Abstract

Liberalism and Marxism in the Work of George Orwell

Julian Warner, Worcester College

Thesis submitted to Oxford University for the degree of D. Phil., Autumn Term 1983. [i.e. 1984]

Orwell often treats liberal and radical figures sympathetically and explores his own political position through them. He discriminates between types of liberalism and strongly prefers nineteenth-century liberalism and radicalism to contemporary liberalism. His patriotism, and its distinction from nationalism, are influenced by G.K. Chesterton and by the 'Little England' section of the late nineteenth-century Liberal Party. Many of Orwell's other values, freedom of expression, privacy, and individual autonomy, are part of liberalism. He attacks Marxist forms of socialism which threaten liberal values, and becomes committed to socialism where it promises to protect or fulfil them, although such a form of socialism remains only a possibility. He is best described as a liberal committed to socialism.

Orwell was dissatisfied with the exclusion of historical considerations from most contemporary literary criticism. Marxism was an exception to this. He is influenced by Marxist criticism in his treatment of proletarian literature, and in his critical method of analysing a writer's work in terms of its political tendency and the writer's position in society. His knowledge of passages of Marx's work itself can be traced to The Adelphi. Orwell argues that the writer must be a liberal, and that prose literature is associated with liberalism, yet also admits the Marxist case that liberalism is a product of capitalism. He then doubts whether the culture of liberalism will continue to exist if capitalism is replaced by socialism, and finds it definitely incompatible with the growth of totalitarianism. An uneasy resolution of these dilemmas is reached in the distinction between a man as a writer and as a citizen, the preservation of the writer's liberal mind in a separate compartment from his activity as a man in an increasingly non-liberal society.

The witness-narrator of Orwell's reportage of the 1930s can be compared to the autonomous self preferred by liberalism. These works were not directly influenced by the contemporary documentary movement. Orwell's tendency to appeal to common sense and to argue from observation and experience can be connected with liberalism, as can his view of language as an instrument, and the validation of personal identity by sensation and memory in his work. The distance of the observing subject of his reportage from the observed person can disrupt attempts at empathy and run counter to his expressed socialism.

A sequence of composition is established for the essays in Inside the Whale.

BODLEIAN LIBRARY OXFORD
DEPOSITED
THESIS
24.1.85

LIBERALISM AND MARXISM

IN THE

WORK OF GEORGE ORWELL

Julian Warner

Worcester College

Thesis submitted to Oxford University for the degree of D.Phil.,

December 1983 [ie 1984]

CONTENTS Page

Introduction

1. Approaches to Orwell i
2. Relevant topics in criticism of Orwell xxi
3. Structure and vocabulary xxvii

Chapter One: Orwell and liberalism

1. Introduction 1
2. Liberal figures in Orwell's journalism, 1940-1946 3
3. Other uses of 'liberal' and 'radical' by Orwell 27
4. Further aspects of liberalism in Orwell's work 40
   - 4:1 Preliminary 40
   - 4:2 Patriotism 41
   - 4:3 Freedom of expression 49
   - 4:4 Individual rational judgment 50
   - 4:5 Privacy 53
   - 4:6 Individual autonomy 55
   - 4:7 Summary 58
5. Liberalism and socialism 60
6. Socialism 70
7. Conclusion 121

Page

Chapter Two: Orwell's response to Marxist literary criticism

1.		Introduction	128
2.		English Marxist literary criticism in the 1930s	131
3.		Other contemporary approaches to literary criticism	139
4.		Orwell's knowledge of Marx and Marxism	142
5.		Soviet literature	148
6.		Proletarian and socialist literature	155
7.		Marxist literary criticism	171
	7:1	Derivations	171
	7:2	Method	177
	7:3	Further similarities	192
	7:4	Aesthetic value	195
	7:5	Criticisms	198
8.		Implications	200

Page

Chapter Three: The idea of the witness in Orwell's work

1.	Introduction	221
2.	Orwell and the documentary movement	224
3.	The development of the witness in Orwell's work	230
4.	The relation of Orwell's idea of the witness to liberalism	238
5.	Ideas of language	244
6.	Ideas of the self	249
7.	Memory and the idea of the witness	252
8.	The visual content of Orwell's observation	262
9.	Superficial content of Orwell's observation	266
10.	Inner and outer vision	270
11.	Prose like a windowpane: aesthetic and content	281
12.	Conclusion	287

Page

Appendix

A note on the dates of the essays in Inside the Whale 290

Bibliography

1. Intellectual and historical background 297

2. Periodicals surveyed and articles cited 307

3. Pamphlets cited from Orwell's collection held in the British Library 311

4. Books cited from the Orwell Archive at University College London 312

5. Criticism on Orwell 313

6. Books by or including contributions by Orwell 319

7. Journalism, poems and published letters by Orwell 321

Abbreviations

ACD	A Clergyman's Daughter
AF	Animal Farm
BD	Burmese Days
'CD'	'Charles Dickens'
CE	Critical Essays
CEJL	The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (1968)
CUFA	Coming Up For Air
D&O	Down and Out in Paris and London
HtC	Homage to Catalonia
ITW	Inside the Whale
'ITW'	'Inside the Whale'
KAF	Keep the Aspidistra Flying
L&U	The Lion and the Unicorn
MEN	Manchester Evening News
NEF	Nineteen Eighty-Four
NEW	New English Weekly
T&T	Time and Tide
WP	The Road to Wigan Pier

INTRODUCTION

1. Approaches to Orwell

This thesis is concerned with liberalism and Marxism in the work of George Orwell, particularly with his response to contemporary Marxist literary criticism. It then studies the implications that the relations to liberalism and Marxism have for the forms of his writing. Liberalism and Marxism are both studied separately and in their relationship to each other, and special attention is also given to the effect their interaction has upon Orwell's idea of socialism.

To place this thesis with regard to previous criticism on Orwell, it is necessary to look at the character and the chronology of this work. There are two main, though not fully separable, aspects of criticism of Orwell to be considered: first, its character as criticism, its method of approach to its subject, the assumptions or tenets about criticism and its objects upon which it rests; and, secondly, the treatment of the particular topics with which the body of this thesis concerns itself. To some extent the general character and development of this criticism has both guided and limited the investigation of particular topics. A simple but important example can show this: the emphasis of much of post-war English and American literary criticism on the need to study the work of literature in isolation from its historical context, as well as the difficulties of access to Orwell's journalism during this period, led to a disproportionate amount of attention to his novels, despite a general agreement as to their weakness, and limited attention to his political ideas and vocabulary.

The nature of Orwell's work creates problems for the critic. It is locally definite, full of hard outlines and aggressively expressed attitudes and opinions, but tending to be fragmentary and difficult to grasp as a whole. It is hard to find an aesthetic or political centre to it which takes account of its variety. These considerations apply both to his longer pieces, which typically mix fiction and history and tend to fall into separate parts, and to his work as a whole. These difficulties for criticism are accentuated by the variety of literary forms that he uses, including fiction, essays and journalism, and autobiography. Another possible obstacle to a critical attempt to grasp Orwell's work as a whole is the number of articles that he published, about 800 pieces of journalism, the majority of which remain uncollected in any published edition. This combination of local clarity and ultimate elusiveness has resulted in problems of selection and focus for criticism.

There have been several types of critical response to these difficulties. The simplest, though least adventurous and interesting, is represented by Richard Voorhees in The Paradox of George Orwell (1961) and by Edward Thomas in Orwell (1965): both are content to record the contradictions between Orwell's positions on various topics, but do not probe for the sources or implications of these contradictions. Something of the difficulty of selection in criticism of Orwell can be gathered from the titles of these books, which do not promise to select an aspect of Orwell's work for study. Some other studies written during the 1950s and 1960s, for example John Atkins's George Orwell (1954) and Richard Rees's George Orwell: Fugitive from the Camp of Victory (1961), have comparable titles and are rather diffuse.

The tendency to generalise about his work underlies another, more stimulating and productive, type of criticism: a thematic rather than descriptive approach which seeks to give a comprehensive account of his work based on a unifying perception of his historical and social, personal, or religious situation. Raymond Williams's work in Culture and Society: 1780-1950 (1958), with his emphasis on Orwell's exile and relation to English social class, is an important and influential example of a thematic approach which studies him as part of his historical context.
Alan Sandison's The Last Man in Europe: An Essay on George Orwell (1974) is an eccentric and misguided attempt to show that his work is a product of the Protestant tradition, although it contains some valuable insights into the importance of the autonomous individual to Orwell's development. Sandison's book in particular suffers from the deficiencies common in this type of Orwell criticism: an indifference to Orwell's own political and, in this case, religious distinctions and comments, and especially to his self-conscious insight into his own position. Although they aim to be comprehensive, thematic studies of Orwell's work have often been based on a partial knowledge of his output, either concentrating on the longer individual works and major essays, or after 1968 with the publication of the Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters wrongly accepting that this was either a complete collection or a fair selection.

In contrast to these general studies, there are those books, and, more frequently, articles, which are descriptive studies of particular aspects of Orwell's work, but which make little use of their research for criticism. William Steinhoff's comprehensive account of the sources for Nineteen Eighty-Four, The Road to 1984 (1975), represents an extreme point of this purely descriptive tendency. Although both the general and the descriptive

criticism contain valuable insights and material, they are incomplete and reveal the difficulty of establishing a focus on Orwell's work which is capable of moving between the general and the specific.

One means by which criticism of Orwell often chose to focus on its subject, particularly in the 1950s and 1960s, was to combine reminiscences or biography with interpretative criticism. At its extreme, this approach is represented by Anthony West's interpretation of Nineteen Eighty-Four in terms of the psychology implied by Orwell's account of his schooldays in 'Such, Such Were the Joys.'[1] George Woodcock's The Crystal Spirit: A Study of George Orwell (1967) and Richard Rees's George Orwell: Fugitive from the Camp of Victory (1961) are examples of a milder combination of reminiscence and criticism. Some important methodological criticisms can be made of this kind of biographical approach. The principal objection is the want of biographical information other than that apparently provided by Orwell's own work, or, in the case of those critics who knew him personally, their own, inevitably partial and unreliable memories of him. Orwell's own autobiographical writings present problems to the critic who wishes to use them for biographical information. They were not intended to be accurate autobiography and are unreliable and contradictory when treated as such. Orwell adapts his experience to his persuasive purpose and generally offers it as that of a typical member of his social class. An interesting sidelight on the legitimacy of a biographical approach to the criticism of Orwell's writing is cast by his own discussion of other writer's lives: in several of his reviews in the 1940s, he remarks on the gulf that can lie between the writer's literary personality emanating

---

1. Anthony West, 'George Orwell', in Principles and Persuasions (New York, 1957), pp. 164-176.

from his work and the writer's private personality as reported by biographers.[1] In view of these objections it is better to eschew the use of personal biography as an entry into literary analysis. The character of the narrator of the longer works of reportage should be treated as a persona which has some common points with, though is not identical to, what can be gathered of Orwell's life from other sources.

Bernard Crick's approach in his scholarly and comprehensive biography, George Orwell: A Life (1980), is markedly different from that of previous biographical critics of Orwell. He repeatedly argues against the interpretation of Orwell's writings as a product of his personal psychology, and especially against the interpretation of Nineteen Eighty-Four which originated with Anthony West. Indeed, he carries this reaction further, quarrelling with the idea that a man necessarily has a psychology in this sense and with the description of character as a legitimate object for biography. He is sceptical as to the historical reliability of any empathy between a biographer and his subject, and rather advocates concentration on the external events and circumstances of the subject's life.[2] There are some obvious objections to Crick's idea of the proper method for biography. Some notion of the subject's character is inescapable, if only for adjudicating between contradictory evidence of

---

1. See for example, 'An American Critic' (Review of The Wound and the Bow by Edmund Wilson), Observer, 10 May 1942, p.3, in which Orwell comments that the contrast between Dickens's possibly criminal private personality and the 'native goodness' of his literary personality is 'even more baffling than usual with creative writers'. A contrast between the private and the literary personality is also made by Orwell in 'Old Master' (Review of Tolstoy: His Life and Work by Derrick Leon) Observer, 26 March 1944, p.3, and in 'Personality behind the Pen' (Review of Chekhov the Man by Kornei Chukovsky), MEN, 23 August 1945, p.2.

2. Bernard Crick, George Orwell: A Life (1980), pp. xxiii-xxx; and 'The Nature of Biography and the Art of Orwell', Lecture delivered at Goldsmiths' College, London on 27th May 1982.

equal reliability, and such an idea of character is implicitly present at points in George Orwell: A Life. The approach actually used in the biography at times clearly contradicts the methods advocated in the introduction, particularly the injunction against empathy. For example, sections from Keep the Aspidistra Flying are used to suggest Orwell's state of mind in the mid-1930s, where hard evidence is scanty, though any suggestion that Orwell may have used the experience of tuberculosis as a source for the descriptions of Winston's physical decay in Nineteen-Eighty-Four is rather perversely avoided.[1]

The aspect of Crick's discussion of biography which has the most interesting implications for Orwell criticism in general is his almost exclusive concentration on method. He is searching with regard to how a biography should be written, but barely questions why, to what purpose or for what interest: whether, for instance, the interest should lie in the circumstances and behaviour of an unusual man, or whether the account of a life can illuminate the writing. It is true that there is an intentional limitation of scope to exclude literary criticism, and that the introduction announces that the texts will only be discussed when strictly relevant to the biography. Despite this limitation, Crick clearly has a case to argue on Orwell's politics, and throughout carefully traces the development of his political knowledge and allegiances, as well as turning to his journalism to clarify the political implications of Nineteen Eighty-Four.[2] So, although George Orwell: A Life does contain passages of literary criticism and some detailed and original political analysis, it does not propose or discover a relationship between Orwell's life and work

---

1. George Orwell: A Life, pp. 120, 150, 169-170 and 371-385.

2. George Orwell: A Life, pp. xxiii-xxx and 377-378.

which could be used for criticism, and, indeed, pays little attention to this possibility in a positive sense. It is a biography which has little patience with biographical criticism.

George Orwell: A Life does give chronological and circumstantial information which can be used as an aid to a detailed reading. Crick himself often uses the information he has collected in this way, though more frequently confining himself to comparisons between Orwell's longer works and his journalism than looking to his reading. Any contextual or scholarly reading of a writer's work depends upon some biographical information - dates of writing and the effects of publishing circumstances, the books an author has definitely or probably read. The new material provided by Crick's biography can be used to refine such an approach.

One persistent type of approach to Orwell's work has indeed been broadly contextual, not studying his reading or closely comparing his work with that of other contemporary English writers, but analysing his political and literary development in relation to their historical context. Such an approach promises to be productive. Criticism of Orwell has suffered from the study of politics and literature as separate disciplines in England and America, and a contextual approach at least transcends this division. It is also far closer to Orwell's own concept of literature, both allowing it a political function and criticising it in terms of its social context, than the practical criticism popular in the post-war period. Accordingly, it has yielded some valuable insights, particularly into the complexities of Orwell's political position. For instance, Irving Howe in Politics and the Novel discusses the suppression of individuality in Nineteen Eighty-Four and notes that 'the whole idea of the self as something precious and admirable is a cultural idea, and as we understand it,

a product of the liberal era.'[1] Howe's recognition and historical assessment of this idea of the self is crucial, but there is a lack of sympathy with Orwell's work often to be found in contextual criticism of it.

This lack of sympathy has proved a limitation on the productivity of this type of criticism. In some cases, there is open hostility: E.P. Thompson's polemical essay, 'Outside the Whale' (1960), in which he attacks Orwell's work for its anti-socialist elements and their influence, is a fine example of this.[2] Criticism along these lines is recurrent in the writings of Marxist critics or of those critics strongly influenced by Marxism. Isaac Deutscher in Heretics and Renegades (1955) objects to the sado-masochistic elements in Nineteen Eighty-Four and to its vicious effect, its contribution to the current apocalyptic mood to Cold War propaganda.[3] James Walsh's article, 'George Orwell', in which he characterises Orwell as a lapsed socialist with an objectionable attitude to the working-class, and especially a lack of confidence in working-class organisation, contains in strongly worded form the principal elements of other Marxist critiques of Orwell.[4] Such critiques do at least form a coherent, though incomplete, view of Orwell's work and do require some response, which they have sometimes received: Peter Thirlby, for instance, makes an intelligent reply to James Walsh in 'Orwell as a Liberal'.[5] In the case of the most influential British left-wing critic of Orwell, Raymond Williams, there is a mixture of respect and partly covert hostility which results in some unfortunate

---

1. Irving Howe, Politics and the Novel (London, 1961), p.237.
2. E.P. Thompson, 'Outside the Whale', in E.P. Thompson, ed., Out of Apathy (1960), pp. 141-194.
3. Isaac Deutscher, Heretics and Renegades (1955), pp. 35-50.
4. James Walsh, 'George Orwell', Marxist Quarterly, III (1956), 25-39.
5. Peter Thirlby, 'Orwell as a Liberal', Marxist Quarterly, III (1956), 239-247.

obscurities, particularly in his monograph, Orwell.[1]

There seem to be several motives for the adverse criticism Orwell has received from British Marxist and left-wing commentators. Clearly, particular anti-socialist tendencies have been found objectionable, yet much of the vigour of this criticism has been directed as much at the influence of his work as at the work itself. In part, this is a response to the adoption of it by Cold War propaganda particularly during the 1950s, when many of these studies were written, but there is another, more interesting and partly hidden, motive for this reaction. The positive influence of Orwell's work, especially in the study of the relation between literature and society, is discernible in the work of the New Left of the 1950s, strongly so, for instance, in Richard Hoggart's The Uses of Literacy (1957).[2] A later book by Raymond Williams, Politics and Letters: Interviews with New Left Review (1979), makes explicit the view, perceptible but merely implicit in his earlier writing, that Orwell had pre-empted and distorted the critical approaches in which he was interested: he asserts that Orwell's work was unfairly dominant in socialist, cultural, and sociological studies in the 1950s, amounting to 'an enormously inflated statue of Orwell warning you to go back.'[3] Hoggart himself writes on Orwell in a tone of wary approval[4], but in the case of Williams the mixture of respect with a partly

---

1. Raymond Williams, Orwell (1971). For example, pp. 89-90 contain a rather equivocal discussion of whether Orwell was a visitor to, or a participant in, revolution and poverty.

2. In addition to a general debt, Richard Hoggart, The Uses of Literacy (1957), p.298 admits that he is specifically indebted to Orwell's essay 'Raffles and Miss Blandish', for his discussion of 'sex-and-violence' fiction (pp. 210-223).

3. Raymond Williams, Politics and Letters: Interviews with New Left Review (1979), pp. 384-392 (p.384).

4. See Richard Hoggart, 'George Orwell and The Road to Wigan Pier' / Speaking to Each other: Volume II: About Literature (1970), pp. 111 - 129

cov o free himself and others from Orwell's influence, produces some equivocal, rather than properly complex judgments, although his attitude is now one of open dislike.

The promise of a contextual and left-wing approach to Orwell's work has not, then, been fully realised. Its polemical aggressiveness has naturally limited the extent of its engagement with his work, or, in the case of Raymond Williams's longer involvement, an uneasiness as to its value has led to a mixture of insight and confusion. All the critics in question seem to have had an incomplete knowledge of Orwell's writings, and tend to concentrate upon Nineteen Eighty-Four, and, to a lesser extent, Animal Farm, in isolation from his journalism. For a contextual treatment of literature, too, there is a certain impatience with historical detail, most tellingly in the criticism of Orwell for ill-tempered and unreasonable attacks on socialists while failing to investigate the actual historical targets of his abuse. A fuller contextual reading would do this and, equally, help to identify those aspects of his work which are simply intolerant or abusive.

Criticism based upon more detailed scholarship should therefore help to correct the deficiencies, particularly the omissions, of the thematic approaches, which have been examined. It ought, for instance, to study Orwell's political vocabulary and ideas in a detailed and attentive way. There has been a culpable neglect of this crucial area in much thematic criticism. Left-wing critics have classified Orwell as liberal and described his socialism, where they have acknowledged it, as an extreme form of liberalism, without studying the development of either of these terms in his work. Scholarly criticism should also avoid the error of much previous criticism of Orwell, of writing about his work as a whole

with only a seriously incomplete knowledge of his writings. There has indeed been a noticeable trend since the late 1960s towards this type of criticism, looking at Orwell's development of individual ideas, his engagement with particular writers, or at his longer works in the context of his journalism. Other types of criticism have continued to be published, though of diminished originality and value.

The passages of criticism and political argument in Crick's biography of Orwell are part of this movement towards contextual criticism. Unlike most other commentators on Orwell's work since the late 1960s, he offers a view which aims to be comprehensive, and is original. Some studies, most notably Alex Zwerdling's Orwell and the Left (1974), have also combined an interpretative and contextual reading. Although he is often perceptive, Zwerdling does not have a strong thesis about Orwell's work, and his grasp of its context is sometimes unsure; he is concerned with Orwell's response to Marxist and other left-wing writing, but, perhaps partly because of his own American situation, does not deal with the contemporary British sources for his knowledge of Marxism. He compares the satire in Nineteen Eighty-Four on the mechanical production of literature with the mechanical metaphors for writing in Soviet thought, without suggesting which intermediate writings could have been sources for Orwell's knowledge of these developments, and, in order to sustain his approach, claims, on insufficient evidence, that Orwell knew Marx's work itself well.[1]

Many of the other contextual studies of aspects of Orwell's work have been shorter pieces, articles rather than books. Chris Pawling's article 'George Orwell and the Documentary in the Thirties' runs into problems

---

1. Alex Zwerdling, Orwell and the Left (New Haven, 1974), pp. 7 and 20.

similar to those evident in Zwerdling's book: he compares Orwell's writings, particularly The Road to Wigan Pier, with Grierson's documentary films and the proposals of Russian revolutionary writings of the 1920s, but admits that Orwell was not part of the cohesive documentary movement of the inter-war years and that he had not come into contact with the Russian writing in question.[1] Jennifer McDowell's '1984 and Soviet Reality' is an early attempt to deal with an analogous question, the relation between the society of Nineteen Eighty-Four and the history of the Soviet Union, which establishes several parallels, but likewise fails to trace the likely sources for Orwell's knowledge of Soviet society, making considerable use of material published only after his death. McDowell makes little attempt at interpretation, and the other studies show evidence of difficulty in connecting the contextual and scholarly information they do have with their critical viewpoint.[2] These approaches try to locate Orwell in his contemporary left-wing context, but fail to give an accurate account of this context. Only a closer attention to the books discussed and reviewed by Orwell can serve as a basis for this.

Several articles have studied Orwell's criticism of particular writers. Michael Maddison in '1984: A Burnhamite Fantasy?' traces the influence of James Burnham's The Managerial Revolution on Nineteen Eighty-Four, particularly on Goldstein's book.[3] George Kateb's 'The Road to 1984', includes this in a sophisticated analysis of Nineteen Eighty-Four and of the development of Orwell's thought between 1946 and 1949, for which, unlike Maddison, he makes extensive use of his journalism of this period.[4]

---

1. Chris Pawling, 'George Orwell and the Documentary in the Thirties', Literature and History, No.4, Autumn 1976, pp. 81-93.
2. Jennifer McDowell, '1984 and Soviet Reality', University of California Graduate Journal, I, Fall 1962, pp. 12-19.
3. Michael Maddison, '1984: A Burnhamite Fantasy?', Political Quarterly, XXXII (1961), pp. 71-79.
4. George Kateb, 'The Road to 1984', Political Science Quarterly, LXXXI (1966), 564-580.

Other studies of this type have preferred to deal with Orwell's literary criticism. Wayne Warncke in 'George Orwell's Dickens' notes that Dickens is only a minor influence on Orwell's creative work, and attempts to explicate what Orwell means by calling Dickens a 'nineteenth-century liberal' by some comparisons with the meanings similar terms are given by their context in passages from the journalism.[1] Orwell's essay on Dickens has often attracted attention: Gordon Beadle in 'George Orwell and Charles Dickens: Moral Critics of Society' is, unlike Warncke, little concerned with critical method, but points to the similarities between Orwell and his image of Dickens. These similarities are used as the basis for a valuable, but by no means original, characterisation of Orwell's work as continuing the Victorian radical tradition. The value of Beadle's analysis is restricted by his simple equation of Orwell's socialism with 'decency'.[2]

This type of approach, concentrating on a particular subject in Orwell's criticism, has yielded an especially interesting article, Patrick Parrinder's 'George Orwell and the Detective Story', which discusses a little-known essay by Orwell on English detective fiction, 'Grandeur et Décadence du Roman Policier Anglais', published in French in Algiers in 1945. Parrinder compares this essay with Orwell's other work on popular culture and literature, noting that it was written about the same time as 'Raffles and Miss Blandish', his study of the crime-thriller, which, like most critics, Orwell takes to be a distinct genre from the detective story. An ambivalent attitude to Victorian complacency is identified in Orwell's work:

---

1. Wayne Warncke, 'George Orwell's Dickens', South Atlantic Quarterly, LXIX, (1970), 373-381.
2. Gordon Beadle, 'George Orwell and Charles Dickens: Moral Critics of Society', Journal of Historical Studies, II (Winter 1969-70), 245-255.

Orwell both attacks Victorian complacency and enjoys the possibility it creates for the growth of popular culture.[1] Parrinder's article is short but it does combine a scholarly approach with a grasp of Orwell's work as a whole and of its context, whereas other articles of this sort tend to lack this and struggle to place their findings in a fuller critical view. There is considerable scope for other studies of Orwell's response to particular writers: the treatment in his critical writing of such writers as G.K. Chesterton, H.G. Wells, and Joseph Conrad has not been satisfactorily surveyed, and the influence of the latter two writers on his fiction has not been properly treated.

Other studies, instead of examining Orwell's response to particular writers, have isolated and studied political or literary ideas in his work. Again, there remains ample scope for supplementary work: the examination of liberalism and socialism in Orwell's thought tends to be in general terms, obscuring important distinctions, and there have been few accounts of narrower ideas. Stephen Lutman's 'Orwell's Patriotism' is an exception to this and makes several interesting points. He connects Orwell's praise in 1932 for Byron's patriotism on behalf of Greece with the loyalty to a foreign cause shown in Homage to Catalonia, and points to the decline of the importance of patriotism in his work after 1945. Although Lutman recognises that patriotism stands opposed to the received view of the left-wing writer, he does not connect Orwell's patriotism with his sympathy for nineteenth-century radicalism.[2] Orwell's ideas on clarity of expression

---

1. Patrick Parrinder, 'George Orwell and the Detective Story', Journal of Popular Culture, VI (1973), 692-697.

2. Stephen Lutman, 'Orwell's Patriotism', Journal of Contemporary History, II (1967), 149-158.

are well-known and his prose has been praised for its exemplification of these standards, or indicted for showing the faults he condemns, but Brian Wicker's article, 'An Analysis of Newspeak' is unusual in analysing Orwell's idea of language. Wicker identifies an important contradiction between an instrumental view of language and the conviction that language is inextricably connected with the origin of thoughts, and finds Orwell's account of general terms incoherent.[1] There has been an unfortunate paucity of response to Wicker's article since it was published in 1962.

An area of Orwell's work which has received a greater amount of scholarly and historical attention is the account of the Spanish Civil War, particularly of the fighting in Barcelona, in Homage to Catalonia. Hugh Thomas's depreciation of the historical value of its account of events in Barcelona as 'often misleading' in his detailed study The Spanish Civil War[2] has excited some subsequent defences: Raymond Carr in 'Orwell and the Spanish Civil War' argues that it is the primary source for knowledge of the fighting and that it has influenced every subsequent history.[3] Crick indicates an error of terminology in Homage to Catalonia but finds Thomas's comment 'ungenerous', although he admits Orwell's relative ignorance of the intricacies of the struggle.[4] Homage to Catalonia has been included in some comparative studies of the literature associated with the Spanish Civil War, such as Frederick R. Benson's Writers in Arms: The Literary Impact of the Spanish Civil War (1968) and Katherine Bail Hoskins's Today the Struggle: Literature and Politics in England during the Civil War (Austin, 1969), although neither of these books show much original critical

---

1. Brian Wicker, 'An Analysis of Newspeak', Blackfriars, XLIII (1962), 272-285.
2. Hugh Thomas, The Spanish Civil War (Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1965), p.544.
3. Raymond Carr, 'Orwell and the Spanish Civil War', in Miriam Gross ed., The World of George Orwell (1971), pp. 63-73.
4. Bernard Crick, George Orwell: A Life (1980), pp. 220 and 437.

insight. There is a tendency, therefore, in the contextual criticism of Homage to Catalonia to use it for its historical information, to paraphrase rather than criticise it. Alternatively, it has been addressed with critical intent, but there has been a failure to examine important questions, for instance, Orwell's treatment of his own motivation.

The scholarly and contextual approach to Orwell's writing, then, has produced some valuable work. However, its content and methods have been limited. Many important areas remain uninvestigated, and the frequent interest in placing Orwell in relation to contemporary left-wing writing is unsatisfactorily answered. Few critics have contented themselves with simple collation, but there has been insufficient connection of the findings of research to an overall critical view, whether to substantiate a position already expressed or to develop a new thesis. In some cases, too, there is an unsure grasp of Orwell's work outside the topic chosen. Where the work aims to be more comprehensive, as with Zwerdling and Crick, it has partly fulfilled its ambitions, but has not always integrated its historical information with criticism: Crick's 'republican' theme, for instance, depends on a virtual suppression of some aspects of Orwell's work, and even of some particular works. The contrast of the scholarly contextual criticism with the, usually earlier, generalising contextual criticism testifies again to the difficulty of focusing on Orwell's work. Criticism of Orwell has provided either stimulating generalisations or local detail, but these viewpoints are rarely integrated with each other.

Some of the more prominent features of the various types of criticism can now be reviewed. In both biographical and sociological criticism, there is a tendency to treat Orwell's writings as if they were pathological, as if they expressed social, cultural, or psychological patterns with only a

limited or distorted conscious knowledge of this. This tendency also underlies the interpretation of his work as a product of a religious tradition or experience, in both Alan Sandison's The Last Man in Europe: An Essay on George Orwell (1974) and in Christopher Small's The Road to Miniluv: George Orwell, the State and God (1975), and is an important common feature of some rather different critical approaches. This relative indifference to Orwell's conscious perspective can be connected to the frequent reluctance to allow for rhetorical sophistication in his work: the autobiographical works of the 1930s have, in some cases, been taken as factual without allowing for omissions, compression or balance of emphasis made for persuasive effect.[1] The criticism of the fiction has also suffered from this reluctance to admit sophistication: Coming Up For Air has been interpreted simply as a product of nostalgia, without suggesting that the apposition of Victorian and Edwardian society with that of the 1930s is, in part, a vehicle for the contrast between an ordered and disordered society.[2] The relative inaccessibility of much of Orwell's work has inhibited the growth of an appreciation of his self-consciousness. The effect of the ignorance of some of Orwell's work can be sensed in one example: if his perceptive and critical review of F.R. Leavis's The Great Tradition had been more widely known[3], it might at least have alerted critics to the possibility that Orwell's own literary criticism was of a different type to Leavis's, rather than simply inferior to it. The more scholarly criticism, which at least avoids these errors, has in most cases lacked the ambition or direction of the criticism with stronger themes.

---

1. For instance by Keith Alldritt, The Making of George Orwell: An Essay in Literary History (1969). p. 17 and passim, although Alldritt, p.51-53 finds Down and Out in Paris and London implausible in parts.
2. John Wain, 'George Orwell', in Essays on Literature and Ideas (1963), pp. 180-213 emphasises the nostalgia in Coming Up For Air.
3. 'Exclusive Club', Observer, 6 February 1949, p.3.

The critical approach favoured for this thesis has guided, and has, in part been guided by, the evaluation of previous criticism on Orwell. In its simplest terms, it should treat his work as a whole and should use detailed information and analysis within a larger argument. Biographical information is admitted where it helps to clarify the historical context of his work. The historical context is studied both in general terms and in a more detailed manner, through contemporary books and periodicals and studies of aspects of the history of the 1930s and 1940s. Special attention is given to the traces in Orwell's work of his response to contemporary cultural developments. It is important to recognise and to attempt to explain the chronology of the development of Orwell's thought, and show how this is affected by public historical developments. Orwell's political ideas and beliefs need to be related to the forms of writing he uses. On the other hand, his work should not be forced into too tight a pattern: contradictions and obscurities should be admitted and some attempt made to account for them. Judgment should be more restrained than in some of the biographical or sociological approaches. At the same time, the results of research need to be integrated with criticism.

To a considerable extent, such an approach is synthesis of the methods which have been found valuable in previous criticism. The position of criticism on Orwell now can be clarified by looking briefly at the chronology of its development. Post-war history has deeply affected criticism of Orwell and the perception of his work in relation to its political context. The use of Orwell's work in the Cold War helps to explain the development of his image as a liberal and a lapsed socialist. It was also seen to be one motive for the vehemence of the attacks upon his work by socialist critics, which were directed as much at the use of this image to discredit socialism, as at the work itself. It is during the 1950s that

many of the most influential studies of Orwell were published: E.M. Forster's essay in Two Cheers for Democracy (1951) characterising Orwell as a 'true liberal'[1], for example, as well as work by Isaac Deutscher, Irving Howe, and Raymond Williams. The judgments, especially the political assessments, made in this period have formed the substance for subsequent critical debate.

From the late 1960s, Orwell criticism tends to become more detached and less vehement, usually no longer written by critics who had some personal acquaintance with him, and less affected by the political debates of the Cold War. It also shows an increasing sense of its own history, with a number of studies of this coming out in the 1970s, of which the most comprehensive and forceful is Robert Klitzke's unpublished thesis, 'Orwell and his Critics: An Enquiry into the Reception of and Critical Debate about George Orwell's Political Works (1977).[2] The call made by Gillian Workman in 1972 in her article 'Orwell Criticism' for abandoning a biographical for a contextual approach has been answered by some subsequent developments.[3] The passages of criticism and political analysis in Crick's biography, which also show this movement towards contextual criticism, have not yet received much attention, other than in brief reviews. In general, criticism of Orwell shows a good deal of continuity in some interests and judgments: H.J. Laski's criticism, for example, in 1937 of the shallowness and

---

1. E.M. Forster, 'George Orwell', in Two Cheers for Democracy (1951), pp. 72-74, (p.72).
2. Robert Klitzke, 'Orwell and his Critics: An Enquiry into the Reception of and Critical Debate about George Orwell's Political Works' (Ph.D., Birkbeck College, London University, 1977). Other studies of this type include George Woodcock, 'Orwell, Blair and the Critics', Sewanee Review, LXXXIII (1975), 524-536; David Pryce-Jones, 'Orwell's Reputation', in Miriam Gross ed., The World of George Orwell (1971), pp. 143-152; and Jeffrey Meyers ed., George Orwell: The Critical Heritage (1975).
3. Gillian Workman, 'Orwell Criticism', Ariel, III, 1 (January 1972), 62-73.

emotionalism of Orwell's socialism in The Road to Wigan Pier[1] has been echoed by many succeeding critics, without, in this and other cases, the later critic necessarily directly knowing the work of the earlier. Despite this continuity, several interesting articles have been neglected by later criticism, even where they deal with similar topics: to take one example, Philip Rieff's 'George Orwell and the Post-Liberal Imagination', published in 1954[2], has received little subsequent notice.

Criticism of any writer has the opportunity from the methods and interests of earlier critics, and the position of criticism on Orwell in the early 1980s does have this privilege. Biographical information is fuller and more reliable than before. The various critical trends, biographical, polemical, and contextual, are clearer in retrospect. What has been found valuable can be taken and used, and those approaches which have been shown to be limited or unsound can be rejected. A detailed and directed contextual criticism of Orwell's work still has to be a deliberate creation; it does not simply present itself. The value of a contextual reading partly depends on the novelty of the information it uses and this demands a return to contemporary publications.

The development since the 1950s of Orwell criticism and of literary criticism, particularly in Britain, does confer one particular privilege on criticism of Orwell written in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The recognition of Orwell's debt to Marxist literary criticism is made easier. Some critics in the 1950s and 1960s tended to regard a Leavisite approach to literature as natural, and to view Orwell's critical interests and

---

1. H.J. Laski, 'Review of The Road to Wigan Pier', Left News, March 1937, pp. 275-276, In Jeffrey Meyers ed., George Orwell: The Critical Heritage (1975), pp. 104-107.
2. Philip Rieff, 'George Orwell and the Post-Liberal Imagination', Kenyon Review, XVI (1954), 49-70.

methods as an aberration of limited interest: Keith Alldritt's comment in The Making of George Orwell: An Essay in Literary History (1969), 'how very slight, how very parochial Orwell's criticism is' when compared to the work of Pound or Leavis[1], epitomises this. Conversely, those critics of the period, such as Howe, Deutscher and Williams, who were familiar with other critical approaches to literature, were insufficiently in sympathy with Orwell's work to recognise its affinities with Marxist literary criticism. The situation since the late 1970s has been very different. Leavis's influence, as well as I.A. Richards's legacy of practical criticism, has been widely questioned and other ideas of literature, including those associated with Marxism, are discussed more frequently. In this situation, Orwell's use of Marxism is more readily recognisable and more likely to be considered worthy of investigation. It is a matter of recognition and of alertness to the possibility of a variety of types of criticism. Orwell's use of Marxism still has to be studied by comparison with contemporary sources, not with subsequent writing, but recent developments in criticism do allow this perspective to be more readily sensed than before.

2. Relevant topics in criticism of Orwell

There has been some critical attention to the topics with which this thesis is concerned: to the place of liberalism and of Marxism in Orwell's work, and to the nature of his observation. The character and historical development of criticism of Orwell was seen to have discouraged or distorted the investigation of some of these topics. They have not been

---

1. Keith Alldritt, The Making of George Orwell: An Essay in Literary History (1969), p.112.

adequately or completely treated either singly or in their relation to each other. The approach to be taken here to Orwell's work has been contrasted with those of previous critics and also shown to be, in part, derived selectively from them. Now its content will be placed by indicating the amount and nature of the work which has been done on similar topics. This will be a less polemical treatment than that used in the body of the thesis; there articles and passages in books which deal with the matter in hand are discussed to sharpen the argument, or to show how they differ.

A greater amount of criticism has been concerned with liberalism in Orwell's work than with his relation to either socialism or Marxism. This criticism commonly describes Orwell as a liberal rather than looks at the place of liberalism in his work. The qualities taken to identify Orwell as a liberal show a deal of consistency, with some variation. E.M. Forster's selection of kindness, good temper, and a concern for accuracy and liberty is a less passionate set of attributes than those generally chosen[1], although his emphasis on Orwell's concern for liberty is shared by many other critics. Philip Rieff is more typical of critical opinion in taking Orwell's honesty, and belief in compassion and intellectual integrity, as characteristic of the liberal imagination, and in describing Orwell as clinging to the remnants of liberalism in an increasingly non-liberal world.[2] The idea that the liberalism in his work was more vigorous in the Victorian period and is now threatened and becoming isolated is common: A.E. Dyson, for instance, in The Crazy Fabric: Essays in Irony compares Orwell to Bertrand Russell and suggests that both are radical Victorian liberals.[3] That Orwell's values are contained by liberalism tends to

---

1. E.M.Forster, 'George Orwell', in Two Cheers for Democracy (1951), pp. 72-74.
2. Philip Rieff, 'George Orwell and the Post-Liberal Imagination', Kenyon Review, XVI (1954), 49-70.
3. A.E. Dyson, The Crazy Fabric: Essays in Irony (1965), pp. 200-207.

grow into an assumption which is felt not to require much argument to support it: Samuel Hynes in 1971 makes the brief comment that they 'were never, strictly speaking, political, though they were consistent with the emotional liberalism that Orwell professed, and called socialism.'[1] All the moral and intellectual qualities taken to identify Orwell as a liberal can be found in his work, but by isolating them a partial view has been made to appear a view of the whole. The use by critics of 'liberal' has often been imprecise and the criticism in this area is general, though often stimulating, rather than analytical in a detailed or thorough way.

Where Orwell has been called a radical in preference to a liberal, the description has had a similar meaning, although more consistently confident. Gordon Beadle's conclusion to his comparison of Orwell with Dickens is representative: unlike many of his contemporaries, Orwell 'remained stubbornly faithful to the Victorian tradition of radicalism, with its emphasis on democracy, pragmatism, morality, and individual freedom.'[2] A more unusual view is taken by Geoffrey Ashe's brief and early essay, 'A Note on George Orwell', which places Orwell among the Tory Radicals. Ashe argues that it is unfortunate that 'Tory' has become a synonym for 'Conservative' in English political vocabulary; private enterprise and imperialism were originally Whig or Liberal, rather than Tory, although they are now part of Conservative doctrine.[3] Neither Ashe himself nor subsequent critics have developed this insight, but these distinctions can be used to interpret Orwell's description of himself in the

---

1. Samuel Hynes, 'Introduction', in Samuel Hynes ed., Twentieth Century Interpretations of 1984 (New Jersey, 1971), pp. 1-19 (p.3).
2. Gordon Beadle, Journal of Historical Studies, II (Winter 1969-70), 245-255 (p.255).
3. Geoffrey Ashe, 'A Note on George Orwell', Commonweal, LIV (1951), 191-193.

1930s as a 'Tory Anarchist', where 'Tory' can be taken to imply a sceptical resistance to change and affection for tradition, without a connection to capitalism.

Orwell's socialism has also been given some attention by critics. There is a widespread agreement that his idea of socialism is vague[1] and some left-wing critics have attacked it for this. They also detect a covertly hostile attitude to the working-class and a distrust of its organisations. The anti-socialist elements in Orwell's work have elicited some resentment and defences: the qualification that the arguments against socialism in parts of The Road to Wigan Pier are written from the stance of a 'devil's advocate' has usually been dismissed as merely technical.[2] Orwell's socialism has often been characterised as a restatement of his liberalism under another name, and, where the critic is especially unsympathetic, as an extension of middle-class values, a means of preserving bourgeois society.[3] Other critics have shown more patience: George Woodcock describes Orwell as an 'independent socialist with libertarian tendencies', and contrasts the success of his iconoclasm with the weakness of his creative political thought.[4] At a later date, Alex Zwerdling gives a similar account: he presents Orwell as a sceptical tester of theories,

---

1. D. Rankin, 'The Critical Reception of the Art and Thought of George Orwell' (Ph.D. University College and Birkbeck College, London University, 1965), p.367 notes that there is some critical concurrence that Orwell's socialism is barely, or only curiously, worth of the name.
2. Victor Gollancz, 'Foreword', in The Road to Wigan Pier, pp. xi-xxxiv is an early example of this.
3. J.E. Miller, 'George Orwell and Our Time', in John Singer ed., Million: Second Collection (1946), pp. 51-57.
4. George Woodcock, 'George Orwell, 19th Century Liberal', Politics, III (1946), 384-388 (p.388).

with a penchant for internal criticism, rather than an original socialist thinker.[1] Other commentators, such as John Atkins in George Orwell, have placed him in the moral tradition of the English socialism of William Morris and Robert Owen, without attempting to reconcile this with his critical comments on these and kindred figures.[2] Bernard Crick also puts Orwell in this tradition, but his account of his political temper as distinctively non-liberal, as harsher and more publicly active, differs from previous published criticism, and is valuable for the attention it draws to The Lion and the Unicorn.[3] Any exegesis of Orwell's socialism has to include this work and the second part of The Road to Wigan Pier, has to show some patience with them and not dismiss them for their vagueness or confusion, and must also place them in the context of the rest of his work.

Orwell's relation to Marxism has not been the exclusive subject of either an article or a book. The treatment by critics of his use of Marxism and of the methods of Marxist literary criticism has been patchy and uncertain, often occurring within criticism whose primary concern is with another topic on which they have impinged. Reviewers of Inside the Whale and Critical Essays recognised Orwell's use of elements of Marxist literary criticism. They often questioned their value[4] and this indicates some opposition to the Marxist cultural movement of the 1930s. In the case of Critical Essays, published in 1946, it also points to the decline of this movement after 1939. An important part of Orwell's historical context was hidden from the view of later critics as a consequence of this

---

1. Alex Zwerdling, Orwell and the Left (New Haven 1974), pp. 3-37 and 82-113.
2. John Atkins, George Orwell (1954), pp. 12-13.
3. Bernard Crick, George Orwell: A Life (1980), pp.xiv-xv, and, 'Introduction' in The Lion and the Unicorn (Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1982), pp. 25 and 29.
4. See Klitzke, pp. 29 and 41-43.

decline. Orwell himself in Inside the Whale shows some embarrassment about his use of Marxism, and a similar embarrassment has inhibited critical investigation of the topic. William Steinhoff in The Road to 1984 uneasily suggests that an invocation of Marx by Orwell is like an appeal to the 'devil'[1]; Edward Thomas finds Orwell's approach to Dickens to be, in summary, that of the 'dreariest Marxist criticism', but immediately denies any deeper resemblance, without being clear how Orwell's criticism is different from Marxism, other than by its inclusion of detailed observation and freedom from dogmatism[2] Wayne Warncke in his study of Orwell's literary criticism points to the paradox of the combination of his loud antipathy to the dishonesties of Marxist literary critics with some affinities to them in his own criticism, but does not follow this insight further.[3]

Criticism of Orwell has often looked at the development of his works of reportage of the 1930s and at connected topics, such as the character of their narrators and observation. Raymond Williams in Orwell (1971) is concerned with the relation between observation and imagination in Orwell's work and traces the creation of his literary identity. Richard Hoggart points to the stasis of Orwell's vision of working-class life[4], and Richard Rees makes a similar point when he argues that Orwell tends to present the urban working-class, particularly in his early novels and Nineteen Eighty-Four, as comic-postcard stereotypes.[5] The criticism has less frequently examined the further areas of the treatment of personal

---

1. William Steinhoff, The Road to 1984 (1975), p.61.
2. Edward Thomas, Orwell (1965), p.68-69
3. Wayne Warncke, 'George Orwell as Literary Critic' (Ph.D., University of Michigan, 1965), pp. 20-24.
4. Richard Hoggart, 'George Orwell and The Road to Wigan Pier', in Speaking to Eachother: Volume II: About Literature (1970), pp. 118-119.
5. Richard Rees, George Orwell: Fugitive from the Camp of Victory (1961), p.40.

identity and the role of memory in his work. Alan Sandison's study, The Last Man in Europe: An Essay on George Orwell (1974) does, despite its eccentricity, make some useful points on the establishment of personal identity through sense-data in Orwell's writing. The study of the development of the witness is a less clearly demarcated area than either Orwell's liberalism, socialism, or Marxism, and relevant passages occur in a number of books and articles. Alex Zwerdling's Orwell and the Left discusses the education of the originally innocent witness[1]; George Woodcock points to the visual bias of Orwell's writing and to the imaging of class barriers as windows in The Road to Wigan Pier[2]; and the remaking of the self in Orwell's work is a persistent theme of Keith Alldritt's The Making of George Orwell: An Essay in Literary History (1969). Despite this variety, there are some deficiencies. An account of the chronological growth of the witness, which will cover all of Orwell's career as a writer, is missing. Orwell's ideas on language have not been properly integrated with analysis of the forms of his writing and observation. The most important deficiency is the absence of a thorough link between this analysis and the development of Orwell's politics: in particular, the similarities between the witness-narrator and the autonomous self favoured by liberalism have not been adequately explored.

