37

The trench warfare on the front was not savage as he had expected. There was not much firing; most operations consisted of being on duty and keeping oneself in the trench. George Kopp, a close friend of Orwell at the front said that it was not a war, it was a comic opera with an occasional death. There was the complete lack of war materials of every kind. Most weapons were out of date and dangerous to the users. For instance, the hand grenades were 'impartial; they killed the man they were thrown at and the man who threw them'. Volunteers were mostly wounded by their own weapons; the reason for this was partly the poor weapons, partly their carelessness and ignorance. Sometimes, they fired at one another by mistake. Once Orwell was nearly shot by his friends.

There was no hope for real fighting at all. He wrote,

In nearly three weeks, I had fired just three shots at the enemy. They say it takes a thousand bullets to kill a man, and at this rate it would be twenty years before I killed my first Fascist.³⁸

The Fascist and the Spanish militia, in the long period of inactivity, used megaphones in place of rifles. There was a great deal of shouting of political slogans from trench to trench. Often, the Spanish militia would try to tempt the Fascists to surrender by shouting that they were fed better than the Fascists. On one occasion, their 'bait' was, "We're sitting down to buttered toast over here! Lovely slices of buttered toast!"³⁹ What impressed Orwell most of all was the sense of equality in the Spanish militia. Equality is one important element in his political belief. It was the first time in his life that he had had a good chance to enjoy equality. In London, Paris and in Upper Burma, he enjoyed nothing; what he experienced were political oppression, social injustice and poverty. Spain was the only place where he could breathe freely and happily. He wrote,

Up here in Aragon, one was among tens of thousands of people, mainly though not entirely of working class origin, all living at the same level and mingling on terms of equality. In theory, it was perfect equality, and even in practice, it was not far from it... For the Spanish militia, while they lasted, were a sort of microcosm of a classless society.⁴⁰

In Homage to Catalonia, his commitment to tell the truth is clear; he tries to give an objective account of what happened. It was difficult to be objective in the face of

the unrest and fighting. One could not describe all things without making some mistakes. He wrote,

And I hope the account I have given is not too misleading. I believe that on such an issue as this no one is or can be completely truthful. It is difficult to be certain about anything except what you have seen with your own eyes, and consciously or unconsciously everyone writes as a partisan.⁴¹

CHAPTER II



ANIMAL FARM

Orwell's experience in the Spanish Civil war had disillusioned him about the motives of the Communists in Barcelona. The Russian intervention in this war caused him to consider Russian political doctrines as a threat to the world. It was clear that the Russian government was the one form of totalitarianism which he hated and feared most. The methods used by the Communist P.S.U.C. party⁴² against other parties in Barcelona made him understand what was really happening in the Russia trials and purges. The Nazi-Soviet Pact of non-aggression before the outbreak of the Second World War served to confirm him in his belief that there was only one enemy: totalitarianism. When Russia was invaded by Germany and became Britain's ally, Orwell was not interested in that event. Popular opinion between 1934-1944 obviously favoured Russia; no criticism was made of her political doctrine and methods. The Allied countries were glad of Russian support. While everyone around Orwell was praising Russian participation, he did not forget the political conflict within the Communist elements in Spain and the political persecution launched by the P.S.U.C. party. Consequently, his motive in writing Animal Farm was to expose the evils of Russian

political practices or 'tactics'. He could not bear to see people being cheated and blinded by Russian double talk. He wrote in the essay, Second Thoughts on James Durnham,

In each great revolutionary struggle, the masses are led on the vague dreams of human brotherhood and then - when the new ruling class is well established in power, they are thrust back into servitude.⁴³

This is the main theme of Animal Farm. Orwell wanted the people to be aware that world domination was the greatest Communist threat. The threat was not less when the Communist movement in Western Europe beginning first as a movement for the violent overthrow of capitalism, degenerated within a few years as an instrument of Russian foreign policy. He prophesied that Communism would be a greater menace than Fascism after the Second World War. Therefore, he began writing this book to warn the people against the naive assumption that Russia, far from being a potential enemy, was our war ally. In fact, public opinion at the time was so pro-Russia that no publisher would accept his work. Later, when more people understood the Russian threat to international peace, his work was a big success and became a best-seller. Again, his motive was made clear in his essay, Why I Write: "Every line of serious work that I have written since 1936 has been written, directly or indirectly against totalitarianism" ⁴⁴ and Animal Farm was the first book in which I tried, with consciousness of what I was doing, to fuse political purpose and artistic purpose into one whole."⁴⁵

Throughout the 19th century, while liberalism and capitalism were still flourishing in most European countries, Russia remained a politically backward and economically retarded state. Russia was a monarchy, but was weakened more and more by unsolved problems: the land reform and the minority group, the Slavic people in Russia. After 1860, the demand for land and constitutional reform was clear and grew increasingly. With the beginning of industrial development, working class parties came into being. These parties came into conflict with one another; the well known split was between the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks led by Lenin.

The war with Japan in 1904 made the internal situation much worse. Czar Nicholas II, seeing the approaching uprising, tried to save the country by forming an Imperial Duma or representative assembly. His effort did not bear any fruit. During this time, an organization of Soviets was established; Soviets were the representative councils among town workers, peasants, and soldiers. In 1917, three years after the outbreak of the First World War, there was the general strike in Petrograd. The Soviets started to play their roles and revolts spread throughout the country, resulting in the abdication of Czar Nicholas II, bringing an end to the Romanov Dynasty. The later governments could not cope with the worsening situation, then gave way to a Soviet Government with Lenin as the leader. At that time, a great economic change took place in Russia. Under provisions of the Soviet Constitution of 1918, the entire land was confiscated from all owners and declared state property. The state was in control of all industrial

and private business. Between 1918 and 1921, Russia suffered a great deal from civil war, economic blockade and military intervention by some European countries. In addition, the fact that Russia was still an agricultural country with little basic industry made the political aim towards state socialism difficult to realize. Therefore the New Economic Policy introduced by Lenin was put into practice in 1921; it was a partial return to Capitalism by permitting free internal trade, offering encouragement to foreign capitalists and recognizing the right of private property. Unfortunately, this economic policy caused a sharp struggle within the Communist party itself. The opposition led by Trotsky who urged the suppression of capitalism did not agree with the majority in the party; the party showed some degree of compromise towards the capitalist elements in the country, especially the rich land owners. Trotsky was defeated and sent into exile; it was assumed that his exile was due to efforts made by Stalin who was then powerful in the party.

In 1924 Lenin died and was succeeded by Stalin whose power was confirmed by his political purges and trials. Trotsky was later murdered in Mexico. Until his end in Mexico, Trotsky conducted a world-wide campaign of opposition to the contemporary Soviet Regime, accusing its leaders of having 'betrayed the revolution' and having turned aside from the principles of Marxism. The chief dispute between Stalin and Trotsky was

that Stalin was interested in reconstruction at home first whereas Trotsky wanted immediate world revolution. Between 1928 and 1941, Russia played an important part in international relations; Russia collaborated with Germany and was opposed to Great Britain and France. When Hitler and Mussolini came to power, Russia felt that she could no longer trust Fascist countries. There was a pact of non-aggression in 1939 between Stalin and Hitler. When the Second World War broke out, Russia took sides with the allied troops and became one of the victorious powers. From 1945 on, the true nature of Stalin's brand of totalitarianism began to reveal itself and the former popular support for the USSR began to disintegrate in Western Europe; the reading public was ready for "Animal Farm".

Mr. Jones was the owner of Manor Farm; he had many kinds of animals: horses, goats, donkeys, pigs, dogs and others. The animals were not pleased with the way their owner treated them. They considered human beings as oppressors so they drove Mr. Jones and his family off the farm. The animals reorganized the Farm and named it, "Animal Farm." In the original plan, the system of working and living were based on the principle "All animals are equal". However, there was a change; the pigs, led by Napoleon and Snowball, became the heads of the farm, organizing the system of work and issuing instructions, to the other animals. Mr. Jones and his party attacked Animal Farm but they failed to take possession; the ownership of the farm

by the animals was secure. Later on, Snowball was exiled because he disagreed with Napoleon on the issue of building a windmill. Soon, Napoleon came to absolute power, protected by faithful dogs. From time to time, he changed the policy at will. At the same time, he accused Snowball of being a traitor, the cause of all troubles and loss on the farm. Many times, the animals were suspicious of Napoleon's activities. However, because of their fear of being killed and because they were ignorant, they outwardly believed everything he said.

The windmill was finished but unfortunately it was destroyed by another farmer. Napoleon ordered the animals to work on the windmill until it was rebuilt. After many years, Napoleon was still the leader and there was peace on the farm. Since the young animals were not aware of the past they conformed to every principle issued by the leader. Eventually, Napoleon formed a close connection, for his own ends, with humans from a neighbouring farm; he called the farm, "Manor Farm" again.

Fable or animal tales are short narratives in prose or verse written to give a moral or constructive lesson. The ruling convention of the fable is that all characters in the story are animals. Animals have one great advantage for the moralist; they can, by their special nature, represent human beings. The animals still behave according to their natures but they are also seen to behave just like human beings who have similar

characteristics. A fox in its nature represents a cunning man, a rabbit, an innocent boy and a pig a wretched fellow.

Animal Farm is written in this convention with a didactic purpose. It suits Orwell well to write this story in the tradition of animal tales; the atmosphere of his day did not discourage him to write any political moral against Russian political methods overtly. A story, gay and droll in the convention of animal stories, was chosen deliberately as the most appealing form in attacking the soviet systems.

Animal Farm is a bitter attack on the Communist Revolution in Russia and on its betrayal by Stalin. Although it is superficially a story about animals, we know that it is in fact, about people. When we see pigs training dogs to guard them instead of bite them and when we see the pigs drinking beer and playing cards with the local farmers, we know that we are seeing an animated cartoon, in which human beings are presented in physical disguise as lower animals.

The opening chapter of the book is a satire on Marxist principles.⁴⁶ The description of the white boar, Old Major, "a majestic-looking pig with a wise and benevolent appearance in spite of the fact that his tusks had never been cut,"⁴⁷ suggests Lenin himself. Lenin was a faithful disciple of Marxism; he devoted much of his life to the study of this political belief, and was widely known for his strict interpretation of Marxist ideology. Therefore everything Old Major

says to the animals before his death is in line with Marxist principles. First of all, the boar pronounces on the difficult life of the animals; "the life of an animal is misery and slavery".⁴⁸ This is identical with Marxist idea that the working class suffers from its poor situation in society. Then the boar turns to the theory of Surplus Value, based on the assumption that the capitalists get more from a piece work done by a worker than the worker himself; the worker has only a small share, not in proportion to the labour he has expended. Substantial profit goes to the capitalists and a minimum to the workers—merely to keep them alive. In Marxism, the workers are the real producers, not the capitalists. Old Major says;

Man is the only creature that consumes without producing. He does not give milk, he does not lay eggs; he is too weak to pull the plough, he cannot run fast enough to catch rabbits. Yet he is lord of all animals. He sets them to work, he gives back to them the bare minimum that will prevent them from starving, and the rest he keeps for himself.⁴⁹

One leading point in Marxism concerns class structure within a society; the ruling class or the capitalists always rules the working class and the state is the instrument of the capitalists. Old Major says, "Man serves the interest of no creature except himself... All men are enemies. All animals are comrades."⁵⁰ Marxism is a revolutionary socialism; the conflict between capitalism and the working class or "proletarians" will disappear only through the revolution by the workers. Therefore the ultimate aim or Communism is the overthrow of capitalism

all over the world, after that there will be one, classless society. Major adds, "What then must we do? Why, work night and day, body and soul, for the overthrow of the human race. This is my message to your comrades: Rebellion!"⁵¹

All the animals on Manor Farm plot a revolt against Mr. Jones in the same way that the Bolsheviks in Russia did against the provisional government after the abdication of Czar Nicholas II. The animals succeed in their attempts and take over the farm. At the beginning, all the animals hold fast to their principles; there seems to be complete equality among them. With the pigs doing the brain work, they formulate their own doctrine, 'Animalism' with Seven Commandments which read:

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 bed.
5. No animal shall drink alcohol.
6. No animal shall kill any other animal.
7. All animals are equal.⁵²

Such was the situation in Russia when the Bolsheviks seized power from the old government in 1917. The slogan, 'All power to the workers' soviets,' and the slogans, 'Land,' 'Bread,' and 'Peace' gave the Bolsheviks the support of peasants and soldiers. The animals design their own flag in a green colour with a picture of a hoof and a horn; the approximation to the hammer and sickle emblem of the Soviet flag is obvious.

It is clear from the start that the pigs have more intelligence and initiative than the other animals and that before long they will begin to exploit their superiority. Soon two of the cleverest pigs, Napoleon and Snowball take charge; these two pigs stand for Stalin and Trotsky. Napoleon is not 'much of a talker' but has 'a reputation for getting his own way.' His personality is identical with that of Stalin whose determination and drive was more impressive than his intelligence. Snowball is "quicker in speech and more inventive, but was not considered to have the same depth of character."

Snowball was more intelligent than Napoleon; he organized many committees; the Egg Production Committee for the hens, The Clean Tails League for the cows, and the Wild Comrades' Re-education Committee. Napoleon is not interested in the activities by Snowball, but secretly trains the young dogs to be his personal bodyguard. This corresponds to what happened in Russia during and after the revolution of November 1917 by the Bolshevik Party; Stalin's role was not so prominent as that of Trotsky, the founder of the Red Army. Though Stalin was not so active in organizing the affairs of the country, yet he was powerful enough and on equal terms with Trotsky; his immense power was derived from his position as general secretary of the Communist Party through which state policy was formulated.