3. Structure and vocabulary

The body of this thesis is divided into three chapters, which deal respectively with the place of liberalism in Orwell's work; with his relation to Marxism; and the implications of this for the forms of his

---

1. Alex Zwerdling, Orwell and the Left (New Haven, 1974), pp. 132-140.
2. George Woodcock, The Crystal Spirit: A Study of George Orwell (1967), pp. 56-60.

writing. The account of Orwell's relation to liberalism first studies the meanings he attaches to 'liberal' and connected terms and ideas, both when they occur in descriptions of people and independently of this. The encounter between Orwell's deep identification with some liberal values and the Marxist ideas of socialism then current has some crucial consequences for the development of his commitment to socialism.

The study of Orwell's socialism, therefore, also forms a transition to the more detailed examination of his relation to Marxism in the second chapter. Literary criticism was a prominent form of Marxist writing in the 1930s, and the aspect of Marxism best known to Orwell, and so the the enquiry into the place of Marxism in his work concentrates on it. Its sociological approach is contrasted with the different emphases of other contemporary literary criticism. Orwell's explicit treatment of Marxist literary criticism is analysed; then some derivations from it are identified, and further similarities in methods and concerns established. His criticisms of it, which rest on a liberal concern for impartiality, are discussed. The final section of the chapter traces the effects of Orwell's acceptance of some Marxist propositions about individualism and economic determinism on his political ideas. An important modification of his liberalism is discovered in the debate between a man's responsibilities as a writer and as a man.

The last chapter examines the connection between the place of liberalism and Marxism in Orwell's work, and the forms of his writing. In brief, liberalism is shown to be connected with detached and independent observation, whereas Marxism is connected with observation from a more definite social position. The chapter first continues to use a contextual approach, looking at Orwell's relation to the documentary

movement of the 1930s, and then traces the chronology of the development of the witness in his work. The idea of the witness is then linked with other areas of Orwell's writing, with his liberalism, and with his treatment of language, memory, and identity. There is a progression to more purely aesthetic topics, the manner of Orwell's recording of observation and his views on prose, and these are related to his political position.

Each chapter, then, moves from the specific to the general and thereby establishes the various meanings covered by its chosen term, liberalism, Marxism, or the witness, before using it in a wider sense which combines related meanings. The term 'witness' refers first to the narrator of Orwell's reportage of the 1930s. Liberalism and Marxism cannot be defined in this way. Nor can either term be reduced to an essence. Rather, they must be described in the historical way practised in each chapter. Nevertheless, some core elements can be identified for both liberalism and Marxism in their application to Orwell's work and its historical context.

Core elements of liberalism in this context are a stress on personal and intellectual freedom, a belief in the value of individual judgment, and the idea of the autonomous self. Individualism is taken to cover similar ideas. It is important to remember that 'liberal' in this sense is more forceful than its common, sometimes pejorative, modern meaning of mild tolerance and hope for small improvements, a meaning which lay behind E.M. Forster's characterization of Orwell.

Marxism is, in its application to Orwell and his context, a term with fairly close historical limits. It refers to the ideas and writings associated with the Marxist cultural movement of the 1930s and, to a

lesser extent, of the 1940s. Although the ideas of this movement are varied, some core elements can again be identified. There is the proposition that culture is determined by the economic and class structure of society. An application of this proposition, that liberalism is associated with capitalism and incompatible with socialism, is crucial to an understanding of the encounter of liberalism with Marxism in Orwell's work.

CHAPTER 1

ORWELL AND LIBERALISM

1. Introduction

It is clear from a review of commentaries on Orwell's work that his thought has often been seen as part of the liberal tradition. Several critics have specifically stressed the importance of liberalism to Orwell's work and have attempted to place him within a tradition of English radical thought. George Woodcock's article, 'George Orwell, Nineteenth-Century Liberal' (1946)[1], which itself reflected the opinions of a large number of previous reviewers[2], is the first substantial example of this critical approach. Woodcock argues that Orwell is 'very much nearer to the old-style Liberal than to the corporate-State socialists who at present lead the Labour Party', and, continuing with this theme suggests Orwell's affinity to his own vision of Dickens: 'a man who is generously angry' - in other words ... a nineteenth-century Liberal, a free intelligence.[3] In a much later memoir of George Woodcock, Julian Symons records that Orwell considered Woodcock's article to be 'the best that had been written' about him[4], suggesting that

---

1. Politics, III, December 1946, pp. 384-388.
2. See Robert Klitzke, 'Orwell and his Critics: An Enquiry into the Reception of and Critical Debate about George Orwell's Political Works'. (Ph.D., Birkbeck College, London University, 1977), pp. 57-59.
3. George Woodcock, 'George Orwell, Nineteenth-Century Liberal', in The Writer and Politics (1948), pp. 123-124. Orwell's 'liberal' is changed, without notice, to 'Liberal' by Woodcock.
4. Julian Symons, 'George Woodcock: An Old Friend', in Critical Observations (1981), p.203.

Orwell also placed himself within this tradition of nineteenth-century English liberalism. Philip Rieff in 'George Orwell and the Post-Liberal Imagination' (1954) continues this attempt to categorise Orwell's work as liberal: 'Orwell was that most liberal of liberals, the Christian who has lost his Christianity, but keeps up the essential Christian action of brotherliness and compassion.' He briefly suggests how this view can be reconciled with Orwell's other commitments: 'Socialism was the last form of faith of the liberal-Christian era.'[1] Peter Thirlby's article, 'Orwell as a Liberal', does not share Rieff's emphasis on the effects of the loss of religious faith but also interprets Orwell's mentality as that of a liberal. Thirlby argues that his socialism is effectively a 'supra-class extension of liberal values' and as such comes into conflict with socialism where it threatens 'through its party discipline, to squeeze out the very moral-cultural values which had brought the liberals to oppose capitalism in the first place.'[2]

Although these articles and other subsequent work on Orwell do at least indicate some of his affinities with liberalism, they are inadequate in other respects. In particular, they fail to examine Orwell's own criticisms of liberalism and of liberal figures. Orwell's work contains important distinctions between types of liberalism: these have not been recognised and commentators have tended to use the term 'liberal' in the most general sense. Nor, as a consequence of these initial failures, do they make the crucial distinction between the simple categorisation of Orwell as a liberal and the more complex elucidation of his relation to liberalism.

---

1. Philip Rieff, 'George Orwell and the Post-Liberal Imagination', Kenyon Review, XVI (1954), 49-70 (pp. 51 and 63).

2. Peter Thirlby, 'Orwell as a Liberal', Marxist Quarterly, III (1956), 243-246.

Their failure to make this necessary distinction also obscures their account of Orwell's commitment to socialism. Orwell's express commitment to socialism is simply subsumed under his imputed status as a liberal; Mary McCarthy's attack on Orwell represents the most extreme and destructive example of a similar tendency: 'It is a question whether Orwell's socialism, savagely felt as it was, was not an unexamined idea off the top of his head: sheer rant.'[1] What is needed, therefore, to resolve this want of critical definition is a close examination of Orwell's relation to liberalism, which will include chronological discriminations, and distinctions between varieties of liberalism, and which shows how his affinity to liberalism is held at the same time as his commitment to socialism.

2. Liberal figures in Orwell's journalism, 1940-1946

Orwell's treatment of liberal figures in his journalism of the 1940s must be seen in the context of the emergence of an explicit concern for liberalism in his slightly earlier work, particularly Coming Up For Air (1939) and Inside the Whale (1940). It has also to be considered in relation to the growing apprehension of war which pervades Coming Up For Air, and to the fear of the disintegration of 'laissez-faire capitalism and of the liberal-Christian culture'[2], revealed particularly in 'Inside the Whale'.

Orwell's sudden transition from opposition to war against Fascism to patriotic support for England is also relevant here. Until August 1939

---

1. Mary McCarthy, 'The Writing on the Wall', in, The Writing on the Wall and Other Literary Essays (1970), pp. 153-171, (p.170).

2. 'ITW', ITW, p.14.

Orwell had opposed war on the grounds, which he held in common with the I.L.P.[1], that English 'bourgeois democracy' and imperialism were morally and politically equivalent to Fascism and that, therefore, they were not worthy of defence against it.[2] At that date he realised his own patriotism and also found political reasons for supporting the war: 'There is no real alternative between resisting Hitler and surrendering to him, and from a Socialist point of view I should say that it is better to resist.'[3] In this passage, Orwell presents himself as part of the Socialist movement; other sources reveal his increasing consciousness of the value of liberalism. English liberalism offered him a tradition which was not only peculiarly English, but which also contained elements of patriotism and of anti-imperialism.

Some characters in Coming Up For Air are specifically identified as liberal. Uncle Ezekiel, distinguished by his moral integrity, is 'a real old nineteenth-century Liberal, the kind that not only used to ask you what Gladstone said in '78 but could tell you the answer.'[4] The reference of 'Liberal' here, as its capitalisation signals, includes the parliamentary Liberal Party; Orwell's use elsewhere of 'liberal' does not necessarily have this reference.

Ezekiel's anti-imperialism and opposition to the Boer War is also of interest: '"Them and their far-flung Empire! Can't fling it too far for me." ... Uncle Ezekiel gave it out that he was a pro-Boer and a Little

---

1. See Martin Ceadel, Pacifism in Britain 1914-45: The Defining of a Faith (Oxford, 1980), p.195 for a brief comment on this.
2. See, for instance, 'Not Counting Niggers', Adelphi XV (1939), 469-473, and, 'The Russian Regime', NEW, XIV (1939), 203.
3. 'My Country Right or Left', Folios of New Writing, II (1940), 40.
4. CUFA, p.56.

Englander.'[1] A Radical section of the Liberal Party had drawn upon its traditional anti-imperialism and opposed the Boer War for financial and humanitarian reasons.[2] There is some continuity here with Orwell's opposition to the Second War. In an article, 'Not Counting Niggers', which appeared shortly after the publication of Coming Up For Air, Orwell argues against opposition to Hitler on the grounds that such opposition would bolster British imperialism and thereby maintain a greater injustice than Fascism[3]: the objection to both the Boer War and to the Second War depends upon the criticism of imperialism.

Bowling's employer, Grimmett, is 'like Uncle Ezekiel a good Liberal', though hypocritical and not sharing Ezekiel's Radical anti-imperialism: 'He'd trimmed his sails during the Boer War ... his canting talk about liberty of conscience and the Grand Old Man.'[4] Nor is Grimmett's form of Liberalism sympathetic to the socialist and labour representation movements which emerged from Radicalism during the late Victorian and Edwardian periods[5]: 'he was a bitter enemy of trade unions and once sacked an assistant for possessing a photograph of Keir Hardie.'[6] Even where, as here, 'Liberal' is being used with a specific historical reference, it covers a contrasting range of meanings.

The Victorian and Edwardian liberal culture represented in Coming Up For Air is destroyed by the growth of larger commercial concerns, embodied in 'Sarazins', and by the First War. Only a weakened and anachronistic

---

1. CUFA, p.56.
2. See S. Maccoby ed., The English Radical Tradition 2nd ed. (1966), pp. 214-217.
3. 'Not Counting Niggers', Adelphi, XV (1939), 469-473.
4. CUFA, pp. 117-118.
5. For an account of these developments see S. Maccoby ed., The English Radical Tradition 2nd ed.(1966), pp. 195-225.
6. CUFA, p.117.

form of liberalism survives in the figure of Porteous, whose mind 'probably stopped working at about the time of the Russo-Japanese war' (1904-1905). Porteous has a classical and rational mind which contrasts with the orgiastic hate of the Left Book Club meeting. His company induces feelings of peace and security in Bowling, though Bowling is satirically aware of Porteous's self-conscious separation from contemporary life and finally sees him as 'dead'. So there is an unresolved choice offered by Coming Up For Air: between a private attachment to a liberal culture, which has largely been historically superceded, though external evidence suggests that there is some connection with Orwell's own political position, and adjustment to a savage and disintegrating modern world: 'Dead men and live gorillas. Doesn't seem to be anything between.'[1] Orwell's subsequent journalism tends to reiterate this contrast between liberal values and the modernity which threatens them or reduces them to isolated impotence.

This contrast is also sustained in Inside the Whale. In the title essay, Orwell argues that the writer is becoming increasingly isolated from society: 'As for the writer, he is sitting on a melting iceberg; he is merely an anachronism, a hangover from the bourgeois age, as surely doomed as the hippopotamus .... For as a writer he is a liberal, and what is happening is the destruction of liberalism.' The writer, as a writer, is necessarily committed to independence of judgement, yet other men are in the process of losing both their independence of action and their independence of intellect: 'The autonomous individual is going to be stamped out of existence.' The writer's experience is increasingly differentiated from that of other men, and, as a consequence of this, as a writer he is reduced to isolation and passivity: 'That does not mean that he cannot help to bring the new society into being, but he can take

---

1. CUFA, pp. 196-197.

no part in the process as a writer.'[1] The origins of the later distinction of writer from the citizen lie here in the sense of the increasing distance of the essentially liberal writer from society.

The concluding eulogy of 'Charles Dickens' presents a similar contrast between liberalism and modernity, in which the liberal side of the antithesis is firmly endorsed, though a distinction between Orwell's use of liberal and nineteenth-century liberal will become apparent. 'It is the face of a man who is always fighting against something, but who fights in the open and is not frightened, the face of a man who is generously angry - in other words, of a nineteenth-century liberal, a free intelligence, a type hated with equal hatred by all the smelly little orthodoxies which are now contending for our souls.'[2] The increased confidence of the commitment to liberal values may well be related to the probable order of the composition of the essays of Inside the Whale.[3] If, as seems likely, 'Charles Dickens' was the last essay of the collection to be written, it would have been completed after the outbreak of war, and after Orwell's realisation of his own patriotism: this would allow for a generous endorsement of an English political tradition which was unlikely to have been encouraged by Orwell's earlier negative and largely isolated position of opposition to war against Fascism.

The firm endorsement of the values of liberalism does not, however, resolve the problem of its survival as a social force. The values denoted here by the term 'liberal' are essentially those of moral indignation and liberty of thought; the other values attributed to Dickens in the concluding section of the essay, values of decency, compassion, resistance to orthodoxy and the 'idea of freedom and equality'[4], are values customarily

---

1. 'ITW', ITW, p.185.
2. 'CD', ITW, p.85.
3. See 'Appendix: A note on the dates of essays in Inside the Whale'.
4. 'CD', ITW, p.84.

endorsed elsewhere by Orwell. It is, therefore, much more clearly a political commitment than the realisation of the writer's necessary status as a liberal qua writer in 'Inside the Whale'. Nevertheless, there is a clear line of development from 'Inside the Whale' to 'Charles Dickens': a sympathy for liberal political values evolves from the continuing commitment to intellectual independence, to the intellectual and personal values of liberalism, a process characteristic of Orwell's work as a whole.

The values denoted here by Orwell's description of Dickens as a 'nineteenth-century liberal' include the quality of moral indignation covered by the use of 'radicalism' earlier in the same section of the essay. They are also consistent with the initial description of Dickens as a 'radical': 'even if Dickens was a bourgeois, he was certainly a subversive writer, a radical, one might truthfully say a rebel'[1]; there is a suggestion here that Dickens's radicalism, his subversiveness, is in conflict with his bourgeois status. In contrast, elsewhere in the essay, 'radical', particularly where it is qualified by another term, has a more specifically historical reference, often akin to that covered by 'bourgeois'; for instance, one passage implicitly suggests the conventional interpretation of nineteenth-century radicalism as a movement for emancipation from feudal restrictions[2]: 'what is curious, in a nineteenth-century radical, is that when he wants to draw a sympathetic picture of a servant, he creates what is recognizably a feudal type.' Another passage suggests an affinity between radicalism and the industrial and commercial interests of the rising class of the 'small urban bourgeoisie', of which Orwell generally, though not in this instance, considers Dickens to be typical: 'What is more striking, in a seemingly 'progressive' radical, is that he is not mechanically minded.'[3] Orwell, therefore, tends to use 'radical', and

---

1. 'CD', ITW, pp. 81 and 10.
2. See S. Maccoby ed., The English Radical Tradition 2nd ed. (1966), passim.
3. 'CD', ITW, pp. 5, 32 and 59.

'nineteenth-century liberal', in two, potentially conflicting senses, without making a clear distinction between them: to refer to the attitudes specific to a particular class and period, and to the more abstract qualities associated with, though not confined to, this class.

In the period 1938-1940, Orwell is becoming increasingly concerned with liberalism, and liberal values are often presented in opposition to the social forces threatening them. This concern is connected with Orwell's response to the literary and political movements of the 1930s, studied in 'Inside the Whale', and to the growing apprehension of social and international crisis, and is also modified by his sense of his own patriotism.

A similar treatment of liberalism is apparent in Orwell's journalism of the 1940s. A contrast between personal rationality and social disintegration is made, in April 1940, in review of Julian Green's Personal Record 1928-1939: 'But what is attractive in this diary is its complete impenitence, its refusal to move with the times. It is the diary of a civilized man who realizes that barbarism is bound to triumph, but who is unable to stop being civilized. A new world is coming to birth, a world in which there will be no room for him.'[1] Although there is no direct reference to liberalism in this particular instance, the qualities discerned in Green are closely associated with it in Orwell's work. The attitude taken towards these qualities is two sided: they are prized but also seen to be becoming outmoded.

A similar sense of the disappearance of rational values is evident in a review, in May 1940, of Havelock Ellis's My Life: 'He is a type now becoming extinct, the completely rational, completely civilised man.'

---

1. 'Entre Chien et Loup', T&T, XXI (1940), 405.

In the same review, Orwell argues that these values have contributed to their own end: 'progress' and 'enlightenment' have gradually destroyed 'the basis of Christian civilisation. It had to be done, but the result was totally different from what had been intended.'[1] Orwell's theme is similar in some respects to that subsequently pursued with regard to H.G. Wells: that rationality and hedonism destroy traditional morality, without creating an adequate substitute, and that they prove incapable of understanding or of dealing with contemporary irrational forces, particularly of nationalism and Fascism, which are released in the absence of traditional morality.[2] Ellis is finally stated to be a 'nineteenth-century liberal[3][s]'; the uncapitalised term is here used without much direct reference to politics and denotes breadth of mind and a commitment to, and confidence in, progress by reason and experiment. Ellis's politics are not Liberal in the narrower sense; he was, in fact, together with Edward Carpenter, a member of the Fellowship of New Life from which the Fabian Society developed and broke away. Ellis, who disclaims any political interests, remained with the parent body but was sympathetic to the Fabians.[4] Orwell refers, in a tone inconsistent with the aggressive intolerance of passages from The Road to Wigan Pier, to Ellis's social milieu, in which 'Socialism, vegetarianism, New Thought, feminism, home-spun garments and the wearing of beards were all vaguely interconnected.'[5]

In contrast to these elegies for the disappearance of rationalist values, a review of June 1940 questions the contemporary liberalism offered by C.E.M. Joad's Journey Through the War Mind. Orwell asserts, in harmony with his previous contrasts of liberalism and modernity, that a 'good

---

1. 'Havelock Ellis', Adelphi, XVI (1940), 362-363 (p.362).
2. See 'Wells, Hitler and the World State', Horizon, IV (1941), 133-139.
3. 'Havelock Ellis', Adelphi, XVI (1940), 363.
4. See Havelock Ellis, My Life (1940), pp. 162-163.
5. 'Havelock Ellis', Adelphi, XVI (1940), 362-363.

liberal', such as Joad, is 'at a time like the present, a helpless anachronism.' Orwell regards Joad's commonsensical assumption of hedonistic mo[illegible]nvalid, and considers that, like other liberals, he states his desired ends, for instance the federation of Europe, without offering or considering the means to these ends. Orwell defends fanaticism and the necessity of patriotic feeling in a time of national crisis, and argues that in a situation such as the present Joad's liberal nicety of judgment inhibits resistance to Fascism and thereby aids its triumph. The treatment of Joad reveals the ambivalence of Orwell's attitude towards liberalism in the early wartime period: regret is expressed for liberal values crushed by the social and international crisis, but at the same time, it is demanded here that these values be rejected as they inhibit the violence and fanaticism required to deal with this crisis. The development of Orwell's patriotism is also relevant in this context: nationalism is evidently an overriding influence on contemporary political conduct; if liberalism is to survive it needs to be combined with some form of nationalistic feeling. Patriotism is later distinguished from nationalism and defined in such a way as to be compatible with liberalism: it is made a defensive idea in contrast with nationalism's aggressive search for dominance. This distinction is implicit here, though not articulated, and somewhat submerged in the advocacy of fanaticism: it underlies the sympathetic comparison of the 'ordinary decent patriot' in Journey Through the War Mind with 'two patriots of a more offensive kind.'[1] It is also possible to see a distinction emerging between the use of 'nineteenth-century liberal' and 'liberal': the qualities covered by the historical term are treated with sympathy even if they are presented as anachronistic, whereas the weaker type of contemporary liberalism, represented by Joad, is strongly criticised.

---

1. 'Mr Joad's Point of View', T&T, XXI (1940), 613.

The theme of the incapacity of the liberal outlook to understand, or deal with contemporary social forces is pursued in a slightly later article, in , 'Wells, Hitler and the World State': 'The energy that actually shapes the world springs from emotions - racial pride, leader-worship, religious belief, love of war - which liberal intellectuals mechanically write off as anachronisms.' The other qualities associated with the use of 'liberal' with reference to Wells are those of common sense, the belief that men are motivated by the pursuit of pleasure, and a confidence in moral and material progress. Orwell's attitude to these qualities is characteristically ambivalent: whilst they are criticised for their impotence, and for the inhibition they offer to the understanding of more violent motives, there is no extensive disagreement with Wells' political aims, though the assumption of hedonistic motivation is clearly rejected. The description of Wells as a 'nineteenth-century liberal' refers to the qualities and to the attitudes, in particular the anti-militarism, associated with his social class, 'the non-military middle class.'[1] Orwell's tone is very rarely anti-militarist, and he connects this anti-militarism with the incapacity of liberalism to deal with violent emotions. Wells's nineteenth-century liberalism is criticised on similar grounds to Joad's liberalism: it is not, therefore, simply that Joad's liberalism is weak, but that nineteenth-century liberal values have been outmoded by historical change. Where Orwell firmly endorses the values of nineteenth-century liberalism, as, for instance, at the conclusion of 'Charles Dickens', they are contrasted with modern social forces, but, at the same time, safeguarded from them by a definite historical distance, and are not eroded by being brought into close contact with them.

---

1. 'Wells, Hitler and the World State', Horizon, IV (1941), 135-137.

Orwell resumes the theme of the relation of liberal values to modernity in an article on Thomas Mann, in Tribune, in September 1943. By this dat relaxation of the acute sense of social and international crisis of the late 1930s and earlier 1940s, his tone is more subdued, neither as elegiac, nor as critical, as before. Mann is described as a 'Liberal humanist', witnessing the European tragedy, though the conditions of the war have improved since 1941, when the last essay of the collection under review, Order of the Day, was written. Orwell then continues: 'It is important to notice that Mann never alters his fundamental opinions, and makes little or no concession to the age he is living in. He never pretends to be other than he is, a middle-class Liberal, a believer in freedom of the intellect, in human brotherhood; above all in the existence of objective truth.'[1] Epistemological and moral values crucial to Orwell's work are gathered together in the idea of Liberalism: intellectual liberty and objective truth are connected to fraternity. Both senses of the term 'Liberal' are present here: it refers to the attitudes of a particular class in a particular period, and also to intellectual values, taken to be characteristic of that class, but which, if their claim to universality is admitted, cannot be confined to that class.

The confrontation of liberalism and the modern world is seen as a personal dilemma for Mann as a writer; the previous chronological gap between nineteenth-century liberalism and contemporary social forces now reappears as a contrast between a fixed self and external pressures on it to change, which are, in this case, largely refused. Orwell then goes on to define Mann's form of liberalism: 'This is not to say that he is the kind of Liberal who sees no further than political 'freedom' and is quite content to leave Western society in its capitalist shape. He sees clearly

---

1. 'The Faith of Thomas Mann', Tribune, 10 September 1943, p. 13.

the need for Socialism, is pro-Russian.' Orwell's use of the term, 'political 'freedom'', and the questioning of the value of such freedom suggested by the typography, indicates an assent to the socialist thesis that political freedom is illusory without economic equality, and that the Liberal struggle for political emancipation will not achieve its ideal ends unless it is accompanied by a change in the economic structure of society. The brief and allusive reference to this commonplace criticism of liberalism also suggests that Orwell would have been confident that his readers would have been familiar with this argument. Mann's acceptance of the limitations of liberal political freedom does not extend to an assent to the Marxist critique of bourgeois individualism and bourgeois culture, familiar to Orwell through the English Marxist writing of the 1930s and 1940s: 'But he never budges from his 'bourgeois' contention that the individual is important, that freedom is worth having, that European culture is worth preserving, and that truth is not the exclusive possession of one race or class.'[1] It is clear from Order of the Day that Orwell is referring to Mann's criticism of Nazi racial theories, as well as to the Soviet Proletcult.[2]

The values Orwell ascribes to Mann, particularly that of 'respect for common decency'[3], are those customarily endorsed by Orwell himself: it is likely, therefore, that Orwell's interest in Mann is stimulated by a sense that their situations are similar. There is also some similarity between Orwell's account of Mann's, and Julien Green's, refusal to succumb to the political pressures of his time and the tension Orwell feels between his own original 'nature' and the contemporary demands of politics which threaten and invade it, a tension exemplified in 'Why I Write'. Like

---

1. 'The Faith of Thomas Mann', Tribune, 10 September 1943, p. 13.
2. See Thomas Mann, 'Culture and Democracy', in, Order of the Day: Political Essays and Speeches of Two Decades (New York, 1942), pp. 228-237.
3. 'The Faith of Thomas Mann', Tribune, 10 September 1943, p. 13.

Mann, Orwell accepts the socialist criticism of the limitations of liberal political freedom but defends related individualistic and cultural values from Marxist criticisms, and his sympathetic account of the transformation of Mann's original commitment to liberal values into support of socialism (without changing these basic values, but accepting that they cannot be achieved by political emancipation) adds to the evidence for a similar process in his own thought.

What distinguishes Orwell's account of Mann from Orwell himself, besides their conflicting attitudes to the Soviet Union, is a waning of the confidence he ascribes to Mann in the ability of liberal values to resist totalitarian pressures. At the conclusion of the review, Orwell remarks that 'it is uncertain how deep the roots of totalitarianism lie', and, with clear relevance to Orwell's account of Nineteen Eighty-Four, first conceived in this year[1], as a satirical extension of totalitarian tendencies in the intelligentsia, adds, 'Judging from the mental atmosphere in Britain and America, the omens are not good.'[2] In his discussion of Mann, and of other liberal figures in his journalism of the 1940s, it is likely that Orwell is trying to define his own position as a writer through interpreting the dilemmas of other writers: this debate fluctuates between an antithesis of liberalism and modernity and attempts to find some way of reconciling them.

A later review, in November 1944, of J.A. Spender's Last Essays adds to the pattern of Orwell's treatment of liberalism during this period. Orwell asserts that J.A. Spender, 'the famous Liberal journalist', 'stood for the very best traditions of old-style English journalism - traditions that included not only a most vigilant regard for truthfulness

---

1. See 'Letter to F.J. Warburg', CEJL, IV, No. 125, p. 448.

2. 'The Faith of Thomas Mann', Tribune, 10 September 1943, p. 13.

and freedom of expression but also a respect for the intellect, which is not too common today.'[1] In his essay, 'On the Freedom of the Press'[2], Spender argues that a free press is essential to freedom and, as Orwell later does in 'The Prevention of Literature'[3], refers approvingly to Milton's defence of this liberty in Areopagitica; Orwell is also generally ostensibly committed to the values he finds in Spender's journalism, though his own practice sometimes departs from them.

The theme of the contemporary erosion of these intellectual and moral values is continued later in the review: 'When he writes of liberty, and especially the liberty of the press, Spender makes one realise what an advantage it was to have formed one's dominant ideas in the nineteenth century. Few modern people are able to be so unafraid of the consequences of liberty.'[4] In the collection's opening essay, 'On Liberty', Spender is concerned to define and to defend liberty: liberty must be more than the absence of restraint, liberty also requires absention from violence in home affairs, mutual tolerance, and informed citizens.

Spender refuses to accept the factual basis of the proposition, which he often finds in Socialist and Communist writing, that we 'must be prepared ... to sacrifice political liberty in order that we may obtain economic liberty.'[5] That Spender finds it necessary to try to define a form of liberty which is neither irresponsibly individualistic nor emasculated by this socialist criticism is an indication of the pervasiveness of this debate during this period. In the context of the general tendency for liberalism to replace socialism as an intellectual and social force

---

1. 'A Champion of Freedom', MEN, 23 November 1944, p. 2.
2. 'Last Essays', (1944), pp. 7-9.
3. 'The Prevention of Literature', Polemic, No.2 (March 1946), 4.
4. 'A Champion of Freedom', MEN, 23 November 1944, p. 2.
5. Last Essays , (1944), pp. 1-7 (p. 3).

during the interwar period, it is interesting to note that Stephen Spender, as J.A. Spender's nephew, is amongst those covered in a remark by Neal Wood in Communism and British Intellectuals, that something 'of the disintegration of Liberalism as a dynamic faith in modern industrial society may be reflected by the fact that at least seven [of the British Communist intellectuals of the 1930s] were from prominent Liberal families.'[1] Orwell's description of J.A. Spender as a 'Liberal' clearly has a political and historical reference, though it also includes abstract moral and intellectual qualities taken to be exemplified in this form of liberalism. These qualities are firmly endorsed and, in accordance with the pattern established by analogous passages in Orwell's work, this endorsement is associated with a contrast of these qualities with modern social forces; liberal values are not here weakened by being brought into close contact with modernity.

Similar concerns to those apparent in Orwell's treatment of J.A. Spender re-emerge in a review of H.W. Nevinson's Visions and Memories in January 1945. Nevinson, a journalist with literary and classical interests, is described as 'at once courageous, civilised, and intellectually honest - a combination that grows rarer and rarer as we move further from the nineteenth century.' Orwell's respect for Nevinson's embodiment of these qualities is slightly tempered by his perception of the 'strain of perversity that existed in Nevinson's own nature. He was in favour of any cause that was unpopular.'[2] The moral and intellectual qualities valued in Nevinson, like those perceived in J.A. Spender, are embodied at a historical distance and are now increasingly isolated. Orwell generally finds the qualities combined in Nevinson, qualities of courage and

---

1. Neal Wood, Communism and British Intellectuals (1959), p. 81.
2. 'Pen and Sword', Observer, 28 January 1945, p. 3.

intelligence, of action and thought, to be unsatisfactorily separated from each other in contemporary society. For instance, the development of the distinction between a man as writer and as a citizen, a distinction which Orwell finds necessary but unsatisfactory, involves a separation of autonomy of thought from autonomy of conduct; or, on a more narrowly political level, particularly during the early years of the Second War, he is critical of the widespread divorce of patriotism from intelligence[1], and, working against the tendency implicit in his own distinction of the citizen, who is by definition a participant in a community, and, therefore, potentially patriotic, from the writer, who is free to refuse the demands of a community upon his thought, attempts to bring them together by persuasion in his own writing.

Several important patterns emerge from Orwell's treatment of liberal figures in his journalism of the 1940s. The theme of the disappearance of the autonomous individual, announced in 'Inside the Whale' and recurrent in Orwell's subsequent journalism, particularly in the early 1940s, finds its equivalent in Orwell's sense that particular individuals who exemplify the intellectual, and often the moral, qualities associated with individual autonomy are also disappearing and are not being replaced. The range of qualities embodied in these figures, qualities of intelligence, sensitivity, moral force, a belief in rational progress, are threatened by modern social forces and are also incapable of understanding or coping with them. In those cases, as with Havelock Ellis and Julien Green, in which the endangered and isolated position of liberal, rationalistic values is emphasised, rather than their inadequacy, Orwell's tone is self-consciously elegiac, and, along with the stress on the disappearance of the autonomous individual, this tone is most frequent in the early 1940s when Orwell's fear that social change was leading towards totalitarianism became acute. Where, as in the

---

1. See, for instance, The Lion and the Unicorn (1941).

cases of H.G. Wells and Joad, it is the inadequacy of liberal rationality to meet the demands of wartime, the need for fanaticism and intemperance in the cause of national unity, qualities also to be found in Orwell's journalism of the early war when invasion was a threat, his tone is highly critical. A single perception of the disappearance of liberal values underlies these apparently disparate tones.

Orwell's terminology, including the use of 'liberal' and related terms, is confusing. However, a pattern, reflecting the fluctuation between elegy and criticism, can be discerned. The term 'liberal' and its variants are used by Orwell in two main senses, and, in some cases, both senses are carried by the one term. In the first sense, exemplified by the argument of 'Inside the Whale', that the writer as a writer is a liberal, it denotes a commitment to intellectual independence, a commitment which extends to a demand for freedom from any falsification of the emotions and intellect by a political movement and the orthodox beliefs associated with it. In the second sense the term denotes the attitudes and beliefs associated with a particular social class at a particular time in history. These include a belief in the value of intellectual independence and in the possibility of objective knowledge, but are by no means confined to this.

The two senses are potentially contradictory: where it is used in the first sense, denoting the writer's freedom from determination by the beliefs and policies of a social group, it would follow that these attitudes are not open to analysis as solely representative of a particular social class, as they explicitly deny the validity of the application of such description to themselves, and, on the contrary, claim a form of universality. Where it is used in the second sense, describing the attitudes characteristic of a particular social class, it is often used, as in the cases of Dickens

and Wells, as part of Orwell's method of class analysis in literary criticism. This ambiguity in the meaning of liberal is therefore connected with Orwell's response to contemporary English Marxist writing: with the technique of analysis of a writer's class which he adapts from Marxism, and with Marxism's insistence of the historical nature of liberalism, of individualistic values, on the falsity of their claim to universality.

These two senses of liberal are inherently difficult to distinguish; they do differ from each other in that the second sense is historical and the first is not:. but the historical description tends to include, along with specific limitations, the abstract qualities covered by the first sense. The influence of the common ground held between these two senses is apparent in the emergence of two important themes in Orwell's writing in the late 1930s and their continuance during the 1940s: there is the theme, announced in 'Inside the Whale', that the writer as writer is a 'liberal', that his status as a writer is dependent on a commitment to intellectual independence, and that the society which is developing will have no room for this value; and there is also the theme, recurrent in Orwell's journalism throughout the 1940s, that particular writers, often liberals in the historical sense, a sense which includes, but is not limited to this abstract commitment to intellectual independence and the possibility of objective knowledge, are the last representatives of a type which social change is forcing out of existence.

A closer inspection of Orwell's terminology helps to clarify the pattern of his treatment of liberalism and reveals that in many cases these different senses of 'liberal' are signalled by the use of variant terms: for instance, 'Liberal', 'nineteenth-century liberal', 'radical' and 'nineteenth-century radical' all carry particular connotations. The

most specifically political and historical variant of 'liberal' is the form, 'nineteenth-century Liberal'[1], used to describe Uncle Ezekiel and Grimmett in Coming Up For Air. The description 'nineteenth-century liberal', whilst clearly also a historical description, does not automatically have the specifically political reference of 'nineteenth-century Liberal' and can, as in the case of Havelock Ellis, be used with reference to a figure whose political attitudes are at odds with nineteenth-century Liberalism. Even where the description 'nineteenth-century liberal' includes a narrowly political reference, the emphasis is not upon this but on a broader set of historically situated moral and intellectual qualities. It can also be used to refer to the attitudes characteristic of a particular social class, generally the urban middle-class: for instance, Orwell connects Wells's and Dickens's dislike of the military and of the aristocracy with their status as 'nineteenth-century liberal[s].'[2]

Orwell's journalism of the 1940s reveals that he values the moral and intellectual integrity and force covered by his use of the description 'nineteenth-century liberal', but consistently questions the class attitudes covered by the same term; in the case of Dickens, in whom aspects of both sides nineteenth-century liberalism are embodied, Orwell establishes a rhetorical, though not necessarily/a logical, separation between these two aspects at the conclusion of his essay.

The description 'nineteenth-century radical' shares a range of reference with 'nineteenth-century liberal', covering both intellectual and moral qualities and class attitudes. 'Nineteenth-century radical' is the narrower description and is used to describe a passionate moral criticism of social injustice rather than a faith in rationality. In contrast,

---

1. CUFA, pp. 56 and 117.
2. 'Wells, Hitler and the World State', Horizon, IV (1941), 137.

'nineteenth-century liberal' can denote either, or both, of these senses. Where the terms 'liberal' and 'radical' are used without the qualification 'nineteenth-century' they can have a historical referent where the context or typography supplies them with one: both elements are present in a remark of Orwell's on Mark Rutherford, who, 'like Dickens,... was a Radical!'[1]

As single terms, without an implicit or explicit historical qualification, 'radical' and 'liberal' have markedly differently connotations, connotations which emerge, in part, from differences in their historical signification. 'Radical', when it is used to describe purely modern movements or figures, survives largely in its adjectival form and covers qualities of political extremism and moral and intellectual conviction. In contrast, 'liberal' survives both as noun and as adjective and covers a weaker set of qualities,

> a belief in the value of reason and in the power of reasonable behaviour.

In all this Orwell's use of 'liberal', 'radical' and their variants, though revealing, is largely conventional and historically accurate. However, further and more telling distinctions can be discerned in the pattern of Orwell's use of these terms. In those cases in which liberal values, including the use of 'radical' in its historical sense, are most firmly endorsed, they receive, implicitly or explicitly, a historical qualification which confines them to the nineteenth century, and which establishes a clear chronological gap between their realisation and present society. In other cases, as, for instance, with the description of H.G. Wells as a 'nineteenth-century liberal', there is still this historical qualification to the description 'liberal', but these values, though originating in the nineteenth century, are not confined to it and their force is weakened by contact with modernity. This pattern, in which liberal values are weakened

---

1. 'As I Please', Tribune, 3 December 1943, p. 10.

as they grow further from the nineteenth century, is also evident in the use of 'liberal', never of 'radical', as a term of criticism when applied to particular contemporary writers, such as Joad, or of weak virtue, of independence of thought divorced from independence of action, when applied to the position of modern writers in general.

So a chronological gap between liberal values, or their representatives, and modern society is essential to the unqualified endorsement of these values. Yet this endorsement is simultaneously undercut by the chronological gap which enables it: if these values have to be safeguarded from modernity in this way, they are, therefore, despite the forceful tone in which they are stated, incapable of dealing with modern social movements. Bernard Crick in George Orwell: A life questions whether the treatment of liberalism in 'Inside the Whale' is 'compatible with a traditional radical optimism, even when put with deliberate understatement in his essay in the same volume on 'Charles Dickens'.'[1] As the study of Orwell's terminology reveals, the concluding eulogy of 'Charles Dickens' to Dickens's liberalism is dependent on a contrast with, and a protection from modernity, as well as on a rhetorical separation of the intellectual and moral aspects of nineteenth-century liberalism from the sense in which it describes the attitudes of a social class: it is therefore part of the same pattern as the weakened form of liberalism presented in 'Inside the Whale'.

The use of 'radical' as an adjective suggests, however, that there is some continuity, which is not eroded in the same way, between the qualities Orwell values in nineteenth century writers and those valued in contemporary writers and movements. Yet this continuity is also incomplete:

---

1. Bernard Crick, George Orwell: A Life (1980), p.260.

'radical' survives primarily as an adjective: the range of qualities found in nineteenth-century radicals are no longer embodied in particular figures. A further distinction also suggests itself here: that where the values of nineteenth-century liberalism are endorsed in the context of a political discussion, they tend to be those also covered by the slightly narrower range connoted by nineteenth-century radicalism.

The persistent, though sometimes partly concealed, historical gap between the liberal values to which Orwell is attracted and the modernity he confronts can be closely related to the distinction, developed during the same period, between the writer and the citizen. All the figures identified as liberals by Orwell during this period are writers and, in several cases, writers of a type similar to himself, journalists or essayists, or with similar concerns, particularly for liberty and social justice. It is therefore probable that in his discussion of these figures Orwell is conducting a debate as to the proper function and status of the writer, in terms which can be closely connected with his own work. The debate parallels the more theoretical debate which leads to the distinction of the writer from the citizen.

The tensions which characterise both debates are similar: with regard to the treatment of liberal figures in Orwell's writing of the 1940s the recurrent tension is between a writer's liberalism and the demands of modern society; the tension in the distinction between the writer and the citizen is between the writer's necessary commitment to the liberal value of intellectual independence and the demands of communal political action. Both debates fluctuate between attempts to resolve this tension and a tendency to make the two poles of the debate mutually antithetical. Thus, in the case of Thomas Mann, Orwell finds a resolution of a commitment to

liberal values and a recognition of the necessity of socialism: in Orwell's interpretation of Mann, suggestive of Orwell's own position, Mann is committed to socialism insofar as it will realise the basic values of liberalism. However, in many other cases the poles of the debate are seen as antithetical: liberalism is historically cut off from the demands of modernity; the writer is sharply distinguished from the citizen.

Nineteen Eighty-Four has a clear thematic connection with these parallel debates and particularly with their antithetical phases: liberal values, both moral and epistemological, are defeated by a totalitarian form of socialism. The title under which it was originally projected, 'The Last Man in Europe', establishes a closer connection with the concern of Orwell's journalism of the 1940s with the disappearance of figures embodying liberal values under the pressure of social change, a theme which could be fairly characterised as 'the last men in Europe'. Closer study of the 1943 outline for Nineteen Eighty-Four, found in Orwell's notebook under the heading 'The Last Man in Europe', reinforces this connection. Orwell's outline refers to the 'Loneliness of the writer. His feeling of being the last man.'; this formulation also suggests that Nineteen Eighty-Four was originally conceived as a first person narrative. As in Orwell's journalism of this period, an emphatic connection is made between the writer and isolation. The second sentence and the outline as a whole make it clear that the isolation of the writer extends to a sense that men of his type are being forced out of existence by social change[1], paralleling the similar theme in Orwell's journalism of this period. The absence of any sign of synthesis of liberalism and socialism within Nineteen Eighty-Four can be partly understood in terms of the subsequent development of the distinction between the writer and the citizen; by the years 1946 - 1948, during which Nineteen Eighty-Four was written[2], the dichotomy between

---

1. 'The Nineteen Forty-Three Outline of Nineteen Eighty-Four', 'Appendix A', in, Crick, pp. 407-409.

2. See, Ian Angus, 'Appendix II', in CEJL, IV, 519-520.

the two had become rigid, and, analogously, liberalism was increasingly difficult to combine with socialism.

Contextual evidence from Orwell's journalism therefore establishes that Nineteen Eighty-Four continues the theme, reaching back to Coming Up For Air and Inside the Whale and continuing, in both abstract and particular forms, throughout his subsequent writing, of the possible relevance of liberal values to the social and political problems with which he is concerned, and of the danger that these liberal values will be forced out of existence by social pressures. What emerges from a study of this material is a sense that Orwell's commitment to liberal values and his recognition of the need for socialist measures are, despite some attempt to do so, not fully reconciled, but are held simultaneously and separately, often with an acute sense of the possible conflict between them.

3. Other uses of 'liberal' and 'radical' by Orwell

In an unsigned editorial to Polemic, written in 1946, Orwell defends the journal's political stance from a Marxist attack in the Modern Quarterly, and, in the course of his defence, invokes the values of liberalism: 'Polemic is attacked because it upholds certain moral and intellectual values whose survival is dangerous from the totalitarian point of view. These are what is loosely called the liberal values - using the word 'liberal' in its old sense of 'liberty-loving'. Its aim, before all else, is to defend the freedom of thought and speech that has been painfully won over during the past four hundred years.'[1] Orwell's remark here on the meaning of 'liberal' is in accord with the pattern of tones and meanings conveyed by the use of 'liberal' and its variants in Orwell's treatment of liberal figures in his work during the 1940s, in which the stronger nineteenth century forms of liberalism are opposed to their weaker contemporary survivors, though Orwell is seldom as explicit on the meanings he attaches to 'liberal'. In other respects also Orwell's treatment of liberalism here is in harmony with that already revealed: liberty of thought and of expression are taken to be vital and are defended without an accompanying

---

1. 'Editorial', Polemic, No.3 (May 1946), 2-8 (p.7). Polemic's commitment to these liberal values is evident in its other issues in 1946 and 1947. For instance, an unsigned editorial to its second issue states that its policy is to encourage 'free speech in an increasingly authoritarian world', and that it is particularly opposed to totalitarianism, but sympathetic to logical positivism and to Karl Popper's rationalist attitude. ('Editorial', Polemic, No.2 (March 1946), 2-3.) An editorial in a later issue, also unsigned, advances kindness, moral courage, and objectiveness, by which is meant the independent existence of a universe, as the basis of human ethics, and opposes these values to the Marxism and moral relativism found in Modern Quarterly. ('Editorial', Polemic, No.5 (Sept.-Oct. 1946), 2-4.) Several of Orwell's major late essays, including 'The Prevention of Literature', 'Politics vs. Literature: An Examination of Gulliver's Travels', and 'Lear, Tolstoy and the Fool', were published in Polemic, all concerned, in different ways, with the liberal issues of intellectual freedom, the nature of tolerance, and the proper limits to authority. So his editorial to Polemic is fair to the journal's outlook, and his other contributions add to the evidence it provides for his sympathy with and interest in liberalism in the post-war years.

defence of liberty of conduct. The Marxist account of the historical development of these liberal values in the bourgeois era is quietly accepted without accepting the Marxist condemnation of these values. Indeed, in accordance with the pattern in Orwell's writing developed since the Spanish War, these values are held in opposition to totalitarianism and to aspects of Marxism, particularly those aspects which he sees as connected with totalitarianism. In general, an examination of Orwell's treatment of liberalism and radicalism in other contexts will reinforce the pattern and distinctions discernible in his discussions of liberal figures during the 1940s.

The values covered by ''liberal' in its old sense' often partly coincide with those covered by 'radicalism' and 'nineteenth-century radicalism', and, from an early date, Orwell shows a persistent sympathy with radicalism. This sympathy is evident in a review by Orwell, in May 1932, in which he refers to the French 'enthusiasm for justice ... which is really a symptom of old-fashioned radicalism' of a type more likely to be found in England in 1840s, but never in the 1920s.[1] Orwell's historical perspective is already apparent: that the values historically associated with English radicalism have now largely disappeared. A slightly later review by Orwell, in September of the same year, makes it clear that he values similar qualities in Byron, though the term 'radical' is not used: 'Still better is the enthusiasm for justice and honesty which led Byron into sympathy with all rebels.'[2] Both reviews praise an 'enthusiasm for justice', used in both its juridical and wider social sense, and reveal how deeply Orwell values this enthusiasm, and how he associates it with radicalism.

---

1. Review of The Civilisation of France by Ernst Robert Curtius, Adelphi, IV (1932), 554.
2. Review of Byron and the Need of Fatality by Charles du Bos, Adelphi, IV (1932), 874.

Orwell's comments on Byron's 'The Isles of Greece' foreshadow his later patriotism: 'Similarly with 'The Isles of Greece' - almost the only good English patriotic poem, though the patria in the case happens not to be England. Romantic nationalism means very little today, but the underlying mood of 'The Isles of Greece', and the peculiar clear ring of its oratory, are permanently valuable.'[1] When Orwell's patriotism emerges fully during the Second War it is connected with the radical tradition of patriotism, as is apparent from his later essay on this subject, 'Notes on Nationalism.'[2] A remark in the course of the early war-time essay, 'The Art of Donald McGill', in which the context and underlying subject is a sense of national unity, provides further evidence for an association in Orwell's work between Radicalism and patriotism: 'The implied political outlook' of McGill's postcards 'is a Radicalism appropriate to about the year 1900.'[3]

Other explicit references by Orwell to Radicalism are infrequent. In 1944, Thomas Paine, later characterised as 'the great English Radical'[4], is invoked and quoted, as part of a humorous polemic against the New Year's Honours List, a topic consistent with the anti-aristocratic strain of English Radicalism: 'As Tom Paine put it: "These people change their names so often that it is as hard to know them as it is to know thieves."'[5] In a review in 1945 Cobbett, without being explicitly identified as a radical, is briefly discussed as a part of a tradition of thought opposed to machine civilisation[6], an opposition also present in Orwell's work,

---

1. Review of Byron and the Need of Fatality by Charles du Bos, Adelphi, IV (1932), 874.
2. Polemic, No.1 (October 1945) pp. 32-47.
3. Horizon, IV (1941), 153-162 (pp. 156-157).
4. 'Front Seat View of Politics', MEN, 2 August 1945, p.2.
5. 'As I Please', Tribune, 7 January 1944, p.11.
6. 'Conquer Nature or Care for it?', MEN, 25 January 1945, p.2.

particularly in his early work, though it is later tempered by the recognition of the necessity of the use of machines; despite the resemblances in tone and genre between The Road to Wigan Pier and Cobbett's Rural Rides, there is little evidence for any direct indebtedness. Orwell's scattered references to English Radicalism therefore sustain the note of approval which was previously apparent, and also suggest some continuity between Radical opinion and his own treatment of similar social and political topics.

In the previous section, the various senses in which Orwell uses 'liberal' and variant terms, to refer to a state of mind, and to political and historical phenomena, were examined. The range of meanings seen to have been covered by 'liberal' is also evident in other contexts in his writing. In its broadest and most fundamental sense, 'liberal' and particularly the description 'nineteenth-century liberal' was used to refer to a set of valuable moral and intellectual qualities, which included a confidence in rational investigation as a means to objective knowledge. This sense is also present, though its force is diminished, in a review, which anticipates the subsequent theme of 'the last men in Europe', in January 1939, of Bertrand Russell's Power: A New Social Analysis. Russell shares a weakness characteristic of contemporary liberalism: 'In dealing with the contemporary situation he is less satisfactory, because like all liberals he is better at pointing out what is desirable than at explaining how to achieve it.'[1] There is a clear connection here with Orwell's developing sense, revealed particularly in the discussion of H.G. Wells in 1941[2], that liberal rationality is incapable of coping with modern social and political tendencies. The terminology, the use of 'liberal' without a qualifier to

---

1. 'The Taming of Power', Adelphi, XV (1939), 205.
2. 'Wells, Hitler and the World State', Horizon, IV (1941), 133-139.

denote a weak form of an originally more assertive ideology, is consistent with Orwell's use of 'liberal' elsewhere. Part of the weakness of Russell's position lies in his isolation: he is a liberal intellectual in an age which 'differs from those immediately preceding it' in 'that a liberal intelligentsia is lacking.' Orwell's sense of Russell's isolation is likely to be connected with his questioning of Russell's confidence in the continuance of liberal values: 'Underlying this is the idea that common sense always wins in the end. And yet the peculiar horror of the present moment is that we cannot be sure that this is so. It is quite possible that we are descending into an age in which two and two will make five when the leader says so.'[1] Orwell's association of 'common sense' with the liberal mind suggests a link between his own tendency towards pragmatic judgments based on personal experience and liberalism. The verbal prefiguration of Nineteen Eighty-Four supports the interpretation of Nineteen Eighty-Four as being concerned with the defeat of liberal values, epistemological as well as moral.

The theme of the distortion of history, and the possibility of the final decay of liberal values, is resumed in a later article in Tribune in February 1944: 'The really frightening thing about totalitarianism is not that it commits 'atrocities' but that it attacks the concept of objective truth: it claims to control the past as well as the future.'[2] In Britain this tendency has been less marked and Orwell's tone is therefore slightly more confident than in his earlier remarks on Russell: 'There is some hope, therefore, that the liberal habit of mind, which thinks of truth as something outside yourself, something to be discovered, and not as something you can make up as you go along, will survive.'[3] In both these reviews Orwell clearly links the idea of history, the objective recording

---

1. 'The Taming of Power', Adelphi, XV (1939), 205.
2. 'As I Please', Tribune, 4 February 1944, p. 11.
3. 'The Taming of Power', Adelphi, XV (1939), 205.

of past events, with the liberal mind; the destruction of history in this sense is also one of the reiterated concerns of Nineteen Eighty-Four.

A less explicit link is also revealed by the apposition of 'truth as something outside yourself, something to be discovered' with 'the liberal habit of mind': between the liberal mind and the method of observation, and of reasoning from observation and discovery, implied by this notion of truth, and to which Orwell's work elsewhere shows him to be generally committed. In his discussions of liberal figures Orwell was seen to value general moral and intellectual qualities, as well as some political attitudes. The reference of 'liberal' in these two articles is almost entirely to qualities of mind, though these may be associated with political attitudes, and, showing tendencies in agreement with those already revealed, rationalistic values are simultaneously asserted and questioned, and, also in agreement with the weakened use of 'liberal', are presented in company with only diminished qualities of morality and action.

Orwell's concern, in these instances, with the liberal mind is connected with his fear of, and opposition to, totalitarian tendencies: liberalism and totalitarianism become opposing poles of a recurrent antithesis in Orwell's work. It is, for instance, present in a review, in 1939, of N. de Basily's Russia under Soviet Rule, which Orwell describes as a criticism of the 'Bolshevik experiment not from a Socialist but from a liberal-capitalist standpoint.' For Orwell, liberalism and totalitarianism are rigidly antithetical: 'In the last analysis it is doubtful whether any liberal criticism of a totalitarian system is really relevant: it is rather like accusing the Pope of being a bad Protestant.' As elsewhere, he is fearful of the destruction of liberalism, whilst remaining committed to its fundamental values: 'as a liberal, he takes it for granted that the 'spirit of freedom' is bound to revive sooner or later. ... In the past every tyranny was sooner or later overthrown, or at least resisted, because

of 'human nature', which as a matter of course desired liberty. But we cannot be at all certain that 'human nature' is constant. It may be just as possible to produce a breed of men who do not wish for liberty as to produce a breed of hornless cows.'[1] Whilst Orwell's sense of the uncertain continuance of liberalism is directly connected here with historical events, it is also likely to be related to his acquaintance with Marxism and with its repeated assertion that individualistic values are historically specific, and, therefore, liable to change and to historical erosion.

The sense that totalitarianism will destroy liberal values underlies a slightly later comment, in August 1940, by Orwell, in which he refers to 'the picture which is customary in modern novels, and common enough in real life, of the liberal intellectual haunted by the approach of totalitarianism.'[2] The easy collocation of 'liberal' and 'intellectual' shows that the two terms have become closely associated with each other, and also reflects the narrowing of the range of meanings covered by 'liberal', from qualities of thought and action, to an emphasis on thought by itself. The general opposition of liberalism and totalitarianism also reveals how a commitment to liberal qualities of mind, to rationality and to objectivity, develops into a more specifically political stance, into an opposition to totalitarian regimes, and to totalitarian tendencies within a society.

Further development along these lines is evident in Orwell's conclusion to his review of N. de Basily's Russia under Soviet Rule: 'The essential act is the rejection of democracy - that is, of the underlying values of democracy; once you have decided upon that, Stalin - or at any rate some-

---

1. 'The Russian Regime', NEW, XIV (1939), 202-203.
2. 'Life in London's Underworld', Tribune, 23 August 1940, p. 18.

one like Stalin - is already on the way.' Orwell's careful qualification of his implied commitment to democracy, to its underlying values rather than to an actual political system, is likely to stem from his political opinions at this date and from his general political development. At this date, in January 1939, Orwell has been shown to be opposed to war against Germany on the grounds that 'bourgeois democracy' and Fascism were of equal value: it was therefore necessary for him to disassociate a commitment to the essential values of democracy from 'the talk of democracy versus Fascism.'[1]

The qualification also has another likely source in Orwell's acceptance of the socialist contention that political democracy will not realise its own ends without some measure of economic equality: his commitment must therefore be to the values rather than to the methods of democracy; as elsewhere in his work, Liberalism is modified in order to accommodate a commitment to socialism. The influence of Orwell's qualification upon his commitment to democracy, and of the divided attitude this qualification reveals, is also evident in a later discussion, in January 1943, of Yeats's political attitudes: 'Translated into political terms, Yeats's tendency is Fascist. ... He is a great hater of democracy, of the modern world, science, machinery, the concept of progress - above all, of the idea of human equality. ... Not much interested in politics, and no doubt disgusted by his brief incursions into public life, Yeats nevertheless makes political pronouncements. He is too big a man to share the illusions of Liberalism.'[2] 'Liberalism' here, as its context and capitalisation makes clear, includes a narrowly political reference, presumably to the belief in progress through political emancipation, and Orwell's phraseology indicates an admiration for Yeats's rejection of this. Liberalism is also connected in this

---

1. 'The Russian Regime', NEW, XIV (1939), 203.

2. Review of The Development of William Butler Yeats by V.K.Narayana Menon, Horizon, VII (1943), 69-70.

passage with the wider range of values hated by Yeats, and Orwell's attitude to these values is a more complicated mixture of dislike and commitment. For instance, a distaste for the influence of industrial technology is recurrent throughout Orwell's work, though its necessity is accepted, and, in contrast to Yeats, there is a persistent commitment to the idea of human equality: Orwell therefore draws selectively from the group of values associated with Liberalism.

The source of Orwell's qualification upon his commitment to democracy is further clarified by some of his later remarks. In an 'As I Please' column in April 1944, Orwell comments on the increased intelligence of the wartime newspapers, which are no longer dominated by the demands of trade and of advertisements, and continuing with this concern for the dissemination of information to the public, argues that the press is to be preferred to the radio. Radio broadcasting is inherently totalitarian as it tends to be controlled by the state, or by large corporations, whereas the control of the press is more diversified and its content more informative: it is therefore 'of its nature a more liberal, more democratic thing.'[1] The association in Orwell's writing between liberalism and democracy is strengthened by this passage, and it also illustrates how Orwell's explicit interest in liberalism tends to arise in connection with an opposition to totalitarian tendencies.

An article, 'Propaganda and Demotic Speech', published in 1944, is similarly concerned with the relation between democracy and the methods, here the government's methods, of informing the public. Towards the end of this article, Orwell argues that the testing of public opinion, and the fullest possible informing of the public by the government, is a condition of 'a

---

1. 'As I Please', Tribune, 7 April 1944, p. 10.

genuinely democratic government.'[1] There is a clear preference for this concept of democracy and it is compared with the procedures of the war-time British government: 'The fact that when you suggest finding out what the common man is like, and approaching him accordingly you are either accused of being an intellectual snob who wants to 'talk down to' the masses, or else suspected of plotting to establish an English Gestapo, shows how sluggishly nineteenth-century our notion of democracy has remained.'[2] The contrast of this conclusion with Orwell's desire for genuine democracy stems from the qualification of the earlier commitment to the values of democracy: it implies that actual democratic governments are not fully democratic, and in order for them to become this, an informed public, and a government informed of public opinion, must be added to the full franchise suggested by the reference to a nineteenth-century concept of democracy. Orwell largely retains the values of democracy and of liberalism, but recognises that the conditions for their realisation must be changed.

Orwell's concern for liberalism and democracy tends to manifest itself in areas closely connected with his own function as a writer: in his concern for the preservation of free speech and of varied and open methods of communication between a writer and his audience. This reflects the nature of his relation to liberalism: if the writer, as a writer, though not necessarily as a citizen, is a liberal, then his concern for liberalism is most likely to arise in connection with his sense of himself as a writer, and with those aspects of society, notably its methods of communication, which impinge most directly upon his writing. Whereas the treatment of those aspects of society connected with his role as a citizen need not

---

1. 'As I Please', Tribune, 7 April 1944, p. 10.

2. 'Propaganda and Demotic Speech', Persuasion, II (1944), 41.

reflect so strongly the concern with liberalism and can indeed be somewhat at odds with it.

This pattern of emphasis in Orwell's concern for liberalism is sustained elsewhere in his work. For instance, in an article in Tribune in November 1945 Orwell defends the right of an observer to report facts where they are inconvenient politically. In this case he is concerned with Tribune's Vienna correspondent's report of the Russian occupation there, though the article can also be read as an indirect defence of his own reporting and writing. The conclusion asserts that the exercise of this right, and the consequent increase of knowledge, is vital to progress, and strongly implies that this right is one of the 'values of liberalism.'[1]

Orwell's involvement, also in 1945, with the Freedom Defence Committee, 'the only voluntary body in which he was ever active'[2], is in line with this concern for freedom of expression. At a later date, he appears as one of a group of signatories, which also included E.M. Forster and Herbert Read, to a letter stating the aims of the F.D.C.: it had been set up 'to uphold the essential liberty of individuals and organisations, and to defend those who are persecuted for exercising their rights to freedom of speech, writing and action.'[3] Within the liberal terms of this statement the F.D.C. had campaigned for an amnesty for those imprisoned under wartime legislation, both military and political.[4] Interestingly, in view of the subsequent use of Orwell by his critics during the Cold War, it also drew attention to the dangers of the British government's proposed enquiry into the backgrounds of civil servants suspected of Communist or Fascist tendencies. It pointed to

---

1. 'Through a Glass Rosily', Tribune, 23 November 1945, p.8.
2. Bernard Crick, George Orwell: A Life (1980), p.344.
3. 'Letter to the press', Freedom Defence Committee Bulletin, No.7, Autumn 1948, p.1.
4. 'The Amnesty Campaign', Freedom Defence Committee Bulletin, No.2, February-March 1946, p.1.

the absurdities of the American witch-hunt and proposed procedural safeguards against injustice for the British investigation; the constitution of the F.D.C. did not allow it to discuss the general political issue.[1]

Orwell's most notable contribution to Freedom Defence Committee Bulletin was an article, reproduced from Tribune, 'Freedom of the Park', defending freedom of speech, in this case of anarchists and pacifists. He argues that the continuance of this freedom is dependent on public concern for it[2]; there is some connection here with the slightly earlier argument that genuine democracy depends on informed citizens. Orwell's other interventions during 1944 and 1945 on behalf of the liberties of anarchists and pacifists, in articles and letters to Tribune.[3], confirm the strength of his concern for liberty of speech, though it had been contradicted by the intolerant tone of his journalism in the early years of the Second War, when the need for national solidarity, and the possibility thereby of the preservation of a society favourable to freedom of speech, was considered of more immediate importance.

Towards the end of his most extended defence of intellectual liberty, 'The Prevention of Literature', published in January 1946, Orwell asserts that, 'Our own society is still, broadly speaking, liberal'. This assertion follows a discussion of the threats to intellectual liberty, and the subsequent context makes it clear that 'liberal' refers primarily to the 'right of free speech.'[4] As in the earlier articles in Tribune, the liberal value of freedom of expression is held in opposition to

---

1. 'Anti-Communism: The American Witch-hunt', and 'F.D.C. Statement on Civil Service Purge', Freedom Defence Committee Bulletin, No.7, Autumn 1948, pp. 2-3. Orwell was one of the signatories to the latter item.
2. 'Freedom of the Park', Freedom Defence Committee Bulletin, No.2, February-March 1946, pp. 6 and 8.
3. See Crick, p.344.
4. Polemic, No.2 (March 1946), 12.

totalitarian tendencies. The liberties of peculiar interest to the writer, freedom of thought and freedom of expression, continue to be stressed without much immediate attention to the wider field of liberty of conduct.

Orwell's general use of 'liberal', and of terms closely connected with it, shows a pattern of values similar to that revealed in his treatment of liberal figures during the 1940s, though his terminology is slightly less varied. For instance, the distinction between 'liberal' and 'nineteenth-century liberal' is not made in this context, though a similar distinction of meaning is made when, in the 'Editorial to Polemic', Orwell carefully notes that he is using 'the word 'liberal' in its old sense'. Examination of Orwell's general treatment of liberalism and radicalism fills out the chronological development of his relation to these topics: an early sympathy, to radicalism especially, is revealed. The increasing concern with liberalism during the 1940s is not therefore an abrupt change of direction, but a development of existing tendencies in response to public events.

The impression of the emphasis of Orwell's engagement with liberalism is also strengthened: it is essentially a commitment to liberal qualities of mind, to objectivity, rationality and moral forthrightness. This commitment to liberalism modulates into political stances, which are, in a narrower, and more specifically political sense, also liberal. Orwell's concern for objectivity and rationality which are also the qualities by which the writer fulfils his responsibilities as a writer and as a liberal, is connected with his concern with those aspects of society which directly impinge upon the survival of these values, with the press, and with freedom of expression in particular. Further development

in this direction, towards a preference for the political values of liberalism, is also evident in the association of liberal with democratic qualities, and in the increasing frequency and intensity of the contrast of liberalism against totalitarian tendencies during the 1940s.

As well as those attitudes connected with his commitment to liberal qualities of mind, other continuities (such as the treatment of patriotism) between liberalism and aspects of Orwell's thought, are suggested by an examination of his explicit references to liberalism. More general comparisons, not confined to Orwell's specific references to liberalism, are needed to cover these continuities.

4. Further aspects of liberalism in Orwell's work

4:1 Preliminary

So far, Orwell's use of 'liberal', 'radical' and their variants has been studied: the meanings covered by these terms and the patterns of criticism and approval in relation to these terms have been elucidated. Further aspects of Orwell's thought, for instance his patriotism and view on freedom of expression, bear so close an affinity to aspects of liberalism and radicalism that they are likely to be partly derived from them. In other cases, for instance with his stress on rational judgment and individual autonomy, there is a more ambiguous mixture of affinity and possible derivation.

At this point in the development of the argument, there is a crucial shift in the use and meaning of liberalism. Until now, the meanings given to liberalism and kindred terms have been governed by their use in Orwell's

own writing, by the implicit or explicit historical and intellectual distinctions there. Now liberalism will be increasingly used in the more general sense of individualist moral and intellectual values, a sense which includes the varieties of form and meaning it has hitherto had, but which cannot be confined to any single one of them. A progressive transition to this more general sense is observed: from an idea, patriotism, which can be directly connected with liberalism, and particularly radicalism, within Orwell's work; to the idea of freedom of expression, which he treats in a way which has some common points with a central document of liberalism, and which is recognisably part of the common core of liberalism in its general sense; and, finally, to those ideas, of intellectual and personal independence, which are identifiably central to liberalism in this sense, and which, in some cases, can be directly connected with his own use of 'liberal'.

Whilst considering the resemblances between Orwell's work and liberalism, and the balance of these with his commitment to socialism, chronological discriminations need to be made, the progress of the development of his affinities with liberalism need to be observed. The influence of the historical context, for instance the threat posed by Fascism, upon this development has also to be considered.

4:2 Patriotism

Orwell's patriotism becomes conscious, in August 1939, immediately before the outbreak of the Second War, and in response to apprehensions of war.[1] It provides the motive for his change to support of the war, and also the basis for many of his subsequent criticisms of the opposition of some

---

1. See 'My Country Right or Left', Folios of New Writing, II (1940), 36-41.

left-wing intellectuals to the war. One of their grounds for opposition to the war attacked by Orwell was formerly held by him and the I.L.P., in the years immediately prior to the war, and continued to be held by the I.L.P. after the beginning of the war: that 'bourgeois democracy' was morally equivalent to Fascism, and that it was therefore absurd to fight for democracy against Fascism. Criticism of this basis of opposition to the war involved some preference for democratic values, which, in turn, have been shown to be associated with liberalism both within and outside of Orwell's work. His patriotism and his explicit concern for liberalism grow at similar dates and partly in response to the same historical events, and both his patriotism and emergent concern for liberalism imply some degree of commitment to English democratic traditions. Examination of Orwell's remarks on liberalism and radicalism before 1940 showed the grounds from which his later attitudes to liberalism developed; in a similar manner, his early sympathy to Byron's romantic nationalism, his attachment to a particular place, prefigures his own later patriotism. Orwell's support for the Spanish Republican cause can be seen as continuing the Liberal and Radical tradition of sympathy and support for wars of national liberation[1], an aspect of his involvement sounded in the title of Homage to Catalonia, as well as involvement in a socialist cause.

Patriotism is therefore a persistent, though occasionally subdued, element in Orwell's adult thought and, after its full emergence, is crucial to his political position during the Second War. Orwell's concept of patriotism is connected with other areas important to his work. A shared English culture is the basis of the patriotism endorsed in The Lion and the Unicorn, and this can be connected with Orwell's concern at this time with popular English culture and with an underlying unity to English

---

1. For some account of this complicated matter see: Alan Bullock and Maurice Shock eds., The Liberal Tradition from Fox to Keynes (1956), pp. xxviii-xxix, 75-94, 153-167 and 243-253.

culture in 'Boy' Weeklies', 'Charles Dickens' and, particularly, in 'The Art of Donald McGill'; a passage from The Lion and the Unicorn adds weight to the evidence for this connection: 'One can learn a good deal about the spirit of England from the comic coloured postcards that you see in the windows of cheap stationers' shops.'[1] Patriotism also provides the proper grounds for a sense of communal solidarity, for the individual's attachment to the community of which he is a member; an attachment which is otherwise difficult to establish within an essentially individualist outlook.

Orwell's distinction of patriotism from nationalism is crucial to his concept of patriotism, and also to an understanding of his relation to liberalism, and, specifically, to radicalism. The essential criticism of nationalism in 'Notes on Nationalism' (1945) is a characteristically liberal and rationalist one: that the unthinking loyalty demanded by the various forms of nationalism is incompatible with a rational approach to political problems, and thereby works against the establishment of objective truth.[2]

Orwell's distinction of patriotism from nationalism in this essay is likely to be derived from radicalism, and, in particular, from G.K. Chesterton. For Orwell, 'Nationalism is not to be confused with patriotism. Both words are normally used in so vague a way that any definition is liable to be challenged, but one must draw a distinction between them, since two different and even opposing ideas are involved. By 'patriotism' I mean devotion to a particular place and a particular way of life, which one believes to be the best in the world but has not

---

1. L&U, p.15.
2. Polemic, No.1 (October 1945), 32-47.

wish to force upon other people. Patriotism is of its nature defensive, both militarily and culturally. Nationalism, on the other hand is inseparable from the desire for power. The abiding purpose of every nationalist is to secure more power and more prestige, not for himself but for the nation or other unit in which he has chosen to sink in his own individuality.'[1] The distinctions here are crucial to Orwell's concept of patriotism: unlike nationalism, it is not aggressive and does not involve a sacrifice, to a larger entity, of the liberal ideal of individual rational judgment.

The terms of Orwell's distinction of patriotism from nationalism are very close to Chesterton's, and the number of references to Chesterton in Orwell's work indicate that he was familiar with a wide range of Chesterton's writing. Chesterton receives several references within the essay, 'Notes on Nationalism': he is produced, and criticised,as an example of a nationalist who 'chose to suppress both his sensibilities and his intellectual honesty in the cause of Roman Catholic propaganda.' More interestingly, Orwell commends another aspect of his work: 'In home politics he was a Little Englander, a true hater of jingoism and imperialism, and according to his lights a true friend of democracy.'[2] In an earlier article in Tribune in 1942 Orwell also refers to this aspect of Chesterton's politics, and uses Chesterton's position on the Boer War as an analogy to defend his own right to individual judgment of whether a war is worthy of his support. In the course of this he advances an implicitly defensive notion of patriotism: 'There are plenty of us who would defend our own country, under no matter what government, if it seemed that we were in danger of actual invasion and conquest.

---

1. 'Notes on Nationalism', Polemic, No.1 (October 1945), 32.

2. 'Notes on Nationalism', Polemic, No.1 (October 1945), 35-36.

But 'any war' is a different matter. How about the Boer War, for instance? ... G.K. Chesterton ... courageously opposed the Boer War, and once remarked that 'My country, right or wrong', was on the same moral level as 'My mother, drunk or sober.'[1]

Chesterton's views on patriotism and nationalism are represented by an essay, 'The Patriotic Idea', which he contributed to the collection edited by Lucien Oldershaw, England A Nation: Being the Papers of the Patriots' Club (1904). The collection as a whole was intended to be a rebuttal of imperialism on the basis of patriotism and is often concerned with the Boer War.[2] In his essay Chesterton does not make Orwell's terminological distinction between patriotism and nationalism, but the concept of patriotism advanced is similar. Patriotism is conceived of an attachment to one's own native land; it is preferred and opposed to 'cosmopolitanism', indifference to one's own country, and is also seen as antithetical to imperialism. Imperialism aims at destroying people's attachment to their native land and is, therefore, the enemy of patriotism: for instance, the annexation of the Transvaal was a crime against the patriotism of the Boers. Patriotism is opposed to imperialism culturally as well as militarily: English political institutions should not necessarily be imposed on India in defiance of its own traditions: 'one nation's meat is another nation's poison. And the moment we have admitted that, we have broken at a blow the whole conception of that extension of Anglo-Saxon civilisation which is the essential of current imperialism.'[3] Chesterton's idea of patriotism is, therefore, sufficiently close to Orwell's to indicate the probability of derivation: both writers have a militarily and culturally defensive

---

1. 'As I Please', Tribune, 24 December 1943, p.12.
2. See J.L. Hammond, 'The Case of South Africa' and, Lucien Oldershaw, 'The Fact of the Matter', in, Lucien Oldershaw ed., England: A Nation: Being the Papers of the Patriots' Club (1904), pp. 183-199 and 253-262.
3. G.K. Chesterton, 'The Patriotic Idea', in Oldershaw, pp. 1-43 (p.34).

concept of patriotism, essentially an attachment to a particular place and way of life, which is the opposite of aggressive and acquisitive nationalism and imperialism.

Other passages in 'Notes on Nationalism' suggest that Orwell was thinking of this type of patriotism: the intelligentsia are asserted to be now almost devoid of 'patriotism of the old kind', and a similar area of thought is revealed in the reference to Lloyd George's opposition to the Boer War,[1] In a later review in February 1946 Orwell credits Chesterton with 'the mental background of a nineteenth-century radical.'[2] In drawing upon Chesterton's concept of patriotism, Orwell is therefore drawing upon an aspect of nineteenth-century radicalism, and, in the argument, persistent in his wartime journalism, that the conduct of the war should combine national and socialist aims, is marrying radicalism to socialism. The radical tradition of patriotism also offers a solution to another problem presented to Orwell by the intellectual climate of his age: it brings together patriotism and intelligence whose separation from each other is lamented throughout his wartime journalism.

H.W. Nevinson, whose treatment in a review by Orwell has already been discussed, is also amongst the contributors to England a Nation, and is critical of imperialism; Nevinson concludes his essay, 'The Case of Macedonia', with an appeal: 'It is not too late to retrieve our reputation as a race capable of chivalry, humanity, and a disinterested love of freedom. It is not too late to abandon the bagman's ideal which calls the flag an asset and measures success by the acquisition of markets, and to revert to that other tradition which is 'older, wider and nobler

---

1. 'Notes on Nationalsim', Polemic, No.1 (October 1945), 35 and 45.
2. 'The Intellectual Revolt (3): The Christian Reformers', MEN, 7 February 1946, p.2.

far.'[1] As with Chesterton, Nevinson's idea of patriotism as attachment to one's native place extends to an opposition to imperialism and also to a demand that international relations should be conducted on a basis of morality, not profit. The form of Orwell's patriotism is clearly derived from this radical tradition; it is also possible that his early anti-imperialism, though immediately motivated by personal experience, is also connected with a similar source from 'Little Englander' opinion. When Orwell became committed to socialism his earlier anti-imperialism is retained and given a more developed economic explanation, and his early sympathy to patriotic feeling is brought into harness with his socialism during the Second War.

Orwell's patriotism is therefore an important and persistent, though interrupted, aspect of his work. Its form is derived from radicalism, and Orwell's self-conscious English patriotism emerges at a similar date to his explicit concern for radicalism and liberalism, and partly in response to the same historical events, particularly the apprehension and outbreak of the Second War. Orwell's patriotism and interest in liberalism both become strongest in his work of the 1940s, though his interest in patriotism, unlike that in liberalism, declines after the end of the war. Both interests are prefigured in Coming Up For Air: the sympathetic references to the Liberal Party's 'Little Englander'[2] position on the Boer War also testifies to the close connection between the two. In addition, both his patriotism and his concern for liberalism include an interest in the preservation and renewal of the essential values of British democracy. There are also some indirect connections between the form of Orwell's patriotism and liberal thought. The role of the nation is broadly similar to the role of the individual in liberal theory:

---

1. H.W. Nevinson, 'The Case of Macedonia', in, Lucien Oldershaw ed., England: A Nation: Being the Papers of the Patriots' Club (1904), pp. 159-182 (p.182).
2. CUFA, p.56.

both should develop and protect their own particular and distinctive identities without interfering in the development of others. The liberal mind prefers, in both individual and nation, the cultural variety provided by this development to dull uniformity.

An aspect of the preference for variety implicit in Orwell's patriotism is the idea that particular cultural qualities may be confined to, or at least exemplified by, a particular place. This idea is reflected in Orwell's tendency to accept the image of nineteenth-century America as the paradigm of a healthy and expansive individualism. The popularity of this image can be seen in its appearance in the work of political writers contemporary with Orwell: for instance, H.J. Laski in The Rise of European Liberalism: An Essay in Interpretation (1936) advances the America of the last hundred years as the 'fulfilment of the liberal idea'[1]; R.H. Tawney in Equality (1938) presents nineteenth-century frontier America as the 'classic example of what may be called, perhaps, natural equality.'[2] Comparable images of nineteenth-century America recur throughout Orwell's work: in 1946 he praises 'the unheard-of freedom and security which nineteenth-century America enjoyed', and concludes: 'in other words, the civilisation of nineteenth-century America was capitalist civilisation at its best.'[3] A similar note is sounded in a discussion of Whitman's social context in 'Inside the Whale': 'The democracy, equality and comradeship that he is always talking about are not remote ideals, but something that existed in front of his eyes. In mid-nineteenth-century America men felt themselves free and equal, were free and equal, so far as that is possible outside a society of pure Communism.'[4] Orwell's

---

1. H.J. Laski, The Rise of European Liberalism: An Essay in Interpretation (1936), pp. 237-238.
2. R.H. Tawney, Equality 3rd ed. (1938), p.102.
3. 'Riding Down From Bangor', Tribune, 22 November 1946, p.21.
4. 'ITW', ITW, p.141.

attitude to nineteenth-century America is in accord with patterns of association and discrimination evident elsewhere in his work: liberal, individualistic values are seen to be historically associated with the development of capitalism; these values, liberty, equality and fraternity, are recognisably those to which he is generally committed, and pure Communism, or socialism, will not depart from these values, but will fully realise them.

4:3 Freedom of expression

The form of Orwell's patriotism has been shown to be derived from nineteenth-century radicalism, and, in his treatment of nineteenth-century America, to involve a characteristically ambivalent attitude toward liberal, individualistic values. His emphasis on the value of freedom of expression can also be closely related to aspects of liberal thought. In 1948 Orwell defends the right of Mosley to freedom of expression in the terms of classical liberalism, a defence in accord with his increasing involvement with liberalism during the 1940s: 'Evidently therefore it is a matter of distinguishing between a real & a merely theoretical threat to democracy, & no one should be persecuted for expression his opinions, however antisocial, unless it can be shown that there is a substantial threat to the stability of the state. That is the main point.'[1] Orwell's argument here is very close to the central principle asserted by Mill's Essay on Liberty that, 'the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self protection.' For Mill, as for Orwell, liberty of expression can be limited where conditions are such that there would be an immediate or substantial danger to the stability of the

---

1. 'Letter to George Woodcock', 4 January 1948, CEJL, IV, No.102, p.401.

community, were expression allowed.[1] There is no need to suppose direct derivation on Orwell's part; it is, however, clear that both his emphasis on the value of freedom of expression, and the conditions under which he is prepared to see this freedom limited, continue this tradition of liberal thought.

Orwell's argument is part of a proposal to George Woodcock that the Freedom Defence Committee should take action on Mosley's behalf[2]: as its manifesto suggested the F.D.C. was open to involvement in liberal causes. Characteristically, Orwell's defence of liberty is motivated by a concern for liberty of expression; liberty of action is of concern principally where it impinges upon freedom of expression and thought. His persistent concern for freedom of expression, and the paramount importance he attaches to this freedom, also connects him with liberalism in general: if this freedom is taken to be one of the central values of liberalism, then the strength of his concern for this value indicates a high degree of affinity to liberalism.

4:4 Individual rational judgment

The high value placed on freedom of speech within liberalism is closely connected to other liberal concepts: diversity as well as freedom of opinion and character is valued. A further central liberal idea is implicit in these evaluations: that the individual is, at least potentially, capable of independent judgment through the exercise of his reason upon information. An intensification of this idea is possible: that the individual should make judgments from his own experience, as

---

1. J.S. Mill, 'On Liberty', in Three Essays (Oxford, 1975), pp. 15 and 69.
2. See 'Letter to George Woodcock' 4 January 1948, CEJL, IV, No.102, p.401: 'I hope the F.D.C. is doing something about these constant demands to outlaw Mosley & Co. Tribune's attitude I think has been shameful.'

well as independently of determination by authority.

Orwell is committed throughout his career to this ideal of independent judgment, and is also given to its further intensification. A persistent testimony to the strength of this idea in his work are the frequent appeals to the judgment of the 'thinking man'. Within liberalism the ideal of the cultivation of personal judgment independent of custom and authority is associated with a dislike of conformity of opinion in itself. Orwell clearly shares this dislike: much of his work is intended to expose the contradictions and lacunae in received opinion, an intention encapsulated by a remark in 1948 in 'Writers and Leviathan': 'To accept an orthodoxy is always to inherit unresolved contradictions.'[1] Orwell does not define what he means by 'orthodoxy', but a commonly acceptable and fair definition would be a fixed set of beliefs held by a group of people. His vehement dislike for orthodoxy is, as the nature of an orthodoxy would indicate, extended to a more muted, though typically liberal, fear of the pressure of public opinion upon individual judgment and expression: 'To exercise your right of free speech you have to fight against economic pressure and against strong sections of public opinion.'[2]

The term 'orthodoxy' also has religious connotations: throughout Orwell's work the Protestant stress on individual judgment and moral responsibility, is preferred to the importance placed by Catholicism on ecclesiastical authority; indeed, Catholicism is criticised on the same grounds as

---

1. Politics and Letters, No.4, Summer 1948, p.39.
2. 'The Prevention of Literature', Polemic, No.2 (January 1946), 12.

totalitarianism.[1] Again a general affinity with liberalism is indicated: liberalism is associated, both historically and in its preference for individual judgment, with Protestantism and with opposition to Catholicism.[2]

However, Orwell's historical context forces him to question the confidence to be placed in individual judgment. Marxism regards an individual's consciousness and judgment as determined by his position in society and history, and denies that it can be objective. The presentation of the witness of Orwell's documentary writing and his critical analysis of other writers reflects this tension between socially determined and objective judgment. The witness of the documentaries can carry both, or either, types of judgment, can be presented as an objective reporter of events, in so far as accidents of situation and observation allow that to be possible, or as a typical member of his social class whose reactions are coloured by his upbringing. Similarly, other writers are treated as reporters of history and also taken as representative of their social class. Where the two types of judgment co-exist, they tend to be distributed in a particular pattern: events are objectively reported, but subjective responses are seen to be affected by the subject's social background.

Orwell's sense of contemporary society and its likely future movement also causes him to question the efficacy of individual judgment as a means of

---

1. See, for instance, 'The Prevention of Literature', Polemic, No.2 (January 1946), p.5. 'The Catholic and the Communist are alike in assuming that an opponent cannot be both honest and intelligent. Each of them tacitly claims that 'the truth' has already been revealed, and that the heretic, if he is not simply a fool, is secretly aware of 'the truth' and merely resists it out of selfish motives.'
2. See, for instance, Steven Lukes, Individualism (Oxford, 1973), pp. 94-98 for some discussion of this.

establishing truths which will be generally acknowledged. The liberal writer is becoming increasingly isolated from other members of his society and they are therefore reluctant to acknowledge the truths revealed by individual investigation. Within his work, liberalism and history are closely associated terms and concepts, as, for instance in the reference in 'The Prevention of Literature' to 'the mentality ... of a liberal historian who believes that the past cannot be altered and that a correct knowledge of history is valuable as a matter of course.'[1] Truth can be established for an individual by his own observation and reasoning, but to establish truth acknowledged by a society, to write history in this sense, requires a measure of agreement not confined to the isolated liberal writer. The difficulty of transitions from personal truth to objective history is analogous to the tendency to separate objective reporting of events from socially typical subjective responses. Despite these tensions, Orwell remains committed to the liberal idea of independent personal judgment and is fearful of its subordination to authority.

4:5 Privacy

Respect for personal privacy, the idea that a man has a right to a sphere of thought and action free from public interference, constitutes one of the central ideas of liberalism, and often gives rise to a debate within liberalism over the proper boundaries between public and private domains of behaviour.[2] So far, Orwell has been seen to be connected to liberalism by his high evaluation of individual freedom of expression and of judgment, and a distinction between subjective and objective judgment and perception has begun to emerge. This distinction can be related to his regard for the value of privacy, to the preference for subjective pleasures, and to

---

1. 'The Prevention of Literature', Polemic, No.2 (March 1946), 7.
2. For some discussion of this see, for instance, Steven Lukes, Individualism, (Oxford, 1973), pp. 59-66.

the recurrent distinction in his work between the subjective, inner self and the objective social roles into which the self enters. Late essays, such as 'Pleasure Spots' and 'Some Thoughts on the Common Toad', reveal the importance Orwell attaches to private, unsophisticated enjoyment and contact with natural life: 'by retaining one's childhood love of such things as trees, fishes, butterflies and - to return to my first instance - toads, one makes a peaceful and decent future a little more probable.'[1]

At the same time, Orwell's sense of a private self is connected with an intermittent disgust with physical existence. 'there is also a sort of inner self which at least intermittently stands aghast at the horror of existence.'[2] This sense extends to a distinction between the private, inner self and the socially determined self, a distinction whose influence is evident in the separation of the writer, 'the saner self that stands aside'[3], from the citizen, the man involved in political action. This inner sanity is threatened by totalitarianism, by state control of the individual's responses: 'The fallacy is to believe that under a dictatorial government you can be free inside.'[4] Accordingly, in Nineteen Eighty-Four, Winston's inner freedom is subdued to the demands of the state.

Orwell therefore shares with liberalism a deep concern for privacy. The destruction of private pleasures and thought within the society of Nineteen Eighty-Four is indicative of the opposition of totalitarianism and liberalism, and also part of the general collapse of liberal values within that work.

---

1. 'Some Thoughts on the Common Toad', Tribune, 12 April 1946, pp. 9-10.
2. 'Politics vs. Literature: An Examination of Gulliver's Travels.', Polemic, No.5 (October 1946), 20.
3. 'Writers and Leviathan', Politics and Letters, No.4, Summer 1948, p.40.
4. 'As I Please', Tribune, 28 April 1944, p.10.

4:6 Individual autonomy

The idea of individual autonomy is, again, one of the fundamental, if often unspoken, elements of liberalism and individualism. This idea of personal self-direction, of a man's capacity to direct his own thought and action, is implicitly included in some of the aspects of liberalism already discussed, for instance in the ideas of freedom of conscience and independent judgment.[1] It is also difficult to reconcile with determinism. Accordingly, Orwell's concern with the waning of the autonomous individual was seen to arise in the late 1930s and early 1940s as part of his sense of the strength of the forces determining thought and conduct : both the increasing pressure of society upon the individual, and his partial acceptance of the Marxist thesis that consciousness is socially determined, and that, therefore, the autonomous individual is a historically specific illusion. A sense that the qualities associated with the autonomous individual are disappearing but that these qualities remain valuable and, indeed, vital to literature characterises his work of this period. This sense is also evident in the treatment of liberal figures in his journalism, figures whose admirable qualities have been left behind by historical change.

In a more confident way, the witness of the documentary writing tends to embody the qualities associated with the autonomous individual. The narrative pattern of Orwell's fiction, however of social rebellion and re-capture, bears witness to his sense of the limited scope for individual independence within society. Privacy is one of the ideas associated with individual autonomy: for characters in the fiction, privacy tends to be reduced to isolation, again testifying to the contemporary constraints Orwell perceives upon individual independence.

---

1. See Lukes, pp. 52-58.

The conclusion of Keep the Aspidistra Flying is particularly interesting in this context. The transition of the narrative, in this case, from disgust at a society founded on individual cupidity to acceptance of this, is, as narrative transitions often are in Orwell's fiction, awkward and sudden: 'Our civilisation is founded on greed and fear, but in the lives of common men the greed and fear are mysteriously transmuted into something nobler.'[1] The weakness of the transition here is particularly indicated by the use of 'mysteriously': the process by which the powerful and reiterated points of disgust at individual greed and the social life connected with it earlier in the novel are converted into this general acceptance is left unclear.

There is a further peculiarity to this passage from Keep the Aspidistra Flying and to the concluding movement of the novel as a whole. It bears a close analogy, even in the use of the term 'mysteriously', to the argument of early economic liberalism that individual self-interest produces of its own accord the general good of society, the argument of Adam Smith that, in his self-interest, man is 'led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention.'[2] The conclusion of Keep the Aspidistra Flying reproduces, presumably without conscious authorial intention, the Newtonian form of liberal ideology in which general harmony is produced by free individual movement.[3] However, the tone of the novel works against its resolution: individual self-interest is still seen as greed even where it contributes to the general harmony, and the conviction with which the final harmony is endowed is weakened by this continuing perception. Furthermore, what moral and intellectual perception Gordon has leads him away from society, runs counter to the final harmony, even though his final action apparently contributes to it.

---

1. KAF, p.308.
2. Quoted in Alan Bullock and Maurice Shock eds., The Liberal Tradition from Fox to Keynes (1956), p.25.
3. For a discussion of this ideological form see D.J. Manning, Liberalism (1976), p.23.

In this tension between perception and narrative action, there is a sign of the later split in Orwell's work between the writer's thought and the social action in which he is involved as a citizen. It also reveals a deeply divided attitude to individual autonomy: independence of thought leads Gordon away from society to isolation and passivity; action within society is not seen as free, and is only insecurely connected to the general good.

The conclusions of Orwell's other novels tend to place their central characters in a similar dilemma: a choice is posed of intellectual independence and isolation against submission to social codes, which are seen to be false, and the possibility of fraternity granted by this submission. The characters tend to make an attempt an intellectual and personal independence, but this attempt is finally a failure and they are trapped within a constricting social code, an orthodoxy. Dorothy in A Clergyman's Daughter is finally returned to the community and social pressures from which she had, albeit unintentionally, escaped. The treatment of the code of conduct provided by Christianity is ambivalent: Dorothy's loss of faith is part of her enlightenment, but at the same time its loss is regretted. In Keep the Aspidistra Flying, Gordon finally succumbs to social pressures, to the 'money-code'.