The main conflict between Snowball and Napoleon concerns the windmill. Snowball considers the windmill as the

most important project in the interest of the animals; it will save a lot of animal labour in agriculture. Napoleon argues that, "the great need of the moment was to increase food production and that if they wasted time on the windmill, they would starve to death."⁵³ Finally, Napoleon is successful in expelling Snowball from the farm just as Stalin was successful in exiling Trotsky; this is done with the help of Napoleon's trained dogs. Then Napoleon takes control of the whole farm. The conflict between these two pigs could be compared with that between Stalin and Trotsky. The most well-known split is on the issue of the nature and scope of socialism to be applied. Stalin expounded the theory of socialism in one country, advocating the self-sufficiency of the Russian Revolution. Trotsky was interested in the plan for immediate world revolution and denounced Stalin's policy as a departure from Leninist internationalism. In 1925, Trotsky was defeated and sent into exile.

The animals are all upset by the fall of Snowball. Napoleon's spokesman, Squealer, a brilliant propagandist, works hard to make them less conscious of what has happened. Squealer's answer to "He fought bravely at the Battle of the Cowshed", is

Bravery is not enough. Loyalty and obedience are more important. And as to the Battle of the Cowshed, I believe the time will come when we shall find that Snowball's part in it was much exaggerated. Discipline, comrades, iron discipline! That is the watchword for today.⁵⁴

Discipline is important to totalitarianism. It keeps the people united and obedient to whatever the leader of the state says or implies. Through discipline, all the animals believe everything Squealer says. Distortion of fact increasing in the projecting of Napoleon as a leader who initiates all plans for the benefit of the farm. The windmill, it turns out, was really Napoleon's own idea and Snowball had stolen the plan from among Napoleon's papers. Napoleon continues to accuse Snowball of his subversive activities. When the windmill falls down at the first puff of wind, Napoleon himself comes forth and snuffs around; "Comrades" he says quietly, "Do you know who is responsible for this? Do you know the enemy who has come in the night and overthrown our windmill? Snowball!"⁵⁵ His subsequent accusations are successful; all animals finally believe that Snowball is a traitor to the farm. Furthermore, Napoleon's complete domination is confirmed by his ruthless execution of the animals who openly disagree with his proposals.

Eventually, the animals' doubt about the activities of Snowball die down. They all believe in Squealer's statement that Snowball is a traitor. However, they are surprised again at the changing situation on the farm. Before Snowball is expelled, there seems to be equality among them. When Napoleon becomes the leader, the situation changes. Napoleon claims that since pigs are the brain workers, they are entitled to some special rights such as drinking milk, taking a rest

in the farmhouse, issuing orders of execution, making policies to engage in trade with other farmers, in the neighbourhood. All these acts are against the commandments written immediately after the revolution. The animals are astonished when they see that the wording of the Seven Commandments inscribed on the wall has been altered. For instance, the Sixth Commandment formerly reads, "6. No animal shall kill any other animal."

Now, Napoleon has Squealer add the phrase 'without cause'. This is done to justify Napoleon's order of execution of some animals on charge of treason and conspiracy. In the end, the Seventh Commandment which sums up all the others is adjusted to suit the post-revolutionary situation: it reads, "All animals are equal but some are more equal than others."

The animals are surprised at these changes but cannot raise any question in front of Napoleon for fear of being killed by his fierce dogs. More and more, Napoleon poses himself as a tyrant. The old song, 'Beasts of England', formerly sung in praise of them all, is now prohibited and a poem, 'Comrade Napoleon' is substituted and inscribed on the wall.

This satirizes the changes in Russia after Stalin became an absolute ruler. Stalin's chief characteristics were his shrewd and ruthless methods of retaining power by mass trial and executions. After defeating Trotsky, he

expelled Trotsky's followers and all opposition leaders. In the great purge, after the introduction of the Constitution in 1936, he staged the great purge trial in which most of the old Bolsheviks and some military leaders were charged with treason, terrorism and espionage. They were brought to 'confess' guilt in the same manner that the animals in Animal Farm confess their guilt in front of Napoleon.

Stalin was also noted for his sudden twists in domestic and foreign policy. Stalin preferred building socialism at home to the world revolution announced by the Marxists. Communism in the day of Lenin was sharply against the rich people. Stalin did not at first show open antagonism towards the Kulaks (well-to-do farmers) in Russia. He showed it only after he had expelled most of his political rivals. He also denied freedom of expression in the Party as requested by the old Bolsheviks and transformed the Party into a 'monolithic' or indivisible body. In foreign affairs, he pursued the policy of not getting involved in any war with democratic countries or with fascist countries. First, before the outbreak of the Second World War, he maintained relations with Hitler. Later when the war broke out, he sided with Britain and the United States. Most of the time, his great concern was to maintain good relations with the western powers. The purpose of Russian participation in any war in the time of Stalin was to protect Russia's interest and not to incite revolution. This helped to make it easier for Stalin to form

alliances with Western powers.

Squealer is the modern propagandist who could explain everything raised by the animals and his explanations are always accepted without further questions. He is a familiar type with, "a very round cheeks, twinkling eyes, nimble movements, and a shrill voice."⁵⁶ He is a brilliant talker, and when he is arguing some difficult point, he skips from side to side and moves his tail in a persuasive way. The others say of Squealer that "he can turn black into white." He is the mouthpiece of the pigs, the new class who find their way into power by the methods Orwell explains in an essay, Second Thoughts on James Burnham:

All talks about democracy, liberty, equality, fraternity, all revolutionary movements, all visions of Utopia or 'the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth' are humbug (not necessarily conscious humbug) covering the ambition of some new class on the way to power.⁵⁷

Squealer is important to Napoleon as a propaganda machine is to any form of totalitarian regimes. Propaganda campaigns were well known in the time of Nazism and Fascism; their integral function was to select and twist the truth for political ends, to keep people in unity and ignorance and preserve their complete faith in the state and its leaders. Squealer probably represents Pravda, the political newspaper of the Soviet government of which Stalin used to be the editor. There was no doubt that this newspaper contributed much to Stalin's succession to Lenin's position in 1924.

At the end of the book, Orwell gives us a picture of the animals at the last stage under Napoleon's control. Napoleon could not run this farm according to the old Seven Commandments. It is impossible for all animals to live in isolation. Napoleon then decides,

Upon a new policy. From now onwards, Animal Farm would engage in trade with the neighbouring farms; not, of course, for any commercial purpose, but simply in order to obtain certain materials which were urgently necessary. 58

In this connection, Orwell ridicules the Communist principles as being unpractical and ridicules the Russian leaders for claiming not to be as weak as other men. Napoleon is subject to personal desires and mistakes; he wants distinction, pleasure and power over the others. In short, he wants to be like the farmers or the capitalists whom he and his followers officially condemn and hate most. In a description of Napoleon and his pigs walking on their hind legs, Orwell makes his point; "the creature outside looked from pig to man and from man to pigs and from pig to man again; but alerady it was impossible to say which was which."⁵⁹

In Animal Farm Orwell seems to have found the ideal form for his message to the public. He had considerable success with the autobiographical approach and very little success in his attempts at fiction. Even 1984, perhaps, his most famous work has notable weaknesses as a novel. When he came to write about the Russian revolution and the Soviet

governments which followed, he was of course unable to rely on immediate personal experience. Had he decided to write a conventional novel, he would certainly have fallen prey to the limitations which hamper his other fictional efforts. In retrospect, the idea of using the fable as a literary form was a stroke of genius for his treatment of it is nothing short of brilliant.

The fable is naturally suitable for writers with a message. In a fable, the moral comes before the story. If the moral is deeply and sincerely felt, as Orwell's was, and if the writer is as talented as Orwell, the fable cannot fail. The style of the fable is necessarily direct and without embellishment, straightforward and honest. Orwell's style was eminently suited to this kind of writing and his reputation as a writer will stand forever on the strength of Animal Farm. Because he was a gifted writer any way, Orwell's work is always worth reading. Yet the strength of his commitment, the need to teach people rather than 'create' for them, involved him in a long and often fruitless search for a form which would not allow him to give too much emphasis to his message at the expense of other aspects. It is not fair to suggest that Orwell had no right to attempt writing novels or that he was simply using the novel as a platform without any respect to its fictional rules. It is fair however, to argue that he never realized his limitations or, at least, refused to accept them. Animal Farm proves that he could

have been an even greater literary figure than he was. Had it been written in another form, his book would have suffered seriously, much worse than his former work, since his tension over political evil reached a high-water mark at the time of writing this fable.

CHAPTER III

1 9 8 4



In an essay, The Prevention of Literature, Orwell wrote,

Any writer or journalist who wants to retain his integrity finds himself thwarted by the general drift of society rather than by active persecution... Everything in our age conspires to turn the writer, and every other kind of artist as well, into a minor official, working on themes handed to him from above and never telling what seems to him the whole of the truth.⁶⁰

After the publication of Homage to Catalonia, Animal Farm and several essays about totalitarianism, it is clearly seen that Orwell's political commitment had grown stronger. His marked independence in politics can be noted from political conviction against the public opinion of the day. In Homage to Catalonia, his understanding of the motive behind the Civil War differed from those expressed by the public. In Animal Farm, he satirized Russian ideology while the people were overwhelmed by Russian participation in the Second World War. His commitment, therefore, is based on his sincere effort to tell what he thinks the basic truth about politics. He was not influenced by public opinion or superficial circumstances. He is extremely sure of his insight into politics and accuses other writers of being influenced by "the general drift of society". He experienced deliberately inaccurate reporting by the English press of the Spanish Civil War.

However, false reports and lies in democratic countries are not so bad as those in totalitarian states. Lying, as he expressed in the same essay, is of extreme importance to totalitarian systems; it is an integral part of the regime. The absence of concentration camps and secret police does not necessarily mean that there will not be lies. He became dedicated to the task of writing a condemnation of the distortion of fact as practised by totalitarian regimes. His commitment is fulfilled in 1984, the vision of a world completely distorted by lying.

After the publication and success of Animal Farm in 1945, Orwell saw that he could no longer take a rest; his health was deteriorating quickly. At the end of the Second World War, the world rejoiced at the victory by the Allied powers; there was an international effort to seek ways and means of establishing an international body which would work out its obligation to maintain peace and order in a much more efficient manner than that the League of Nations had done. Yet, Orwell was not interested in these international drives. Instead, he was afraid of the new threat to world peace and this new threat he had just demonstrated in Animal Farm. This is focused on the evils of the Communist regime in the time of Stalin and the possibility that this regime would spread throughout the world. In other words, Nazism and Fascism had disappeared, but Communism had taken their place and on firmer ground. His fear seemed to contradict the peaceful atmosphere

of the time. Immediately after the war was over, Russia paraded as a peace-loving nation and her Marxist doctrine was still restricted to her own country. Furthermore, she collaborated with other powers in establishing the United Nations; in the United Nations Charter drafted at the San Francisco Conference in 1945, a seemingly grand political relationship was formed; all big powers seemed to enjoy 'The Grand Alliance' as exhibited in the composition of the Security Council, the most important section of the organization. Five big powers: The United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France and China became permanent members of the Council. With these five powers seated in this organization, it was expected then that permanent peace would be achieved. For Orwell, the situation of the day did not leave any room for hope. His time spent in various lands and cities in the midst of suffering and social differences had made a great impact on his political thinking; he considered imperialism in Burma oppressive, he looked on British socialism as crude material progress in place of decency, justice and liberty, he considered the revolution by the worker in Barcelona, a political move in Marxism rejected by the Communist party there. This aggravated his lack of confidence in the political system and ideology practised and preached by political leaders. With these preoccupations added to his personal unhappiness at the end of his life, there came a strong conviction to him that the world of the future would not be so bright as the public

expected. In his vision, if humanity proved unable to change its present course, the world would turn out to be much more sullen and gloomy than ever. His expression of the future world is not wholly imaginary; in fact his vision is based on the contemporary situation described in his essay: Inside the Whale.

We live in a shrinking world. The 'democratic vistas' have ended in barbed wire. There is less feeling of creation and growth, less and less emphasis on the cradle, endlessly rocking, more emphasis on the tea pot endlessly stewing. To accept civilization as it is practically means accepting decay. It has ceased to be a strenuous attitude and become a passive attitude-even 'decadent', if that word means anything.⁶¹

On this view of this situation, his fear for the future is based. He feared that with the fall of democracy in the capitalist countries the world would be crushed by totalitarianism, with one party exercising absolute power, a tyranny more oppressive than any known before. Totalitarianism aims at destroying freedom of thought and of speech and depends on the fabrication of records and facts to bring them into line with the party policy, a practice Orwell first became aware of in Spain.

There is in 1984, not only a change in the scope of commitment but also a change in his attitude. In the former works, Orwell posed as a writer, a novelist, a satirist and an essayist. In 1984 he posed as a prophet, a saint whose mission is to save humanity with his own personal gospel, a warning of immediate danger.

In our day, 1984 is considered one of the most striking and famous visions of the future. It was published in 1949. It is the story of an English man, Winston Smith who lives in the late twentieth century when the world is divided into three superstates: Oceania, Eurasia and Eastasia. Britain is a province of Oceania called Air-Strip One. It appears that the three superstates are, for most of the time, at war. From time to time, to avoid gaining advantage on one another, they maintain a temporary peace. Oceania, comprising the Americas, the Atlantic islands including the British Isles, Australasia and the southern portion of Africa, is ruled by a single totalitarian party of which the methods of controlling the people are ruthless and brutal. Because of the Party's war policy, Britain has become an impoverished and hopeless land ruled by a group of people who are anxious to retain their power as long as possible. Winston, who works in the Ministry of Truth, responsible for keeping records in conformity with the Party's line, is watched by secret agents of the state, because of his emotional independence and intelligence. He seeks a love affair with Julia, a girl member of the Party. Finally he is caught in the act of treason, tortured and brain-washed into giving up all his former beliefs. The love between Winston and Julia is completely destroyed by the Party's thorough techniques. After his torture, Winston becomes insane, accepting everything said by his leader, Big Brother. In the end he is shot.

Orwell's 1984 has two aspects. The first is an expression of the writer's forecast; his pessimistic view of future political trends and a state ruled by absolute power. The book is also a warning; a warning to all human beings that if they do not seek preventive measures in time, they might fall victims to the evils of totalitarianism under which they would be reduced to such state that they would lose all human qualities.