Despite the ambivalence of A Clergyman's Daughter and of Orwell's other novels, it is generally true that acceptance of a social code is seen as a regression, as being trapped, for the central characters of Orwell's novels: the autonomous individual is constrained by orthodoxy. The pattern of the narrative of Orwell's novels suggests a lack of confidence in the efficacy of individual independence, in the possibilities for individual autonomy of action. To move outside of the dominant social

code involves, for both Dorothy in A Clergyman's Daughter and Gordon in Keep the Aspidistra Flying, isolation, poverty, and passivity, a sacrifice of action, or finally for Flory in Burmese Days, suicide. Fraternity is only permanently possible within the dominant social group and by acceptance of its codes: the pattern of Orwell's fiction indicates, therefore, how far intellectual liberty and fraternity have diverged. Personal integrity, liberty of conscience, is mixed up with guilt and isolation: Gordon's private self, his affectation for poetry, figures as 'a lumpish weight in his inner pocket.'[1] This pattern can be partly explained by the narrowness of the societies of Orwell's novels which allow little room to intellectual independence. After taking this into account, it still has important implications for his politics: liberty of conscience, one of the basic values of liberalism, tends to be at odds with the impulse to fraternity, an equally essential value of socialism.

4:7 Summary

Many of the central values of Orwell's work are, therefore, closely comparable to those covered by liberalism. Some of these values, for instance, his patriotism and emphasis on freedom of expression, are closely related to political aspects of liberalism; indeed, his patriotism is likely to be derived from nineteenth-century Radicalism. Other values, for instance his emphasis on privacy and individual autonomy, do not have this close connection to specifically political aspects of liberalism, but are still recognisably part of liberalism. Within Orwell's work, as well, this latter group of values tend to be associated with qualities actually specified as liberal: for instance, his sense of the imminent extinction of the autonomous individual emerges at the same date, and often in the same contexts, as a sense of the end of the era of liberalism.

---

1. KAF, p.309.

There is also a conceptual relation amongst the group ideas Orwell shares with liberalism: they are closely connected to, and perhaps ultimately dependent on, the idea of the autonomous individual, the idea of a man's capacity to think and act independently, free from determination or control by society. The heart of his relation to liberalism is to be found here in his unswerving commitment to this idea, to the liberal self, as a moral and intellectual ideal. This commitment is thought out and articulated, and the survival of such an ideal sometimes questioned, through an encounter with criticism, particularly with criticism from a Marxist standpoint, of this concept of self. At this point, the intimate relation between liberalism and individualism is evident and important: in England, liberalism, both as a term and as a movement, carried many of the values associated with individualism.[1]

In a general analysis the distinctions between liberalism, radicalism and other connected terms do not emerge directly, but the attitudes underlying them are confirmed. Within liberalism as a whole, Orwell clearly prefers the moral and intellectual passion and energy earlier seen to be covered by nineteenth-century radicalism and liberalism to the rationalism, declining into mere reasonableness, seen to be denoted by 'liberal' as an unqualified term. The generally ambivalent attitude towards liberal, individualist values revealed in the treatment of liberal figures, and in the use of liberal as a term, also persists. He is clearly deeply sympathetic to the values of liberalism, but also sees them as being in historical decline, and, as before, there are suggestions of an uneasy relationship between a strong sympathy to these values and the development of his commitment to socialism.

---

1. See Lukes, pp. 32-39.

5. Liberalism and socialism

The relationship between liberalism and socialism in Orwell's work can be schematically, but fairly, described: socialism is endorsed in so far as it promises to fulfil the values of liberalism. Where socialism does not promise to do this, where it will not 'preserve and even enlarge the atmosphere of liberalism'[1], its values are rejected, even whilst its triumph is seen to be historically inevitable. Those forms of socialism which are alien to liberalism can be in stark conflict with it, and, for Orwell, the conflict is particularly acute between liberalism and the forms of socialism, influenced by Russian Communism, current amongst British intellectuals. Individual integrity, the liberal stress in liberty of thought and expression, can conflict with the demands of communal action for socialism, and with the restrictions of life within a Communist society, as with the parody of such a society in Nineteen Eighty-Four. Even where socialism promises to largely fulfil the ideals of liberalism, there is scope for tension between the two, a tension which also tends to arise between the demands of liberal personal freedom and those of the community, and of the ideals of equality and fraternity.

A simple terminological point is relevant to the conflict between Orwell's liberalism and his commitment to socialism. Orwell was prepared in the early 1930s, according to reports of his conversation, to describe as himself as being a 'Tory anarchist': for instance, he presented himself to Rayner Heppenstall 'as a Tory anarchist, but admitted The Adelphi's socialist case on moral grounds'[2]; Jack Common also recalls Orwell using this phrase to characterise himself.[3] A passage in The Road to Wigan Pier,

---

1. 'ITW', ITW, p.184.
2. Rayner Heppenstall, Four Absentees, (1960), p.32.
3. Jack Common, 'Orwell at Wallington', Stand, XXII, (1981), 36.

which is not specifically autobiographical, suggests a position very similar to that recalled by Heppenstall: 'For the moment the only possible course for any decent person, however much of a Tory or an anarchist by temperament, is to work for the establishment of Socialism.'[1] In a similar way, at a later date, Orwell is prepared to state that the writer, and, hence, implicitly, himself, is a liberal as a writer. In both cases Orwell, or the writer is stated to be a particular, though different, thing politically.

There is a clear contrast with the terms in which he is accustomed to formulate his commitment to socialism. In a review in 1936, he implies that he is someone 'who cares for the cause of Socialism'[2]; at a much later date, in 1945, he states: 'I belong to the Left and must work inside it.'[3] In neither of these formulations, which are typical of other statements throughout his career, does he describe himself as being a socialist: his commitment to socialism is generally, though not always, phrased as membership of the socialist movement, generally in its broadest sense, or as support for this general movement.

A crucial distinction can be inferred from this persistent terminological contrast: Orwell presents his being, his inner self, as a Tory anarchist, or, at a later date, and implicitly, as a liberal; his activity takes place on behalf of, and within, the socialist movement, but this need not alter his essential self. The many faceted nature of his work springs from this complex combination of attitudes.

The increasing difficulty of sustaining this distinction between essence

---

1. WP, p.251.
2. 'Propagandist Critics', NEW, X (1936), 230.
3. 'Letter to the Duchess of Atholl', 15 November 1945, CEJL, IV, No.8, p.30.

and activity can be sensed in the contrast between the direct description of himself as a Tory anarchist, and the implicit description of himself as liberal in his capacity as a writer. At an early date in his career Orwell is capable of confidently reconciling his Tory anarchism with support for socialism on moral grounds; as his thought develops and grows more complex, his nature becomes more difficult to reconcile with his activity, and his liberalism is therefore stated in a more complex way. Orwell's general political position reflects this division between being and activity: for the latter part of his career, he is, in schematic terms, a liberal committed to socialism, and, in his writing, liberal ideals are largely retained, but socialism is recognised to be necessary in order to realise these ideals.

Nineteen Eighty-Four shows many of the areas of conflict between liberalism and socialism. Orwell's purpose in Nineteen Eighty-Four was to show 'the perversions to which a centralised economy is liable and which have already been partly realised in Communism and Fascism'[1], and to parody 'the intellectual implications of totalitarianism.'[2] Within the novel, the society of Oceania is repeatedly compared to those of Nazi Germany and of Soviet Russia, and is presented as an extrapolation of tendencies inherent and already apparent in those societies.[3] Allusions to Soviet Russia are, however, are more frequent and marked, and there also parodies of incidents drawn from Soviet history, particularly of episodes connected with Trotsky and the Moscow trials.[4] This emphasis is consistent with Orwell's

---

1. 'Letter to Francis A. Henson (extract)', 16 June 1949, CEJL, IV, No.158, p.502.
2. 'Letter to Roger Senhouse', 26 December 1948, CEJL, IV, No.132, p.460.
3. See for instance, NEF, p.225.
4. For some account of this, see: Jennifer McDowell, '1984 and Soviet Reality', University of California Graduate Journal, I (1962), 12-19.

intention to satirise totalitarian tendencies amongst British intellectuals, more often Russophile than admirers of German or Italian Fascism, and with the naming of the Party in Oceania as 'Ingsoc'. The parody of Marxism in the doctrines of the Party is also part of this emphasis. However, the Party is also compared to the Catholic church and to the medieval Inquisition[1]; in addition, Orwell draws heavily upon the language of Christianity and particularly of conversion, and occasionally upon psychological terms, for the narrative and for O'Brien's speech during the final episode of Winston's torture and submission.

All these institutions and doctrines to which Nineteen Eighty-Four refers share a demand for orthodoxy of thought and conformity of behaviour. They can all be regarded as contributing to 'Ingsoc', but they contribute in different ways. With the comparisons to Bolshevism and Nazism the effect is clearly that of allusion, whereas the language of Christianity and conversion seems to be used more/the resonances it will create in the reader's mind, than allusively. With some reservations therefore, the society of Oceania and the doctrines of 'Ingsoc' can be treated primarily as parodic extrapolations of tendencies in totalitarian forms of socialism, particularly of Russian Communism and of types of socialism influenced by it, and secondarily of the orthodoxies represented by the other institutions and doctrines to which allusions are made, and whose languages are used.

Earlier, contextual evidence was used to establish the concern of Nineteen Eighty-Four with the decline and defeat of liberalism. Analysis of the novel itself supports this interpretation, and, in particular, shows that the values of liberalism and individualism are excluded from 'Ingsoc', and that they are etiolated in Oceanic society. These values include

---

1. See, for example, NEF, p.254.

both those generally recognisable as part of liberalism and those identifiable as liberal from comparisons within Orwell's work.

One of the clearest instances of the exclusion of liberal values from 'Ingsoc' is contained in the Appendix, in the reproduction of a famous passage from the American Declaration of Independence, a document of a liberal, bourgeois revolution, which could only be rendered into Newspeak by 'an ideological translation, whereby Jefferson's words would be changed into a panegyric on absolute government.'[1] In Goldstein's The Theory and Practice of Oligarchial Collectivism a more historical and qualified account is given of the displacement of the ideals of liberal revolutions by the growth of totalitarianism: 'The heirs of the French, English, and American revolutions had partly believed in their own phrases about the rights of man, freedom of speech, equality before the law, and the like, and have even allowed their conduct to be influenced by them to some extent.'[2] In both these cases, Orwell is going back to an assertive and historically past form of liberalism; despite the parody of the language of political, particularly Trotskyist, writing and the later revelation that Goldstein's book was composed by a group of writers, including O'Brien[3], it seems fair to take it as a factual, though ideologically coloured by Goldstein's position, account of the history of Oceania.

The simple term 'liberal' in Nineteen Eighty-Four tends to carry the weaker meaning it also bore in Orwell's journalism: for instance, again in Goldstein's book, it is associated with an indifferent tolerance of departures from orthodox opinion: 'all the tyrannies of the past were half-hearted and inefficient. The ruling groups were always infected

---

1. NEF, p.311.
2. NEF, p.205.
3. See NEF, p.262.

to some extent by liberal ideas, and were content to leave loose ends everywhere, to regard only the overt act and to be uninterested in what their subjects were thinking.'[1] The tone here implies a criticism of the weakness of liberalism from a revolutionary standpoint, and a later passage in Goldstein's book, also offering an explanation of the collapse of previous oligarchies, brings out this implication: 'or they became liberal and cowardly, made concessions when they should have used force, and once again were overthrown.' A stronger sense of liberal, presumably denoting independence of thought, is conveyed in another passage by the coupling of 'liberalism' with 'scepticism'[2] as threats to the dominance of the Party.

One of the central values of liberalism in its historical and stronger sense, equality before the law, is connected in Nineteen Eighty-Four with the French, English and American revolutions; there is a clear contrast with Oceanic society in which there 'is no law'[3], but in which, as in Orwell's account of the society of the Houyhnhnms in Gulliver's Travels a high degree of conformity in thought and action is demanded. In both Nineteen Eighty-Four and, for Orwell, in the final part of Gulliver's Travels, the positive restrictions imposed by public opinion or orthodoxy are more comprehensive and more rigid, and hence more objectionable, than the largely negative prohibitions of law, which apply to behaviour alone.[4]

Other civil liberties are also suppressed in Oceanic society: freedom of speech, which, like equality before the law, was quoted as one of the ideals of liberal revolutions, is no longer allowed, and the original connotations of the word 'free' are excluded from 'Newspeak'.[5]

---

1. NEF, p.206.
2. NEF, pp. 216 and 209.
3. NEF, p.212.
4. See 'Politics vs. Literature: An Examination of Gulliver's Travels', Polemic, No.5 (October 1946), pp. 5-21.
5. NEF, p.300.

A further political value of Orwell's liberalism which is destroyed in Oceanic society is patriotism: England is renamed as 'Airstrip One'; there is general loss of cultural variety, for instance, the familiar imperial units of measurement are replaced by the metric system, and an aggressive, intolerant nationalism, foreign to the idea of defensive patriotism, is encouraged.

The group of social and moral values, associated in Orwell's work with the political values of liberalism, are also excluded from 'Ingsoc'. Privacy and the development of a private personality are discouraged,and 'individualism and eccentricity', a characteristically liberal collocation of ideas, are disparagingly known in 'Newspeak' as 'ownlife'. As in the earlier novels, but in a firmer and clearer way, and by intentional action by the Party, personal freedom is reduced to isolation: O'Brien associates the two concepts: 'Alone - free - the human being is always defeated.' The Party also reduces Winston to extreme physical weakness; almost naked and alone, he is the 'last man'.[1] The echo of the originally projected title of Nineteen Eighty-Four and of one of the concerns of Orwell's journalism during the 1940s is significant: the liberal personal qualities which Orwell values, rationality and individuality, as well as more general personal characteristics such as loyalty to others, are vulnerable and liable to be crushed unless social arrangements are maintained to protect them.

The progress of Winston's humiliation is in line with the attack on individualism in 'Ingsoc', an attack summed up in the translation of the dominant philosophy of Eastasia, a philosophy closely comparable to 'Ingsoc', as 'Obliteration of the Self'. Orwell's journalism of the 1940s reveals

---

1. NEF, pp. 83, 265 and 270-273.

a deep sympathy for the liberal idea of man as an autonomous individual, coupled with a fear that this type of individuality was in danger of disappearing, and a recognition that this type of human nature need not be constant, that, for instance, there need not always be an innate desire for freedom. In Nineteen Eighty-Four this fear and recognition are enacted, the liberal self is obliterated, 'Men are infinitely malleable.'[1] Other individualist values are also suppressed in Oceania: liberty of the intellect, the slightest deviation from orthodox opinion, is not allowed to Party members.

Nineteen Eighty-Four also provides a link between the moral and political values of liberalism and individualism and the epistemological values which tend to be associated with them in Orwell's work. Various methods of thought are excluded from 'Ingsoc': the scientific approach is not tolerated, and 'all words grouping themselves round the concepts of objectivity and rationalism were contained in the single word oldthink.'[2] There is no room for the whole range of liberal values in 'Ingsoc': neither for the moral passion for social justice, earlier seen to be associated with nineteenth-century radicalism and liberalism, nor for the rationality covered by these terms, but often separately denoted by 'liberal' itself.

There is a closer link between this group of concepts and liberalism in Nineteen Eighty-Four than their common exclusion from Ingsoc, though this is important in itself. Both concepts and values are ultimately dependent on the assumption of continuous individual consciousness, but, at the same time, also on the recognition by society as a whole of the validity of this consciousness. Winston is reduced by torture to submission when

---

1. NEF, pp. 198 and 270.
2. NEF, p.305.

the restraints of morality and law are removed from government action; similarly, his own memory and perception cannot create history, in Orwell's terms a communally recognised and objective account of past events, unless they are recognised by others: '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.' In Nineteen Eighty-Four, history is seen to be dependent on evidence, on the agreement of physical evidence and personal testimony, on 'written records and ... human memories.'[1] The Party controls both records and memories and hence is capable of altering knowledge of the past.

A strong tendency towards this control of accounts of the past is inherent in the philosophy of the Party, in which not 'merely the validity of experience, but the very existence of external reality, was tacitly denied ... The heresy of heresies was common sense.'[2] It is interesting to note how closely, albeit negatively here, the two concepts of sincerity and authenticity, of truth to inner, and truth to observed experience, are associated. They in turn, by their shared exclusion from the philosophy of the Party, are associated with 'common sense'. Earlier, the idea of 'common sense' was seen to be part of Bertrand Russell's liberalism, and this gives contextual support to the association in Nineteen Eighty-Four between the individualist political and moral values and the methods of thought excluded from 'Ingsoc'.

Another type of thought excluded from 'Ingsoc' is 'the empirical habit

---

1. NEF, p.305.
2. NEF, p.82.

of thought', a term denoting a similar type of thought to that covered by 'common sense', though more technical and referring only to the method, not the content, of thought. Winston's identity, like the truth of history, is guaranteed for him by evidence used in this empirical way: both by evidence drawn from consciousness of his own thought and memory, and by that derived from sensation: 'I think I exist,' he said wearily. 'I am conscious of my own identity. I was born and I shall die. I have arms and legs. I occupy a particular point in space. No other object can occupy the same point simultaneously.' What enables the falsification of history in Oceania, and what also causes Winston to doubt the evidence for his own identity, is the isolation which tends to bring special insight and madness together: 'Perhaps a lunatic was simply a minority of one.'[1] In Nineteen Eighty-Four, the liberal individual attempts to cling to associated moral and epistemological values, but is finally defeated through torture and isolation.

There are, therefore, many points of conflict between liberalism and socialism in Orwell's work. Even where the socialism in question is a desirable form, the contrasting forms of endorsement reveal different types of commitment to liberalism and socialism, and hint at a possible conflict between them. They are, however, most clearly antagonistic where, as in Nineteen Eighty-Four, the type of socialism is undesirable and totalitarian. This antagonism serves to futher define and group those values of his work which have already been identified as liberal. The destruction of liberal values within Nineteen Eighty-Four also shows that without social arrangements to protect them, liberalism and the liberal individual are vulnerable. At the same time as the absence of such arrangements indicates the need for them, there is a further

---

1. NEF, pp. 190, 260-261 and 81.

difficulty implied ~~by the totalitarian development of socialism~~ by the reservation in Orwell's phrasing of his commitment to socialism: social arrangements, and, in particular, socialist measures, are necessary to guarantee the continuity of liberal values, but these measures themselves endanger this continuity, particularly the survival of the scope for liberty and privacy. Elsewhere in his work Orwell does attempt to evolve a concept of socialism which will incorporate and develop the values of liberalism. Equally such an attempt involves a continual polemic against inadequate contemporary ideas of socialism, particularly against its definition in merely economic terms. Any account of the development of the positive content of Orwell's concept of socialism is complicated by, and must take account of, the tendency in his work for there to be a split between the values to which he is deeply sympathetic and the actions he proposes to safeguard or nurture these values. It must in this case in particular establish what connection there is between his sympathy to liberalism and the aggressively tough-minded measures for socialism proposed in The Lion and the Unicorn, in the 'London Letters to Partisan Review', and in his other writing of the early 1940s.

6. Socialism

A comprehensively detailed examination of Orwell's relation to socialism and to socialist parties is outside the scope of the argument. However, it is necessary to indicate the main features of Orwell's relation to socialism and to show how its content and development is deeply affected by his sympathy for liberalism. The scope of the terms 'liberalism' and 'socialism' cannot be sharply or readily distinguished: for instance, some forms of socialism can be identified as developments of liberalism, whether they acknowledge this or not. In Orwell's case, however, an

explicit engagement with various forms of liberalism has been identified and traced, and a discussion of his relation to socialism need not descend to a quarrel over terminology.

The scope of the terms 'liberalism' and 'socialism' is continuously modified by their historical context: Orwell's own distinction between 'nineteenth-century liberalism' with its suggestion of moral and intellectual force and the unqualified term 'liberalism', connoting a weakened faith in rationality and reasonable behaviour, provides a telling example of this modification. The historical weakening of liberalism to which this particular change of meaning testifies is arguably part of a larger shift in the relation between liberalism and socialism: the strong tendency in late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Britain for liberalism to develop into socialism, and for the labour representation movement embodied in the Labour Party to displace the Liberal Party.[1]

L.T. Hobhouse's Liberalism (1911) is an important and representative example of the first of these tendencies: for Hobhouse, liberalism had originally been a revolutionary and progressive movement but was now approaching its end. Economic individualism had completed the destruction of feudalism and opened the way to great material advances, but at a considerable cost to the well-being of the masses. It must therefore be restrained in the interests of the community and for the alleviation of poverty, and a pragmatic and limited programme of social welfare and state control of economy is proposed in its place. Hobhouse acknowledges that liberalism now shares many ideals with socialism and argues that his form of liberalism represents a compromise between abstract individualism

---

1. For accounts of this transition see, for example, Alan Bullock and Maurice Shock, eds., The Liberal Tradition from Fox to Keynes (1956), pp. 180-230; and Henry Pelling, 'Labour and the Downfall of Liberalism', in, Popular Politics and Society in Late Victorian Britain (1968), pp. 101-120.

and abstract socialism. The essential distinction between liberalism and socialism arises in the familiar area of individual liberty: liberalism emphasises 'elements of individual right and personal independence, of which Socialism at times appears oblivious.'[1] The distinction signals an area of conflict which was also to trouble Orwell: to what extent the liberal ideal of individual liberty will remain compatible with the growth of the state's activities under socialism.

Along with the tendency of liberalism to incorporate aspects of socialism, occurred the growth of the trade unions and labour representation movements. The attempts of socialist thought and movements to ally themselves with the emergent labour representation movements often resulted in an uneasy relationship. Stanley Pierson's account of the origins and growth of the Fabian Society in British Socialists: The Journey From Fantasy to Politics analyses a central and typical tension in this alliance: the divergence between the socialist ideals of those members drawn largely from the lower-middle class, and working-class supporters who entered socialist movements, not necessarily or primarily the Fabian Society, to protect or advance interests which had already been articulated by trade unions. This divergence of aims created 'a discordant blend of the utopian and the practical' in the British Socialist movement of the early twentieth century. For Pierson the persistence of this split helps to explain a paradox of modern British political history: 'the simultaneous consolidation of the Labour Party and the decline of the Socialist movement.'[2] Orwell's own perception of this split was acute, and much of his own work represents an attempt to transcend it, to develop a form of socialism which will be popular both in its form and in its manner of expression.

---

1. L.T. Hobhouse, Liberalism (1911) passim, (p.211). Alan Bullock and Maurice Shock eds., The Liberal Tradition from Fox to Keynes (1955) reproduce several extracts from Hobhouse's book in their documentation of liberalism.

2. Stanley Pierson, British Socialists: The Journey from Fantasy to Politics (1979), pp. 345-350. Quotations from pp. 347 and 345.

A further consideration in an account of Orwell's relation to socialism must be the general weakness of British socialist and labour movements during the 1930s, the period in which his political opinions developed. The Labour Party, of which Orwell shows more awareness during the 1940s than in this period, was weak both electorally and intellectually. The Fabian Society, whose outlook Orwell generally found unsympathetic anyway, was in decline and suffered from a reduction in membership and activities and from the loss of interest amongst its leading members such as the Webbs and Harold Laski. In her The Story of Fabian Socialism Margaret Cole summarises the state of British socialism and Labour during the 1930s as a story of 'pathetically hopeful but unsuccessful little combinations' trying to create some common resistance to Fascism.[1]

The I.L.P. disaffiliated from the Labour Party in 1932[2] and its continuing opposition to war against Fascism, which had attracted Orwell to it in 1938 as a counterbalance to the Popular Front[3], was to make it an increasingly marginal force in domestic politics after the start of the Second War.[4] On the crucial issue of the alleviation of the effects of unemployment and protest against it both the Labour Party and the T.U.C. were generally apathetic and inactive. Only the N.U.W.M., whose work Orwell admired[5], and which had strong Communist associations, was persistently active on behalf of the unemployed though without much positive result in national terms.[6] The 'class against class' policy of the Communist Party was still

---

1. See Margaret Cole, The Story of Fabian Socialism (1961), pp. 214-242, 218-222 and 217.
2. See Henry Pelling, 'The Story of the I.L.P.' in, Popular Politics and Society in Late Victorian Britain (1968), pp. 121-129 (p.127).
3. See 'Why I Join the I.L.P.', The New Leader, XXXI, 24 June 1938, p.4.
4. Crick, p.257 notes Orwell's resignation from the I.L.P. at this time.
5. See, for example, WP, pp. 83-84. In January 1936, before Orwell's journey to Wigan, the Communist Party had also disassociated itself from the N.U.W.M. as part of a popular front policy; see James Jupp, The Radical Left in Britain (1982), pp. 27 and 201.
6. See John Stevenson and Chris Cook, The Slump: Society and Politics during the Depression (1977), pp. 145-194.

remembered and resented when in 1933 it began to attempt to co-operate with other left-wing parties. This resentment limited the effectiveness of its later attempts at a Popular Front and the decision in early 1939 of the Labour Party Executive to expel those working for the Popular Front from the Labour Party was overwhelmingly supported by the following Labour Party Conference.[1] Orwell, particularly in the 1930s, was more concerned and better acquainted with the radical and intellectual left than the larger organisations of the Labour Party and T.U.C., of which he shows only a limited awareness in The Road to Wigan Pier. The period as a whole was marked by an aggravation of existing divisions between these parts of the British left-wing movement, divisions from which he suffers and which he deplores.

It was within this context that Orwell's statements on socialism must be considered. The Road to Wigan Pier contains the fullest early statements of what he means by socialism. There are continuities with both his earlier and his subsequent work. He expands upon his previous concern with English social class, and there is also a curious analogy, as well as substantial differences, between the theme of much of the second part of The Road to Wigan Pier - that the lower-middle class should recognise its fundamental unity of interest with the working-class and merge with them in action - and his earlier social exploration, with its deliberate descent through social classes into poverty. Much of the second part of The Road to Wigan Pier, particularly the section ascribed to the 'devil's advocate', is an argument against received ideas of socialism, especially Soviet and Marxist models, and Orwell's later polemic was to continue with this vein. The tensions which are to characterise his subsequent relation to socialism, for instance that between a deep attachment to English culture and apprehension of the cultural change thought to be implicit in the transition to socialism, are present but not, as yet, fully explicit or developed.

---

1. Henry Pelling, The British Communist Party: A Historical Profile (1958), pp. 76-99.

Taken as a whole, the argument of The Road to Wigan Pier for socialism is pragmatic and compassionate: it is simply wrong that men and women should be forced to live in the ways described in the documentary part, and we should seek ways to change this for the better; and that socialism, properly defined, is such a way. The second part is chiefly concerned with rejecting false or repellent forms of socialism but does also give some definitions of its positive values in its proper sense. 'Justice and liberty' are repeatedly asserted to be the 'essential aims of Socialism' or in another phrase, the 'underlying ideal of Socialism.'[1] 'Justice' and 'liberty' are terms and values which are already strongly associated in Orwell's work with radicalism and which continue to be associated with it and with liberalism in its stronger senses and forms. Orwell's rhetorically emphatic and simplified definition of socialism in The Road to Wigan Pier reveals how deeply his developing commitment to socialism draws upon an already existent and continuing sympathy to radicalism and to liberalism.

It is also interesting to note the terms omitted from Orwell's definition of the fundamental meaning of socialism: 'justice and liberty' are not explicitly wedded to their traditional partners of 'equality and fraternity'. The limitations of this definition of socialism can be taken as an uncannily precise and unconscious exemplification of R.H. Tawney's comment in Equality that 'Liberty and equality have usually in England been considered antithetic; and, since fraternity has rarely been considered at all, the famous trilogy has been easily dismissed as a hybrid abortion.'[2] There is some feeling for fraternity and equality within The Road to Wigan Pier outside of this definition of socialism;

---

1. WP, pp. 246-248.
2. R.H. Tawney, Equality 3rd ed. (1938), p.207.

for fraternity in parts of the accounts of working-class life; and for equality in the argument that the middle-class should merge with the working-class. However, if it is accepted that socialism, even where it develops from this originally liberal trilogy, must emphasise fraternity and equality and that, as Tawney's comment implies, this emphasis has often been felt to be to the detriment of liberty, then the absence of explicit reference to 'equality and fraternity' as constituents of the ideal of socialism does indicate a potential conflict between a sympathy to liberalism and a commitment to socialism.

Orwell does give more extended definitions of the meaning of socialism at other points in The Road to Wigan Pier. As well as 'justice and liberty', 'Socialism means justice and common decency.' 'Justice' here is social rather than juridical, although it would be fair to regard it as including the principle of equality before the law. The nature of the social justice suggested is clarified by a slightly earlier exhortation which fits in with the emphasis on the disparity between the harshness of the miners' work and their poor pay and conditions: 'we must all co-operate and see to it that everyone does his fair share of the work and gets his fair share of the provisions.'[1] There is also the simple compassion for those in poverty irrespective of their work.

The definition of socialism as 'common decency' is in harmony with the overall argument of The Road to Wigan Pier that by any reasonable standard it is wrong for people to be forced to live in the ways described in the documentary sections. In so far as 'decency' is associated with a particular historical period it is, as the concluding section of 'Charles Dickens' shows, associated with a Christian ethic

---

1. WP, pp. 208 and 203.

(though not necessarily Christian faith), with English culture, and, in the case of Dickens, with nineteenth-century liberalism. 'Common sense' can be fairly taken as companion term to 'common decency' referring to matters of knowledge and intellectual judgment rather than morality; it has been shown to be closely associated in Orwell's work with liberalism and specifically with a belief in man's rationality, and capacity and desire for progress.

One of the first positive definitions of socialism in The Road to Wigan Pier is in line with this groups of liberal assumptions: 'Indeed, from one point of view, Socialism is such elementary common sense that I am sometimes amazed that it has not established itself already. The world is a raft sailing through space with, potentially, plenty of provisions for everybody'. To this definition of socialism Orwell adds qualities strongly associated elsewhere in his work with radicalism, opposition to tyranny and an instinctive sympathy with the poor and the oppressed: 'Everyone who knows the meaning of poverty, everyone who has genuine hatred of tyranny and war, is on the Socialist side, potentially'. This anti-tyrannical edge to Orwell's socialism can be connected to the overriding concern for justice and liberty; tyranny denies justice and liberty to at least some of its subjects. Another slightly later passage further asserts that the active desire 'to see tyranny overthrown' is 'the mark of a real Socialist.'[1]

The concluding passage on the meaning of socialism, or at least on the best form in which to present it, brings together most of these themes already noted: 'more about justice, liberty, and the plight of the unemployed. ... Socialism is compatible with common decency.'[2] It is

---

1. WP, pp. 203, 249 and 253.
2. WP, pp. 262-263.

difficult to see how the set of values asserted to be fundamental to socialism in The Road to Wigan Pier - common decency and common sense, justice, liberty, and an instinctive siding with the poor against tyranny - differ from those values strongly associated elsewhere in Orwell's work with radicalism and with liberalism.

If it were simply the case that the values of socialism were confined to the values it derives from radicalism and liberalism, then the development of Orwell's commitment to socialism would not create tensions and contradictions within his work. However, a close reading of The Road to Wigan Pier establishes that socialism is not limited to this, that it has further cultural and social implications beyond those implied by these central liberal values. The claim that socialism has these implications is a strong theme of Marxist writing of this period. Orwell's quarrel with such ideas of socialism has a curious edge: he does not argue that they are mistaken, but rather that they obscure or neglect the essential aims of socialism, and that it would be impolitic to emphasise them at the present time of crisis.

Several passages carry this line of argument. Orwell accepts that, as Marxists argue, 'Socialism cannot be narrowed to mere economic justice and that a reform of that magnitude is bound to work immense changes in our civilisation and way of life.' This claim for the deep cultural influence of socialism follows naturally from the heavily stressed theme of earlier sections that the transition to a classless society will not be painless, but will involve a fundamental change in middle-class habits and moral standards: 'perhaps it means a bleak world in which all our ideals, our codes, our tastes - our 'ideology', in fact will have no meaning.'[1]

---

1. WP, pp. 208 and 200-201.

Orwell accepts that socialism will mean radical cultural changes at the same time as he finds both this view itself and the principal proponents of it distasteful. He contrasts 'the typical working-class Socialist who only wants to abolish poverty and does not always grasp what this implies', with 'the intellectual, book-trained Socialist, who understands that it is necessary to throw our present civilisation down the sink and is quite willing to do so.'[1] Orwell clearly finds such ideas of social and cultural change unpleasant, and does question their validity at points in The Road to Wigan Pier, but he never clearly asserts that they are wrong.

A later passage, again contrasting working-and middle-class conceptions of socialism, again argues that it would be inappropriate to emphasise such ideas at the present time: 'it is a waste of time to insist that acceptance of Socialism means acceptance of the philosophic side of Marxism, plus adulation of Russia. The Socialist movement has not time to be a league of dialectical materialists: it has got to be a league of the oppressed against the oppressors.' As before, the Marxist idea of socialism is contrasted with Orwell's own positive concept of socialism, with justice, liberty, and common decency; and, again in line with previous passages, the main thrust of the argument is that it is impolitic to stress Marxist ideas of socialism, not that these ideas are mistaken. Orwell's concluding passages drive home this paradoxical argument: 'Beyond all else, therefore, we need intelligent propaganda. Less about 'class consciousness', 'expropriation of the expropriators','bourgeois ideology', and 'proletarian solidarity', not to mention the sacred sisters, thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.' The distinction which the tone of their reference to 'adulation of Russia' had previously suggested is now made explicit: Marxist philosophy is accepted to be a concomitant of socialism,

---

1. WP, p.214.

if an unwelcome one, whereas admiration of the Soviet Union and its industrial progress is 'not an integral part of Scoialist doctrine.' Again the unattractiveness as propaganda of Socialism where it is influenced by Marxism and the Soviet model is contrasted with the intrinsic and persuasive value of the meaning Orwell gives to socialism, a meaning 'compatible with common decency.'[1]

There are several important recurrent features to Orwell's quarrel with Marxist ideas of socialism. The distinction between his preferred meaning for Socialism and the meaning Marxism gives to socialism is also consistently a distinction between the types of socialism held by different social classes. Orwell argues that, 'Socialism in its developed form is a theory confined entirely to the middle classes'[2], whereas the values he perceives in working-class socialism are generally the same as his own meaning for it.

Although Orwell accepts that his own, and therefore the working-class, idea of socialism is in practice linked to the Marxist idea of socialism - for example that measures to alleviate poverty will bring about deep cultural and social changes - they are rhetorically opposed to each other. This ambivalence, by which essentially liberal ideas of socialism are both linked and opposed to Marxism, indicates a crucial area of uncertainty in Orwell's thought of this period. An important aspect of The Road to Wigan Pier can be partly understood in terms of this ambivalence: Orwell's satire is directed at the eccentricities of middle-class socialists and at Marxist terminology rather than at Marxist ideas of socialism. These ideas of socialism are largely, if grudgingly, accepted and Orwell has to use other methods of distancing them for the purposes of persuasion.

---

1. WP, pp. 253-254 and 262-263.
2. WP, p.205.

For an understanding of Orwell's relation to socialism, the most crucial ambivalence lies in his response to the threat socialism poses to the social and cultural life to which he is attached. His comments on the possibility of the growth of Fascism in England cast a revealing sidelight on this. For Orwell, there are two aspects to the danger of Fascism. There is the military threat posed by European Fascism to which only the widespread diffusion of socialist doctrine will provide a certain resistance; 'The capitalist-imperialist governments, even though they themselves are about to be plundered, will not fight with any conviction against Fascism as such.'[1]

There is also, and more interestingly, a perception that Fascism may grow as an internal movement in England; similarly, only the establishment of an effective socialist party in England will be an effective defence against it.[2] Fascism 'draws its strength from the good as well as the bad varieties of conservatism', from a feeling for discipline, tradition and European civilisation, and from a revolt against 'hedonism and a cheap conception of progress.' The growth of a sympathy for Fascism among English intellectuals is therefore a possible defensive response to the cultural aggressiveness of Marxist ideas of socialism: 'If you present Socialism in a bad and misleading light - if you let people imagine that it does not mean much more than pouring European civilisation down the sink at the command of Marxist prigs - you risk driving the intellectual into Fascism.' In order to prevent this dangerous development it is necessary to make it clear that socialism can contain the good qualities of Fascism[3], that is, that it will be able to incorporate the valuable aspects of conservatism.

---

1. WP, p.247.
2. WP, p.263.
3. WP, pp. 244-246.

By the time of The Lion and the Unicorn (1941), when it was apparent that a substantial Fascist movement was not going to develop in England, Orwell is clear that its development has been prevented by the native English culture with its belief in justice, liberty, and objective truth, and its strain of anti-militarism, as well as by insufficiently bad material conditions. The socialism of The Lion and the Unicorn will release and revivify these English traditions. In The Road to Wigan Pier, however, whilst it is argued that socialism ought to, and in the present crisis must, include traditional social, cultural and moral values, it is still accepted, in line with contemporary Marxist ideas, that it will involve a radical departure from these traditions, however vaguely this departure is conceived. Socialism therefore is, in The Road to Wigan Pier, the only certain safeguard against the internal and external threat of Fascism. However, at the same time, its cultural aggressiveness is felt to be likely to drive intellectuals towards Fascism, and to threaten those peculiarly English qualities which are subsequently considered to have prevented its growth in England. This dilemma is rhetorically resolved by emphasising what Orwell takes to be the essential meaning of socialism and demanding that its implications be given less attention; it is not, however, logically resolved.

An analysis of Orwell's worry over the growth of Fascism therefore gives an acute indication of the crucial and central problem of his concept of socialism: how far socialism will be compatible with English traditions, traditions which embody many of the qualities associated with nineteenth-century liberalism and with radicalism in his work. This problem is not fully resolved in The Road to Wigan Pier, and perhaps not entirely consciously realised. It lies at the heart of Orwell's subsequent relationship to socialism and is formulated in increasingly explicit and sophisticated ways and with varying emphasis according to time and intention.

For instance, in the early war-time propaganda of The Lion and the Unicorn, where socialism is presented as largely a continuation of English traditions, the concern as to its further implications, which continue to run through Orwell's journalism of this period, are largely excluded.

A connection can be made between the lack of a resolution to this dilemma in The Road to Wigan Pier, and the definition of socialism as 'justice and liberty' without explicit reference to equality or fraternity. In both cases radical and English values are stressed, and less emphasis given to the further implications of socialism, in order to secure the support of 'normal decent people.'[1] There is an analogy with the conflict between Orwell's sympathy for individual endeavour and hardness, and his commitment to socialism: socialism requires industrialisation, at least to some extent, and this will discourage the growth of these qualities. Like the larger cultural difficulty it is not fully resolved. At this point also, a distinction begins to emerge which is to characterise and complicate Orwell's subsequent work: between the values to which he is deeply sympathetic and the actions proposed to preserve these values, or at least to limit their further deterioration.

In The Road to Wigan Pier Orwell takes received ideas of socialism to be primarily Marxist, or, at least, heavily influenced by Marxism. It is reasonable to assume, given his personal history[2], that his knowledge of these Marxist ideas is partly derived from The Adelphi of the early and mid-1930s and from related works such as J.M. Murry's The Necessity of Communism (1932). A comparison of The Road to Wigan Pier with these

---

1. WP, p.248.
2. Much of his early work was published in The Adelphi and in 1936 he attended one of its summer schools. See Crick, p.201 and passim.

texts also shows a curious mixture of satire and partly concealed similarity, with the possibility of derivation. The Adelphi of this period contains, often in J.M. Murry's own articles, reiterated statements of the need to create a specifically English form of Marxism and Communism,[1] and, again like The Road to Wigan Pier, calls for the professional middle-classes to recognise their true interests and to go over to socialism.[2] In addition to this, Orwell also shares the ethical and practical stress of some of the ideas of socialism found in The Adelphi, the idea that a commitment to socialism requires a change in personal life.[3]

These themes are also developed in The Necessity of Communism, Murry's attempt to synthesise the 'ethical passion' of Christianity with Marxism, and create a humanised, English communism from them. Murry urges his bourgeois reader to incorporate himself with the proletariat, an incorporation which will require a sacrifice of his ego and, very possibly, of his culture.[4] Similarly, in The Road to Wigan Pier, Orwell accepts, at least intermittently, that socialism will demand a fundamental change of the self and of culture. A comparison of The Road to Wigan Pier with The Adelphi and The Necessity of Communism therefore provides further evidence of the ambivalence of its attitude to Marxist ideas of socialism. Orwell may be satirical of the social milieu associated with middle-class socialist movements, and critical of their isolation, but there are important similarities between one such contemporary movement and his own

---

1. For example, J.M. Murry, 'Prologue to Russia' Adelphi, II (1931), 351-353; 'The Isolation of Russia and the Way Out', Adelphi, III (1932), 195-205.
2. For example, Judith Todd and Donald Fraser, 'The Middle Class Proletariat', Adelphi, VI (1933), 48-53.
3. For example, E.C. Julier, 'The Ethical Stimulus to Revolution', Adelphi, IX (1935), 265-270.
4. J.M. Murry, The Necessity of Communism (1932), pp. 14-75.

idea of socialism and the transition to it. Here too, in the satire and in Orwell's tone, a pattern emerges which is to characterise his subsequent relationship to socialism and socialists: a deliberately plain-spoken and tough-minded, sometimes intolerant, tone and treatment of them, which, as in this particular case, can disguise some mutual resemblances. Orwell's tone in these passages, and at other times, is also far removed from the dainty judiciousness he perceives in some forms of contemporary liberalism, such as Joad's, and from the tolerance and defence of eccentricity, as well as fair-mindedness and objectivity, associated generally, and by himself, with liberalism. In its forcefulness, however, it does have some correspondence with his own image of nineteenth-century liberalism.

Orwell's treatment of socialism in The Road to Wigan Pier, therefore, establishes, though it does not make fully explicit, two related patterns which are to characterise his subsequent engagement with socialism: the definition of socialism largely in terms of liberalism; and the quarrel with received ideas of socialism in order to promote and enforce this definition. The ambiguous edge to the quarrel with these ideas is to persist. There is a fluctuation from the acceptance that Marxist and related ideas of socialism, though undesirable, are largely true and inevitable, as, for instance, in the apocalyptic prophecies of 'Inside the Whale', to the more frequently expressed position that such a future is possible but can be averted. Orwell's own writings, 'against totalitarianism and for democratic Socialism'[1], are themselves an attempt to persuade his readers and thereby help to avert this prospect. The development of both of the patterns of Orwell's engagement with socialism can now be traced in slightly more detail.

---

1. 'Why I Write', Gangrel, No.4, Summer 1946, p.8.

Orwell's account in 1938 of his motives for joining the Independent Labour Party show how far his commitment to socialism is connected with a desire to preserve the values of liberalism. He had already been associated with the I.L.P. in England and in Spain[1], and by September 1937 shared enough of their policies for Crick to describe him as 'its fellow-traveller'.[2] The I.L.P. had held a central position in the development of the British Left from the 1890s to 1932, but since its disaffiliation from the Labour Party in that year it had suffered a sharp decline in membership, and an accentuation of its tendency to be dominated by middle-class elements and of its hostile relation with the trade unions.[3]

Orwell's article 'Why I Join the Independent Labour Party' begins with his reasons for an active commitment to socialism rather than for the choice of the I.L.P. in particular. As a writer he is professionally interested in freedom of expression: 'And the only regime which, in the long run, will dare to permit freedom of speech is a Socialist regime. If Fascism triumphs I am finished as a writer - that is to say, finished in my only effective capacity.'[4] The argument of the article as a whole recalls a theme of The Road to Wigan Pier that socialism is the only force capable of preventing the growth of Fascism. It also anticipates the theme more fully developed in 'Inside the Whale', that the writer is inextricably attached to freedom of speech and must therefore favour a form of society which will guarantee this freedom.

The other motives for his commitment to socialism are continuous with

---

1. See, for instance, 'Letter to Alec Houghton Joyce', 12 February 1938, CEJL, I, No.115, p.302.
2. Crick, p.235.
3. Henry Pelling, 'The Story of the I.L.P.', in, Popular Politics and Society in Late Victorian Britain (1968), pp. 121-129.
4. New Leader, XXXI, 24 June 1938, p.4.

The Road to Wigan Pier: a desire to alleviate poverty, and an opposition to capitalism and imperialism. The attraction of the I.L.P. in particular lies in the firmness of its 'Socialist principles' and its policy on the best resistance to Fascism, its opposition to an 'Imperialist war.[1] After the start of the Second War, which the I.L.P. continued to oppose, Orwell resigned from it.[2] 'Why I Join the Independant Labour Party' does make one pattern of The Road to Wigan Pier slightly more explicit: a commitment to socialism is made in order to guarantee, or at least preserve, the liberal value of freedom of speech.

Such a commitment is liable to give rise to an uneasy and troubled relationship to socialism. Some forms of socialism, satirised but also partly accepted in The Road to Wigan Pier, threaten those cultural values Orwell most wishes to see preserved. 'Inside the Whale' shows how acute this tension can become: socialism is bound to extinguish freedom of thought and individual autonomy, values to which the writer as a writer and, as a liberal, is irrevocably linked.

A piece in June 1941, 'Literature and Totalitarianism', repeats and pursues these themes. By this date, however, Orwell does see some possibility of an escape from this dilemma. It may be possible to evolve a form of socialism which will not be 'totalitarian, in which freedom of thought can survive the disappearance of economic individualism.' Such a form of socialism is most likely to evolve in 'those countries in which liberalism has struck its deepest roots, the non-military countries.' The tensions typical of Orwell's previous relationship to socialism have become far more explicit and clear. The importance of a sense of the

---

1. 'Why I Join the Independent Labour Party', New Leader, XXXI , 24 June 1938, p.4.
2. See Crick, p.257.

nature of the writer and of literature to the formation of political attitudes remains. It is now quite clear that a desirable form of socialism will incorporate the primary values of liberalism, though not of the economic individualism associated with it, and is most likely to develop from it. This type of socialism is only a possibility, a possibility which 'may be no more than a pious hope'[1]; totalitarian forms of socialism continue to threaten freedom of thought. The distinction of liberal from totalitarian socialism represents a terminological, though not a practical, resolution of the ambivalence of Orwell's earlier writing: there socialism both threatened and promised to preserve liberal and associated cultural values; now the threat and promise are divided between different types of socialism.

Orwell's idea of socialism as 'a sort of moralised liberalism'[2] remains only a hope and is not given substance as a vision. Indeed, a later article in 1943 reveals a suspicion of the opening such utopian visions afford to pessimism and political reaction. He acknowledges that the absurdity of the claim that man and society can be perfected through political changes can be easily shown. A possible response , associated in this article with what Orwell terms 'the neo-reactionary writers', though not a logical corollary, to the non-perfectibility of human nature is a 'refusal to believe that human society can be fundamentally improved' and a consequent apathetic withdrawal from political action. If socialism claims that mankind can be perfected then it is liable to arouse this response, which can, however, be avoided by disassociating 'Socialism from Utopianism.'[3] Although, at a later date, Orwell finds utopian visions like those of Wilde's The Soul of Man Under Socialism and William Morris's

---

1. 'Literature and Totalitarianism', Listener XXV (1941) 882.
2. 'Literature and Totalitarianism', p.882.
3. 'As I Please', Tribune, 24 December 1943, p.11.

News from Nowhere valuable as reminders of the original aims of socialism,[1] he generally asserts, as in a revision of his views on Henry Miller in 1946, that 'politics is the science of the possible.'[2] Orwell's own socialism is therefore not utopian, and he turns to dystopia as a literary form. Where he does give extended expression to positive ideas of socialism, as in The Lion and the Unicorn, they are not only free from utopianism but rather opposite to it: pragmatic, building on existing, if latent, culture and life, and, as a consequence, tending to be fragmentary and difficult to analyse.

The problem of creating a form of socialism which will incorporate the values of liberalism, and of avoiding totalitarian forms is couched in 'Inside the Whale' and 'Literature and Totalitarianism' in both historical and more theoretical terms. A review in 1944 of F.A. Hayek's The Road to Serfdom and The Mirror of the Past by Konni Zilliacus makes it clear how acute a practical and contemporary difficulty it is. Orwell, in a paraphrase, largely endorses Hayek's thesis that socialism, as collectivism 'is not inherently democratic, but, on the contrary, gives to a tyrannical minority such powers as the Spanish Inquisitors never dreamed of'[3], but he disagrees with Hayek's argument that it is necessary to return to unplanned capitalism in order to restore personal liberty. Zilliacus, later to be attacked as an 'underground' Communist M.P. in Partisan Review and Tribune[4], is commended for his 'able and well-documented attack on imperialism and power politics' but his intellectual integrity, particularly in his equivocations over Soviet foreign policy, is questioned. Orwell sums up by contrasting the opposing viewpoints of these two books and proposes a possible solution to their deficiencies: 'Capitalism leads

---

1. 'Wilde's Utopia', Observer, 9 May 1948, p.4.
2. 'Words and Henry Miller', Tribune, 22 February 1946, p.15.
3. 'Grounds for Dismay', Observer, 9 April 1944, p.3.
4. 'London Letter', Partisan Review XIII (1946), 320-325; Letter to Tribune, 17 January 1947, p.11.

to dole queues, the scramble for markets and war. Collectivism leads to concentration camps, leader worship, and war. There is no way out of this unless a planned economy can be somehow combined with the freedom of the intellect.' Again this synthesis of a socialist programme with a central value of liberalism is only a possibility for both Orwell and for Hayek and Zilliacus, both of whom are felt to be aware of the need for it, 'but can show no practicable way of bringing it about.'[1]

Orwell's condition for this synthesis, the restoration of 'the concept of right and wrong ... to politics'[2] is also interesting. The judgment of political and social action in moral terms can fairly be associated with nineteenth-century radicalism and liberalism. In 'Charles Dickens' Orwell describes Dickens's criticism of society as 'almost exclusively moral'[3] and, though his lack of insight into the structure of society is felt at points in the essay to be a limitation, this quality is connected to his generous anger at injustice and thereby with his nineteenth-century liberalism. Some nineteenth-century liberal politicians, notably Gladstone, proposed that foreign policy should be conducted according to the demands of morality and of justice, not of expediency and power.[4] In arguing for the restoration, rather than the addition, of moral judgment to politics, it is possible that Orwell had this tradition in mind. Again a quality which can be associated with liberalism, and especially nineteenth-century liberalism, needs to be married to socialist measures. One of the chief constituent values of Orwell's socialism, 'common decency', also has moral rather than political connotations. In the division of the writer from the citizen, however, there is a contrary tendency to the

---

1. 'Grounds for Dismay', Observer, 9 April 1944, p.3.
2. 'Grounds for Dismay', Observer, 9 April 1944, p.3.
3. 'CD', ITW, p.13.
4. See, Alan Bullock and Maurice Shock eds., The Liberal Tradition from Fox to Keynes (1956), pp. xxxviii-xli and 83-92.

synthesis of politics and morality he proposes in this review: the free intelligence and moral judgment of the writer is separated from the participant in political action.

An article in the Manchester Evening News, 'What is Socialism?', in 1946 shows what continuity, and what change, there is from Orwell's earlier ideas of socialism. The emphasis on individual commitment persists, and socialism is still seen to require a revolution of both the individual and of society. The ambivalence of his early work as to the implications of socialism, which had developed into a division of the types of socialism, is now recast into a more certain historical perspective. For Orwell, in an account similar in some respects to passages in Goldstein's The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism in Nineteen Eighty-Four[1], there had been an ideological split in the socialist movement in the 1930s between supporters of the Soviet regime and utopian socialists whose idea of socialism was bound up with 'liberty and equality'. Those writers who have reacted against the Machiavellian and anti-democratic elements of Communism and reverted to an older conception of socialism are arguably the 'true upholders of Socialist tradition'. Such a form of socialism is exemplified by Koestler and Silone and is in the tradition of the early Christians, the Diggers and Levellers, Rousseau, Whitman, and William Morris. It centres upon the ideas of liberty, equality and human brotherhood and involves a fundamental belief in human decency and in the possibility of improvement in human nature.[2] Some of these terms and values are continuous from his early statements on socialism: liberty and decency are almost invariable components of Orwell's socialism; justice is now omitted as a term. Other terms, customarily associated with socialism, have now been added:

---

1. NEF, pp. 163-166.
2. 'The Intellectual Revolt (2): What is Socialism?', MEN, 31 January 1946, p.2.

the presence of 'equality' and 'human brotherhood' repairs the omissions of The Road to Wigan Pier.

In vocabulary, therefore, there has been some development: from a definition of socialism almost entirely in terms strongly associated with liberalism and radicalism throughout his work, to an account of socialism which still retains these original values but which adds more socially oriented qualities to them. Orwell's increasing use in the 1940s of the term 'democratic Socialism' also reflects this development: the values of democracy, which have been seen to be originally associated with liberalism, are combined with socialism.

It is questionable, however, how deep this synthesis is. Given the historical situation, and Orwell's perception of it, such a form of socialism has to remain a hope rather than an achieved reality. Several aspects of his work, particularly the tendency to divorce liberty of thought from freedom of action, and the crucial split between the writer and the citizen, between the writer as a liberal and the participant in group political action, run counter to this theoretical synthesis. They suggest that the potential conflict between individual freedom on the one hand, and equality and a collectivist society on the other, has not been fully resolved.

There has also been a considerable change in the tone and manner of the treatment of socialism since The Road to Wigan Pier. The strident intolerance of the treatment of socialist writers has been replaced by a wider and more broad-minded range of reference, a development which the contrasting treatment of William Morris shows particularly clearly.[1]

---

1. Compare WP, p.216, with 'Wilde's Utopia', Observer, 9 May 1948, p.4.

An expansion of the scope of Orwell's thought is also evident in the change from the preoccupation of The Road to Wigan Pier with Marxist theories and representatives of socialism to a wider political awareness: for instance, there is the interest in parliamentary and international politics revealed in the 'London Letters' to Partisan Review. The tone of Orwell's discussion is now quieter, often in the later 1940s with an element of nostalgic sympathy for the ideas of earlier socialist writers, without the agressive simplifications and repetition of The Road to Wigan Pier. In the 1940s in general, the quieter tone is matched by a reduction of the emphasis on the autobiographical framework of his commitment to socialism. Where, in the later essays, the tone is forceful, it is usually part of a clearly developed and firmly stated argument, a manner of argument which does correspond to the stronger sense of liberalism. The attacks of The Road to Wigan Pier upon the language of socialism and the life-styles of socialists were seen to be connected with an unresolved ambivalence towards Marxist ideas of socialism. The change in tone does indicate a clearer and more settled political position, including a recasting of this ambivalence into a distinction between types of socialism, if not a complete resolution of it.

The Road to Wigan Pier also established another important pattern of Orwell's treatment of socialism: a continuous quarrel with received ideas of socialism. It is important to remember how many of Orwell's attacks had substantial, if now obscure targets. Socialism in Britain in the 1930s was strongly influenced by ideas of planning and of scientific and industrial progress, ideas which were themselves partly derived from the Soviet Five Year Plan. For instance, in 1934 George Lansbury, then leader of the Labour Party, envisaged, in a tone similar to that mocked by Orwell, a planned England which would be 'a land fit for intelligent

people to live in'[1]. Gary Werskey in The Visible College points to the obsession of the British Left in the 1930s with the scientific route to socialism, and notes J.D. Bernal's confidence in 1939 that, in the socialist future, science would be able to provide 'the totally enclosed, spacious (and) air conditioned town.'[2] Orwell's accusations that socialists are motivated by a 'hypertrophied sense of order' and a taste for Wellsian utopiae, 'the paradise of little fat men'[3], do, for all their occasional wildness of tone, have actual contemporary sources.

A principal subsequent extension of this rhetorical technique of The Road to Wigan Pier is the thesis, reiterated throughout Orwell's journalism, that economic definitions of socialism are inadequate. This technique is encouraged by Orwell's historical situation, by the prevalence of such ideas of socialism and by the movement towards centralised control of the national economy in the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany without the emergence of the other values of socialism.[4] It is also enforced by the development of his own thought: if socialism as 'moralised liberalism' remains only an indistinctly defined hope, it is necessary, and perhaps only possible, to first dispose of misleading ideas of socialism in order to arrive at this essential idea. In addition to this, it is reasonable to suppose that Orwell enjoyed this iconoclastic role, and that he shared 'the strain of perversity', of affection for unpopular causes which he detected in H.W. Nevinson.[5]

There are many instances of this technique throughout Orwell's journalism, some of which can be studied. A discursive article in Time and Tide in

---

1. From Henry Pelling, ed., The Challenge of Socialism 2nd ed. (1968) p.323. See also pp. 321-330.
2. Gary Werskey, The Visible College (1978), p.199. See also pp. 135-257.
3. WP, pp. 211 and 225.
4. Jenni Calder, Chronicles of Conscience: A Study of George Orwell and Arthur Koestler (1968), p.171 makes this point about wartime Britain as well.
5. 'Pen and Sword', Observer, 28 January 1945, p.3.

March 1940 argues that an economic definition of socialism is too limited, that it needs some moral meaning as well. In the course of this argument Orwell asserts that 'Socialism in the narrow economic sense has nothing to do with liberty, equality or common decency of any description.' Here too, there is a development from The Road to Wigan Pier: equality has been added to the previously held values. As elsewhere, Orwell's concept of socialism does involve some measure of economic centralization and public ownership, though it cannot be limited to or defined by this, and he is often wary of the possible implications of centralization for freedom in intellectual and social life. His longstanding anti-imperialism is now allied to this idea of socialism. If socialism is wrongly limited to economic centralization it would be technically 'possible to 'Socialize' England tomorrow and still continue to exploit India and the Crown colonies for the benefit of the home population.'[1] The values of liberty and decency Orwell wishes to incorporate into socialism would ensure that this would not happen. The article exemplifies the persuasive technique designed to make the reader question conventional and limited definitions of socialism. Within the context of the article it is still rather unclear how liberty and decency are to be combined with socialism in its economic sense, other than by the moral effort encouraged by this persuasive technique.

A slightly later piece, May 1940, in Time and Tide, a review of F. Borkenau's The Totalitarian Enemy, continues with related themes. Orwell argues that the Russo-German pact exposed the inadequacy of the thesis, accepted by 'Blimps and Left Book Club members alike', that National Socialism was a decadent form of capitalism and made it clear that it 'is a form of Socialism, is emphatically revolutionary, does crush the property owner just as surely as it crushes the worker.' It is clear that he considers it to

---

1. 'Notes on the Way', T&T, XXI (1940), 337.

be socialist by virtue of the economic organisation forced on it by the conduct and preparation of war: 'When the State has taken complete control of industry, the so-called capitalist is reduced to the status of a manager, and when consumption goods are so scarce and so strictly rationed that you cannot spend a big income even if you earn one, then the essential structure of Socialism already exists, plus the comfortless equality of war-communism.' The survival of ownership and of the capitalists in person under the Nazi regime is not fully dealt with in the rather limited space of the review. The resemblance in economic structure between the Soviet and Nazi regimes, between the actual representatives of Socialism and of Fascism, makes it self-evidently inadequate to define a desirable socialism purely in economic terms. Both regimes are tending to become forms of 'oligarchical collectivism', a concept Orwell develops further in his later work, particularly in the essays on James Burnham and in Nineteen Eighty-Four. What is required in order to prevent socialism in England from coming to resemble Fascism, is not a perverse refusal of already existing tendencies towards economic centralisation, but a combination of this with other qualities, 'a humaner, freer form of collectivism.'[1]

Orwell asserts that such a form of collectivism could be 'rapidly, almost easily' achieved but that it 'needs the eye of faith to see the present Government doing it.'[2] No further explanation of the transition to socialism is given in the review. For this it is necessary to turn to The Lion and the Unicorn, written at a slightly later date and constituting Orwell's fullest statement of what he wants socialism to be, in both its values and its programme, and of the means of transition to socialism. Until recently this text had received little critical attention, and

---

1. 'Red, White and Brown', T&T, XXI (1940), 484.
2. 'Red, White and Brown', T&T, XXI (1940), 484.

Bernard Crick's biography makes a deliberate attempt to reverse this. Indeed he takes The Lion and the Unicorn as the central statement of Orwell's political position. Crick is particularly concerned to discredit interpretations of Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-Four as anti-socialist from a liberal or conservative viewpoint. Rather, he argues, Orwell remained a socialist until the end of his life, and was firmly committed to both egalitarianism and libertarianism. Orwell's frame of mind is repeatedly characterised as 'republican'[1], in particular contradistinction to liberal squeamishness over the necessity for violence in political action.

What Crick means by 'republican' is given more body in his essay 'Freedom as Politics', in which he quarrels with Isaiah Berlin's well-known distinction between positive and negative liberty.[2] His quarrel is not so much with Berlin's historical account but with the practical insufficiency of negative liberal freedom. Crick returns to the idea 'freedom as citizenship' as a resolution of this debate and as a socialist idea of freedom: freedom is not isolation or withdrawal into privacy, it is an activity, participation in political and social action, a vigilant and active concern for liberty. This view of freedom concentrates on those qualities considered necessary to operate states which were characterised as republican. The citizen of such a state would ideally be involved in the common culture and have the 'qualities of endeavour, involvement and audacity which hold states together.' Crick thus gives liberty a real content beyond the absence of interference associated with 'negative liberty'. At the same time this idea of freedom as citizenship avoids the pitfall of autocratic 'positive liberty' which, as Crick agrees with

---

1. Crick, pp. 208 and 258.
2. Isaiah Berlin, 'Two Concepts of Liberty', in, Four Essays on Liberty (1969), pp. 118-172.

Berlin, by valuing liberty only as a means to a particular end, for instance of service, has consequences that are 'both linguistically self-contradictory and often morally obnoxious.'[1] Both in the biography and in his introduction to a new edition of The Lion and the Unicorn Crick treats Orwell's literary persona and his political thought as the exemplar of the active qualities required by the idea of freedom as citizenship, 'as by no means typically liberal, but standing in a harsher, more realistic republican tradition, partly Jacobinical, partly old English Puritan.' Crick's interpretation of Orwell's concept of freedom makes this identification entirely clear: 'Liberty is not just being left alone, it is up and doing: a positive freedom of active citizenry.'[2] Some reviewers of George Orwell: A Life commented on the similarity between Crick and Orwell's political sympathies[3]: comparison with Crick's other work reveals how close they lie - at least in Crick's account of Orwell. This account is valuable for the attention it draws to the non-and anti-liberal elements in Orwell's work, the impatience with moral scrupulousness, and the willingness to endorse violence in pursuit of an overriding end. However, it remains an unbalanced and incomplete view of Orwell. Berlin's essay did not begin a debate on positive and negative liberty where there was none before. Rather it summed up and recast a longstanding argument with which Orwell was familiar, particularly from contemporary Marxist writing on liberty and individualism, and to which he responded in a radically different way from Crick. In his essay, Crick notes that the idea of freedom as citizenship had been current in the late seventeenth century and throughout the eighteenth, but had been swallowed up in the

---

1. Bernard Crick, 'Freedom as Politics', in, Political Theory and Practice (1975), pp. 35-62 (pp. 57-58 and 59).
2. Bernard Crick, 'Introduction', in, The Lion and the Unicorn (Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1982), pp. 7-30 (p.24).
3. For instance, NW, 'Orwell and the Anarchists', Freedom - Anarchist Review, 30 January 1981, p.9; and Peter Sedgwick, 'A Hard Man to Use', Guardian, 27 November 1980, p.9.

nineteenth by nationalism, worship of the state, or alternatively by liberalism.[1] In view of its history it is apparently unlikely that this idea would have been readily available to Orwell, a reservation Crick makes as he asserts an aspect of it: 'Whether he knew it or not he lay close to the Graeco-Roman republican roots of European civilisation which assumed the indivisibility of citizenship and culture.'[2] The context suggests that the 'indivisibility of citizenship and culture' is to be understood in two main senses: that Orwell was interested in English popular culture and that this affectionate interest was one of the sources of his patriotism; and that, in a sense more closely connected with the idea of freedom as citizenship, he approached the private and the public, literature and political action, with the same sensibility and regarded them as inseparable. The first of these claims is easily acceptable; the second simplifies and distorts Orwell's position.

Where Orwell was presented with ideas of a close relationship between literature and a community, culture and citizenship, for instance in the work of Gaudwell and MacNeice, one strong part of his response is actually to propose a division between the two. Louis MacNeice in Modern Poetry: A Personal Essay (1937) argues that the contemporary poet should integrate himself with a community and make his work useful to that community, and that the poets of Michael Roberts's anthology, New Signatures (1932), including Auden and Spender, are doing this. He takes as his model the Greek poet of the fifth century B.C. who was an active member of a community and articulated their beliefs: consequently, his 'attitude as poet was not distinguished from his attitude as man.'[3] Orwell's criticisms in 'Inside the Whale' of this idea, an idea similar in some respects to Crick's unity of citizenship and culture, cannot be dismissed as simply

---

1. 'Freedom as Politics', in, Political Theory and Practice (1971) pp. 35-62 (p.57).
2. George Orwell: A Life (1981), pp. xix-xx.
3. Louis MacNeice, Modern Poetry (1938), pp. 1-30. Quotation from p.1.

a response to the immaturity of the political commitment of some English intellectuals in the 1930s, or to their Communist allegiances. They are part of a debate which continues throughout Orwell's work of the 1940s and which examines the problems of the compatibility of liberty with socialism, and of the writer's intellectual independence with the demands of group political action. The final resolution of this debate, a resolution with which Orwell himself is dissatisfied, is the antithesis of the writer and the citizen, the separation of culture from citizenship.

There are, of course, tendencies contrary to this division in his work, notably the desire to fuse political purpose and artistic purpose into one whole.[1] However, a simplified account of Orwell's developed position, robbed of its ambiguities and contradictions, would be that he recognises the urgent need for involvement in political action and persuasion in order to protect liberty, but that freedom, and particularly the writer's intellectual liberty, is not fully experienced in that activity. Public action is needed to safeguard a freedom whose basis is private, to preserve, in so far as it is possible, the autonomous individual. Crick does not deal with Orwell's sympathy for this concept of man, but criticises a similar idea, 'the self-reliant individual', as 'not human, but an anatomical abstraction, and put sociologically, impossible.'[2] This vision of man as separate from society is seen by Crick to be inherent in negative liberty, in the idea freedom as the absence of restraint, the insufficiency of which he is concerned to demonstrate. It would seem, then, that Crick has formed Orwell into an image of his ideal political man, and that in so doing he has obscured a crucial divergence between his own and Orwell's response to similar debates. If a line of demarcation is to be crudely

---

1. See 'Why I Write', Gangrel, No.4, Summer 1946, p.9.
2. Bernard Crick, 'Freedom as Politics', in Political Theory and Practice (1971), p.41.

drawn between the liberal and the socialist, then it would be reasonable to draw it in this area of liberty, and of individual autonomy. Orwell himself uses Laski's 'individualist outlook' and instinct for 'an old-fashioned version of liberty' as evidence for identifying him as 'a Socialist by allegiance and a Liberal by temperament.'[1] The phrase would be an equally valid description of Orwell himself. Crick's misreading of Orwell's idea of freedom obscures the complexity of this position and masks the extent of his positive relation to liberalism.

The other deficiencies of Crick's analysis of Orwell's thought are connected with this misreading. Those works which most clearly contradict his analysis, the title essay and collection Inside the Whale and the journalism on related themes throughout the 1940s, are neglected; 'Inside the Whale' itself is largely dismissed in a reference to the 'grim pessimism in this overstated essay.'[2] The evidence for Orwell's republican frame of mind is mostly drawn from The Lion and the Unicorn itself and partly from Orwell's early war-time journalism, particularly the 'London Letters' to Partisan Review. In attempting to correct the misleading emphasis established in Orwell criticism by Sonia Orwell's introduction to the Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters and in the selection of that collection, Crick substitutes a contrasting, but also misleading emphasis. Although he is critical of those who separate politics from literature, and values Orwell's attempts to bring them together, Crick himself tends to follow this division, turning to the more overtly 'political' texts to trace the development of Orwell's political thought and allotting considerably less attention to his fiction and literary criticism. His interpretation of The Lion and the Unicorn, therefore, suffers from a failure to place it in its full context in

---

1. 'Revolt in the Urban Desert', Observer, 10 October 1943, p.3.
2. George Orwell: A Life (1981), p.260.

Orwell's work.

It still remains, however, necessary to relate The Lion and the Unicorn to the general development of Orwell's ideas on socialism. A schematic, but fair, analysis of the socialist revolution envisaged in it would be that this revolution will set free 'the native genius of the English people'[1], and that the qualities in this 'native genius' are largely identical with those associated with liberalism in its stronger senses. The pattern discernible in various forms throughout Orwell's work is therefore sustained: socialism is valued for its promise to fulfil and realise the ideals of liberalism.

This analysis needs amplification and the similarities between the English culture which socialism will set free and liberalism need to be identified in greater detail. Contradictions will be revealed within The Lion and the Unicorn, particularly between the methods of the revolution and the qualities it is intended to preserve and liberate; between, for instance, the gentleness and anti-militarism of the English people, and the harshness and military endeavour required by the wartime situation. In addition to these contradictions there is a crucial omission: the possibility that socialism may have totalitarian implications is left largely unstated, presumably because of the need to persuade rather than to disturb his audience at a critical time, and because the programme for socialism is intended to avert this possibility. In view of this omission, it is particularly misleading to consider The Lion and the Unicorn without a full sense of its context in Orwell's work.

The idea of revolution in The Lion and the Unicorn is essentially similar

---

1. L&U, p.74.

to that contained in a brief passage in an article, 'My Country Right or Left', written at a similar date. There, too, only revolution can avert defeat in war; it may involve domestic violence, and, crucially, it renews and releases existing or latent qualities rather than introducing new ones: 'when the red militias are billeted in the Ritz I shall still feel that the England I was taught to love so long ago and for such different reasons is somehow persisting.'[1] This idea of revolution, incorporating renewal and continuity, gives scope to patriotism which is defined as 'devotion to something that is changing but is felt to be mystically the same.'[2] Revolution in The Lion and the Unicorn, accordingly, means change but also a deep continuity: 'In whatever shape England emerges from the war it will be deeply tinged with the characteristics that I have spoken earlier ... England will still be England.' The conclusion reaffirms this view of revolution as growth and fulfilment rather than radical departure. Revolution will bring the 'real England to the surface', it is the process by which 'we become more ourselves, not less.'[3] This idea of revolution is strikingly different from the idea of revolution found in Marxism, as violent and unconstitutional action leading to radical change in society. The emphasis on renewal and continuity rather than fundamental change, though the possibility of violent action is allowed, serves to assimilate a socialist idea and term to an outlook which remains essentially liberal.

Prominent amongst the characteristics Orwell discerns in English life, and which revolution will therefore renew, is a belief in 'justice, liberty and objective truth'. Throughout The Lion and the Unicorn there is a concern

---

1. 'My Country Right or Left', Folios of New Writing, II (1940), p.41; The Lion and the Unicorn was written between August and October 1940: see Bernard Crick, 'Introduction', in The Lion and the Unicorn (1982), p.16.
2. 'My Country Right or Left', Folios of New Writing, II (1940), p.40.
3. L&U, pp. 55 and 126.

for these and other qualities which differentiate English from European culture and which have prevented the growth of Fascism, which, as Orwell repeatedly argues, employs a totalitarian idea of the relativity and malleability of truth. For Orwell, these concepts are not fully realised in contemporary English life - neither the law nor the electoral system is administered in accordance with them - but the belief in them continues to influence conduct and the national life. The possibility that they may be made actual through revolution is in itself sufficient reason for preferring democracy to totalitarianism: 'in choosing between them one chooses not so much on the strength of what they now are as of what they are capable of becoming.'[1]

The belief in individual liberty, which persists 'almost as in the nineteenth-century' is obviously illusory: 'even this purely private liberty is a lost cause. Like all other modern peoples, the English are in the process of being numbered, labelled, conscripted, 'co-ordinated'.'[2] It is clear, therefore, that the beliefs in justice, liberty, privacy, and objective truth, which Orwell considers to be generally held by the English people and which the socialism of The Lion and the Unicorn will, in general, release, are also beliefs in the values covered by his idea of liberalism. This identity can be partly explained by a simple historical similarity, evident in the reference to the continuity of the nineteenth-century belief in liberty. Where he is concerned with the social manifestations of liberalism, as for instance in the analysis of the class mentality of Dickens and Wells, Orwell is drawing upon an aspect of English culture which he now directly describes as a whole.

It is admitted that these beliefs may be illusory, that they may be

---

1. L&U, pp. 24, 22-25 and 122.
2. L&U, p.15.

mistaken as descriptions of contemporary English life. In this connection, it is important to remember that it is at this time that Orwell most severely questions the validity of some liberal assumptions. The political behaviour of men under totalitarianism and in war is felt to reveal the inadequacy of the assumption that man are motivated by the desire for liberty and pleasure. The beliefs asserted to be generally held by the English people may therefore be illusory in this sense as well. Yet they continue to be valued for their influence on conduct. This pragmatic solution to a potential problem avoids the question of the final validity of such beliefs. At a later point in The Lion and the Unicorn it is implied that neither Orwell nor the reader can 'have access to absolute standards'; political choices, for instance between democracy and totalitarianism, therefore should be made on the basis of immediate sympathies and a practical understanding of the situation.[1] Connected with this sense of the impossibility of absolute certainty there is a developing interest in codes of conduct, such as decency, Christian morality, even gentlemanliness and hypocrisy, which influence behaviour in desirable ways although they do not have a certain basis. Indeed the socialist government projected in The Lion and the Unicorn will 'retain a vague reverence for the Christian moral code.' This rather agnostic frame of mind can be connected to the distaste for ideas of socialism as a utopian order, an order which would imply knowledge of absolutes, and to the undogmatic willingness to allow an English socialist government to 'leave anachronisms and loose ends everywhere'[2], thereby preserving much of English culture.

The belief in justice which Orwell identifies in the English character is connected to a belief in the rule of law. Although it is understood

---

1. L&U, p.122.
2. L&U, pp. 24 and 112-113. See also the treatment of snobbishness and hypocrisy in 'Raffles and Miss Blandish', Horizon, X(1944), 232-244.

that the administration of the law is unfair in its discrimination between rich and poor, there remains an 'all-important English trait: the respect for constitutionalism and legality, the belief in 'the law' as something above the State and above the individual.' This belief is part of that culture which has preserved England from totalitarianism and will be incorporated in an English socialist government: 'it will never lose touch with the tradition of compromise and the belief in a law that is above the State.'[1] Equality before the law is one of the ideals ascribed to the heirs of liberal revolutions in Goldstein's Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism[2], though belief in the rule of law alone is also associated by Orwell with late nineteenth-century Conservatism. The incidental reference to a 'tradition of compromise' suggests that an English socialist government should also inherit and assimilate this recognizably liberal idea of the reconciliation of conflicting interests. Again, therefore, socialism will fulfil English liberal beliefs.

The English socialism of The Lion and the Unicorn will include other aspects of liberalism and radicalism in their historical senses. Socialism should make use of patriotism and 'bring patriotism and intelligence into partnership'. Throughout, patriotism is seen as an attachment to English ways of life and is clearly differentiated from aggressive nationalism: 'all the boasting and flag-wagging, the 'Rule Britannia' stuff, is done by small minorities. The patriotism of the common people is not vocal or even conscious.'[3] In view of this distinction, it is fair to identify this type of patriotism with the culturally and militarily defensive sentiment, quite possibly derived from an aspect of nineteenth-century radicalism, which Orwell distinguishes from nationalism in his later essay 'Notes on Nationalism'.

---

1. L&U, pp. 22 and 112.
2. NEF, p.205.
3. L&U, pp. 96 and 19.

Anti-militarism is also identified as an English characteristic. Although it primarily means a dislike of standing armies, it is connected with the 'gentleness of the English civilization'[1] and with the absence of aggressive nationalism. Elsewhere anti-militarism is seen as part of the class outlook of such nineteenth-century liberals as Dickens and Wells. In the case of Wells this bias is felt to be a limitation on his understanding of contemporary military and political developments.[2] This criticism of Wells points to a contradiction within The Lion and the Unicorn. English anti-militarism and gentleness are valued, in part for their inhibition of the growth of military dictatorship. Yet in a later passage the intellectual left is criticised for its attempt to make 'their own countrymen unwarlike', for their 'belief that the English are no longer a martial race.'[3] It is clearly implied that resistance in war does require these qualities. This contradiction can be seen as analogous to the persistent tension in Orwell's commitment to socialism between the values to which he is committed and the actions proposed to safeguard them. It results in an ambivalent attitude towards liberalism: an affection for its values, and a desire to preserve them, is combined with a tough-minded impatience with a weakly liberal tendency to equivocate over the need for harshness and violence, an impatience which results in an advocacy of actions which partly contradict the original values. This ambivalence can also be partly understood in terms of the difference between 'nineteenth-century liberalism' and liberalism, between the moral and intellectual passion Orwell admires, and the mere advocacy of reasonable behaviour criticised in Wells.

Indifference to or ignorance of the Empire is identified as part of English anti-militarism. Orwell acknowledges the hypocrisy of this

---

1. L&U, p.17.
2. 'Wells, Hitler and the World State', Horizon, IV(1941), 133-138.
3. L&U, pp. 115-117.

attitude, and criticises the insularity of a socialism which neglects the issue of the Empire or proposes an irresponsible dissolution of it. Rather he advocates a 'positive imperial policy which would aim at 'transforming the Empire into a federation of Socialist states.'[1] An analysis of the treatment of imperialism and of the Empire in The Lion and the Unicorn yields some interesting insights into Orwell's relation to nineteenth-century liberalism and to socialism.

There is a sympathy for those members of the lower orders of the imperial administration actively involved with and situated in the colonies, and a distaste for the outlook of the domestic and higher colonial administrators. A passage of historical summary suggests that part of this sympathy springs from a nostalgic conservatism: 'In a narrowing world, more and more governed from Whitehall, there was every year less room for individual initiative. ... Well-meaning over-civilized men, in dark suits and black felt hats, with neatly rolled umbrellas crooked over the left forearm, were imposing their constipated view of life on Malaya and Nigeria, Mombasa and Mandalay.' Orwell's sympathy with lower colonial officers is also apparent in the proposals for a positive imperial policy, in which the lower officials with practical skills, 'civil engineers, forestry and agriculture experts, doctors, educationists', are given an active role in the development of India and its transition to full independence, whereas, for this policy, the 'higher officials, the provincial governors, commissioners, judges, etc., are hopeless.'[2]

This mixture of admiration and sympathy for local officials, qualified elsewhere by doubts as to the morality of the activities of their nine-

---

1. L&U, pp. 19-20 and 90.

2. L&U, pp. 45 and 108.

teenth-century predecessors[1], and distaste for the outlook of more senior administrators, should be understood in the context of the relations between liberalism and imperialism discussed in Eric Stokes's The English Utilitarians and India. Early nineteenth-century liberalism, associated with Macaulay and with free-trade and economic expansion, had favoured the imposition of English ways upon India. This attempt at assimilation was met with horror by a generation of administrators, with culturally conservative leanings, who favoured the paternalistic protection of Indian culture. This response drew out by opposition the latent authoritarianism in utilitarianism, its preference for centralised uniformity to be created by the immense and immediate influence it ascribed to law and government.[2] The treatment of the history of imperialism in The Lion and the Unicorn, as well as the interest in Burmese culture to which Burmese Days testifies, makes it clear that Orwell shares part of this reaction against the utilitarian outlook, particularly against the remote imposition of uniformity. However, Orwell's response is not simply conservative. He does argue for the development of India and other colonies towards socialism; he does not merely wish to preserve their native cultures, but, in contrast to the authoritarian strain in utilitarianism, insists that the Dominion Status that such a development would require must include 'the unconditional right to secede' from this status. The responsibility implied in this idea for a positive imperial policy is also a corrective to the deficiencies of the 'old-fashioned anti-imperialism'[3], itself associated with radicalism[4], held by the Labour Party.

Orwell's reaction against the utilitarian aspect of nineteenth-century

---

1. 'Rudyard Kipling', Horizon, V(1942), 111-125 (p.115).
2. Eric Stokes, The English Utilitarians and India (Oxford, 1959), pp. xiv-xvi, 55 and passim.
3. L&U, p.89, pp. 109 and 89.
4. S. Maccoby, The English Radical Tradition 2nd ed.(1966), pp. 86, 110-116, 180-182 and 214-217.

liberalism can be linked to his treatment of Fabianism. In addition to its general inheritance from utilitarianism and philosophical radicalism[1], an attitude to imperialism similar to that of the utilitarians in India was revealed by the Boer War. A section of the Fabian Society favoured the imposition of civilised ways upon frontier communities and therefore supported the war; they proposed a democratic rule by the whites in South Africa, initially under British protection and continuing to be subject to conditions.[2] Coming Up for Air has been seen to show that Orwell was sympathetic to an opposing view, to a 'Little Englander' anti-imperialism. The Fabian figures of Shaw and Mrs Sidney Webb are criticised in The Road to Wigan Pier for their authoritarian and condescending ideas of socialism. For Shaw, 'Poverty and, what is more, the habits of mind created by poverty, are something to be abolished from above', and Mrs Webb is criticised on similar grounds and for the 'mealy-mouthed' tone of her autobiography, 'a most revealing picture of the high-minded Socialist slum-visitor.'[3] Underlying this criticism is the same respect for the autonomy of different ways of life, and resistance to their change in a remote authoritarian manner, which colours his attitude to imperialism - in this case of working-class rather than colonial or foreign ways of life. The treatment of imperialism in The Lion and the Unicorn alerts us to areas of nineteenth-century liberalism and of socialism to which Orwell was unsympathetic: to utilitarian ideas of colonial administration and, by this date, to a simple radical and socialist anti-imperialism, and, on comparable grounds to his objection to these utilitarian ideas, to Fabian socialism.

---

1. For accounts of this, see Maurice Beer, A History of British Socialism (1940), pp. 275-277, and Stanley Pierson, British Socialists: The Journey from Fantasy to Politics (1979), pp. 30-34 and 92.

2. See Pierson, p.41 and H.M. Pelling, The Challenge of Socialism 2nd ed. (1968), pp. 179-181.

3. W.P., p.211.

It is clear, therefore, that the socialism of The Lion and the Unicorn will build on existing English culture, and that it will thereby develop and incorporate in a discriminating way many of the values of liberalism and radicalism to which Orwell is attached. The interest in a form of socialism which will not be totalitarian, and which will be clearly differentiated from Fascism, is also continued.

Several remarks in The Lion and the Unicorn indicate that it is precisely those liberal attitudes, the beliefs in privacy, justice and liberty, and the anti-militarism, which are understood to have inhibited the growth of Fascism in England. These beliefs may be illusory, but they continue to influence social movements; the affection of the English people for private liberty, for instance, means that 'the kind of regimentation that can be imposed on them will be modified ... No party rallies, no Youth Movements, no coloured shirts, no Jew-baiting or 'spontaneous' demonstrations. No Gestapo either, in all probability.'[1] Orwell's understanding of Fascism influences his idea of socialism in two ways: it is extended beyond the grossly inadequate definition of it as state control and ownership of the economy[2]; and this extension is intended to secure the inclusion of those qualities which have hitherto limited the development of Fascism.

The polemical tone of parts of The Road to Wigan Pier was directed against misrepresentations of socialism which obscured its essential values, values which are asserted in The Lion and the Unicorn to be held by the English people. This polemic continues there in a modified form, as an attack upon the attitudes of the intelligentsia, which can be connected with the desire to prevent the growth of Fascism or totalitarianism. Unlike the common people of England the intelligentsia are not guided by a respect

---

1. L&U, pp. 15-16.
2. L&U, p.62.

for privacy, or by the Christian ethic; instead they are infected by the 'power-worship which is the new religion of Europe.' Continuing with a similar theme, he asserts that the root of their 'generally negative, querulous attitude' lies in 'their severance from the common culture of the country.'[1] Their mentality, therefore,is potentially totalitarian, a theme amplified in his later work, but here they are primarily attacked for the effect of their anti-British attitudes on national morale and conviction in war. In The Road to Wigan Pier, Orwell's positive concept of socialism was made explicit in a rather bare set of values which tended to be submerged in the polemic against misrepresentations of socialism. The Lion and the Unicorn shows a development from this. The polemic now has a clearer and more definite target and is counterbalanced by a separate and more substantial positive idea of socialism.

The earlier preoccupation with social class is sustained. It shows itself in a general structural analogy between The Road to Wigan Pier and The Lion and the Unicorn. In both works the argument for socialism begins with an account of social class and, in the latter, of national character, rather than with a description of socialism. The acceptance in parts of The Road to Wigan Pier that socialism will mean deep changes in ways of life, that there will not be a substantial continuity with the culture described, is rather at odds with this method. In The Lion and the Unicorn, however, this method is matched by the idea that socialism, properly conceived, will realise and fulfil the existing but latent qualities described.

There is also a similar account of the relation of various social classes to socialism. The rhetorically phrased assertion of the earlier work,

---

1. L&U, pp. 17 and 47-48.

'that a working man, so long as he remains a genuine working man, is seldom or ever a Socialist in the complete, logically consistent sense'[1], that he thinks of socialism simply in terms of improvement in existing social and material conditions, is replaced by a more general analysis of the relation of the Labour Party to socialism. It is also primarily interested in improving material conditions and is seen as representing the sectional interests of the trade unions. Despite its socialist pretensions and nominal anti-imperialism, it was thereby interested in 'the prosperity of British capitalism' and 'the maintenance of the British Empire, for the wealth of England was drawn largely from Asia and Africa.'[2] This analysis repeats in a less vehement, and more general and historical form the earlier account of the working-class conception of socialism. Its essentials are retained in Orwell's later work[3], and it is also representative of the general contemporary left-wing view of the role and limitations of the Labour Party.[4]

Orwell's criticism of the insularity of the Labour Party indicates a crucial weakness at the heart of The Lion and the Unicorn. Socialism is taken to make the beliefs of the mass of the English people actual, but where these beliefs have received some, though not complete, realisation in political action, in this case in the Labour Party, they are criticised as limited and unsatisfactory. There is evidence here of a discrepancy between the beliefs with which the English people are credited and the attitudes implicit in their political behaviour. A similar discrepancy is revealed in the account of the popular political attitudes of the 1930s:

---

1. WP., p.208.
2. L&U, p.89.
3. For example, in 'Britain's Struggle for Survival: The Labour Government after Three Years', Commentary, VI (1948), 343-349.
4. See James Jupp, The Radical Left in Britain 1931-1941 (1982), pp. 147-162.

'it is almost certain that between 1931 and 1940 the National Government represented the will of the mass of the people. It tolerated slums, unemployment and a cowardly foreign policy. Yes, but so did public opinion'. Orwell is also impatient with the English people's endorsement of Chamberlain's foreign policy, with their irresolution, their reluctance to 'pay the price either of peace or of war.'[1] A similar impatience was discernible in the comments on the hypocrisy of working-class ignorance of the Empire, although in that case the anti-militarism of which it is a part was valued. So although revolution will bring 'the real England to the surface' it will do so in a selective way. It will realise those beliefs, in justice and in liberty, and those characteristics of English life, gentleness, tolerance, anti-militarism, which Orwell emphasises. It will however presumably exclude those undesirable characteristics, of concentration on immediate material interest and indifference to poverty and exploitation, which are also common amongst the English people, and amongst the working-class and middle-classes with whom he is particularly concerned. Yet the argument of The Lion and the Unicorn as a whole tends to disguise this selectiveness and the discrepancies from which it stems.

There is a further central weakness to which these discrepancies point. Apart from them, the identification between the beliefs ascribed to the English people, in privacy, justice, liberty and objective truth, and those values to which Orwell is generally and strongly committed is disturbingly neat. The attribution of these beliefs to the English people rests largely on simple assertion. In his other work comments on social temper are more directly informed by observation and autobiography, as in The Road to Wigan Pier, or by the analysis of representative literature or cultural products in the near contemporary essay 'The Art of Donald McGill' and other essays

---

1. L&U, pp. 31-32.

on popular culture. The crux of the argument of The Lion and the Unicorn is not substantiated in this way and is partly contradicted by other elements in the work. The pre-war condemnation of 'bourgeois democracy' has been abandoned, but the underlying perception of the defects of English society persists and interrupts the account of the values of the English character. In general, however, in The Lion and the Unicorn this perception is uneasily reconciled with patriotism by defining patriotism as a belief in a potential, rather than in the actual England. In addition to this, the particularly troubling issue of hypocrisy about the empire is dealt with by the advocacy of a positive imperial policy, a policy which does not grow from the beliefs of the English people but rather corrects their insularity.

Analysis of The Lion and the Unicorn, therefore, reveals several important continuities with Orwell's treatment of socialism elsewhere: the insufficiency of economic definitions of socialism; the polemic against misrepresentations of it; the crucial role assigned to the technical and managerial middle-classes; and the demand that socialism should fulfil the values of liberalism. It also reveals a weakness in his method which can be related to the continuing perception of the defects of English society.

The method of assertion and of exhortation towards socialism entirely excludes an equally important perception. The idea that socialism may have totalitarian or deep cultural implications, an idea which continues to be present in Orwell's other work where the persuasive concern is less acute, is simply omitted. In The Road to Wigan Pier Orwell referred to the failure of 'the genuine working man' to grasp 'the deeper implications of Socialism'; instead his 'vision of the Socialist future is a vision of present society with the worst abuses left out, and with interest centring round the same things as at present - family life, the pub, football, and

local politics.'[1] The Lion and the Unicorn gives essentially this idea of socialism, at the expense of the exclusion of a discussion of its possible implications, and by a method based on simple assertion.

Although the possibility that socialism may have totalitarian implications is not explicitly dealt with, it forms the background to the contrasting argument of The Lion and the Unicorn. Socialism will rather develop from existing culture - will, in terms of the work's pervasive image, place the 'family' of England in its rightful order. This image is in accord with the idea of revolution; it suggests growth, though with some possibility of disruption, rather than violent structural change. The argument is largely conducted by assertion, but there are also proposals for action intended to secure this type of socialism, and to avert totalitarianism. The brevity of Orwell's 'six-point programme' makes it difficult to assess how far it is likely to ensure this end. Such an assessment would also have to be speculative to an undesirable degree.

Another reservation arises from the marked tentativeness, a tone rare in Orwell's work, with which the programme is presented. It is introduced as 'the kind of thing we need' and the conclusion is similarly indefinite: 'that or something like it should be our declared policy.' There is comparable reservation as to the precise lines of the policies proposed in the call for publicity: 'if not exactly the programme I have sketched above, at any rate some policy along those lines.'[2] So although there is a clear commitment to the themes of these proposals it would be wrong to attach a great deal of importance to their details. The specific proposals for action, and indeed the optimistic tone of The Lion and the Unicorn

---

1. WP, pp. 208-209.
2. L&U, pp. 99, 109 and 110.

are partly based on Orwell's assessment of contemporary political changes felt at the time to amount to a revolution, but an assessment later admitted to be grossly mistaken in this and other important respects.[1] However, the policies which are later proposed for the 1945 Labour government show many of the same basic concerns, for instance for nationalisation and for Dominion status for India, and indicate the persistence of these themes.[2]

The content of the six-point programme reflects Orwell's preoccupations in The Lion and the Unicorn and in his other work, and the nature of the socialism called for in it. The argument that socialism requires economic change is matched by the demand for immediate and extensive nationalisation. Public ownership has been taken to be a necessary but not a sufficient condition of socialism, and in accordance with this there are other proposals intended to create a 'sense of equality.' To this end, a movement toward greater equality of incomes and reform of the educational system, including the abolition of private schools, are proposed. The final three points - Dominion status for India, the formation of an 'Imperial General Council, in which the coloured peoples are to be represented', and the announcement of a 'formal alliance with China, Abyssinia and all other victims of the Fascist powers' - are a product of the concern for a positive imperial policy, and of the demand that the war should be, and should be seen to be, directed against Fascism. The proposals for educational reform and greater equality of incomes reflect the hatred of privilege which consistently informs Orwell's socialism and which, particularly as it is directed against inherited privilege, can also be fairly associated with radicalism. Even the demand for

---

1. 'London Letter', Partisan Review, XII (1945), 77-82.
2. See 'London Letter', Partisan Review, XII (1945), 468-469.

nationalisation, which, as the context makes clear, is intended to eliminate the waste inherent in capitalism, is part of this sentiment against privilege, against 'the class of mere owners who live not by virtue of anything they produce but by the possession of title-deeds and share-certificates.'[1] The familiar preoccupation with social class is also present here: the proposed measures for socialism are intended to accelerate the pace of the tendency for class distinctions to become less pronounced.