The description of an ideal society has been present in the literature of the west since the day of Greece and Roman. In The Republic of Plato, we find a perfect society conceived on the principle of justice and virtue, with a philosopher as the head of the state.

The hope for a better future for mankind was prevalent in the eighteenth and nineteenth century and remained unchanged till after the First and Second World Wars. Events after the two World Wars extremely weakened public faith in a better future. The political regimes in Germany, Italy and Russia, the economic crisis affecting all nations, the tremendous casualties after each of the World Wars and political unrest everywhere left nothing but unhappy memories which still linger today. In this connection, it was not surprising in postwar Europe to find the theme of hopelessness appearing in the works of many authors, Orwell is not alone. There are other two writers, the Russian Zamyatin in his book We, and Aldous

Huxley in his Brave New World whose description of the future are similar to Orwell's. As their description of the future world are quite in contrast to the utopian thoughts, their expression can be called 'negative utopias'.⁶² The early utopias show that human beings can seek a better society with their advance in technology and science, whereas the negative utopias express human hopelessness and despair in face of their progress.

Orwell describes the international scenes in the middle of the twentieth century as follows; the world is split into three super-states: Eurasia is the whole part in the north of the European and Asiatic region from Portugal to the Bering Straits; Oceania comprises the Americas, the Atlantic islands with the British Isles, Australasia and the Southern portion of Africa; Eastasia, is China and the countries to the south of China, also the Japanese Islands and some areas of Manchuria, Mongolia and Tibet. These superstates have totalitarian regimes which are essentially the same, though with different names. In Oceania, the regime is called Ingsoc or English Socialism. In Eurasia, it is called Neo-Bolshevism and in Eastasia, it is called Obliteration of the Self.

War among these three superstates is still present but with difference in aims and limitation in scope. In the preceding centuries, the aim of the war was the defeat of the enemy, with heavy loss in human life and wide material devastation. The conventional causes were due to the conflict in

economic interest and political ideology between the states. Since the three superstates enjoy self-sufficiency because of vast rich territory under their sovereignty, a strong natural defense system and the same kind of political beliefs, there is no point in their waging a decisive war as previously. The nature of the war is explained in the book; "it is a warfare of limited aims between combatants who are unable to destroy one another, have no material cause for fighting, and are not divided by any genuine ideological difference."⁶³ The scope of the present war is also limited; fighting always takes place on the remote frontiers of each state; nobody knows definitely where they are.

The limited aims in modern warfare are clearly explained in the significance of the war to the existence of a totalitarian state in 1984. War was formerly an instrument in foreign policy-making but now it is an important condition of permanent power in a totalitarian society; its scope is national rather than international. Though there is no serious war between the states, it does not mean that there is temporary peace in each state. Internal peace in view of the political party in 1984 is destructive to totalitarianism. Generally, if there is peace, the condition of the people should be much developed by the role of the machine in the industrial age. With the help of technological progress and participation by the so-called welfare states, there would be less hunger,

overwork, illiteracy and poverty. These developments are unpleasant in the eyes of the totalitarian states because they would in turn lead to the downfall of a hierarchical or class society. Orwell wrote;

For if leisure and security were enjoyed by all alike, the great mass of human beings who are normally stupefied by poverty would become literate and would learn to think for themselves; and when once they had done this, they would sooner or later realize that the privileged minority had no function, and they would sweep it away. In the long run, a hierarchical society was only possible on the basis of poverty and ignorance.⁶⁴

In order to keep the masses ignorant, busy and hard-working and deprived of leisure time, a state of continuous warfare must be maintained. First of all, arms production must go on, no matter whether the weapons shall be used or not. Arms production can consume a large portion of human labour which, if spent in productive activities, would be very helpful in the raising of the general standard of living. As most human labour is expended in this useless business, scarcities of necessary things for living will ever be maintained. As human labour is largely deployed in arms production, the problem of the surplus of consumption goods raised in the former industrial societies will never exist. As a result, people will be as poor as they were; the whole attention of the public will be inevitably directed to their daily needs and there is no room in their thoughts for political interest. Under such circumstances, people are miserable, poor and foolish. However, their deplorable state is desirable

for the party; it is the strength of the party control.

The state of war is also important to the morale of the party members; it keeps them active in their given assignment and adapting themselves to the war atmosphere. To have the state of the war real and convincing, propaganda campaigns have to be carried out constantly, dealing with battles which never really take place. While the masses and the outer party are possessed with war hysteria, hatred of the enemy and the dream of their final victory, they will feel content to hand over all power to the ruling group, to run the country in the time of crisis. Here, Orwell explains the concept to the war,

The war is waged by each ruling group against its own subject, and the object of the war is not to make or prevent conquest of territory but to keep the structure of society intact.⁶⁵

With the state of war in the country, power of the ruling group is firm and this is an explanation of the party slogan "War is Peace".

Orwell's concept of the structure of a totalitarian society in 1984 is brilliantly explained in the extract from The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism by Emmanuel Goldstein. The name of the author, Goldstein, suggests the Trotsky of Russia and the Snowball of Animal Farm.⁶⁶ The political theory of social change in human society before the establishment of a well-arranged totalitarian state in

1984 is written in imitation of the class struggle in Marxism.

Goldstein begins with a brief outline of the structure of human society. In the past, people have been grouped into three kinds, "the High, the Middle, and the Low". Each of the three groups has its own aim in life, the aim of the High is to stay on top, of the Middle to replace the High, and of the Low he writes;

When they have an aim—for it is an abiding characteristic of the Low that they are too much crushed by drudgery to be more than intermittently conscious of anything outside their daily lives—is to abolish all distinctions and create a society in which all men shall be equal. 67

At the apex of the power pyramid is Big Brother. Big Brother is infallible and all powerful. Every success, every achievement, every victory, every scientific discovery, all knowledge, all wisdom, all happiness, all virtue, are held to issue directly from his leadership and inspiration. The place of Big Brother and his great mind in the structure, can therefore be compared with those of Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin. However, Big Brother is somewhat imaginary because nobody has ever seen him. He is seen only on picture, posters everywhere and his voice is heard only on the telescreen. He is for political purpose, considered as a focusing point for love, reverence and fear from which complete obedience and unbreakable unity shall materialize.