The programme indicated in The Lion and the Unicorn, then, includes proposals for economic and constitutional reform, but these measures are valued for their likely effect on individual experience of social life. A similar sense of the importance of social atmosphere and a radical opposition to privilege, as well as a perception of the insufficiency of merely economic measures, is the basis of Orwell's dissatisfaction with the progress of the 1945 Labour Government: 'little change seems to have happened as yet in the structure of society. ... in the social set-up there is no symptom by which one could infer that we are not living under a Conservative government. No move has been made against the House of Lords, for example, there has been no talk of dis-establishing the Church, there has been very little replacement of Tory ambassadors, service chiefs or other high officials, and if any effort is really being made to democratise education, it has borne no fruit as yet.'[2] A passage from a work apparently unconnected with this judgment, Homage to Catalonia, adds to the evidence that social atmosphere is taken to be the crucial test of socialism: at the front Orwell experiences a lack of class distinctions, a sense of equality and comradeship amounting to a 'foretaste of Socialism, ... the prevailing mental atmosphere was that of Socialism.'[3] The

---

1. L&U, pp. 99-105. Quotations from pp.103 and 99-100.
2. 'London Letter', Partisan Review, XIII (1946), 320-325 (p.321).
3. H&C, p.139.

liberal ideal of judgment from personal experience re-emerges as an important test of socialism.

In addition to its six-point programme, which consists of proposals for immediate action, there are other indications in The Lion and the Unicorn of the form a socialist society should take. It is questionable, though again not open to any definite resolution, how far the structure of the society indicated would be compatible with the desire to preserve the values of liberalism. Some loss of liberty and privacy is seen by Orwell to be inescapable, in the inevitable movement towards collectivism. The proposals for a socialist economy give a degree of control to the state which could well further endanger this liberty. It is accepted that socialism will involve comprehensive planning of production by the state, and that money will become 'a sort of coupon or ration-ticket, issued in sufficient quantities to buy up such consumption-goods as may be available.' The latter aspect of a socialist economy is included in a slightly modified form in the proposal for an immediate move towards equalisation of incomes.[1] Public ownership and planning are both presented in The Lion and the Unicorn as necessary, though not sufficient, conditions of socialism. Orwell's other work suggests a further qualification. He is consistently wary of the possible implications of such measures for intellectual and social life, dubious as to how far intellectual and personal liberty can survive without economic liberty, and it is unclear how the degree of state control of economic life advocated in The Lion and the Unicorn avoids this threat to liberty.

The Lion and the Unicorn attempts to reconcile the values to which Orwell is committed with a programme for socialism. Despite this attempt, there

---

1. L&U, pp. 62 and 102-103.

are signs of the emergence of the familiar split between the values held and the actions proposed, for instance in the areas of liberty and attitudes to military prowess. There is also an underlying weakness in method. The republican, anti-liberal elements which Crick identifies are best seen as an aspect of the split between values and actions, as part of the harshness and public spirit always considered necessary to protect privacy and liberty, and acutely needed in time of war.

In part, Crick's identification of Orwell's anti-liberal attitudes rests on a gross misreading. In his introduction to The Lion and the Unicorn, he quotes a passage from the description of the ideal English socialist government: '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.' The 'republican spirit' of this is contrasted with that of 'the good liberal, respecting the rule of law until it was late.'[1] This interpretation is extremely misleading. Orwell is not calling for a state which would disregard the law as its needs for preservation dictate, but for the fair application of a harsh law. The idea that there is no law is identified as totalitarian in The Lion and the Unicorn itself and elsewhere in his work, and a belief in the rule of law is seen as one of the components of liberalism.

The harshness of the law called for is at odds with the squeamishness Orwell perceives in contemporary liberalism. This harshness is not a new quality in his work; it is present, in a slightly different context, in The Road to Wigan Pier: 'it is always necessary to protect peaceful people from violence. In any state of society where crime can be

---

1. 'Introduction', The Lion and the Unicorn (1982), p.25.

profitable you have got to have a harsh criminal law and administer it ruthlessly.'[1] There is a necessarily complex mixture of attitudes here: peacableness is valued but in order to preserve it toughness is acknowledged to be necessary. Similarly, in The Lion and the Unicorn the gentleness and tolerance of the English people is held dear, but harsh measures are proposed to preserve them; liberalism is to be protected by actions which are not weakly liberal. The legal severity proposed there allows ample scope to the liberal value of freedom of expression and is quite compatible with the later, clearly liberal defence of Mosley's right to this freedom.[2] This aspect of Orwell's thought, from which Crick largely derives his republican characterisation, is therefore better understood in terms of his relation to liberalism. A tough-minded impatience with the reluctance of weak contemporary liberalism to accept the necessities of action, is combined with a desire to preserve liberalism, generally understood in its stronger senses but also including gentleness and tolerance.

7. Conclusion

The combination of proposals for harsh measures with a desire to preserve liberty of opinion and discussion, and some scope for privacy, can be related to the distinctions revealed by Orwell's use of liberal and kindred terms. In addition to providing a firm and discriminating basis for a more general discussion of his relation to liberalism, these distinctions also indicated various sympathies within liberalism as a whole. Some of the more crucial distinctions can be recapitulated. The reference of nineteenth-century Liberalism included the political attitudes of the Liberal Party of the later nineteenth-century; where the tone was most

---

1. WP, p.128.
2. See, 'Letter to George Woodcock', 4 January 1948, CEJL IV, No.102, p.401.

favourable, it tended to cover Liberal anti-imperialism and particularly Little Englander opposition to the Boer War. Nineteenth-century radicalism was associated with this anti-imperialism and was also used to refer to the attitudes of the rising middle class; with respect to both Liberal and radical the historical qualification could be supplied by the context, rather than definitely stated. 'Nineteenth-century liberal' was capable of including all these meanings, though with less emphasis on specifically political attitudes; when used as a term of praise it meant primarily a moral and intellectual passion for justice and freedom. In a slightly less positive and passionate sense, as in the case of Havelock Ellis, it denoted a rationalist viewpoint, a commitment to and a confidence in, progress through investigation and experiment. In this latter sense, it is presented favourably only when it is protected from the present by a historical gap, and accordingly, the tone in which it is treated tends to be elegiac. When similar views are in direct contact with modernity, as in the case of H.G. Wells, they are seen as incapable of comprehending contemporary political conduct. Where the bare term 'liberal' is used, it can have the related meaning of pious reasonableness, as it does when applied to Joad; or it can be endowed by the context, for instance in 'Inside the Whale', with the stronger meaning of intellectual independence, though without the moral passion and energy connoted by nineteenth-century liberalism.

Orwell reserves his strongest praise for nineteenth-century liberalism in its vigorous sense, and is acutely concerned for the survival of the rationalist approach, but simultaneously critical of mere reasonableness when applied to modern politics. The contrast between these attitudes to different aspects of liberalism is at its starkest in the early 1940s. For instance, his patriotism, which develops immediately prior to and during this period, connects him with nineteenth-century radicalism and

distances him from the reasonableness of liberalism, particularly because of its tone, and because the distinction between patriotism and the fanaticism of aggressive nationalism, though sometimes implicit, is not yet formulated. The vigorous tone and advocacy of harsh and far-reaching measures in The Lion and the Unicorn can be understood as part of Orwell's self-conscious inheritance from his image of nineteenth-century liberalism. Similarly, the tendency for the more private and rationalist aspects of liberalism to become submerged, though not eliminated, in this advocacy can be related to the intensity of the dichotomy within his attitude to liberalism at this period.

The balance of sympathies within liberalism which an inspection of Orwell's terminology reveals is therefore crucial to an understanding of his overall relation to liberalism, and to his political position in general. The preference for the vigour of nineteenth-century liberalism is also matched by the characteristic tone of his writing, usually polemical and strongly-stated, sometimes intolerant and violent. A different tone emerges in some of the post-war essays, nostalgic and markedly allusive with an emphasis on private and natural pleasures, and this in turn can be related to the qualified affection for the humane and peacable aspects of liberalism, which were also seen with a degree of nostalgia. The polemical manner is continued in other essays, though in a more controlled way than in the 1930s and early 1940s. So that aspect of Orwell's work, its vehemence, which seems most at odds with the reasonableness and moderation commonly associated with liberalism, can rather be understood in terms of his own discriminations within liberalism. Where, however, this vehemence strays into intolerance it then comes into conflict with other aspects of liberalism, the rationalist respect for fair argument and the value placed on variety of character, qualities which Orwell also values but whose efficacy he doubts. So, in addition to the conflict between a commitment to the values of liberalism and a recognition of the need for socialism,

there are also conflicts, indicated by the variations in vocabulary, within Orwell's liberalism.

There are several further areas to be considered; the chronology and development of Orwell's relation to liberalism and of its interaction with socialism; the degree to which he is self-conscious about these developments; and finally a question of critical judgment, to what extent the conflicts within his work are creative, or a sign of confusion. The basic shape of the chronology itself is fairly clear. An explicit concern for liberalism and its survival develops in the period immediately before the war and continues throughout the 1940s. However, this concern is built upon a pre-existent sympathy to liberalism and radicalism, and to the values associated with them in his work. There is not therefore an abrupt change of direction but an intensification and articulation of existing trends. The confidence in the survival of liberal values ebbs and gains, partly in response to public events, from 1939 onwards: it is at its lowest in 'Inside the Whale', where the writer is allowed only an attenuated form of liberalism, and more vigorous in some of the writing of the mid-1940s, for instance in his editorial to Polemic in 1946.

A growing self-consciousness is apparent from this chronology: there is a tendency during the 1940s for Orwell to become more explicit about his sense of the importance to liberalism, and about its conflict and possible reconciliation with socialism. In contrast, the earlier The Road to Wigan Pier is confused: at points it is accepted that socialism will make an abrupt break from existing ways of life; at other points, socialism is asserted to be the new means of realising justice and liberty, values strongly associated with liberalism elsewhere in Orwell's work; alternatively, it is argued to be dangerously impolitic to emphasise the changes its introduction will cause. There is, as yet, no clear idea of a

liberal socialism. In 'Inside the Whale' and in some of his journalism of the period, liberalism is starkly opposed to and menaced by socialism. At the same time, the idea of a socialism which will incorporate what is valued in liberalism emerges: analysis of The Lion and the Unicorn shows that it is this idea of socialism which is delineated there, and this pattern is sometimes more explicit elsewhere in his writing. Such a form of socialism remains simply an idea, in contrast to the historically actual non-liberal forms. In The Lion and the Unicorn the proposals for action do not entirely harmonise with the society at which they are aimed, and there is a crucial, but concealed, discrepancy between the beliefs attributed to the English people and the evidence of their actual social and political attitudes. As Orwell's sense of the irreducible importance of the moral and epistemological values he connects with liberalism and individualism grows firmer during the 1940s, they become a platform from which to attack the moral relativism apparent in Marxism: the confusion of parts of The Road to Wigan Pier is replaced by the clarity of the editorial to Polemic and of 'Politics and the English Language' and by the breadth of Nineteen Eighty-Four. The debate as to the possible survival of liberalism, and its reconciliation with socialism, is worked out in a variety of forms: in reviews, essays and fiction; as part of a response to particular situations, and, less often, in more abstract argument. To trace its development it has been necessary to abstract and collate its various appearances.

In its turn the degree of self-consciousness with which this debate is pursued is connected to the final question: whether the conflicts manifested in Orwell's work are resolved or whether they, perhaps inescapably, remain open. A crucial absence of resolution can be discerned in the attacks on the moral relativism of Marxism: it is accepted, in line with the assertions of contemporary Marxism, that liberal ideas of truth

and morality are tied to the post-feudal era, that they have had a historical growth and can, therefore, also decline. At the same time, further possible implications of moral and epistemological relativism, in particular the Soviet and Communist manipulation of history, are criticised from an avowedly liberal basis as if this basis were not itself relative. The mixing of liberal values with Marxist methods of description has, therefore, a double effect resulting in an ambiguous product: liberalism is forced to acknowledge its historical relativity; it is also sharpened and defined by confrontation with Marxism. This ambivalence can be seen in Nineteen Eighty-Four, in which liberal values, as well as the residual hope perceived in the mass of the people, are contrasted with and opposed to totalitarianism, but are defeated. The mixture of agnosticism and conviction in this position, the assertion of standards which are acknowledged to be relative, can be connected to Orwell's tendency to concentrate upon values and terms - on the need for decency, or the evil of poverty - which demand immediate recognition without requiring metaphysical justification.

The distinctions within liberalism revealed by Orwell's terminology were seen to clarify his relation to liberalism as a whole, and his political position in general; they can also be seen to illustrate and confirm the crucial ambivalence at the heart of this relation. For instance, the closing eulogy of 'Charles Dickens' establishes a rhetorical separation between two aspects of nineteenth-century liberalism, between its moral and intellectual passion and the attitudes of the non-military middle class: a distinction is made which the study of beliefs in terms of their historical context does not easily allow, and, accordingly, it remains only rhetorical. Where, as in this case and in Orwell's journalism of the early 1940s, the praise for liberal values is strongest, these values are historically qualified and therefore cannot be accepted as satisfactory contemporary standards; though in 'Charles Dickens' they seem to be

offered as such, elsewhere the elegiac tone points to their distance, whilst appreciating them. Where similar values are brought into direct contact with modernity, they become ineffectual or survive only in a diminished form, a process apparent in the contrast of the meaning of 'nineteenth-century liberal' with the bare term 'liberal'. Orwell's terminology testifies therefore to the ambivalence discernible in his polemic against moral relativism: liberalism is always valued, but is seen to be historically rooted and in historical decline, and where most praised is most clearly marked as past. In the early 1940s his response to this predicament tends to be despairing or regretful, whereas in the later 1940s there is a far stronger conviction that liberal values may well be essential to the survival of civilisation and that socialism, properly conceived, may safeguard their continuance. Like the larger relation to liberalism, the terminology shows the effect of the acceptance of the Marxist idea of the influence of economic and social life upon beliefs, and the consequent study of the development of beliefs in terms of historical changes in economy and society. The absence of a resolution to the problems raised by his work is itself part of Orwell's liberalism: a willingness to leave 'loose ends everywhere' is associated with liberalism in Nineteen Eighty-Four, and is part of the socialism of The Lion and the Unicorn.[1]

---

1. NEF, p.206; L&U, p.112.

CHAPTER 2

ORWELL'S RESPONSE TO MARXIST LITERARY CRITICISM

1. Introduction

In the previous chapter it has been necessary to refer to Marxism, particularly in connection with the effect of Orwell's acceptance of some Marxist methods of analysis and description upon his political ideas in general and upon his liberalism. The particular variety of Marxism with which he was acquainted, and the extent of his knowledge of it, now needs to be described in more detail. A body of Marxist writing developed in England during the 1930s and Orwell, though at times highly critical of some examples of this work, makes use of some of its insights, and adopts its methods to his own literary criticism. This mixture of criticism and acceptance has some crucial consequences for his work.

Marxism, like liberalism, is a broad term capable of considerable internal discriminations and contrasts of meaning. In an important respect, however, it is narrower in scope than liberalism. Liberalism can refer to both a type of thought and a type of society or political system. In contrast, Marxism refers primarily to a method of thought and description, and Communism to a society. It is this distinction which allows Orwell's response to Marxism to be studied largely separately from his opinions of Communism. Such a study has also to attend to the internal variety which Marxism shares with liberalism, and similarly to move from historically and textually specific references to their implications.

The prolonged conflict between Orwell's liberalism and his commitment to socialism was itself seen to be connected with his acceptance of the Marxist claim that individualism is historically specific. Other crucial debates in his work are also connected with his response to Marxism: the proper relation of the writer to political parties and action, the nature of intellectual freedom, the relation of literature to society, and to a writer's beliefs and social position, and, as an extension of this, the prospects for the continuity of literature. The moral, political and cultural debates intermingle with each other and have a common centre in their concern for the relation of the moral and intellectual values, especially liberty, which Orwell holds and upon which he considers literature to depend, to liberal capitalism. All these debates have a connection with ideas of culture: it is desired that socialism should preserve the way of life and scope for freedom associated with English liberalism, and, for instance, examination of the use of language is asserted to be crucial to the judgment of political positions.

The two topics, Orwell's relation to liberalism and his response to Marxism, are connected to each other in several ways. Most crucially, Marxism influences the idea of personal and intellectual freedom which lay at the heart of his liberalism; this idea is also sharpened and developed in opposition to aspects of Marxism. The intersection of Marxism with liberalism has been shown to affect the form of his socialism: a desire to preserve some individualistic values co-exists uncomfortably with an understanding that socialism will be a radical and destructive break from them. The scope for individualism, and particularly for personal autonomy, was seen by Orwell to be diminished by its contemporary context, and the growth of Marxism and of Communism is a central part of this context. There is, however, a vital distinction between his relation to liberalism

and to Marxism: liberal values are sufficiently fundamental to his work to identify it as coming from an essentially liberal outlook, whereas Marxism is used as a means of analysis, although it is strong enough to alter his beliefs. In this attitude itself, in the tendency to separate the analytical aspects of Marxism from its revolutionary doctrine, there is something liberal in its broadest sense: it is open-minded and experimental in its search for truth, but retains its own judgment in preference to submitting to a system of belief, and allows for a cultural continuity and progress which revolution would disrupt.

Literary criticism is the area of contemporary Marxism with which Orwell is most fully acquainted. This writing deals with issues similar to those present in Orwell's own thought, and also has the interest of tendentiously political literature. In the treatment of this topic it is necessary first to look at his response to examples of contemporary Marxist literary criticism, and to show what use he made of it in his own work; then to demonstrate the critical approaches he shares with this writing; and finally to bring the various debates together by tracing the implications for his work of the positions taken.

The influence of the intellectual context of the 1930s can be seen in the reception of Inside the Whale. Many contemporary reviewers pointed to its use of Marxist approaches to literature, although they differed as to their judgment of the extent of this use. For instance, in an interesting but unbalanced review of Inside the Whale, the reviewer for the Times Literary Supplement comments on Orwell's treatment of Dickens: 'He seems, indeed, to be arguing that, incomprehensibly, Dickens is not a revolutionary, not a Marxist; it pains him to confess that Dickens did not envisage the proletarian dawn. Only after he has got these conventional

irrelevances of materialist criticism off his chest, in fact, does Mr Orwell proceed to say true and illuminating things about Dickens. Why he feels or felt that Dickens ought to have been a Marxist, ought to have had a revolutionary message, only he can tell; but it is plain that, like more rabid critics of this type he has only an uncertain sense of English history before the Industrial Revolution and no very intimate knowledge of the nature of nineteenth-century English radicalism.'[1] Philip Mairet's review in the New English Weekly also recognises and simultaneously disparages Marxist elements in Orwell's critical stance in Inside the Whale: 'he is really a sociological writer, but the only traces of sociological theory that his work exhibits are remains of a Marxism which he has almost outgrown and which it is doubtful if he ever more than half accepted .... It seems to me that he uses a fragment of Marxist ideology now and then, as a substitute for some deeper and more valid criterion which he feels but cannot yet formulate.'[2] Though the emphasis of these reviews is different, they indicate an aspect of Orwell's work that has been largely neglected by subsequent critics: that his relationship to Marxism is not solely critical, but that he uses elements of Marxist literary criticism in his own work.

2. English Marxist literary criticism in the 1930s

In his slighting reference to 'more rabid critics of this type', the Times Literary Supplement reviewer is likely to be referring to the body of English Marxist criticism which developed during the 1930s, and whose principal periodical was Left Review.[3] Besides the shorter pieces of

---

1. Unsigned notice, TLS, 20 April 1940, p.192, in Jeffrey Meyers ed., George Orwell: The Critical Heritage (1975), pp. 180-181.
2. Philip Mairet, New English Weekly, 14 March 1940, pp. 307-8, in Meyers, pp. 177-180 (p.179).
3. David Margolies contributes a short article on Left Review, 'Left Review and Literary Theory', to Jon Clark and others eds., Culture and Crisis in Britain in the Thirties (1979), pp. 67-82.

criticism published by Left Review, this produced several briefly influential books in the late 1930s: for instance, The Mind in Chains (1937) edited by C. Day Lewis, and Crisis and Criticism (1937) by Alick West. Historically important works of literary criticism on a Marxist basis were also produced by writers not as directly associated with Left Review: for instance, Christopher Caudwell's Illusion and Reality (1937) and Studies in a Dying Culture (1938) and Ralph Fox's The Novel and the People (1937).

This body of work cannot be treated as entirely homogeneous: Left Review bears witness to disagreements between its contributors. For instance, Lewis Grassic Gibbon characterises as 'bolshevik blah' the assertion, contained in a statement of the aims of the British section of the Writers' International Conference that 'the period from 1913 to 1934 is a decadent period.'[1] Alick West reviews Dmitri Mirski's The Intelligentsia of Great Britain (1935) under the review-title 'Mirsky's One-sided Picture' and is critical of Mirski's over-simplification. Edgell Rickword, in an unfavourable review of Philip Henderson's Literature (1935), objects to Henderson's inaccuracies and omissions and to his schematic classification of bourgeois literature.[2]

Despite these disagreements, simple and recurrent themes can be traced in this body of criticism. As would be expected in a Marxist body of criticism, there is a stress on the relation of literature to the economic basis of society.[3] Often this relation is crudely conceived: society is

---

1. 'From Lewis Grassic Gibbon', in, Controversy: Writers' International (British Section)', Left Review, I (1935), 179, and 'Writers' International (British Section)', Left Review, I (1934), 75.
2. Left Review, I (1935), 324-328, and 'Review of Philip Henderson, Literature', Left Review, II (1935), 41-44.
3. See, for instance, C. Day Lewis ed., The Mind in Chains; Socialism and the Cultural Revolution (1937); Christopher Caudwell, Illusion and Reality: A Study of the Sources of Poetry (1937); and Philip Henderson, Literature and a Changing Civilisation (1935).

characterised as either feudal or capitalist, and the criticism concentrates upon the content of literature, though both Alick West and Christopher Caudwell are more sophisticated in their attention to the form and content of literature in relation to its social base.[1] An aspect of this interest in the relation between the economic form of society and its literature is an interest in the influence of the class position of the writer upon the political and social views expressed in his work.[2] There is a particular concern for the effect upon the writer of his relation to the working class. This can be connected with a strong theme of this body of critical work; a demand for and an interest in 'proletarian literature', defined either as tendentiously socialist literature or as literature written by working people.[3] Connected with this interest in proletarian literature is an interest in the development of literature in the Soviet Union, which was taken in this writing to be a society in the process of transition to Communism or, indeed, to be a fully realised Communist society.[4]

Implicit in this interest in proletarian literature is an emphasis on the function of literature.[5] Literature was understood to be an instrument

---

1. Alick West, Crisis and Criticism (1937), and Christopher Caudwell, Studies in a Dying Culture (1938), Illusion and Reality (1937).
2. See, for instance, Alec Brown, The Fate of the Middle Classes (1936).
3. Alick West, Crisis and Criticism (1937), pp. 183-199; Christopher Caudwell, Illusion and Reality (1937), pp. 305-330.
4. James Jupp, The Radical Left in Britain 1931-1941 (1982), p.132 and passim discusses the Left's attitude to the Soviet Union in this period.
5. See David Daiches, Literature and Society (1938), pp. 5-15. David N. Margolies in The Function of Literature: A Study of Christopher Caudwell's Aesthetics (1969), pp. 20-21 asserts that Caudwell's importance lies in his treatment of literature's function, of how and why literature is valuable, and notes, pp. 120-121, that most Marxist critics of the 1930s saw an immediate political function for literature.

of political education.[1] An interest in the political function of literature was naturally extended to an interest in the relation between a writer and his audience, both in historical terms and in the contemporary possibility of the use of literature as an instrument of persuasion. The concern for the function of literature is part of one of the most pervasive ideas of this criticism, and of other writing on literature in England in the 1930s: in its simplest terms, culture and literature are taken to be of primary importance. Not only are literature and culture understood by Marxist writing to be inextricably associated with politics, but they are also taken to be the medium through which writers and their audience both can be and are drawn into politics: an initial concern for literature is encouraged to develop into a concern for a society which will nourish literature. Furthermore, political decisions and objectives are evaluated on the basis of their probable effect upon culture. The pervasiveness of this notion of the idea of the primacy of culture helps to explain the development of a body of Marxist literary criticism: the corollary of a belief in the value of literature and culture as an instrument of political change is a critical interest in the analysis of literature and culture for their social and political implications.

Part of the concern with proletarian literature was a willingness to publish new literature of this sort. Left Review published fictional and documentary work as well as critical and political articles. New Writing, first published in the spring of 1936 and edited by John Lehmann, himself a contributor to Left Review[2], also encouraged and published

---

1. One of the most curious manifestations of this idea is the scheme for an encyclopaedic project, in imitation of Diderot and the Encyclopedistes to preserve culture from Fascism. See, 'International Writers in London', Report by Derek Kahn of the recent conference of the International Association of Writers for the Defence of Culture.' Left Review, II (1936), 481-490. The Left Book Club is probably the most important result of this concern for political education.

2. For example, 'Should Writers Keep to their Art', Left Review, II (1936), 881-885, and 'The Seven Soviet Arts', Left Review, III (1937), 558-560.

writing of this type. The declaration of its manifesto, that 'NEW WRITING is first and foremost interested in literature, and though it does not intend to open its pages to writers of reactionary or Fascist sentiments, it is independent of any political party', suggests a more moderate political and literary tone than actually characterised the bulk of its articles in the 1930s. There is some suggestion in its manifesto that New Writing was regarded as a supplement to the critical work of Left Review: 'It does not intend to concern itself with literary theory, or the criticism of contemporaries.'[1] As well as the shorter pieces of proletarian literature published in these and other periodicals, many longer works, both fiction and documentary, of this type were published during the 1930s: Alec Brown's Daughters of Albion (1935)[2] and Fred Bower's Rolling Stonemason (1936)[3] are two contrasting examples of tendentious socialist fiction and working class autobiography, known to Orwell. The concern for education towards socialism through literature extended to drama, evidenced by the Unity Theatre.[4] So although the majority of this work, both critical and fictional or documentary, is now of merely historical rather than intrinsic interest , it does constitute a central part of the literary and intellectual context of the 1930s to which Orwell responded.

Given the quantity and variety of criticism on Orwell's writing, it is surprising that this aspect of his work has not been investigated. An explanation for this omission can be found in the historical development

---

1. 'Manifesto', New Writing, No.1, Spring 1936.
2. Characterised as 'a huge wad of mediocre stuff' in a review of Philip Henderson, The Novel Today (1936), 'Propagandist Critics', NEW, X (1936), 230. Henderson deals with Brown's novel, pp. 259-264.
3. Reviewed in 'Real Adventure', T&T, XVII (1936), 1041-1042.
4. Stuart Samuels, 'English Intellectuals and Politics in the 1930s', in Philip Rieff ed., On Intellectuals: Theoretical and Case Studies (New York, 1969), pp. 219-224 gives a brief account of the connection between drama and left-wing politics in the 1930s.

of literary criticism in Britain and America since the 1930s; it is unlikely that it is simply an accidental lacuna in Orwell's criticism. The lack of any substantial continuity from the Marxist literature of the 1930s is one factor here. In addition, the dominant strains of post-war literary criticism were opposed to the sociological bias of the Marxist treatment of literature.[1] Orwell's consistent attacks on Communist policy would seem to make an affinity to Marxist criticism unlikely. The political atmosphere of the post-war period, that of the Cold War, also encouraged the image of Orwell as a liberal[2], and made recognition of an affinity between his work and that of earlier Marxists unlikely. The political and literary movement, the New Left, which developed in the mid-1950s and which was free from these restrictions had other inhibitions: it tended to accept the received judgments of the poor quality of earlier English Marxist writing[3], which had also been retrospectively discredited by its association with Stalinism, and its members were often ambivalent or hostile in their attitudes to Orwell's work and its influence.[4]

The abrupt decline of the English Marxist movement of the 1930s had historical causes. The political contradictions in which this movement had

---

1. Robert Klitzke, 'Orwell and his Critics: An Enquiry into the Reception of and Critical Debate about George Orwell's Political Works' (Ph.D., Birkbeck College, University of London, 1977), pp. 140-144 and 172, argues that formalist-biased criticism is incapable of dealing properly with Orwell's work, and, p.292, notes that the influence of Leavis may well have helped to produce the image of Orwell as a liberal and a moralist in the 1950s and 1960s.
2. Robert Klitzke, pp. 298-303.
3. The most famous of these is Raymond Williams's evaluation of Caudwell in Culture and Society: 1780-1950 (1958), p.277: 'he has so little to say, of actual literature, that is even interesting ... for the most part his discussion is not even specific enough to be wrong.'
4. Raymond Williams's attitude to Orwell is now largely hostile: see Politics and Letters: Interviews with New Left Review (1979), pp. 384-392. E.P. Thompson in 'Outside the Whale', in E.P. Thompson ed., Out of Apathy (1960), pp. 141-194 conducts a polemic against Orwell's work and its influence.

been involved, in particular the general association between an interest in Marxism and loyalty to Soviet Communism, were aggravated by the events of the late 1930s. Some sense of these contradictions can be gathered from T.A. Jackson's contributions to Left Review in March 1937: an article on 'Dickens the Radical' is followed by an attack on Trotsky and a defence of the Moscow trials asserting that 'every trained observer of repute present at the trial - lawyers like Dudley Collard, journalists like Walter Duranty - was unhesitating and unreservedly convinced of the scrupulous fairness of the trial, and the unquestionable and entire guiltiness of the accused.'[1] Russian policy in the Spanish War[2], the increasing discomfort at the revelations of the internal affairs of the Soviet Union and of the Moscow trials, and finally the Russo-German pact, were to make this combination of critical and political attitudes increasingly difficult to hold.

Specific events within these larger political movements are also relevant: the death of two of the principal Marxist critics, Ralph Fox and Christopher Caudwell, in the Spanish War[3]; the closure of Left Review in May 1938[4], and the change of the Left Book Club at the beginning of the Second War from an organisation committed to a single viewpoint, that of the Popular Front, into a forum for discussion.[5] Under the pressure of external political events, the Marxist critical movement of the 1930s lost its impetus. Evidence for this decline can be found in Orwell's

---

1. T.A. Jackson, 'Dickens the Radical', Left Review, III (1937), 88-95, and 'The Moscow Trial', Left Review, III (1937), 116-118 (p.116).
2. Hugh Thomas, The Spanish Civil War revised ed. (1965), p.700 notes that after the Munich agreement, Stalin wanted to withdraw 'the army of the Comintern, the International Brigade' from Spain, and to end Russia's involvement in the Spanish Civil War.
3. Hugh Thomas, pp. 436 and 489.
4. See 'Editorial', Left Review, III (1938), 957-980.
5. See John Lewis, The Left Book Club: An Historical Record (1970), pp. 116-121.

own work. In 1944, when he came to review Jack Lindsay's pamphlet, 'Perspective for Poetry', he described it as 'one of the ablest pieces of Marxist criticism that have been written for some years past.' As well as noting this temporal hiatus, he contrasts it with its contemporary context: 'a good pamphlet, and an effective counterblast against the frank declarations of irresponsibility that have been made by various young poets recently.' Orwell accepts Lindsay's basic thesis that the writer is most free and least isolated when he is assisting the historical development of society towards communism. However, he explicitly rejects Lindsay's argument that this involves membership of the Communist Party and acceptance of its orthodoxy.[1] The distinction made here is crucial to Orwell's critical and political position: it enables him to use Marxism as a method of analysis without accepting the policies of the Communist Party as a concomitant. The absence of this distinction had contributed to the difficulties of the Marxist criticism of the 1930s, and its effect on the writers of that period was noted by Orwell in 1941[2]. The distinction between being a Marxist and membership of the Communist Party was not generally made in Britain until after Kruschev's denunciation of Stalin in 1956[3].

Investigation of Orwell's relation to the Marxist cultural movement of the 1930s was not only hampered by the dominant forms of English and American literary criticism in the 1950s and 1960s, but also by the difficulty of access to much of Orwell's work. Until the publication of

---

1. 'No Vacuum for the Artist', MEN, 30 November 1944, p.2. Robert Hewison, Under Siege: Literary Life in London 1939-45 (1977) provides an account of changes in literary temper in wartime England.
2. See, 'The Frontiers of Art and Propaganda', Listener, 29 May 1941, pp. 768-769 (p.769).
3. Robert Hewison, In Anger: Culture in the Cold War 1945-1960 (1981), pp. 161-163 makes this point.

the four-volume Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters (1968), Orwell's journalism was available only in the original periodicals. However, despite its title, this collection is highly selective, and the selection is clearly made on ideological grounds which themselves reflect post-war literary and political attitudes. As Robert Klitzke argues in 'Orwell and his Critics', the editing of the collection was influenced by the largely apolitical concept of literature associated with Cyril Connolly and Horizon. Klitzke contends that the omission of some of Orwell's political statements of the 1940s allowed Sonia Orwell, as the joint editor, to uphold the image of his disgust with the political realities of this period, and that the image of Orwell as a non-political, would-be novelist presented by her introduction and editing is a partial one.[1] Although Klitzke does not deal with this specific issue, the editorial policy seems to have determined the omission of much of the material which would have enabled critics to have dealt with Orwell's relation to the Marxist cultural debate of the 1930s. The exclusion of Orwell's enthusiastic reviews of Richard Wright's Native Son and of Robert Tressall's The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists[2] are particularly clear evidence of this policy. Though the collection did contain some material which contradicted the attitudes of Orwell's 'advocatus diaboli' in The Road to Wigan Pier, that the 'real Socialist writers, the propagandist writers, have always been dull empty windbags'[3], it did not expose the extent of this contradiction in Orwell's work.

3. Other contemporary approaches to literary criticism

An examination of Orwell's response to Marxist literary criticism clearly

---

1. Klitzke, pp. 256-262.
2. 'Black Man's Burden', Tribune, 26 April 1940, pp. 16-17, and, 'Legacy from a Housepainter', MEN, 25 April 1946, p.2.
3. WP, p.216

requires a brief survey of his attitudes towards the other types of literary criticism which were available to him. There is a frequently reiterated dissatisfaction with the standards of commercial reviewing. In one case, in 1934, this is extended to an attack on the critical judgments associated with T.S. Eliot: 'The prevailing type of critic is the young gentlemen who wants to cut off our supply of Milton, Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats and deliver us over, bound hand and foot, to Mr Eliot's frigid and snooty muse.'[1] There is a continuity between the objection to Eliot's attempt to restrict the enjoyment of certain poets and the similar, much later, criticism of F.R. Leavis's The Great Tradition (1948) for the narrowness of its treatment of the English novel.[2] Orwell's response to the work of I.A. Richards, which is not as vehemently critical as that shown to Eliot and Leavis, is both interested and partly humourously dismissive: 'For anyone who wants a good laugh I recommend a book which was published about a dozen years ago, but which I only recently succeeded in getting hold of. This is I.A. Richards's Practical Criticism.'[3]

Orwell's dissatisfaction with the main currents of contemporary literary criticism is part of a sense of the limitations of formalist criticism, revealed in a review of G.K. Chesterton's Criticisms and Opinions of the Works of Charles Dickens: 'There is one great advantage about Mr Chesterton's manner of approaching Dickens, and that is that it is not too purely literary. Most modern literary criticism is literary and nothing else - that is, it concentrates on an author's style and thinks it rather vulgar to notice his subject matter.'[4] Though this criticism

---

1. Review of Critique of Poetry, by Michael Roberts, Adelphi, VII (1934), 468.
2. 'Exclusive Club', Observer, 6 February 1949, p.3.
3. 'As I Please', Tribune, 5 May 1944, p.10.
4. Review of Criticisms and Opinions of the Works of Charles Dickens by G.K. Chesterton, Adelphi, VII (1933), p.224.

has a healthy influence, 'it misses part of the point with such a writer as Dickens' as he is a moralist rather than a writer of Flaubert's type.

In Orwell's remarks on 'modern literary criticism' it is possible to detect a reference to the criticism associated with Eliot and Richards and to the stress on the primary value of the novel's form in the tradition of criticism initiated by Henry James.[1] It is reasonable to assume that Orwell would have been familiar with the literary debate between Henry James and H.G. Wells from his reading of Wells's Experiment in Autobiography (1934), and, therefore, with Wells's defence of the 'use of the novel as a help to conduct' and as 'an ethical enquiry' rather than as the Jamesian 'rendering of a system of impressions.'[2] Orwell's own work, particularly after Coming Up For Air, lies much closer to Wells's rather than James's idea of the novel. It clearly has a polemical purpose, as does the work of the writers, for instance, Dickens, Samuel Butler, and Wells himself, with whom he deals critically. The Jamesian tradition of novel criticism was therefore ill-adapted to the novelists in whom Orwell was interested. Neither Eliot nor Richards showed much interest in criticism of the novel, to which Richards's technique of close verbal analysis was inappropriate, and their criticism was largely unhistorical.[3] An interest in the social function of literature, and in the beliefs of a writer in his social and historical context, is not specific to Marxist

---

1. George Watson, The Literary Critics: A Study of English Descriptive Criticism (1964), pp. 148-160 discusses James's attempt to create from nothing a tradition of novel criticism which stressed the primary value of form.

2. H.G. Wells, Experiment in Autobiography 2 Vols. (1934), p.488. Orwell in The Road to Wigan Pier and elsewhere, for instance, 'George Gissing', London Magazine III (June 1960), 33-43 (p.42), shows that he was familiar with Wells's autobiography.

3. Watson, p.181 notes that I.A. Richards 'shared the modish prejudice of the years between the wars against historical information', and, p.162, Eliot's contempt, in practice, for historical criticism.

literary criticism; for instance, a contextual and historical approach was natural to Victorian critics[1], and it is possible to trace a debt on Orwell's part to Gissing's and Chesterton's essays on Dickens. Nevertheless, the Marxist criticism of the 1930s would seem to be the only contemporary sociological criticism, whatever its crudities, which was known to Orwell.

4. Orwell's knowledge of Marx and Marxism

There are several reasons why it is not possible to determine precisely Orwell's knowledge of Marxist critical work of the 1930s. The bulk and variety of this work, often published in periodicals, are themselves a problem. Nor can it be assumed that the references to this work in Orwell's published writings form a complete catalogue of his knowledge of this context. Bernard Crick in George Orwell: A Life suggests that Orwell would have gathered his knowledge of Marxism from an 'oral tradition': this source is important and, in general, impossible to trace.[2] However, it is possible to make some attempt to trace the extent of Orwell's knowledge of this work.

Orwell's pamphlet collection, now held in the British Library, is relevant here. The collection includes Max Eastman's 'The End of Socialism in Russia' (1937)[3]; there is, therefore, a possibility, that he was familiar, directly or indirectly, with the account of literary developments in Russia

---

1. Watson, p.134.
2. Crick, p.201.
3. The catalogue number of the index to Orwell's pamphlet collection is BM 1899 ss. 48. Max Eastman's 'The End of Socialism in Russia' (1937), is at BM 1899 ss. 3 (30). Orwell does not seem to have made any annotations to relevant pamphlets in this collection.

contained in Eastman's well-known book, Artists in Uniform: A Study of Literature and Bureaucratism (1934). Other relevant pamphlets, amongst the substantial collection of Communist and Marxist literature, are the Dean of Canterbury's 'Marxism and the Individual' (Marxism Today Series, 1943), and F.D. Klingender's 'Marxism and Modern Art: An Approach to Social Realism' (Marxism Today Series, 1943).[1] Orwell began the collection in 1935 and had it catalogued and arranged by a secretary in 1946, when it amounted to about 1200 items.[2] The collection is broadly classified by subject and divided into boxes accordingly. Most of the collection is concerned with politics and society, and predominantly with left-wing politics. For example, Box 3, consisting of over sixty items, contains material on anarchism, Stalinism and the People's Front, and includes several pamphlets by Trotsky.[3] Other boxes continue with these themes and also contain extensive material on Marxism and Communism[4], and on Soviet Society.[5] There are several pamphlets on the Moscow trials[6], and on Soviet and Communist Party policy during the war.[7] The collection includes boxes which contain literature on other contemporary political issues: on the Labour Party and post-war Britain[8], on pacifism[9], and on Zionism and anti-semitism.[10]

---

1. At BM 1899 ss. 14 (13); and BM 1899 ss. 14 (14).
2. See, 'Letter to Geoffrey Gorer', 22 January 1946, CEJL, IV, No.21, pp. 86-88.
3. Pamphlets by Trotsky include, 'The Death Agony of Capitalism' (1938), BM 1899 ss. 3 (1); 'The Lesson of Spain' (1937), BM 1899 ss. 3 (34); and 'I Stake My Life' (1937), BM 1899 ss. 3 (53).
4. Box 28, BM 1899 ss. 28.
5. Box 14, BM 1899 ss. 14; Box 23, BM ss. 23.
6. For instance, Workers' International Press, 'Summary of the Final Report of the Commission of Enquiry into the Charges made against Trotsky in the Moscow Trials' (1938?), BM 1899 ss. 4 (46); and Adler, 'The Witchcraft Trial in Moscow' (Commission of Enquiry into the Conditions of Political Prisoners, 1936), BM 1899 ss. 8 (40).
7. Box 15, BM 1899 ss. 15.
8. Box 7, BM 1899 ss. 7.
9. Box 1, BM 1899 ss. 1; Box 2, BM 1899 ss. 2.
10. Box 20, BM 1899 ss. 20.

The New Statesman pamphlet, 'Stalin-Wells Talk: The Verbatim Record and a Discussion by G. Bernard Shaw, H.G. Wells, J.M. Keynes, Ernst Toller and others' (December 1934)[1], is also in the collection. In it Ernst Toller quarrels with H.G. Wells's public assertion that 'in Soviet Russia the intellectual freedom of the writer has been completely suppressed, and that, therefore, 'there was no intellectual life' and Toller also defends the conduct of the 1934 Soviet writer's Congress.[2] It is extremely likely that Orwell was familiar with this particular pamphlet: it was widely known and he had a particular interest in Wells. However, the depth of his knowledge of the rest of the collection is uncertain. He criticises the bulk of it for its poor quality and the 'extraordinary viciousness and dishonesty' of the political pamphlets. Despite this, as the size of the collection suggests, his interest in this type of writing was persistent and strong: 'For years past I have been an industrious collector of pamphlets, and a fairly steady reader of political literature of all kinds.'[3] It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that Orwell was well acquainted with the main themes of his pamphlet collection but not, unless there is corroborative evidence, with specific items of that collection.

Orwell's interest in ephemeral literature included a wide reading of periodicals as well as his interest in pamphlets. Left Review receives a disparaging reference in The Road to Wigan Pier: 'Everyone knows, or ought to know by this time ... bourgeois culture is bankrupt, bourgeois 'values' are despicable, and so on and so forth: if you want examples, see any number of Left Review ....The sincerity of much of this is suspect.'[4] Orwell also contributed to New Writing, and other remarks show

---

1. At BM 1899 ss. 5 (7).
2. 'Stalin - Wells Talk: The Victorian Record and Discussion by George Bernard Shaw, H.G. Wells, J.M. Keynes, Ernst Toller and others.' (1934), pp. 27-30.
3. 'As I Please', Tribune, 8 December 1944, p.2.
4. WP, p.198.

that he was aware of the nature of its contributions.[1] He was a fairly frequent contributor to The Adelphi in the early 1930s and mixed socially with its other contributors.[2] His visit to the Adelphi Centre in the summer of 1936 is reported in a letter to Jack Common, and his tone here is rather different from that of the 'advocatus diaboli' of The Road to Wigan Pier in the description of the, presumably comparable, I.L.P. summer school at Letchworth: 'I enjoyed my very short trip there and met some interesting people, and I wished I could have stayed longer especially to hear Holdaway and John Strachey lecture.'[3] In the early 1930s The Adelphi published discussions of Russian literary developments, of Marxist literary criticism, and of proletarian literature. Other periodicals mentioned by Orwell include the Daily Worker and New Masses, an American periodical comparable in political and literary content to Left Review[4], though both are considered to contain 'romantic warmongering muck' at the time of the Spanish War.[5] Yet, as with Orwell's pamphlet collection, the number of relevant periodicals is far too large for one to be certain of Orwell's knowledge of particular items, though it is also fair to assume a general knowledge on his part of their contents.

The Adelphi of the early 1930s does provide a probable source for Orwell's knowledge of two passages from Marx's own work. In October 1932 it published a translation of Marx's criticism of the treatment of money by Shakespeare in Timon of Athens, and, in March 1933, a passage from the

---

1. Orwell reviewed the Summer 1943 volume of New Writing ed. John Lehmann for The Spectator: 'Young Writers', Spectator, 30 July 1943, p.110.
2. Crick, George Orwell: A Life (1981), passim. gives an account of Orwell's association with The Adelphi.
3. 'Letter to Jack Common', 5 October 1936, CEJL, I, No.86, pp. 233-234.
4. See New Masses: An Anthology of the Rebel Thirties (New York, 1969), ed. Joseph North.
5. 'Looking Back on the Spanish War', England Your England, p.153.

'Introduction to a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law', which included the well-known saying 'religion is the people's opium', and accompanied this by an editorial note drawing attention to the meaning its original context gives it.[1] Orwell was a contributor to both these issues, providing a review in October 1932 and a poem in March 1933.[2] It is therefore extremely likely that The Adelphi is a source from which he would have known these passages, without necessarily any further direct acquaintance with Marx's work. At a later date, in 1940, Orwell also notes how the meaning of 'religion is the opium of the people' is altered by its context, a fragment of which he reproduces. In 1941, in the course of a discussion of Tolstoy's criticism of Shakespeare, he simply alerts the reader to the existence of Marx's piece on Timon of Athens.[3] There are many other secondary sources for these passages which could have served as reminders to Orwell in the interim.

The question then naturally arises of whether, and to what extent, Orwell had read Marx's own work, or whether his reading was confined to extracts and criticism in secondary sources. From the evidence available, it seems extremely unlikely that he had any substantial direct knowledge of Marx's writing, and, indeed, it is probable that he knew very little of it directly. There are some firm grounds for this judgment. His references to Marx's work itself are infrequent: where they are specific,

---

1. 'Shakespeare on Money', translated from Karl Marx, Nationalökonomie und Philosophie, Adelphi, V (October 1932), 2-6 and 'From the Introduction to a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law', Adelphi, V (March 1933), 391-393. Crick, p.434 notes that these passages are easily found in secondary sources, but does not specify or suggest The Adelphi.
2. Review of Phantom Fame, by Henry Reichenbach, Adelphi, V (October 1932), 76; and, 'Sometimes', Adelphi, V (March 1933), 410.
3. 'Notes on the Way', T&T, XXI (1940), 358-359; and 'Tolstoy and Shakespeare', Listener, XXV (1941), 809-810 (p.809).

they are extremely rare, and, in the two cases quoted, the most prominent in his work, can be traced to a particular secondary source; where they are more general, though more common, they could be derived from a number of secondary sources, and their character does not suggest any extensive knowledge of Marx's writing. His annotations to a copy of the two-volume Everyman edition of Capital suggest that he had not read that copy: they do not appear to extend beyond G.D.H. Cole's introduction, and next to Cole's comment that it 'is impossible thoroughly to understand Marx's thought without appreciating this mystical view of reality', he has pencilled 'quite!', a comment which suggests that he was not attracted by the introduction to the prospect of reading Capital itself, whether in this copy or another.[1]

There has been some critical confusion and equivocation about Orwell's knowledge of Marx. Richard Rees's assertion at some distance in time in his mixture of memoir and criticism, George Orwell: Fugitive from the Camp of Victory (1961), that Orwell displayed a considerable knowledge of Marx at the Adelphi summer school in 1936, has misled some subsequent critics.[2] For instance, Peter Stansky and William Abrahams in Orwell: The Transformation (1979) refer to Rees's account, but their conclusion is unclear and equivocal.[3] Alex Zwerdling in Orwell and the Left (1974) is clear but mistaken: largely on the basis of Orwell's knowledge of the passages which can be found in The Adelphi, he claims that Orwell had

---

1. See the copy of Karl Marx, Capital, introduction by G.D.H. Cole, translated from the fourth German edition by Eden and Cedar Paul, 2 vols., Everyman's Library, 1934 reprint (London, J.M. Dent, 1930), p.xxviii at ORWELL N 10 MAR in the Orwell Archive. The copy is included amongst those books from Sir Richard Rees's library which he thought belonged to Orwell and the annotations are in Orwell's handwriting. On pp. xxii and xxiii, he records two other disagreements with Cole's exposition of Marx's economics.
2. Rees, p.147.
3. Stansky and Abrahams, p.171.

'read Marx with care and understanding.'[1] If a proper allowance is made for the historical context, for the development of Marxist writing in England in the 1930s then Orwell's position becomes clear: he combines a virtual absence of direct acquaintance with Marx's work with some interest in English Marxism, an interest natural to an English writer of that period interested in left-wing writing, and any account of his use and criticism of Marxism must attend to this context.

5. Soviet Literature

Orwell's reading of pamphlets and periodicals would have furnished him with some knowledge of Marxist literary criticism and of Soviet literary developments, and perhaps of brief examples of Soviet literature. The gift of 25 Years of Soviet Russian Literature (1918-1943) (1944) from the author, Gleb Struve, would have helped to clarify Orwell's knowledge of these developments. Struve argues that his earlier book, Soviet Russian Literature (1935), from which the later book has been adapted, gave a more objective and detailed account of Soviet literary and critical developments than Max Eastman's Artists in Uniform (1934).[2] Struve's intention was to show what had been accomplished in the Soviet Union in spite of the lack of artistic freedom. In a reply to Struve Orwell remarks: 'I am afraid I know very little about Russian literature and I hope your book will fill up some of the many gaps in my knowledge.'[3] As this echoes a similar admission of ignorance of Soviet literature, nominally attributed to the 'advocatus diaboli' of The Road to Wigan Pier[4], it cannot be dismissed as conventional politeness.

---

1. Zwerdling, p.20
2. Gleb Struve, 25 Years of Soviet Russian Literature (1918-1943) (1944), p.xx.
3. 'Letter to Gleb Struve', 17 February 1944, CEJL, III, No.2, p.95.
4. WP, p.216.

Nevertheless, Orwell's work shows a knowledge of other books which contain information on Soviet cultural developments, albeit in a less coherent or concentrated form. For instance Henri Barbusse's One Looks at Russia (English edition, 1931)[1] contains a section on this and on the related topic of proletarian literature on which Orwell comments: 'it is stated almost in so many words that a novel about 'bourgeois' characters cannot be a good novel.'[2] Orwell considered Eugene Lyons's account of the Soviet Union in Assignment in Utopia (1938) to be 'much more reliable than most'[3], and Lyons does give some account of Soviet literary policy in the early 1930s. Gide's Retour de l'U.R.S.S.(Paris, 1937) which Orwell knew[4], treats Soviet attempts to control literature as absurd and dangerous.[5] Several remarks by Orwell indicate that he was sympathetic to Nadezha Krupskaya's portrait of Lenin in her Memories of Lenin (English edition, 1930) and was particularly familiar with the section on Lenin's views on literature[6], which were at odds with the almost exclusively functional view of literature imposed in the Soviet Union during the 1930s.[7] As with Orwell's reading of pamphlets and

---

1. Henri Barbusse, One Looks at Russia translated by Warre B. Wells (1931), pp. 121-131.
2. 'Propagandist Critics', NEW, X (1936), 229.
3. 'Impenetrable Mystery', NEW, XIII (1938), 169.
4. See, for instance, 'CD', ITW, p.40.
5. Andre Gide, Retour de l'U.R.S.S. (Paris, 1936), translated into English by Dorothy Bussy as Back from the U.S.S.R. (1937), pp. 73-83.
6. References to Krupskaya's account of Lenin's taste in literature occur in 'Charles Dickens', ITW, p.9 and in 'Introduction' to Love of Life and Other Stories by Jack London, p.7. The reference in ITW, presumably drawn from memory, is inaccurate and was silently corrected when 'Charles Dickens' was republished in Critical Essays, p.7. Krupskaya's account is contained in an appendix, 'The Kind of Fiction that Pleased Ilyich' in her Memories of Lenin, 2 vols., translated by E. Verney from the 2nd. Russian ed. (1930), pp. 203-209.
7. Max Eastman, Artists in Uniform: A Study of Literature and Bureaucratism (1934), pp. 215-252 has a supplement 'Lenin's Views of Art and Culture' by Vyacheslav Polonsky, translated by Eastman, which gives an account of this conflict.

periodicals, it is not possible to give a comprehensive account of the books which served as sources for Orwell's knowledge of Soviet literary and cultural developments. However, it is possible to indicate some further sources for his knowledge of these topics.

Orwell's comments on official Soviet literary developments are generally critical. In 1940, that is before the receipt of Struve's 25 Years of Soviet Russian Literature (1918-1943) (1944), he satirises the solemnity of official Soviet attitudes to literature, whilst praising the book in question: 'It must be about ten years since there was translated into English a very amusing, mildly satirical novel about Soviet Russia called The Little Golden Calf. It was issued with a rather deprecatory introduction by Lunacharsky, who could not make up his mind whether humour had any place in proletarian literature.' The same review contains a sympathetic treatment of Diamonds to Sit On by Ilya Ilf and Eugene Petrov: there 'is a good socialist moral on top of the comedy', though the novel is very similar in 'social atmosphere to the novels of Tsarist days.'[1] A later remark of Orwell's suggests an acquaintance with Soviet literature published in Britain: he notes that Gvadi Bigva by Leo Kiacheli is an unusual example of the many 'contemporary Russian books ... translated into English during the past five years' and which tend to be published by Hutchinsons.[2]

However, Orwell's references to Soviet literature are usually less specific and often in connection with a general discussion of the position of literature in a totalitarian society. In 1941, he asserts: 'And even in Russia the literary renaissance we once expected has not happened, and

---

1. 'A Soviet Farce (with a Socialist moral)', Tribune, 9 August 1940, p.16.
2. 'What is a Novel?', MEN, 4 October 1945, p.2.

the most promising Russian writers show a marked tendency to commit suicide or disappear into prison.'[1] The reference to earlier expectations about Soviet literature does show an early and continuing interest in it. Orwell's knowledge of these developments could be drawn from Eugene Lyons's Assignment in Utopia (1938), though his tone suggests that such knowledge was widespread and could be assumed in his audience. Lyons traces the development of Soviet culture from the 'comparative tolerance of the'N.E.P. period' to which time 'with few exceptions the finest things in post-revolutionary Russian drama, cinema and dance belonged', through to the increasing censorship, and productive failure, of Soviet writers in the 1930s.[2] A later article by Orwell deals with Soviet literary purges under Zhdanov, who is satirised for his ignorance and for the naivety of his attitude towards literature: ''Surely', says Zhdanov 'our new Socialist system, embodying all that is best in the history of human civilisation and culture, is capable of creating the most advanced literature, which will leave far behind the best creations of olden times.''[3] A comparison of this with Zhdanov's speech at the 1934 Soviet Writers' Congress, 'Soviet Literature - the Richest in Ideas, the Most Advanced Literature'[4], though there is no evidence to show that Orwell was familiar with this particular document, will show that his parody is not unfair. Orwell's occasional journalism is, then, highly critical of Soviet literary policy of the 1930s and 1940s, though sympathetic to some particular works of Soviet literature, especially of a satirical nature.

---

1. 'Literature and Totalitarianism', Listener, XXV (1941), 882.
2. Eugene Lyons gives an account of policy and developments in the arts in post-revolutionary Russia in Assignment to Utopia (1938), pp. 63-65, 244-248, 332-333, 465-473 and 494-502.
3. 'As I Please', Tribune, 3 January 1947, p.12.
4. Problems of Soviet Literature: Reports and Speeches at the First Soviet Writers' Congress, A. Zhdanov and others, ed. H.G. Scott (1935), pp. 15-24.

An examination of the major late essay, 'The Prevention of Literature', will make the essential grounds of Orwell's criticism clear. The essay is primarily a defence of intellectual liberty from totalitarian tendencies in the left-wing British intelligentsia, but also contains remarks on Soviet literature. Orwell repeats his observation on the detioration of Russian literature 'since the early days of the Revolution, though some of the verse appears to be better than the prose'. In Orwell's aesthetic theories, verse is less dependent on individual consciousness, and hence on individual intellectual liberty, than prose. The effect of totalitarian control upon Soviet literature is noted: 'Writers ... are viciously persecuted. It is true that literary prostitutes like Ilys Ehrenburg or Alexei Tolstoy are paid huge sums of money, but the only thing which is of any value to the writer as such - his freedom of expression - is taken away from him.'[1] Besides the substantial moral objection to literary purges, there is further edge to Orwell's criticism of Soviet attitudes towards literature. His prose aesthetic, based on the concepts of sincerity and artistic truth to individual experience, is likely to be opposed to any form of legislative or prescriptive demands on the creation of literature. Language itself, and the form of the novel, are often felt as constraints on the expression of individual experience.[2] Legislative criticism is, therefore, likely to be treated as a further, and more intense, constraint upon individual expression. This is particularly so where, as was the case in the Soviet Union, legislative criticism does not only involve censorship but also imposes positive demands for a particular artistic form and content. So, in addition to the firm historical grounds for Orwell's criticism of Soviet literary policies, there is a basic ideological opposition.

---

1. 'The Prevention of Literature', Polemic, No.2 (March 1946), 4-14. (pp. 11 and 13).
2. Orwell's ideas of language, and of the expression of experience, are treated in more detail in Chapter 3.

Nineteen Eighty-Four draws upon elements of Soviet literary history. The popular fiction of the society of Nineteen Eighty-Four is manufactured in the way advocated by some Soviet critics, such as Tretiakov, quoted by Eastman in Artists in Uniform: 'We foresee the operation of literary workshops where the functions are divided ... We assume that book production can be planned in advance like the production of textiles or steel.'[1] Yet the content of this fiction is not didactic on the Soviet pattern, but similar to that of the commercial fiction with which Orwell was familiar: 'There was a whole chain of separate departments dealing with proletarian literature, music, drama and entertainment generally. Here were produced rubbishy newspapers containing almost nothing except sport, crime and astrology, sensational five-cent novelettes, films oozing with sex, and sentimental songs which were composed entirely by mechanical means on a special kind of kaleidoscope known as a versificator.'[2] Commercial fiction was capable of being produced to order and mechanical production is a parodic extension of this tendency.[3] The popular fiction of Nineteen Eighty-Four does have a social function as a form of political control of the 'proles' through the false gratification of their fantasies. This is different from the political education of the Soviet model, and its social function is at the expense of its value as literature. In Nineteen Eighty-Four, literature is no longer the expression of individual consciousness; O'Brien states of Goldstein's The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism: ''I wrote it. That is to say, I collaborated in writing it. No book is produced individually, as you know.''[4] Some Soviet critics had confined

---

1. Max Eastman, Artists in Uniform: A Study of Literature and Bureaucratism (1934), p.45. Similar statements would have been available to Orwell in other sources.
2. NEF, pp. 45-46.
3. See, for instance, Orwell's treatment of the Writer in 'As I Please', Tribune, 17 November 1944, p.10.
4. NEF, p.262.

the individual production of literature to the era of bourgeois individualism.[1]

Associated with the concept of proletarian literature, there were discussions of the position and function of the literature of the past in a communist society and in the Soviet Union. Three basic positions are discernible: the literature of the past could be valued for itself; or proletarian culture could draw upon the techniques of past literature; or, as the October literary group and RAPP argued in the late 1920s, all literature to date was solely class literature and, therefore, that proletarian culture must reject and break from the bourgeois literature of the past. There are many possible sources for Orwell's knowledge of these developments: for instance, Struve gives an account of the debate in the Soviet Union[2], and Krupskaya's Memories of Lenin contains an example of these discussions which reveals Lenin's evaluation of literature: Lenin was talking to some young art students in 1921: 'What do you read? Do you read Pushkin? - 'Oh. no!' someone blurted out. 'He was a bourgeois. Mayakovsky for us.' Ilyich smiled. 'I think Pushkin is better.' After that Ilyich somewhat took to Mayakovsky.'[3]

The use of the literature of the past in Nineteen Eighty-Four is modelled on the assumption that it is not valuable in itself: 'The whole literature of the past will have been destroyed. Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Byron - they'll exist only in Newspeak versions, not merely changed into something different, but actually changed into something contradictory of what they used to be.'[4] Also present here is an allusion to the dialectical

---

1. As, for instance, Tretiakov quoted above. See also Eugene Lyons, Assignment in Utopia (1938), p.248.
2. Gleb Struve, 25 Years of Soviet Russian Literature (1918-1943) (1944), pp. 79-88, 201-261.
3. Krupskaya, p.207.
4. NEF, p.55.

method parodied in The Road to Wigan Pier in a reference to 'those sacred sisters, thesis, antithesis and synthesis.'[1] Those elements in Nineteen Eighty-Four, which correspond to tendencies in the Soviet treatment of literature, also resemble arguments in English Marxist writing about the value of bourgeois writing, which are themselves connected with Soviet developments.[2] It is clear that Orwell knew of Soviet and Marxist debates about the independent value of bourgeois literature, and that he was highly critical of approaches to literature, and of the Soviet government measures associated with them, which reduced art to the instrument of a class.

6. Proletarian and socialist literature

In some respects, Orwell's response to the topics associated with Soviet literary developments, 'socialist realism' and 'proletarian literature', is also critical. In a review of Philip Henderson's The Novel Today (1936), Orwell echoes the assertion of The Road to Wigan Pier that it is 'doubtful whether anything describable as proletarian literature now exists'[3], but in more specific terms: 'To the Communist, good literature means 'proletarian' literature. (Mr Henderson is careful to explain, however, that this does not mean literature written by proletarians; which is just as well, because there isn't any.)'[4] These assertions of the absence of proletarian literature are contradicted elsewhere in Orwell's work; in both cases, they can be partly understood as a polemic

---

1. WP, p.262
2. For instance, Edward Upward in 'Sketch for a Marxist Interpretation of Literature', in C. Day Lewis ed., The Mind in Chains: Socialism and the Cultural Revolution (1937), pp. 41-55 argues that the work of Proust, Joyce, and Lawrence is limited by their participation in the life of a decaying social class, the bourgeoisie.
3. WP, p.207.
4. 'Propagandist Critics', NEW, X (1936), 229.

against the defects, and, in particular, the affectation, of middle-class socialism. Orwell's satirical tone in a much later review also offers evidence for this interpretation: 'In China, as in England, poets who would not have known which end to milk a cow wrote praises of the country life, others wrote proletarian literature which the proletariat was unable to understand, and the rival claims of propaganda and pure art were savagely disputed.'[1]

Orwell's comments on Henderson also suggest how his adversely critical treatment of the concept of proletarian literature is connected with his frequent dissatisfaction with the covert confusion of political and aesthetic judgment in literary criticism. This dissatisfaction is evident in a late review, in 1948, of The Novel and the World's Dilemma by Edwin Burgum: 'Unfortunately Mr Burgum's approach is not only sociological but political. What he demands of a novelist is, in effect, 'socialist realism', though he is broadminded enough to allow that novels written according to other prescriptions can have at any rate symptomatic value ... as examples of bourgeois decadence.'[2] Orwell, then, is often critical of the Marxist enthusiasm for 'proletarian literature' and 'socialist realism' on the grounds, familiar in his work, of affectation and of political narrowness.

However, Orwell's response to examples of proletarian literature itself is often more sympathetic than is apparent from his criticism of the enthusiasm for this concept. For instance, his praise for Jack Hilton's Caliban Shrieks extends to a strongly stated interest in the genre:

'Books like this, which come from genuine workers and present a genuinely

---

1. 'Chinese Miracles', Observer, 6 August 1944, p.3
2. 'Contemporary Novelists', TLS, 2 October 1948, p.556.

working-class outlook, are exceedingly rare and correspondingly important. They are the voices of a normally silent multitude .... If all of them could get their thoughts on to paper they would change the whole consciousness of our race.'[1] A later book by Hilton on similar themes also receives a sympathetic, though more moderately expressed review: his English Ways is a 'valuable addition to contemporary history.'[2] Orwell compares Rolling Stonemason by Fred Bower and Old Soldier Sahib by Private Richards to Hilton's Caliban Shrieks and asserts that, 'one of the few encouraging results of universal education is that, at rather rare intervals, books written from a genuinely working class standpoint are beginning to appear.'[3] He also gives an appreciative review to Jack Common's The Freedom of the Streets (1938), a connected series of essays on political and literary topics. In the course of the review, Orwell, whilst praising Common, expresses reservations about much of proletarian writing: Common 'is of proletarian origin, and much more than most writers of this kind he preserves his proletarian viewpoint.' His familiar claim that 'the word 'Socialism' means something quite different to a working man from what it means to a middle-class Marxist'[4] receives some support from Common in 'Fascism in Men of Good Will'[5], an essay particularly recommended by Orwell.[6]

---

1. Review of Caliban Shrieks by Jack Hilton, Adelphi, IX (1935), 379-380.
2. 'England with the Knobs Off', Adelphi, XVI (1940), 431.
3. 'Real Adventure', T&T, XVII (1936), 1042.
4. 'Authentic Socialism', NEW, XIII (1938), pp. 192-193. Orwell's personal acquaintance with Common is traced by Crick, passim.
5. In this essay Common asserts that the 'real dilemma is that you cannot continue to live a bourgeois life and at the same time wring any reality out of your glimpses of socialism. That is very hard on a well-meaning man.', The Freedom of the Streets (1938) pp. 141-172 (p.145).
6. 'Authentic Socialism', NEW, XIII (1938), pp. 192-193.

Similar reservations as to the value of proletarian literature as a genre and as descriptive term are also made by Orwell in the longer discussion, 'The Proletarian Writer'. However, particular examples of this genre are again cited appreciatively: 'Jack Hilton's Caliban Shrieks, Jim Phelan's prison books, George Garrett's sea stories, Private Richards's Old Soldier Sahib, James Hanley's Grey Children - to name just a few.'[1] Of these examples of 1930s proletarian writing, only the work of George Garrett, which had appeared in The Adelphi, had not been previously reviewed or mentioned by Orwell.[2] The Unity Theatre, New Writing and Left Review are referred to in a neutral tone by Orwell in this discussion, though the conservatism in technique of the proletarian literature published by these two journals is noted and contrasted with the experimentation of Lionel Britton's Hunger and Love, 'an outstanding book.'[3] This represents a change of judgment from Orwell's much earlier review of the same book, which accepts its value as a social document, 'Most fiction is written by the well-fed, about the well-fed, for the well-fed. This is the ill-fed man's version; the world as it appears to an unskilled workman - a workman, necessarily, with enough brains to grasp what is happening to him', but is critical of its lack of form and of its technique: 'truth is not served by leaving out commas.'[4]

From this survey of Orwell's journalism, it is clear that Orwell was sympathetic towards particular examples of the proletarian literature of

---

1. 'The Proletarian Writer: Discussion between George Orwell and Desmond Hawkins', Listener, XXIV (1940), pp. 878-879 (p.879).
2. Crick, p.186 notes that Orwell wanted to meet George Garrett, who wrote for The Adelphi under the pseudonym of Matt Low, whilst collecting material for The Road to Wigan Pier.
3. 'The Proletarian Writer: Discussion between George Orwell and Desmond Hawkins', Listener, XXIV (1940), 879.
4. 'Poverty - Plain and Coloured', Adelphi, II (1931), 80-81.

the 1930s where they deal with working-class life or viewpoints. He remains hostile to the tendentiously socialist literature associated with enthusiasm for it. This hostility is evident in his review of Philip Henderson's The Novel Today: 'a huge wad of mediocre stuff called Daughters of Albion, by Mr Alec Brown, gets pages and pages of praise all to itself, because here at last you have real 'proletarian' literature - written, like all other 'proletarian' literature, by a member of the middle classes.'[1] This divided response, a mixture of appreciation and hostility, to the proletarian writing of the 1930s will also be apparent in the response to the literary criticism associated with it.

As Orwell notes in 'The Proletarian Writer', proletarian literature merges into socialist literature as a whole. Some of the writers with whom Orwell deals straddle both categories. For instance, Jack London's The Road[2] is cited as an example of proletarian literature, and Orwell later discusses the contradictions in London's socialism revealed in his work as a whole: 'London was a Socialist with the instincts of a buccaneer and the education of a nineteenth-century materialist.'[3] Robert Tressall's The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists is also quoted as an example of proletarian literature in 'The Proletarian Writer'[4], though Orwell is later careful to point out that it is not covered by the received sense of the term: 'A 'proletarian' book has come to mean not necessarily a book written by a member of the working class, and still less the kind of book that the average working man would willingly read, but the kind of book which in the opinion of middle-class intellectuals every right-minded worker ought to read. 'Proletarian literature' means

---

1. 'Propagandist Critics', NEW, X (1936), 230.
2. 'The Proletarian Writer : Discussion between George Orwell and Desmond Hawkins', Listener, XXIV (1940), 879.
3. 'Introduction' to Love of Life and Other Stories by Jack London, p.13.
4. 'The Proletarian Writer: Discussion between George Orwell and Desmond Hawkins', Listener, XXIV (1940), 879.

books about industrial life written from a Marxist angle, and its most successful practitioners are people who have either never done any manual work or have long since abandoned it.' Though The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists is popular and has often been reprinted, it 'seldom gets a mention when this school of literature is discussed.' Orwell praises Tressall's book for the accuracy of its observation and for its absence of idealisation of the working class, evident in the irony of the reference to philanthropy in the book's title and in the indifference and hostility of the book's workmen to socialism.[1]

Orwell's sympathy with Tressall's naive, idealistic socialist propaganda can be linked to his response to Oscar Wilde's 'The Soul of Man Under Socialism': 'Wilde's pamphlet and other kindred writings - News from Nowhere, for instance - consequently have their value. They may demand the impossible, and they may - since a Utopia necessarily reflects the aesthetic ideas of its own period - sometimes seem 'dated' and ridiculous, but they do at least look beyond the era of food queues and party squabbles, and remind the Socialist movement of its original, half-forgotten objective of human brotherhood.'[2] The date, 1948, of Orwell's comments on Wilde's pamphlet is significant: it is likely that Orwell is attracted by his attempt to reconcile socialism and individualism. The reference to News from Nowhere supports this interpretation: the Communism of the society of News from Nowhere does not involve an unpleasant or oppressive 'tyranny of a majority'[3], that is, it does not subordinate the liberal ideal of individuality to the domination of public opinion. So Orwell's criticism of these English socialist writers is generally favourable and interested, and, occasionally, clearly

---

1. 'Legacy from a Housepainter', MEN, 25 April 1946, p2.
2. 'Wilde's Utopia', Observer, 9 May 1948, p.4.
3. William Morris, News from Nowhere, in The Collected Works of William Morris, 24 vols.(1910-1915), Vol.XVI, p.90.

guided and changed by the development of his own political position.

Orwell's criticism of socialist and proletarian literature therefore often contradicts the aggressive generalisation of The Road to Wigan Pier: 'But it is certain that in Western Europe Socialism has produced no literature worth having .... The real Socialist writers, the propagandist writers, have always been dull, empty windbags - Shaw, Barbusse, Upton Sinclair, William Morris, Waldo Frank, etc., etc.'[1] The change in the evaluation of William Morris may well have been partly determined by the subsequent development of Orwell's political thought. However, this would not account for the qualified praise for Upton Sinclair's veracity elsewhere[2], though the judgments of Shaw[3] and Barbusse[4] are endorsed elsewhere in his writings.

However, the roots of these discrepancies in Orwell's evaluation of particular socialist writers lie more in the polemical intention of The Road to Wigan Pier, in its attempt to disassociate socialism from the defects of its supporters. The remarks of The Road to Wigan Pier on socialist literature, and on W.H. Auden in particular, seem to have subsequently embarrassed Orwell, as is shown by 'Inside the Whale': 'Some years ago I described Auden as 'a sort of gutless Kipling'. As criticism this was quite unworthy, indeed it was merely a spiteful remark.'[5] Orwell does not entirely retract his previous judgment: 'in Auden's work, especially his earlier work, an atmosphere of uplift - something like Kipling's If or Newbolt's Play Up, Play Up, and Play the Game! - never seems to be very far away.'[6] Orwell, in common with

---

1. WP, p.216.
2. 'Some Recent Novels', NEW, IX (1936), 397.
3. See, for instance, 'Letter to Brenda Salkeld' (extract) Friday Night (10? March 1933), CEJL, I, No.42, p.119.
4. See, although Orwell's polemical intention is here similar to The Road to Wigan Pier,'Propagandist Critics', NEW, X(1936), 229-230.
5. 'ITW', ITW, p.162. See WP, p.215.
6. 'ITW', ITW, p.162.

many of his critics, ignores the attribution of the remarks on Socialist literature in The Road to Wigan Pier to an 'advocatus diaboli.'[1] The judgments of the 'advocatus diaboli' are, therefore, partly endorsed elsewhere in Orwell's work. There is also an occasional continuity of tone, and of general attitudes, between this section of The Road to Wigan Pier and Orwell's letters and journalism, as, for instance, in a letter to Jack Common, written at about the same time as The Road to Wigan Pier: 'The trouble is that the socialist bourgeoisie, most of whom give me the creeps ... have at the back of their minds a vision of the working class all T.T., well washed behind the ears, readers of Edward Carpenter or some other pious sodomite.'[2] The polemical force of this passage, like similar sections of The Road to Wigan Pier, is directed against the 'socialist bourgeoisie'; the judgments of socialist writers are coloured by this rhetorical intention.

The rhetoric of The Road to Wigan Pier masks a discrepancy between the dismissive judgments of socialist writers and the extent of the knowledge of this literature, including, besides a wide range of reference to contemporary English left-wing writing, Barbusse's Le Feu and Russie.[3] An analogous discrepancy between the attacks on the socialists associated with the I.L.P. and The Adelphi and the evidence of substantial acquaintance with them is also concealed, though it easily reveals itself to a critical reading. The judgments of socialist writers in The Road to Wigan Pier must be seen in terms of that work's polemic, and can be questioned through

---

1. WP, p.205
2. 'Letter to Jack Common', Thursday (16? April 1936), CEJL, I, No.76, p.216.
3. WP, p.212. The quotation in 'according to Henri Barbusse, the characters in the novels of Proust, Gide etc., are "characters whom one would dearly love to have at the other side of a barricade"' is taken from Russie (Paris, 1930), though Orwell does not specify this source. The English translation by Warre B. Wells, One Looks at Russia (1931), p.129 has the same wording and may be Orwell's direct source.

internal discrepancies. Though there are some continuities between these evaluations and the rest of Orwell's work, they are often contradicted, if generally at a later date, and works of socialist literature are often received sympathetically.

The treatment of proletarian writers in The Road to Wigan Pier is at odds with the reception of examples of proletarian literature of the 1930s in Orwell's journalism. In The Road to Wigan Pier he asserts that: 'the working-class intelligentsia is sharply divisible into two different types. There is the type who remains working-class - who goes on working as a mechanic or a dock-labourer or whatever it may be and does not bother to change his working-class accent and habits, but who 'improves his mind' in his spare time and works for the I.L.P. or the Communist Party; and there is the type who does alter his way of life, at least externally, and who by means of State scholarships succeeds in climbing into the middle class. The first is one of the finest types of man we have. I can think of some I have met whom not even the most hidebound Tory could help liking and admiring. The other type, with few exceptions - D.H. Lawrence, for example - is less admirable .... Literary London now teems with young men who are of proletarian origin and have been educated by means of scholarships. Many of them are very disagreeable people, quite unrepresentative of their class.'[1] There is an important similarity between this passage and the praise for Jack Common's retention of his proletarian viewpoint, but, taken as a whole, the passage clearly contradicts Orwell's general treatment of proletarian writing.

The roots of this contradiction are to be found in the form and purpose of The Road to Wigan Pier. The form of the travelogue, with its witness

---

1. WP, pp. 195-196.

narrator, is liable to reinforce the dichotomy between the active observer and the passive objects of the narrator's observation. For instance, in Down and Out in Paris and London it is the narrator who moves between Paris and London and finally exits from the world of the report, whereas the other characters remain trapped within their environments. A similar tendency is discernible in Homage to Catalonia, in which Orwell's wife tends to remain a rather shadowy presence. The diary for The Road to Wigan Pier is less dominated by the presence of the narrator and does not contain any section parallel to the discursive second part of the book.

Several critics[1] have seized upon the differences between the diary and The Road to Wigan Pier itself as evidence for Orwell's dislike of organised labour, for his enforcement of passivity upon the working-class people he met. Implicit in this comparison is the naive assumption that the diary is a simple transcript of events, not altered by Orwell's preconceptions, and that the modifications the book imposes upon this transcript can be taken as distortions which are especially revealing of his political position. The naivety of this assumption has now been made obvious by Bernard Crick's George Orwell: A Life: 'This 'Diary', it should be said, is clearly not a diary kept day to day, but must have been worked up afterwards - complete with author's footnotes: it is not the primary source of the final book, but either an intermediate stage or, more probably, a first thought as to how to present the material for publication.'[2] The diary, therefore, has as much, and as little, claim

---

1. The latest of these is Frank Gloversmith in 'Changing Things: Orwell and Auden', in Frank Gloversmith ed., Class, Culture and Social Change: A New View of the 1930s (Brighton, 1980), pp. 101-141 (pp. 116-122).

2. Crick, p.182.

to be taken as a direct and uniquely authoritative transcript of Orwell's experiences and opinions as The Road to Wigan Pier itself has.

Apparent in the book is not the imposition of Orwell's political views upon recalcitrant material, but the extent to which the genre, with its concentration upon the narrator's own experiences, encourages the representation of the observed objects as passive. The treatment of working-class intellectuals and writers in The Road to Wigan Pier is part of this tendency of the genre and is quite clearly contradicted by passages in the looser form of the diary, for instance in the account of a meeting with a working-class writer: 'I was very greatly impressed by Garrett. Had I known before that it is he who writes under the pseudonym of Matt Low in The Adelphi and one or two other places, I would have taken steps to meet him earlier.'[1] Orwell's purpose in The Road to Wigan Pier must also be considered. Not only is there the polemic against the 'socialist bourgeoisie' in which the vogue for proletarian writing is included, there is also the intention to arouse the reader's indignation at the suffering of the unemployed. The reader's compassion is aroused by an emphasis on the passivity of the victims of poverty, on their inability to alter their own situation; a consequence of the presentation of the unemployed as passive is a tendency to fix them in this role, and to dislike or exclude their active breaking from passive roles. In conclusion, the evaluations of socialist and proletarian writers in The Road to Wigan Pier are part of Orwell's response to this literature, and some of the evaluations are echoed elsewhere in his writing, though generally in a milder tone. At the same time, The Road to Wigan Pier presents only an aspect, and an often atypical aspect, of Orwell's response to this literature, and

---

1. 'The Road to Wigan Pier Diary, 31 January - 25 March 1936', CEJL, I, No.74, pp. 170-214 (p.187).

its presentation is coloured by the constraints of genre and of rhetorical intention.

Orwell's discussion 'The Proletarian Writer' 1940, is interesting for itself, and for its similarities to the treatment of proletarian literature by Christopher Caudwell, one of the leading English Marxist critics of the 1930s, in his Illusion and Reality: A Study of the Sources of Poetry (1937).[1] In this discussion, Orwell repeats, in slightly different forms, the claim that the proletarian writer 'isn't really creating an independent literature. He writes in the bourgeois manner, in the middle-class dialect. He is simply the black sheep of the bourgeois family, using the old methods for slightly different purposes.' Orwell's definition of 'bourgeois' as 'the whole dominant culture of our time'[2] is, like Caudwell's far-reaching and undiscriminating.[3] Caudwell's assessment of the limitations of the methods of the proletarian writer is similar to Orwell's: 'men with proletarian lives attempt to interpret these in terms of existing bourgeois categories, that is, they use the already existing bourgeois artistic technique.'[4]

---

1. A copy of Illusion and Reality: A Study of the Sources of Poetry is included amongst the books from the library of Sir Richard Rees which he thought belonged to Orwell and which are now held in the Orwell Archive at University College London. It is shelved at ORWELL N 10 CAU. As this edition is of a later date, 1947, than 'The Proletarian Writer' it cannot have been the particular source for it. The earlier edition could have been used, and the presence of this book indicates an interest in Caudwell's work by Orwell. The copy in The Orwell Archive is not annotated; Orwell seems to have been an infrequent annotator other than, occasionally, as notes for a review.

2. 'The Proletarian Writer: Discussion between George Orwell and Desmond Hawkins', Listener, XXIV (1940), 878-879.

3. In Illusion and Reality (1937), Caudwell uses 'bourgeois' to denote the whole post-feudal era.

4. Illusion and Reality (1937), p.326.

Both Caudwell and Orwell virtually confine proletarian literature in this sense to the period of change from bourgeois to classless society. Orwell considers that the term 'proletarian literature' has 'had a certain use as a label for a rather heterogeneous literature belonging to a transition period'; Caudwell argues that the attempt at writing by men with proletarian lives 'gives rise to what is sometimes regarded as being essentially proletarian art, although it is really an art in transition.'[1] For Orwell, not only is proletarian literature associated with the change from bourgeois to classless society, it is also 'one of the signs of change.'[2] Caudwell also takes proletarian literature to be one indicator of this change: 'This transition has only begun, but already its effects are felt throughout the sphere of art.'[3] Until this transition is completed, proletarian literature must remain subordinate to bourgeois literature, cannot be fully itself. Orwell reiterates the claim that 'for there to be what could really be called a proletarian literature the proletariat would have to be the dominant class.'[4] Caudwell's interpretation is similar, though his final terminology is different: 'We speak of proletarian art; it is an art which expresses the movement of the proletarian class itself, and this movement is to annihilate its existence as a class by becoming coincident with society as a whole ... how then could ... proletarian art exist, as a higher form than bourgeois art, before proletarian society had developed its own distinctive consciousness? ... Proletarian art in realising itself will become communist art.'[5]

---

1. Caudwell, p.326.
2. 'Proletarian Writer', p.879.
3. Caudwell, p.316.
4. 'Proletarian Writer', p.879.
5. Caudwell, pp. 316-318.

These similarities are insufficient grounds for definitely concluding that Orwell was directly drawing upon Caudwell's Illusion and Reality, though there is a strong possibility that this is the case.[1] However, it remains clear that Orwell is reproducing a Marxist account of the status and development of proletarian literature. The connection between this generalised account of proletarian literature and Orwell's remarks on it outside this discussion is not always close. Within the discussion, however, the observation of the conservatism in technique of proletarian writers can be linked with the general argument that proletarian literature must necessarily use the methods of bourgeois writing. 'The Proletarian Writer' is an important example of the use of an aspect of Marxist literary criticism, the historical explanation of developments in literary genres, and quite possibly of direct derivation from it.

The question of the representation of dialect speech frequently occurs in connection with discussions of proletarian literature.[2] With reference

---

1. One similar account, though considerably less complete than Caudwell's, which Orwell would have known is in Jack Common in The Freedom of the Streets (1938), pp. 52-53: 'Books come to be written almost always because a man has acquired a technique of observation which is necessarily shaped by the culture of the class then ruling', and, therefore, there is no proper proletarian culture as yet. Orwell reviewed Common's book in 'Authentic Socialism', NEW, XIII (1938), 192-193. A similar account of proletarian literature is contained in Max Eastman's Artists in Uniform: A Study of Literature and Bureaucratism (1934), p.131: Eastman quotes from Trotsky, Literature and Revolution: 'there is no proletarian culture and ... there will never be any .... The proletariat acquires power for the purpose of doing away for ever with class culture and to make way for human culture.' Eastman, pp. 131-132, notes that this opinion is familiar from the writings of Rosa Luxemborg who argues that the 'working class cannot create its own art and science until after it is completely emancipated from its position as an actual class.' Similar accounts may have been available to Orwell in other forms.

2. For instance, in the enthusiastic criticism of Lewis Grassic Gibbon, A Scots Quair (1933-34), in Philip Henderson's The Novel Today (1936), pp. 271-281; the concern with dialect is likely to have arisen in part from the belief, expressed by David Daiches in Literature and Society (Left Book Club, 1938), p.271, that in healthy periods of literature 'literary style has been ultimately grounded on popular speech.'

to Orwell's critical treatment of dialect it is important to note the especially strong sense in which he tends to use the term. In 'Politics and the English Language', for instance, the term does not simply denote a particular set of words and phrases but also the patterns of thought associated with this type of language: 'When you think of something abstract you are more inclined to use words from the start, and unless you make a conscious effort to prevent it, the existing dialect will come rushing in and do the job for you, at the expense of blurring or even changing your meaning.'[1] The use of the term in 'The Proletarian Writer', 'the bourgeois manner ... the middle-class dialect'[2], is equally strong and denotes a restricting series of conventions. Proletarian literature needs to have its own dialect if it is to break from these conventions: Orwell asserts in a review in 1936 'Some day, perhaps working-class writers will learn to write in their own dialect instead of standard South English, and then we shall have a new class of literature which will drive much that is pretentious and silly out of existence.'[3] The practical difficulties of writing in 'their own dialect' are noted in 1938 in a letter to Jack Common, in which some of the general arguments of 'The Proletarian Writer' are foreshadowed: 'The stuff in Seven Shifts is written from a prole point of view, but of course as literature it's bourgeois literature. The thing is that all of us talk and write two different languages, & when a man from, say, Scotland or even Yorkshire writes in standard English he's writing something quite as different from his own tongue as Spanish is from Italian. I think the first real prole novel that comes along will be spoken over the radio.'[4] In these latter two examples, Orwell is

---

1. Horizon, XIII (1945), 252-265 (p.264).
2. 'The Proletarian Writer: Discussion between George Orwell and Desmond Hawkins', Listener, XXIV (1940), 878-879 (p.879).
3. 'Real Adventure', T&T, XVII (1936), 1042.
4. 'Letter to Jack Common', 20 April 1938, CEJL, I, No.124, p.314.

concerned with the representation of dialect in its simpler sense of the speech patterns specific to a region or class. This representation has an importance similar to that attributed to dialect elsewhere in his work: there it determined patterns of thought, here types of literature.

The idea that literary, written English has a normative effect upon proletarian writing, that it prevents the expression of the proletarian writer's dialect, and hence of his outlook, is approached from another angle in 'Charles Dickens'. Dickens's mentality and origins, as a member of the 'small urban bourgeoisie', make it, despite his radicalism, 'next door to impossible for him not to think of a working class exterior as a stigma.' As a result of this attitude, Dickens normalises the speech of his working-class characters: ' A comic hero like Sam Weller, or a merely pathetic figure like Stephen Blackpool, can speak with a broad accent, but the jeune premier always speaks the then equivalent of B.B.C. This is so, even when it involves absurdities. Little Pip, for instance, is brought up by people speaking broad Essex, but talks upper-class English from his earliest childhood .... Even Rachel in Hard Times has barely a trace of Lancashire accent, an impossibility in her case.'[1] With regard to proletarian literature, literary English was seen as a normalising medium; in his criticism of Dickens, Orwell points to examples of this use of standard English, to the normalisation of dialect on selective and revealing grounds.[2] In both cases, literary

---

1. 'CD', ITW, pp. 32 and 46.
2. Norman Page in Speech in the English Novel (1973), p.97 comes to a similar conclusion on Dickens's use of dialect: characters of moral worth do not generally depart from standard usage and Dickens uses 'the convention whereby speech is determined not by environmental factors but by innate moral qualities.' George Gissing in Charles Dickens: A Critical Study (1898), pp. 76-77, which Orwell knew, makes a similar point with reference to Lizzie Hexam in Our Mutual Friend.

English carries the mentality of a social class : proletarian literature is trapped within the conventions of the language it uses, whilst Dickens uses this language to reinforce similar conventions. For Orwell the existence of dialect points to a political problem: the linguistic gap between the governing and the governed[1]; the treatment of dialect reveals the continuity of concerns between his literary criticism and political writing. Thus Orwell shares the concern of the Marxist writers of the 1930s with the relation between dialect, social class and literary language. This similarity of concerns is likely to have arisen from a consideration of the problems associated with the particular genre of proletarian literature, as much as from any immediate influence.

7. Marxist literary criticism

7:1 Derivations

There are other specific resemblances between Orwell's criticism of Dickens and the claims of Marxist criticism.[2] The virtual exclusion of working-class characters from English fiction as a whole, and hence from Dickens's novels, is indirectly related to the selectivity of Dickens's vision: 'Wonderfully as he can describe an appearance, Dickens does not often describe a process. The vivid pictures that he succeeds in leaving in one's memory are nearly always the pictures of things seen in leisure moments, in the coffee-rooms of country inns or through the windows of a stage-coach; the kind of things he notices are inn-signs, brass door-

---

1. See, in particular, 'Propaganda and Demotic Speech', Persuasion, II (Summer Quarter 1944), 14-18 and 41.

2. Although the Marxist characterisation of Dickens by T.A. Jackson in Charles Dickens: The Progress of a Radical (1937) as a 'blood-thirsty revolutionary', 'CD', ITW, pp. 9-12 (p.9), is specifically refuted, Orwell makes some similar points to Jackson and shares his historical approach.

knockers, painted jugs, the interiors of shops and private houses, clothes, faces and above all, food. Everything is seen from the consumer-angle.' The final term, 'consumer-angle' serves to identify this as a specifically Marxist point. Orwell then discusses how this bias of Dickens's vision affects his representation of work and of industry: 'When he writes about Coketown he manages to evoke, in just a few paragraphs, the atmosphere of a Lancashire town as a slightly disgusted southern visitor would see it.'[1]

The account of the tendencies of Dickens's vision is very similar to Alick West's criticism of Joyce in Crisis and Criticism (1937). West argues that work, and workers, are largely omitted from Ulysses, and that this is part of the selectivity of Joyce's representation of social relations. West's conclusion on this selectivity is similar in substance, and method of argument, to Orwell's conclusion on Dickens: 'The reality of Joyce's social world is not its production and the conflict in that production; it is numberless acts of consuming, spending, enjoying of things that are already there. His selection of the social relations to be described is that of the consumer.'[2] The parallels between the arguments, conclusions and vocabulary of these passages are sufficiently close to justify the conclusion that Orwell is using an argument derived from the English Marxist aesthetics available to him. As Orwell never mentions the work of Alick West, it is unlikely that Crisis and Criticism is the specific source for Orwell's argument. The remarks on the exclusion of work, and of workers, from English fiction are commonplace in the English Marxist literary criticism of the 1930s.[3] Orwell's distinction between the description of a process and an appearance, though related to the frequent distinction between inner and outer vision else-

---

1. 'CD', ITW, 57.
2. Alick West, Crisis and Criticism (1937), p.169.
3. For instance, David Daiches, Literature and Society (1938), p.175.

where in his work, is also, in view of its connection here with the description of consumption, likely to be derived from the Marxist literary criticism of this period. There are, for instance, hints at the development of such a distinction in Caudwell's Illusion and Reality[1], and the distinction between process and appearance is, presumably, ultimately derived from Marx's definition of the commodity.[2] Orwell's use of these elements of Marxist literary criticism is comfortably connected to the flow of his argument. The aspects of Marxism which Orwell uses here are quite closely connected with the discussions of proletarian literature, which had also been concerned with the implications of the manner in which work and consumption were represented.