Under Big Brother comes the Inner Party of which the

number is limited to six millions or nearly two per cent of the population. Below the Inner Party comes the Outer Party; its number is not determined definitely. The part played by the Inner Party is more important than that by the Outer Party; the Inner Party serves as the brain of the state whereas the Outer Party as the hands. Admission to membership of each Party is possible through examination, without any racial discrimination. Between the two parties, there is a certain exchange process. The weak member of the Inner Party is excluded and replaced by the intelligent member from the Outer Party. Members of each Party are constantly watched by the secret police. There is no question as to their having individual opinions or personal emotions because all the members have been educated within the Party line while they are young. They are moulded, "to live in a continuous frenzy of hatred of foreign enemies and internal traitors, triumph over victories and self-abasement before the power and wisdom of the Party."⁶⁸

Below the Outer Party come the masses, at the base of the pyramid; the masses or 'the proles', or in the traditional classification 'the Low' number approximately eighty five per cent of the population. This sheer weight of numbers is unimportant to and overlooked by the ruling group. If there is any clever person among them, he must be eliminated by the Thought Police. The insignificance of the Low is described by Goldstein:

From the proletarians, nothing is to be feared. Left to themselves, they will continue from generation to generation and from century to century, working, breeding, and dying, not only without any impulse to rebel, but without the power of grasping that the world could be other than it is. They could only become dangerous if the advance of industrial technique made it necessary to educate them more highly; but, since military and commercial rivalry are no longer important, the level of popular education is actually declining. What opinion the masses hold, or do not hold, is looked on as a matter of indifference.⁶⁹

The aim of the party is absolute power. Power, in international politics, was, is and will be sought by all nations with the conviction that by power they can maintain sovereignty; the right of conservation will be materialized only when each nation is potential in military strength. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in European history, the Balance of Power was held by many countries as the only possible way to keep peace. In the period of colonialization, power was extremely essential for imperialist countries in their exploitation, as in Asia and Africa. In the time of 1984 it is evident that power as originally understood, nearly loses its conventional meaning. The world in Orwell's vision has only three super states and there is no necessity for them to get involved in a big war. There is no political conflict, nor economic disagreement. Each super-state possesses a large area and as a consequence, each can be self-sufficient. While power is less significant in international relations, it is more so inside each state under a totalitarian regime. Power is important to the existence of the

regime; it enables the ruling group to be in its position as it wants to.

Power in the totalitarian state is defined by O'Brien as follows:

The first thing you must realize is that power is collective... the second thing for you to realize is that power is power over human beings. Over the body but, above all, over the mind. Power over matter—external reality, as you would call it—is not important. Already our control over matter is absolute.⁷⁰

Power as defined in the above context obviously denotes the control of the party or the state for the purpose of influencing the behaviour of the individual both physically and mentally. The relationship between the Party, the governor and the masses, the governed, is entirely one-sided. Experience from past governments shows that the power relationship in a state is hardly unilateral; it is a reciprocal relationship. That is to say the ruler affects the ruled as much as he is by the ruled. Harold D. Laswell, an American political scientist, says, "Power is an inter personal situation; those who hold power are empowered. They depend upon and continue only so long as there is a continuing stream of empowering response."⁷¹

Consequently the power described in 1984 is absolute, for it does not depend on common consent, nor does it come from 'the general will' of the masses. It is centralized because power lies in the head of the state and it is exercised

by the Party only. Also the motive of the party to gain power differs from the normal one. Usually, power is not an end; it is acquired merely as a means for further ends such as social changes, or internal peace or military preponderance in international relations. In 1984, the real motive of seeking power is explained by O'Brien;

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. 72

Power is integral to totalitarianism as much as life is to a living thing. Absolute power, the totalitarian concept as made known in 1984, is not power over things but over man. Man, therefore, is of primary concern to the state. To have the absolute power that lasts, the Party has to see to it that there is an effective change in the human mind within the given surroundings. Man must be changed by certain means: espionage, betrayal, arrests, tortures and executions, disappearances or 'vaporization'. The condition in the country must be "a world of fear and treachery and torment, a world of trampling and being trampled upon, a world which will grow not less but more merciless as it refines itself."⁷³ and,

In our world there will be no emotions except fear, rage, triumph and self-abasement. Everything else we shall destroy... there will be no loyalty, except the loyalty towards the Party. There will be no love, except the love of Big Brother.⁷⁴

Only within these circumstances, the existence of

absolute power will be ensured forever.

From its knowledge of history, the Party knows that in the past, there was no government which could be in power permanently; part of the reason for this is that after the seizure of power, the ruling groups were not interested in retaining their power; they were spoiled by privileges and comforts that power brought; their minds became weaker and weaker. They began to tolerate all liberal ideas proposed from the Middle and the Low; they were less careful of conspiracy against them and soon they were overthrown. The Party which realizes this is active in the retention of political power by keeping its citizens under constant surveillance. The people must be kept aware of the ceaseless control of the state over them, of the absolute power that still exists and is always exercised. Laws and regulations must be immediately enforced if there is any violation.

Constant surveillance is carried out through various means. As Big Brother is considered the focusing point in the Oceanic society, a symbol of unity and infallibility of the Party, from him all commands are issued. To Big Brother, whose mind is immortal and collective, people have to submit complete obedience and faith. Big Brother may not be seen but he is present everywhere, on posters in the street, in offices or in flats. His presence is intended to remind the people of their faith towards the leader and at the same time

as a warning that people are under his notice at all times.

From the first page of 1984, Winston Smith, the central figure feels uneasy when he goes upstairs for his room in Victory Mansion in London. He is afraid because on each landing, opposite the lift shaft, the poster with the enormous face gazed from the wall. It was one of those pictures which are so contrived that the eyes follow you about when you move. "Big Brother is Watching You, the Caption beneath it ran."⁷⁵

Another control by the Party over the people is made with telescreens. A telescreen is an oblong-metal plaque, an effective instrument designed and fixed openly or secretly in all private rooms so that the state can check the public's activities. Telescreens are used not only to control the individual's behaviour but are also very helpful in propagating the party's slogans, principles, truth and news from the battlefield in which Oceania always wins the war. The instruments can pick up a voice or sounds made by human beings.

In Oceania, the political police is called, in the Newspeak language, The Thought Police, whose responsibility is similar to that of the political police in Fascist and other totalitarian countries. The Thought Police perform their duty, mostly by detecting and investigating the activities of the masses. However, the most important part played by the Police is their control over party members. Party members are not wholly trusted by the Party because they are in a

better condition than the masses; they are more intelligent and have some background in education. For the masses, there is nothing to be feared so long as they are kept poor, illiterate and misinformed. How the party members are controlled is described below:

A Party member lives from birth to death under the eyes of the Thought Police. Even when he is alone, he can never be sure he is alone. Wherever he may be, asleep or awake, working or resting, in his bath or in bed, he can be inspected without warning and without knowing that he is being inspected.⁷⁶

The purpose of torture in 1984 is similar to that in the Stalinist regime in post Revolutionary Russia. Winston, brought before O'Brien, his interrogator, admits that he has been brought to confess or to be punished. O'Brien said,

No! Not merely to extract your confession, not to punish you. Shall I tell you why we have brought you here? To cure you, to make you sane! Will you understand, Winston that no one whom we bring to this place ever leave our hands uncured? We are not interested in the stupid crimes that you have committed. The Party is not interested in the overt act; the thought is all we care about. We do not merely destroy our enemies; we change them. Do you understand what I mean by that? ⁷⁷

The necessity of brain-washing is further explained by O'Brien. To him and to the Party, torture with death at the end is useless because the offender dies without any change in his mental state; he may confess but in a reluctant way; he may obey but in a negative way. This kind of torture is neither efficient nor desirable. The Party holds that nobody shall have any belief other than that in the Party because reality

exists only in the mind of the Party. The Party truth is absolute. If a person is found guilty but still clings to his former conviction, he must be brain-washed. The man must be tortured until his mind is clear and void of any old belief. In a figurative way, he must be tortured to such an extent that his mind is as blank as the paper on which the state truth shall be written. It is required that nobody shall be killed before showing his complete submission to the state. O'Brien tells Winston:

Everything will be dead inside you. Never again will you be capable of love, or friendship, or joy of living, or laughter, or curiosity, or courage or integrity. You will be hollow. We shall squeeze you empty, and then we shall fill you with ourselves.⁷⁸

The horror of this kind of torture is grimly evoked by Orwell. After receiving a hard blow on the elbow, a series of beatings with fists, truncheons, steel rods, boots at different parts of his body, he sustains another brutal attack, they slap his face, pull his ears and hair, make him stand on one leg, refuse him leave to urinate, shine glaring lights in his face until tears come out because of pain. In the course of the primary investigation, Winston confesses everything demanded by the interrogator. After this he is strapped into an electric chair with dials, and brought in front of O'Brien. Whenever O'Brien presses the lever over the dials, an electric shock enters Winston's body. Under such torture, Winston feels that his limbs are being torn apart.

He is tortured several times till he is forced to admit that a human hand has four fingers, not five. Because of extreme pain, Winston cries, "Four! Five! Anything you like. Only stop it, stop the pain!"⁷⁹

O'Brien realizes that such torture is not entirely successful; Winston's conviction is not completely eradicated. Most important of all, his love for Julia is not shaken; he still loves her. It is clear that O'Brien finds it difficult to destroy the human faculty of reasoning and arguing and particularly human emotion. So he resorts to the other stage which is the ultimate cruelty, known to prisoners as Room 101. By stimulating the victim's greatest, most secret fear, O'Brien reduces Winston to a quivering whimpering hump of fear. He places a cage of carnivorous rats in front of him and threatens to open the cage door. Winston rejects his love for Julia, crying, "Do it to Julia! Not me! Julia! I don't care what you do to her. Tear her face off, strip her to the bone. Not me!"⁸⁰

At the end of the book, Orwell gives us a picture of Winston as a brain-washed person. He looks absent-minded and spends most of the time drinking Victory gin, listening to the telescreen with indifference. He is no longer watched by anybody. He can do anything of his own will but there is nothing for him to do. Once he meets Julia who has been similarly treated. He follows her and notes the great change

in her; Julia looks stern and indifferent, not eager and nice as previously. Her body, when Winston touches it, is stiff and thick. Neither speaks about love; they accuse each other of betrayal. Winston is allowed to work in the office as usual. There he works among many who are also brain-washed. The real picture of these helpless persons can be seen when they stop working; "And then suddenly the life would go out of them and they would sit around the table looking at one another with extinct eyes, like ghosts, fading at cock-crow."⁸¹

English Socialism or Ingsoc of the Oceanic Society in 1984 is quite opposite to socialism in the old sense which appeared in the early nineteenth century. The underlying principle of socialism before the period of 1984 is,

The requirement that the ownership and control of the primary means of production, distribution and exchange shall be vested in the whole people and operated by representative agencies to provide a maximum of economic well-being. In an ethical sense, socialism seeks to create that material environment most conducive to the growth of harmonious and constructive relationship among men. 82

It is clear that the principal aims of this brand of socialism are equality and a better standard of living for everyone in society. These aims are abandoned in the new socialism of Oceania, since the state, in its purpose of retaining power as long as possible, is interested only in keeping the people in fear, ignorance and poverty. In Oceania, private property is abolished. However, it does not

mean that all property will be transferred to the state on behalf of the people. In fact, all property is transferred to the Party which disposes of all state property of its own accord, without any representation by the people.

The main principles of Oceanic socialism deal with the control of the human mind rather than the economic life of the state. There is nothing serious in the economic field since the Party efforts in keeping the people in a low condition are successful. The Party control over material life is unquestionable but there is a lot to be done to attain the correct kind of mental attitude to the Party line. English socialism deals with the following items:

The necessity of changing the past is the central principle of Ingsoc. In view of the Party, past events do not exist like other material things; the existence of the past is in written records and human memories. According to this theory, it is quite possible and easy for the Party to prove that there is no failure under the regime of Big Brother. Any past events or written records that show the mistakes in internal administration or defeat in the battle field must be destroyed or revised. This is the fabrication of truth.

In his essay, The Prevention of Literature, Orwell wrote, "Totalitarianism demands, in fact, the continuous alteration of the past, and in the long run, probably demands a disbelief

in the very existence of objective truth..."⁸³ Orwell was first aware of the lies shown in the Spanish Civil War; the Nazis and the Fascists were represented as Christian patriots saving Spain from a Russian dictatorship; the number of Russian volunteers in Spain was exaggerated by as many as half a million; the revolution by the working class in Spain was wrongly interpreted as a rebellion against France.

Orwell was extremely embittered by misrepresentations of this kind. He felt that people have a right to know the truth. He wrote in an essay, Why I Write:

When I sit down to write a book I do not say to myself, 'I am going to produce a work of art,' I write it because there is some lie that I want to expose, some fact to which I want to draw attention, and my initial concern is to get a hearing...⁸⁴

In 1984, he showed that falsification of truth was important to totalitarianism in all ages. In the Oceanic society, it is strictly stated by the Party that there should be no other truth except the truth expressed or fabricated by the Party itself. Truth as seen by individuals, who are subject to errors and mistakes because of human weakness, is false; the ideal truth must be in the mind of the Party which is collective and immortal. In 1934, the Records Department, a single branch in the Ministry of Truth is responsible for the selection and fabrication of truth. Winston Smith has the job of correcting old issues of newspapers, books, records and other printed matters which contain undesirable facts.

For instance, if an official forecast is made about consumption goods to be produced in a given period, and later it appears on the daily newspapers that the figures obtained are not identical with those mentioned in the official forecast, Winston has to alter the original figures to make them agree with the later ones.

Though the Party can control the past by falsification of truth by revising the written records that show mistakes of the Party, however, there remains the necessity of controlling human memories. An old truth may be destroyed but people may be able to remember it because of the human faculty of memory. Therefore it is necessary for every Party member to control his memory so that it can easily accept new, contradictory truths. The system adopted for this end is called 'reality control' in the old language and in the new language, Newspeak, 'Doublethink'.

As defined in 1984, Doublethink means 'the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them'. The system may be explained in a simpler way as follows: the Party members know in what way their old memories are changed but the system will not prevent him from feeling that the old truth is distorted or altered. The new truth he accepts deliberately without any sense of uncertainty or guilt. Only through this system, lies are accepted easily and old memories are consciously

or sub-consciously obliterated.

Crimestop is another method of controlling the human mind. It is taught to all, even young children. Any person who is well-trained will be capable of crimestop, the faculty of not thinking anything which is against the truth of the Party, also the faculty of not being able to overlook logical errors, simple mistakes, or points of comparisons. This state is successful because of the fabrication of truth in written evidence by the Party. As people are cut off from the old truth; what they know and understand come from the false ones which will never appear disagreeable for any person to think about. People who are not well trained in crimestop, like Winston, may be detected in the act of face crime. Face crime means showing by facial expression, disapproval or disbelief of the Party's policy or activities.

The control over the human mind is also managed through the official language of Oceania: Newspeak. The purpose of Newspeak is "not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc, but to make all other modes of thought impossible;"⁸⁵ and "Newspeak was designed not to extend but to diminish the range of thought, and this purpose was indirectly assisted by cutting the choice of words down to a minimum."⁸⁶

1984 is Orwell's last work. As we have seen, his experience in the Spanish Civil War and his understanding of

the world event before and after the Second World War had greatly intensified his political commitment against totalitarianism. He was suffering from tuberculosis and realized that his end was approaching. This gave him more driving force to write something for the sake of humanity, for the world which to him was misinformed and weak. He felt that he had an important message to give to the people about the evils of totalitarianism.

One of the most impressive features of 1984 is the thoroughness with which Orwell has imagined this horrific totalitarian regime. He has worked out the implications of each basic principle to the last detail. An example of the pains Orwell took to make the Ingsoc-doctrine clear is the inclusion in the novel of two chapters from Goldstein's book, containing an elaborate exposition on the structure of society in Oceania and the aims of the Inner Party. The amount of painstaking detail is a measure of the degree of Orwell's concern and fear for the future. The exposition in the Goldstein chapters is very clear and logical, and as a theory, it is convincing. We cannot help but pay attention to a writer who is so obviously and sincerely committed to the good of mankind.

It is in Orwell's account of the regime at work, the principles of Ingsoc in practice, that the weakness of the book lies. In the characterization, especially in the case

of Winston, and in the description of settings, Orwell's pessimism, that dark sullen streak of his talent seems to have taken over. One has the impression, not only from 1984, but from all his work, that Orwell somehow relished unpleasant, sordid conditions and the maltreatment of average mortals. Or at least, the impression is that he would have been disappointed not to have something to condemn or criticize. Sometimes, one cannot resist suspecting that Orwell enjoyed his pessimism, that at times he revelled in it.

The world of 1984 is a little too black, a little too devoid of hope to be convincing. Why, for instance, should the gin not just be bad but as bad as it could possibly be? Why cannot the cigarettes simply be substandard, instead of well-nigh unsmokable? Such passages as the following strike one as being rather naively pessimistic.

The stuff was like nitric acid, and moreover, in swallowing it one had the sensation of being hit on the back of the head with a rubber club... He took a cigarette from a crumpled packet marked Victory Cigarettes and incautiously held it uprights whereupon the tobacco fell out onto the floor. 87

Not satisfied with his descriptions of the depressing squalor of the London of 1984, Orwell also feels it necessary to make the weather bad in most scenes. The opening paragraph of the book gives us an example of 1984 weather;

It was a bright cold day in April, and the clocks were striking thirteen. Winston Smith, his chin nuzzled into his breast in an effort to escape the vile wind, slipped quickly through the glass doors of Victory

Mansions, though not quickly enough to prevent swirl of gritty dust from entering along with him. 88

This immediately strikes us typical of Orwell as a novelist. There are almost identical passages in Keep the Aspidistra Flying and A Clergymen's Daughter. It is all too depressing to be true.

The biggest strain on our credulity is imposed in the love scenes between Winston and Julia, when suddenly the weather happens to be good; a thrush conveniently provides accompaniment to the love-making.

A thrush had alighted on a bough not five metres away, almost at the level of their faces. Perhaps, it had not seen them. It was in the sun, they in the shade. It spread out its wings, fitted them carefully into place again, ducked its head for a moment, as though making a sort of obeisance to the sun and then to pour forth a torrent of song. 89

A serious novelist, if he is to be successful, must convince us at least temporarily of the reality of his world; if at any point we feel unable to accept what he tells us, he has failed. Orwell is guilty of distorting his world to suit his message, a mistake so easily made by writers of commitment.

There are moments in the action too, when one feels a serious lack of conviction about the scene described. A case in point is the reaction of the crowds in Trafalgar Square

when, in the middle of demonstrations against Eurasia, it is suddenly announced that Oceania is no longer at war with Eurasia; she is at war with Eastasia. Within minutes after this announcement, the masses have redirected their hostilities to Eastasia and torn down all posters and banners denouncing Eurasia and, we are expected to believe, are able to accept as fact that Oceania was never at war with Eurasia. This startling instance of mass doublethink is simply too far-fetched. It is doubtful whether any totalitarian method could ever succeed in controlling people's minds collectively at such a speed!

As a novel then, 1984 is not completely successful; it is weak in characterization and plot, and other important techniques in the novel writing. However, it is a famous book because of the strength of his commitment that brings forth brilliant passages on The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism. His exaggeration which may be extreme, still shakes the reader's mind with horror and despair because of his sincerity and meticulous observation. His imagination of the future language of Oceania, Newspeak and its principles is original.

Certainly Orwell's vision of the future world in 1984 is very frightening. It is not a picture of the totalitarian regime in any country in particular; it could apply anywhere in the world. The readers may react in two ways; one is by

feeling hopeless and helpless, the second by feeling that there is still a hope to divert such a desperate situation by changing or improving the political systems of our present society.

Now in the late sixties, it seems that the world we are leading for is more like the world of Aldous Huxley's Brave New World than that of Orwell's 1984. The need to divert the ills of which Orwell warns us is not so pressing as it was. But one is still capable of the first reaction; the book certainly leaves us feeling hopeless and helpless.

It would not be quite correct to think that his fear for the future originates solely from the inhuman practices of the Communist government. However, if one reads his essay, Second Thoughts on James Burnham, one understands that Orwell shows his implicit approval of Burnham's theory concerning the new kind of ruling group in our present society, the class that will be neither capitalist, nor socialist. It is the theory of managerialism described in the following paragraph,

What is now arising is a new kind of planned, centralized society which will be neither capitalist, nor in any accepted sense of the word, democratic. The ruler of this new society will be the people who effectively control the means of production: that is, business executives, technicians, bureaucrats and soldiers, lumped together by Burnham under the name of 'managers'. These people will eliminate the old capitalist class, crush the working class, and so organize society that all power and economic privilege remain in their own hands. Private property rights will be abolished, but common ownership will not be established. The new 'managerial' societies will not consist of a patchwork of small, independent states, but of great superstates grouped round the main industrial centres in Europe,

Asia and America.90

James Burnham explains that managerialism exists in the present world. It has reached its full development in Russia and appears in a different form in the United States. In 1984, it is quite clear that from the following quotation that the new aristocracy is the same as Burnham's managerial class;

The new aristocracy was made up for the most part of bureaucrats, scientists, technicians, trade-union organizers, publicity experts, sociologists, teachers, journalists and professional politicians. These people whose origins lay in the salaried middle class and the upper grades of the working class had been shaved and brought together by the barren world of monopoly industry and centralized government.⁹¹

Therefore, Orwell's fear of the future world stems from the present forms of governments all over the world, regardless of whether there would be the so-called 'representative agencies' in the internal politics in each country, or not. With this new aristocracy, there is a probability that society will become totalitarian, like that in 1984. He may possibly agree with Burnham that a democratic society has never existed; what exists is oligarchical in its nature. The question is, after the fall of capitalism, what form of government will follow, oligarchy like that in 1984, or true democracy?