In the reference to Dickens's vision of Coketown as a 'slightly disgusted southern visitor', it is possible to detect an acknowledgement of some of the criticisms of The Road to Wigan Pier.[3] The other remarks on Hard Times in 'Charles Dickens' also show a response to Marxist, and other

---

1. Caudwell, pp. 110-111 distinguishes art as a process, evident in the collective festival, from the objectivity the work of art acquires when the poet's public becomes strange to him. David N. Margolies, The Function of Literature: A Study of Christopher Caudwell's Aesthetics (1969), p.11 discusses Caudwell's idea of literature as a process.
2. Caudwell,pp. 110-112, discusses the change in the character of the art-process in terms of commodity-fetishism.
3. For instance, to take two rather different examples, Sir Arthur Bryant, 'Preface', in G.W. Tomlinson, Coal-miner (1937), p.11, 'though Wigan and Sheffield may perhaps genuinely seem Hell to a super-sensitive novelist paying them a casual visit, they do not seem Hell to the vast majority of people who live there'; and W.H. Williams 'A Working Class Epic' (Review of Cwmardy by Lewis Jones), Left Review (1937), 428-429; 'The description of Len's first day in the mine, when as a lad of fourteen years he starts to work with his father, is magnificent. Compare this with the chapter telling of a visit to a coal mine (good though it is) in a recent book, The Road to Wigan Pier. The first writes of an intimate experience, that is part of the very fibre of his being; the second typifies the outsider, horror-stricken by the conditions under which the coal-miners have to work.' Orwell is likely to have known the main themes of criticism of The Road to Wigan Pier; he would probably have read reviews of it on his return from Spain.

left-wing criticisms of The Road to Wigan Pier, and, at the same time, some use of the methods of Marxist criticism. There had been two principal socialist criticisms of The Road to Wigan Pier, both of which have persisted in the work of Orwell's subsequent socialist critics. It was felt that the definition of socialism, as justice and liberty, was inadequate and merely emotional, and this definition did not amount to socialism in any proper sense.[1] The absence of attention to trade-unions and kindred organisations in The Road to Wigan Pier was also judged to be a significant limitation on Orwell's socialism; Derek Kahn's review in Left Review contains a typical example of this judgment: 'No doubt if Mr Orwell extended his investigations so as to include the established organisations of the working-class he would emerge with a conception of Socialism more in keeping with present realities.'[2] Orwell's analysis of Dickens's politics in Hard Times is remarkably similar to the first of these criticisms of The Road to Wigan Pier: 'There is not a line in the book that can properly be called Socialistic; indeed, its tendency if anything is pro-capitalist, because its whole moral is that capitalists ought to be kind, not that workers ought to be rebellious.'[3] The method of argument, and the conclusions, of Marxist critics on the debate between the moralist and revolutionary, were often similar to Orwell's assertion here: for instance, Alec Brown in The Fate of the Middle Classes (1936) argues that a call for a change of heart to alter economic conditions works on behalf of the class-structure of society by obscuring the class struggle.[4] Again, Orwell is using the techniques

---

1. For instance, Victor Gollancz 'Foreword' in The Road To Wigan Pier, pp. xxii-xxiii: 'Mr Orwell does not once define what he means by Socialism; nor does he explain how the oppressors oppress, nor even what he understands by the words 'liberty' and 'justice'.' See also H.J. Laski, Left News, March 1937, pp. 275-276, Critical Heritage, pp. 104-107.
2. 'The Road to Wigan Pier', Left Review, III (1937), 186-187 (p.187).
3. 'CD', ITW, 14.
4. Alec Brown, The Fate of the Middle Classes (1936), pp. 250-251.

and some of the conclusions of Marxism, though the final resolution of 'Charles Dickens' is more sympathetic to the position of the moralist than the extract might suggest in isolation.

His further remarks on Hard Times are equally likely to have been influenced by the second principal criticism of The Road to Wigan Pier, its lack of attention to organised labour: Dickens 'is slightly hostile to the most hopeful movement of his day, trade unionism. In Hard Times trade unionism is represented as something not much better than a racket, something that happens because employers are not sufficiently paternal.' Dickens's dislike of trade unionism is related to the moral emphasis of his approach to politics, and to his lack of any 'consciousness that the structure of society can be changed.'[1] In both Orwell's criticism of Dickens, and in the socialist criticism of The Road to Wigan Pier, it is felt that the moral impulse to action is sufficiently aroused, whereas the method of action is not politically defined.

Orwell's criticism of Hard Times shows how complex is his response to Marxist literary criticism. Orwell uses some of the methods and points of Marxist criticism, though, again, to his own purpose. These aspects of Marxist criticism are also those which were used in the reviews of The Road to Wigan Pier. An anticipation of this type of criticism can be discerned in a remark of Orwell's prior to the publication of The Road to Wigan Pier: 'I should think the chances of Gollancz choosing it as a Left Book Club selection are small, as it is too fragmentary and, on the surface, not very left-wing.'[2] The political naivety of The Road to Wigan Pier is implicitly defended here in terms of its underlying

---

1. 'CD', ITW, p.18.
2. 'Letter to Leonard Moore', 15 December 1936, CEJL, I, No.92, p.256.

intention to defend socialism from middle-class socialists, and to arouse the reader's compassion: in a manner similar to the selection of his autobiography for emphasis, the apparent naivety is partly assumed for rhetorical purposes. With the benefit of the subsequent developments in his own thought and in criticism, particularly that concerned specifically with The Road to Wigan Pier, Orwell was capable of sophisticated analysis of similar social attitudes. For this analysis he both responds to and draws selectively upon Marxist criticism.

Orwell's contrast of Dickens's moral insight with his lack of a sense of the need for a change in the structure of society was identified by the Times Literary Supplement reviewer as one of the 'conventional irrelevances of materialist criticism.' The assured tone of this judgment is itself indicative of the state of literary criticism in England in the 1930s and 1940s. The virtual exclusion from much of conventional, academic criticism of analysis of a writer's political attitudes in their historical context, makes this critical approach almost exclusively Marxist. In addition to this aspect of Orwell's criticism in 'Charles Dickens' there are other specifically Marxist points. For instance, Orwell notes the 'feudal atmosphere' of master and servant relations in Dickens's novels, and then defends this type of relation: 'given the fact of servitude, the feudal relationship is the only tolerable one.'[1] The implicit contrast here between feudalism, in which relations of servitude were at least customary and humane, and capitalism, which renders servitude inhumane, is familiar in the Marxist writing of this period. The simple Marxist contrast between feudalism and capitalism is parodied in Nineteen-Eighty-Four: 'Anything large and impressive, if it was reasonably new in appearance, was automatically claimed as having been built since the Revolution, while anything that was obviously of earlier date was ascribed

---

1. 'CD', ITW, p.53.

to some dim period called the Middle Ages. The centuries of capitalism were held to have produced nothing of any value.'[1] A sceptical remark in an article on Tobias Smollet is intermediate in tone between 'Charles Dickens' and Nineteen Eighty-Four in its allusion to this schematic view of history: Roderick Random 'includes a self-contained story, "Mr Melopyn's Tragedy", which should make anyone who thinks aristrocratic patronage a good basis for literature think twice.'[2] So Orwell draws upon the Marxist scheme of history in 'Charles Dickens' for his criticism, but is more sceptical and detached at other points in his work.

7. Marxist literary criticism

7:2 Method

Orwell's criticism is, therefore, directly indebted to the English Marxism. The probability of a more general similarity of critical approach is suggested by a review of Alec Brown's The Fate of the Middle Classes (1936). In this review, Orwell argues that the 'statement that 'every ideology is a reflection of economic circumstances' explains a good deal, but it does not explain the strange and sometimes heroic snobbishness that is found in the English middle-classes.' This moderate criticism of deterministic Marxism suggests a desire to refine this method in his own work, by the consideration of cultural as well as economic factors. Orwell's direct comments on The Fate of the Middle Classes also offer evidence of a concern to develop a more sophisticated approach from Brown's Marxism: 'The analysis of H.G. Wells, chosen as a typical middle-class writer, is brilliantly done, but, once again, it fails to take

---

1. NEF, p.99
2. 'Tobias Smollet: Scotland's Best Novelist', Tribune, 22 September 1944, p.16.

account of the stratifications within the middle class itself.'[1] A similar attitude is taken towards Brown's economic determinism is The Road to Wigan Pier.[2] In passing, the shared characteristics of The Fate of the Middle Classes and The Road to Wigan Pier ought to be noted: both works are written from the viewpoint of a member of the marginal middle-classes, and are addressed to members of this class with the intention of encouraging them to recognise their essential unity of interest with the working-class, and, thereby, work towards socialism.[3] In some respects, Wells's position is similar[4], particularly in his emphasis on the role of the technical intelligentsia in the move towards socialism, and, hence, is of particular interest to Brown and Orwell.

Brown's account of Wells begins by noting the large reading public he enjoyed, and his function as a spokesman for the vast middle-class to which he belonged. Despite their desire to reshape the world, Wells and other intellectual workers are incapable of so doing. This incapacity is partly a result of a failure to acknowledge the historical changes to the class from which Wells has emerged. Wells spent his childhood and youth at a time of transition when the intellectual middle-class was rising, and historical conditions have fostered a false belief that this will continue. As a consequence of this false belief Wells has projected this pattern onto the future.[5] In The Road to Wigan Pier the 'pessimistic utopia' of

---

1. Review of The Fate of the Middle Classes by Alec Brown, Adelphi, XII (1936), p.128.
2. W.P., p.256.
3. Alec Brown, The Fate of the Middle Classes (1936), passim. See in particular, pp. 84-109.
4. See, 'Stalin - Wells Talk: The Verbatim Record and a Discussion by G. Bernard Shaw, H.G. Wells, J.M. Keynes, Ernst Toller and others' (1934), pp. 8-15 for an interesting demonstration of the conflict between Wells's view of the importance of the 'technical intelligentsia' and Stalin's refusal of an independent historical role to them in his bipartite analysis of class.
5. Brown, pp. 14-16, 26-34 and 46-48.

The Sleeper Awakes is characterised as distasteful, 'a sort of prig's paradise' and Orwell argues that it 'suffers from vast contradictions because of the fact that Wells, as the arch-priest of 'progress', cannot write with any conviction against "progress".' This contradiction is resolved in favour of 'progress' in Wells's later, and more characteristic, utopian works.[1] Some similarity to Brown's account of Wells is apparent here in the claim that Wells has projected the conditions of his own era onto the future. The distaste for Wells's vision of the future in The Road to Wigan Pier is part of an objection to mechanisation in itself, whereas Brown, in a more conventionally socialist argument, objects to the way machines are used under capitalism.[2]

The similarities between the critical method, and, in this particular case the conclusions, of Orwell and Brown, is more apparent in Orwell's later treatment of Wells than in The Road to Wigan Pier. In his wartime essay, 'Wells, Hitler and the World State', Wells's class position is compared to that of Dickens: both belong to 'the non-military middle class'. The effects of Wells's class origins upon his political views are analysed: 'The war-lords and the witch-doctors must fail, the common-sense World State, as seen by a nineteenth-century liberal whose heart does not leap at the sound of bugles, must triumph.' Wells's confident vision of a rational future has been rendered shallow by history, specifically by the growth of 'nationalism, religious bigotry and feudal loyalty', which Wells's liberal sanity cannot comprehend. Orwell's interest in Wells extends to a concern for his influence on his audience: 'But is it not a sort of parricide for a person of may age (38) to find fault with H.G. Wells? Thinking people who were born about the beginning

---

1. W P , pp. 234-235.
2. 'CD', ITW, p.32.

of this century are in some sense Wells's own creation.'[1] Orwell's personal response to Wells's work is linked through its typicality to Wells's influence on his audience. The relation of Orwell's treatment of Wells to Brown's The Fate of the Middle Classes, and to deterministic Marxism in general, is complicated. The same basic model is shared: a class viewpoint is made manifestly inadequate by historical change. However, as his original comment on The Fate of the Middle Classes suggests, Orwell's description of the mentality of a class incorporates a variety of cultural, as well as economic, determinants.

Despite the lapse of time between his review of The Fate of the Middle Classes and his later essays on Wells, Orwell's criticism of Wells may have been indebted to Brown for its general conclusions, and it clearly does use a refinement of the critical method represented by Brown's work. Orwell's criticism often makes use of this refinement of deterministic Marxism. This similarity of method is crucial to an understanding of Orwell's criticism, affecting his critical approach where no immediate derivation can be traced. It can be discerned across the mixture of genres, principally essays and reviews, containing autobiographical and anecdotal material, which make up his critical work.

This method reveals itself in his attention to social class. He is often careful to specify the social position of a writer, and to trace the implications of this position for the writer's work. For instance, he uses this approach in a review in The Adelphi in 1935: Henry Crabb Robinson 'belonged to the puritanical monied class which was rising on the ruins of the old aristocracy, and which was liberal in the sense that it rather

---

1. 'Wells, Hitler and the World State', Horizon, IV (1941), 136-138.

liked shaking its fist at any tyrant who was safely distant.'[1] As this analysis occurs before the review of The Fate of the Middle Classes, it seems likely that Orwell's response to the analysis of H.G. Wells in terms of his class position is part of a general enthusiasm for this method, rather than an isolated response to Brown's work.

His interest in Dickens is connected with his social typicality, though not, either ostensibly or in practice, confined to this: 'Mentally he belongs to the small urban bourgeoisie, and he happens to be an exceptionally fine specimen of this class, with all the 'points', as it were, very highly developed. That is partly what makes him so interesting.' Orwell then gives an account of Dickens's social attitudes in relation to his class, and to position of this class within a simple model of history: 'although Dickens lived in a period when the bourgeoisie was really a rising class, he displays this characteristic less strongly than Wells.'[2]

In his criticism of Gissing, both in an article in Tribune in 1943, and in the later and fuller essay in 1948, Gissing's own enforced transition between social classes is seen as the source of the social attitudes of his work. Gissing is described as 'a humane, intelligent man of scholarly tastes, forced into intimacy with the London poor'; as a result of this experience, Gissing 'regards them as savages', and was preoccupied with the insecurity of the middle-classes, and with the constraints of their code of respectability. These preoccupations, which stem from Gissing's peculiar social position, are enacted in the lives of the characters of The Odd Women: 'in each case the ultimate reason for the disaster lies

---

1. Review of The Life and Times of Henry Crabb Robinson by Edith J. Morley, Adelphi, XI (1935), 61.
2. 'CD', ITW, pp. 32-34.

in obeying the accepted social code, or in not having enough money to circumvent it.'[1]

In an article on W.B. Yeats, Orwell attempts to establish a relation between Yeats's poetic style, occult philosophy, and yearning for feudalism, and finally suggests that these characteristics may be related to Yeats's personal social position, that they may be 'traceable to mere snobbishness, a product of Yeats's own position as an impoverished offshoot of the aristocracy.'[2] Orwell's interest in the implications of a writer's class position is partly derived from and clearly similar to the English Marxism of the 1930s.

It is also part of an independent consciousness of the importance of social class and of the stress on authenticity in Orwell's work. A writer necessarily draws upon his own experiences, and his work is both enriched and limited by its source in personal experience. Social origin is one of the conditions which determine a writer's personal experience. In other cases, nationality can be as important to a writer's biography and work as social class: for instance, Orwell considers that Conrad's European experience gives him 'sort of grown-upness and political understanding which would have been almost impossible to a native English writer at that time.'[3] Social class is presented by Orwell as a major constraint on his own vision: in The Road to Wigan Pier Orwell presents

---

1. 'Not Enough Money: A Sketch of George Gissing', Tribune, 2 April 1943, p.15, and 'George Gissing', London Magazine, VII (June 1960), 36-43 (p.38). The editors of CEJL, IV, p.436 state that the second essay was written in 1948.

2. Review of The Development of William Butler Yeats by V.K. Narayana Menon, Horizon, VII (1943), 71.

3. 'Conrad's Place and Rank in English Letters', Wiadomosci, 10 April 1949, p.1.

his education as that of a typical member of 'the lower-upper-middle class'[1], and analyses his own biography for its representative value. There is a mixture of personal and social considerations: he is interested in a writer's biography, including his own, where it intersects with social class and historical changes. In the case of Conrad, an unusual personal history gives him a privileged access to experiences which are then taken to be of wider value.

In his consideration of a writer's work in relation to his experience of social class, Orwell does allow some importance to directly economic factors. He argues, in 1937, that the Marxist claim that people's opinions are determined by the economic base of their society is 'blatantly untrue in detail', but useful as a generalisation, and 'not altogether untrue.'[2] Orwell's literary criticism shows evidence of some use of economic determinism. In an early review in The Adelphi he balances cultural against economic determinants, with the stress on the economic: for the classical and static nature of French thought, 'surely recent life, especially recent economic life is more important than remote Celts and Latins? If one looks at the history of the nineteenth century one sees that France, with her settled agricultural life and unsettled politics, could not possibly have developed the same culture as a truly modern country.'[3] A similar emphasis is apparent in a slightly later remark on Baudelaire's difficulty: 'Probably the truth is that artistic obscurity, so common this last seventy years, is only one of the morbid growths of our decaying civilisation, and is traceable to directly economic causes. The pity is, though of course it is only what one would expect, that artists should succumb to it more

---

1. WP, p.153.
2. 'The Lure of Profundity', NEW, XII (1937), 235-236.
3. Review of The Civilisation of France by Ernst Robert Curtius, Adelphi, IV (1932), 553.

or less in proportion as they are gifted.'[1] Although the general phenomenom of artistic obscurity may have economic causes, a particular writer has a choice within this context: what is true in general need not be true in detail. Orwell's comment on Baudelaire offers a hint of the connection between the critical interest in a writer's position with regard to the class and economic structure of his society, and other critical interests: the regret expressed at the growth of artistic obscurity can be connected to the concern, common to both Orwell and English Marxist criticism, for the relation between a writer and his audience, and for the function of literature, for the means by which a writer can reach and affect an audience.

The reservation as to the absolute truth of economic determinism is revealed in the use of the qualification 'probably' in the discussion of Baudelaire. A similar reservation, though here it concerns the difficulties of research and evidence rather than of the truth of the method, is present in Orwell's clearest statement of a form of economic determinism. In a talk broadcast in 1942, 'The Rediscovery of Europe', it is asserted that historical changes in the 'whole spirit and tempo of life', in 'political behaviour, ... manners, ... literature and everything else' are 'no doubt ... ultimately traceable to changes in industrial technique, though the connexion isn't always obvious.'[2] Despite the qualification as to the possibility of specifying the relationship between particular social and literary changes, it is a firm endorsement of a critical method developed from Marxism, and shows what an extensive

---

1. Review of The Aesthetic of Stephen Mallarmé by Hasye Cooperman and Baudelaire: The Tragic Sophist by T. Clapton, Adelphi, VIII (1934), 292.

2. 'The Rediscovery of Europe', Talking to India, pp. 40-51 (p.41). The version in the Listener, XXVII (1942), 370-372 is abridged and does not include this opening passage.

influence is credited to the economic situation for changes in types of literature. It reveals a sophistication of the earlier biographical approach to social class and literature, and allows for statements of the determination of literature by social change without a biographical intermediary. In Orwell's criticism of the 1940s the interest in a writer's biography is retained, but to this is added an interest in the direct relation between literature and society, and in the social attitudes expressed in literature. In the case of Yeats these concerns, including an interest in the relation between belief and style, are given more prominence than the simply biographical; the interest in a writer's biography had itself rarely been psychological, but had rather focused on the intersection of his life with changes in society.

Some notion of a relation between the economic base of a society and its literature is apparent in Orwell's contention that the association between the idea 'of "art for art's sake"' and 'the whole period between 1890 and 1930 ... the golden afternoon of the capitalist age' is significant, rather than accidental. Orwell accounts for this association in terms of the economic security of the period, which allowed the 'illusion of pure aestheticism' to remain undamaged until the events of the 1930s.[1] Marxist critics had also noted this association between aestheticism and capitalism, but had given different explanations for it. It had been interpreted by Caudwell in Illusion and Reality (1937) as a consequence of 'commodity-fetishism', the valuing of an object for exchange value rather than for its use: the work of art becomes like the commodity, depersonalised and objective, with its actual relations to society veiled by the market.[2] The same association is noted but a different explanation is given for it.

---

1. 'The Frontiers of Art and Propaganda' Listener, XXV (1941) 768-769.
2. Christopher Caudwell, Illusion and Reality (1937), pp. 109-112.

Orwell has, like the Marxist criticism of the 1930s, a sense that the work of literature becomes a commodity in a simpler meaning, under capitalism: in a review, 'The Book Racket', he argues that book-reviewers treat 'books as commodities like soap or cheese.'[1] This attitude is also credited to the owner of the bookshop who employs Gordon in Keep the Aspidistra Flying: 'To him a book was as purely an article of merchandise as a pair of second-hand trousers.'[2] It is also the stance adopted in a humorous manner, in a later article in Tribune, 'Books v. Cigarettes.'[3] There are other probable sources for the sense of literature as a commodity: Gissing's New Grub Street and Trollope's An Autobiography, are both concerned, in different ways, with the production of literature for money, and were well known to Orwell.[4] He shares a concern for the economic position of literature within society, and a sense of its status as a commodity under capitalism, with the Marxism of the 1930s, but this sense could have been stimulated by other sources.

The clearest instances of the use of arguments based on simple economic determinism occur in Orwell's work of the early 1930s. Dissatisfaction with the crudity of this method is apparent in Orwell's later work: 'Marxist criticism has a short way with such phenomena as Surrealism. They are 'bourgeois decadence' (much play is made with the phrases 'corpse poisons' and decaying rentier class'), and that is that. But though this

---

1. Adelphi, XV (1939), 605-606 (p.606).
2. KAF, p.265.
3. Tribune, 8 February 1946, p.15.
4. There are several fairly close parallels between Trollope's account of incidents and situations of his own schooldays and those Orwell recounts of himself in 'Such, Such Were the Joys'. See Anthony Trollope, An Autobiography (Oxford, U.P., 1950), pp. 4-19. These parallels suggest either that Orwell confuses his memory of his life and of his reading in 'Such, Such Were the Joys', or that he is there concerned more with a polemic against private education than with accurate autobiography; whichever explanation is preferred, it is inadvisable to rely upon its autobiographical veracity.

probably states a fact, it does not establish a connexion. One would still like to know why Dali's leaning was towards necrophilia (and not, say, homosexuality), and why the rentiers and the aristocrats should buy his pictures instead of hunting and making love like their grandfathers.'[1] The dissatisfaction is qualified: the general conclusions of Marxist criticism of surrealism are accepted, but, as before, they are felt to be insufficiently detailed, and to neglect motivation, a criticism of Marxism which he repeats elsewhere; a need for a refinement of this criticism is implied. Orwell's criticism, therefore, makes substantial, though not unqualified, use of economic determinism, and reveals an interest in developing this method.

So far the similarity between Orwell and English Marxist literary critics has been apparent principally in their treatment of a writer's work in relation to his social class, and in the use of various forms of economic determinism. A comment by Orwell in a talk broadcast in 1941, 'The Frontiers of Art and Propaganda', suggests the possibility of a further similarity: 'If we look back at the English literature of the last ten years ... the most lively criticism has nearly all of it been the work of Marxist writers, people like Christopher Caudwell and Philip Henderson and Edward Upward, who look on every book virtually as a political pamphlet and are far more interested in digging out its political and social implications that its literary qualities in the narrow sense.'[2] Orwell's range of reference to Marxist literary criticism here is narrow and somewhat at odds with his previous work: for instance though Philip Henderson is commended here, Orwell's review of his The Novel Today (1936) had

---

1. 'Benefit of Clergy: Some Notes on Salvador Dali', CE, p.129.

2. 'The Frontiers of Art and Propaganda', Listener, XXV (1941), 768.

characterised it as 'badly written and thoroughly dull all through.'[1] The narrowness of Orwell's range of reference may well be related to the constraints of space within a radio talk to an Indian audience; though the precise extent of his acquaintance with Marxist writing is not ascertainable, it is not confined to the writers instanced here.

The technique of analysis of literature for its political implications is less specific to this body of Marxist writing than analysis of social class and economic determinism. Consideration of literature in this manner was natural to Victorian writers, as Orwell notes in 'Charles Dickens': 'every writer, especially every novelist, has a 'message', whether he admits it or not, and the minutest details of his work are influenced by it. All art is propaganda. Neither Dickens himself nor the majority of Victorian novelists would have thought of denying this.'[2] Nevertheless, in terms of the English literary criticism of the 1930s and 1940s, Marxism is the chief carrier of this approach to literature. A review by Orwell in 1942 of Edmund Wilson's The Wound and the Bow illustrates this situation and his perception of it. He characterises Wilson as 'one of the few literary critics of our day who give the impression of being grown up, and having digested Marx's teachings instead of merely rejecting them or swallowing them whole'; Marx is, quite fairly, invoked in an account of Wilson's eclectic and partly sociological critical approach, and the tone shows Orwell's appreciation of this balanced combination of qualities. Orwell's similarity of approach to his own account of Marxist writing connects him with this form of Marxism, though not as closely as his use of class analysis and economic determinism.

---

1. 'Propagandist Critics', NEW, X (1936), 230.
2. 'CD', ITW, p.66.

Like the work of the Marxist critics mentioned in 'The Frontiers of Art and Propaganda', Orwell's literary criticism is far more concerned with the beliefs implied by a writer's work than with its formal qualities. Following the discussion of Dickens's social and political attitudes, he makes a gesture towards criticism based on more purely aesthetic criteria: 'I have been discussing Dickens simply in terms of his 'message', and almost ignoring his literary qualities.'[1] The similarity of phrasing between this and the description of Marxist criticism, the reference to the neglect of 'literary qualities', confirms the affinity between them. The remark here is largely a gesture of apology to the reader: the previous method of analysis is resumed and the phrase 'literary qualities' is not given a substantial meaning. Orwell shows no knowledge of a critical apparatus which could be used for formal description of the Victorian novel, and there was no extended criticism of this sort available to him.[2]

It was apparent that Orwell was dissatisfied with the inability of much literary criticism to deal with a writer's 'message'. Possibly as a reaction against the tendency of inter-war English literary criticism to concentrate on form and verbal analysis[3], he points to aspects of Dickens's novels which are also outside the scope, and often frowned upon, by this criticism: 'Dickens is obviously a writer whose parts are greater than his wholes. He is all fragments, all details - rotten

---

1. 'CD', ITW, p.66.
2. George Watson, The Literary Critics: A Study of English Descriptive Criticism (1964), pp. 148-160 discusses the Jamesian tradition of criticism of the novel and notes how James's stress on the primary value of form in the novel causes him to dislike the 'fluid puddings' of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. Although Watson does not make this point, the Victorian novelists in whom Orwell is interested would suffer from similar criticisms.
3. Watson, pp. 160-194.

architecture, but wonderful gargoyles -'. Even within episodes, 'the outstanding, unmistakeable of Dickens's writing is the unnecessary detail'[1]: literary criticism which demands economy of form cannot, therefore, deal with these qualities in Dickens.

Orwell is slightly unfair to his own critical method: at points, as in the treatment of the use of dialect, the account of Dickens's class attitudes does rest upon verbal analysis, upon an account of his 'literary qualities.' Similarly, in 'Inside the Whale', Auden's use of the phrase 'necessary murder' is taken as the starting point for an attack on the shallowness of Auden's politics. However, in general, the critical method of 'Inside the Whale' is similar to that of 'Charles Dickens': the investigation of the social and political attitudes implied by literature in its historical setting. Orwell's apology for this approach is more perfunctory than that offered in 'Charles Dickens', and is immediately qualified by a defence of the essay's treatment of literature: 'It will be seen that I have discussed Housman as though he were merely a propagandist, an utterer of maxims and quotable 'bits'. Obviously he was more than that .... But at bottom it is always a writer's tendency, his 'purpose', his 'message', that makes him liked or disliked .... Some tendency or other is always discernible, in verse as much as in prose, even if it does no more than determine the form and the choice of imagery.' Despite the phrasing here, a poet's tendency is granted a considerable effect on his work, as well as an overriding importance for its reception: it does determine the form and imagery.

---

1. 'CD', ITW, pp. 75 and 69.
2. 'ITW', ITW, pp. 151-152.

A similar argument for a close relation between a poet's tendency and use of language is more assertively stated in a later essay, 1943, on W.B. Yeats: 'a writer's political and religious beliefs are not excrescences to be laughed away, but something that will leave their mark even on the smallest detail of his work.' Although Orwell feels that there is a need for criticism that will demonstrate the close relation between a poet's 'tendency' and style, his own criticism generally fails to do this: for instance, in the essay on Yeats the comments on Yeats's use of language are not closely related to the political analysis.[1] In the essay on Yeats, and in the slightly earlier, 1942, essay on T.S. Eliot, the critical method of Inside the Whale is sustained: literature is considered in terms of its social and political implications. The verbal analysis of Eliot's poetry is tied in with the changes in Eliot's beliefs, though not, as Orwell was to demand in the essay on Yeats, directly with the particular content of Eliot's beliefs but with the degree of conviction with which they are held, and with which it is possible to hold them: 'The church has not now any living imagery, any new vocabulary to offer: "The rest / Is prayer, observance, discipline, thought and action." Perhaps what we need is prayer, observance, etc., but you do not make a line of poetry by stringing those words together ... the struggle with meanings would have loomed smaller, and the poetry would have seemed to matter more, if he could have found his way to some creed which did not start off by forcing one to believe the incredible.' The work of Yeats and Eliot is seen partly as expressive of social attitudes which are described in terms of class: Eliot's early poems 'were an end-product, the last gap of a cultural tradition, poems which spoke only for the cultivated third-generation rentier.'[2]

---

1. Review of The Development of William Butler Yeats by V.K. Narayana Menon, Horizon, VII (1943), 67-71 (p.71).
2. 'Points of View: T.S. Eliot', Poetry (London), No.7, October-November 1942, pp. 56-59.

Although literature is still taken as expressive of the attitudes of a social class, the writer's own social position here occupies a secondary place in the criticism of his work: a development, though not a complete departure from the earlier analysis of the implications of the personal social class of Dickens and Wells is apparent here. In the essay on Yeats, Orwell's overt intention was to fill a gap he perceived in Marxist criticism: 'One thing that Marxist criticism has not succeeded in doing is to trace the connexion between 'tendency' and literary style ... Yet some such connection there must be.'[1] Other aspects of Orwell's critical work of the early 1940s, in particular the continuing attempt to elicit the social and political implications of literature, represent a development from the elements of Marxism revealed in Inside the Whale, and also correspond to his own description of the Marxist approach to the criticism of literature.

7. Marxist literary criticism

7:3 Further similarities

Some of Orwell's other critical preoccupations are connected with the concerns which he shares with Marxist literary criticism. They are, therefore, similar to the recurrent topics of this criticism. However, there is no evidence to suggest that his further critical concerns are directly derived from Marxist literary criticism. The similarity is more likely to be a result of a parallel development from concerns and methods which are common to both Orwell and to the Marxist critics of this period. For instance, a statement of the writer's class position is implicitly a

---

1. 'Review of The Development of William Butler Yeats by V.K. Narayana Menon, Horizon, VII (1943), 67.

statement of the writer's relation to society as a whole as mediated through his social class. It is often also a description of a writer's relation to his audience: of the particular class to which a writer's work is addressed, and of the writer's closeness to or isolation from that class. These concerns are common to both Orwell and the Marxist writers of the 1930s, and are of a piece with the emphasis on the connection between a writer's social class and his work. In his comments on the relation between the writer and society, Orwell occasionally approaches the Marxist position that the modern novelist is hampered by his relative isolation from society as a whole: 'The sort of person who has the leisure to write a novel nearly always belongs to the middle classes. He can't make contact with the manual workers, even if he wants to, and the bulk of his own class, who are much more intolerant intellectually than the proletariat, look down on him as a 'highbrow'. Whether he likes it or not he is forced back into the sterile little world of the literary intelligentsia, with the result that novelists of real gift, like Aldous Huxley and Virginia Woolf, are ruined simply by lack of subject-matter.'[1] As before, Orwell's critical comment, close to that of some Marxists[2], is connected with other critical concerns: with the issue of proletarian literature, and with the expression of the viewpoint of a class.

For Orwell, as for the Marxist writers of the 1930s, an interest in the audience of literature extends naturally to a concern for the function of literature, for the effect literature can have upon its readers. To some extent, Orwell shares H.G. Wells's belief in the capacity of literature to affect its reader's actions: in Coming Up For Air, Bowling's reading

---

1. 'From Bloomsbury to the Bowery', Tribune, 12 April 1940, pp. 20-21 (p.20).
2. Compare, for instance, T.L. Hodgkin, 'The Individual and the Group' Left Review, III (1937), 627-629.

includes 'H.G. Wells's The History of Mr Polly, in a cheap shilling edition which was falling to pieces. I wonder if you can imagine the effect it had upon me, to be brought up as I'd been brought up, the son of a shop-keeper in a country town, and then to come across a book like that.'[1] Yet though The History of Mr Polly may have an initial effect on Bowling, it does not finally impel him to achieve fulfillment through personal effort: through a combination of historical pressures and personal lack of direction, Bowling fails to achieve happiness comparable to that of Mr Polly at the Potwell Inn at the conclusion of The History of Mr Polly. Orwell, therefore, whilst retaining a belief in the persuasive capacity of literature, is sceptical as to its final effect: in this particular case, the contrast between Bowling and Mr Polly is likely to be related to Orwell's sense that the social restrictions upon the individual's activity have increased since the Edwardian era of Wells's novel, and to his sense that Wells's liberal values are now anachronistic.

Bowling's personal response to Wells's novel is related to his own social role as a member of the Edwardian lower middle-class. Where Orwell offers his own responses in the course of his own criticism, he often presents himself as typical of a particular period and class, or is using the essayist's rhetorical technique of direct address to the reader. The implied typicality is evident in a short article on Rudyard Kipling: 'In the average middle-class family before the War, especially in Anglo-Indian families, he had a prestige that is not even approached by any writer of today .... For my own part I worshipped Kipling at thirteen, loathed him at seventeen, enjoyed him at twenty, despised him at twenty-five and now again rather admire him.'[2] There is an important connection here between Orwell's

---

1. CUFA, p.147.
2. 'Rudyard Kipling', NEW, VIII (1936), 289.

critical concern for the audience and function of literature and his own fiction and documentary work. His documentary writing is often clearly aimed to arouse a response of moral indignation at poverty or oppression in the reader, and thereby to urge the reader to political action. The documentary writing is also often addressed to a particular audience: for instance, The Road to Wigan Pier is directed to a middle-class audience. Orwell's fiction, particularly Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-Four is intended to affect the reader's political views. In giving literature a political function, in his fictional and biographical as well as critical work, Orwell is closer to Marxist ideas of literature than to other contemporary approaches which tended to value literature for its moral or aesthetic effect.[1]

7. Marxist literary criticism

7:4 Aesthetic value

The emphasis of Orwell's criticism on the beliefs and attitudes implied by a writer's work leads to a problem over the status of aesthetic value: literature is discussed in terms of these qualities but its ultimate value is felt to reside elsewhere. Aesthetic value is generally respected in Orwell's literary criticism, but the meaning of the term is uncertain and lies outside of the main thrust of the critical argument. The test of survival which Orwell often substitutes for aesthetic criteria is a sign of pragmatic impatience with the inadequacy of other aesthetic theories.[2]

---

1. See George Watson, The Literary Critics: A Study of English Descriptive Criticism (1964), pp. 148-208.
2. Orwell frequently claims that survival is the only worthwhile test of aesthetic merit: for example, 'CD', ITW, p.78; 'Lear, Tolstoy and the Fool', Polemic, No.7 (March 1947), 5 and 16-17. In the latter essay it is clearly a rebuff to the ultimate futility of Tolstoy's moral and aesthetic criteria.

It is not, in practice, fully accepted as a test by Orwell himself: for example, Orwell writes on and praises both Leonard Merrick and George Gissing[1], yet, as he notes, much of their work is no longer in print and cannot, therefore, be widely read. A measure of the indifference in practice of Orwell's criticism to purely aesthetic criteria can be seen in the continuity of approach, evident particularly in the concern for implicit social codes, between the essays on popular culture and the criticism of poets and novelists.

Orwell accuses both Catholic and Marxist critics of confusing political and aesthetic judgments. He does not himself fall into this abuse of critical judgment, but aesthetic criteria are generally only briefly introduced into his criticism: for instance, in a longer essay on Kipling, they are perfunctorily acknowledged: 'Kipling <u>is</u> a jingo imperialist, he <u>is</u> morally insensitive and aesthetically disgusting.' Although Orwell acknowledges the importance of the aesthetic, it is unclear what is meant by it and the conclusion of the essay does not clarify its meaning there: he rejects T.S. Eliot's distinction between verse and poetry and argues that Kipling can be better understood as a 'good bad poet', who survives by his appeal to popular emotions.[3] The formulation 'good bad poet' simply elides the issue of aesthetic value.

In the essay, 'Why I Write', the aesthetic is used to denote structure, organisation and rhythm and is largely opposed to polemical impulse.[4]

---

1. 'Introduction' to <u>The Position of Peggy Harper</u> by Leonard Merrick, <u>CEJL</u>, IV, No.15, pp. 52-56; and 'George Gissing', <u>London Magazine</u>, VII (June 1960), 36-43.
2. This is a reiterated claim; for example, in 'Propagandist Critics', <u>NEW</u>, X (1936), 229-230; and 'Letter to Richard Rees', 28 July 1949, in 'Some Letters of George Orwell', <u>Encounter</u>, XVIII (1962), 65.
3. 'Rudyard Kipling', <u>Horizon</u>, V (1942), 112 and 122.
4. <u>Gangrel</u>, No.4, October 1946, pp. 5-10 (p.7).

A similar meaning and contrast is implicit in 'Arthur Koestler', though never clearly stated: The Gladiators is felt to be unsatisfactory for its lack of internal coherence, and Arrival and Departure for its want of conviction as fiction. Although Orwell's perception of these defects is presumably guided by his sense of the aesthetic, they are not simply seen as artistic failures but as a consequence of the confusion of Koestler's political position with regard to revolution.[1] In the essay on Swift, 'Politics vs. Literature', roughly contemporary with 'Why I Write', 'literary quality' is again implied to be verbal organisation, as 'a native gift for using words.' Yet this quality is tangential to Orwell's enjoyment of Gulliver's Travels: the pleasure available in Gulliver's Travels, and ultimately, its value as art, is more closely related to the degree of conviction with which a world view, compatible with sanity, is held.[2] Unlike the Communist and Catholic writers he criticises, aesthetic value is not covertly tied to a particular world view.

The contrast between literary quality and political purpose is present in both the essay on Swift and in 'Why I Write', but the balance between them is different: in the former there is a more obvious sympathy for political purpose. Orwell's image of himself in 'Why I Write' as the private man thrust into politics, as the natural novelist 'forced into becoming a sort of pamphleteer'[3], has influenced many commentators. His account of himself in these terms is not confined to 'Why I Write' and does correspond to the historical transition, which he both observes and experiences, from the 'illusion of aestheticism', associated with the period 1910-30, to the political writing of the 1930s. Nevertheless, it is a partial image and, in 'Why I Write', has a rhetorical function: if a man's conscience

---

1. 'Arthur Koestler', CE, pp. 130-141.
2. 'Politics vs. Literature: An Examination of Gulliver's Travels', Polemic, No.5 (September-October 1946), 19 and 21.
3. 'Why I Write', Gangrel, No.4, October 1946, p.8.

forces him against his will into politics, then the sincerity of his involvement is unlikely to be questioned. On the basis of this image, it is misleading to assert, along with Raymond Williams in Orwell (1971), that, in his combination of literary and political writing, Orwell continued to feel 'that in some way he was evading or abandoning literature: "a sort of pamphleteering", as he said with the sneer he had been taught.'[1] There is a continuous tension between aesthetic and political concepts of literature in Orwell's writing, but the balance of sympathy is often more towards the political than the aesthetic pole. A body of critical work, which stressed the importance to his work of a writer's social and political attitudes and which attacked aestheticism, was available to him. He draws on this body of Marxist criticism and, in his literary criticism, is generally closer to this work than to other contemporary attitudes to literature.

7. Marxist literary criticism

7:5 Criticisms

The grounds of Orwell's criticisms of Marxist literary criticism are more familiar; so familiar, in fact, that they have generally been mistaken for the whole of Orwell's relation to Marxism. The aesthetic may be an insubstantial category in Orwell's treatment of literature but it is generally respected, if not always explicitly acknowledged. A reiterated claim of Orwell's attacks on Marxist literary criticism is the dishonest confusion of aesthetic and political judgments of literature: 'They are employing a double set of values and dodging from one to the other according to as it suits them. They praise or dispraise a book because

---

1. Raymond Williams, Orwell (1971), p.37.

its tendency is Communist, Catholic, Fascist or what-not; but at the same time they pretend to be judging it on purely aesthetic grounds.'[1] The subordination, in practice, of literary judgments to political ends implies an indifference to the value of literature. Orwell attacks this narrow attitude to literature in The Road To Wigan Pier: 'In the old Worker's Weekly (one of the forerunners of the Daily Worker) there used to be a column of literary chat of the 'Books on the Editor's Table' type. For several weeks running there had been a certain amount of talk about Shakespeare; whereupon an incensed reader wrote to say, 'Dear Comrade, we don't want to hear about these bourgeois writers like Shakespeare. Can't you give us something a bit more proletarian?' etc., etc.'[2] A similar criticism of the socialist movement's attitude to literature recurs in an article in 1943 in Tribune, 'Literature and the Left': 'There is no knowing just how much the Socialist movement has lost by alienating the literary intelligentsia. But it has alienated them, partly by confusing tracts with literature, and partly by having no room for humanistic culture.'[3]

Although Orwell's criticisms of socialist attitudes to literature in general, and Marxist literary criticism in particular, are firmly stated, they never amount to an outright rejection of this approach: in the same article in Tribune, Orwell argues that 'left-wing literary criticism has not been wrong in insisting on the importance of subject-matter. It may not even have been wrong, considering the age we live in, in demanding that literature shall be first and foremost propaganda.'[4] Orwell, as

---

1. 'Propagandist Critics', NEW, X (1936), 230.
2. WP, p.255.
3. Tribune, 4 June 1943, p.19.
4. 'Literature and the Left', Tribune, 4 June 1943, p.19.

contributor and as literary editor, seems to have found the policy of Tribune particularly congenial for its effort, during the mid-1940s, to combine a 'radical Socialist policy with a respect for freedom of speech and a civilized attitude towards literature and the arts.'[1] Elsewhere, particularly in the second part of The Road to Wigan Pier and in Keep the Aspidistra Flying, Orwell satirises the social milieu he associates with the socialist movement of the 1930s. Orwell's attacks in the 1940s on the abuses of language in political writing obviously include Marxist political writing and, to some extent, therefore, Marxist writing on literature, though there is no explicit reference to the language of Marxist literary criticism.[2] So Orwell's criticisms of Marxist and socialist attitudes to literature are substantial and strongly expressed. Yet these reservations coexist with a use of some elements of Marxist literary criticism and with a qualified acceptance of some of the principle tenets of the Marxist approach to literature.

8. Implications

So far both positive and negative responses to Marxist literary criticism have been evident in Orwell's work: there has been evidence that he has drawn upon this criticism, and, more importantly, that he has used it in the development of his own literary criticism, and also that he was vehemently critical of the inadequacies and dishonesties of this work. A third type of response is also discernible: the ethical and political values to which Orwell is committed, in particular the central liberal values of freedom of expression and of conduct, are altered by his

---

1. 'As I Pleased', Tribune, 31 January 1947, p.19.
2. A series of articles on the topic of political language culminates in 'Politics and the English Language', Horizon, XIII (1946), 252-265.

acquaintance with this body of work. In the previous chapter, the treatment of liberal figures in Orwell's writing in the period following Coming Up For Air and Inside the Whale was analysed. They were usually writers, often, like Orwell, essayists or journalists. The more theoretical, but still parallel, debate about the nature and function of the writer, his relation to liberty and to liberalism, will now be traced.

As the essay 'The Prevention of Literature' makes clear, Orwell's clarification of his concept of freedom of expression is connected with his opposition to aspects of Marxism. In this essay, Orwell defines liberty of expression in terms of the scope for opposition to public opinion: 'freedom of the Press, if it means anything at all, means the freedom to criticise and oppose.' The essay's opening reference to Milton's Areopagitica establishes a connection between Orwell's defence of liberty of expression and a text associated with the origins of liberalism. As this reference is also part of his technique of beginning an essay with an anecdote, its importance should not be exaggerated; the main substance of the essay's relation to liberalism consists in its general argument, not in its explicit references. Orwell identifies two principal threats to intellectual liberty. There is 'the general drift of society ... the concentration of the Press in the hands of a few rich men, the grip of monopoly on radio and the films .... 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.' This general tendency of society is the most immediate threat to truthfulness, but, in this essay, Orwell is chiefly concerned with the second threat to liberty, the declining desire for liberty amongst the English intelligentsia, and, specifically, the English Communist intelligentsia: 'In Communist

literature the attack on intellectual liberty is usually masked by oratory about 'petty-bourgeois individualism', 'the illusions of nineteenth-century liberalism', etc.'. He concludes that these attacks on intellectual liberty are simply expedient, that their covert purpose is the defence of the U.S.S.R., and that therefore they 'are merely a forensic device, the aim of which is to make the perversion of history seem respectable.'[1]

Besides pointing to the abuse of these Marxist terms for expedient purposes, Orwell also constructs an opposing definition of intellectual liberty: 'Freedom of the intellect means the freedom to report what one has seen, heard, and felt.'[2] This definition of intellectual freedom is related to the idea of the responsibility of the writer to be true to his sensual and moral experience, which pervades his work. The concept of authenticity is accompanied by a demand that language should, in a sense, also be authentic, that a word should have a direct and unambiguous relation to its referent, that language should not obstruct the reporting of experience.[3] Part of Orwell's criticism of political language in general, and, in 'The Prevention of Literature', of Communist language in particular, is that it does not have this direct reference and is not, therefore, meaningful: 'words of abuse such as 'romantic and 'sentimental' ... since they do not have any agreed meaning, are difficult to answer.'[4]

Orwell's criticisms of political language are a sign of a more general disagreement over the status of language: Marxist critics tended to see language and consciousness as inseparable and to argue from this that, as

---

1. 'The Prevention of Literature', Polemic, No.2 (March 1946), 4-14 (pp.4-6).
2. 'The Prevention of Literature', p.6.
3. 'Politics and the English Language', Horizon, XIII (1946), 252-265 is again the clearest example of this demand.
4. 'The Prevention of Literature', p.6.

language belongs to a society rather than an individual, individual consciousness is also socially formed.[1] In contrast, Orwell describes language as an instrument for the expression of individual consciouness, though, both in its image and in its use, language has a more autonomous role in his work than this description of it as an instrument would suggest. This disagreement over the status of language is never explicitly registered but it is apparent, in a modified form, in Nineteen Eighty-Four. Orwell's concept of language demands that there is a reality prior to, and outside of, language; the Marxist account of language implies that consciousness is modified by language. In Nineteen Eighty-Four, O'Brien asserts that 'reality exists ... only in the mind of the Party, which is collective and immortal'[2], and the manipulation of history and science by the Party bears out this claim. The language of the society of Nineteen Eighty-Four, 'Newspeak', which also resembles the bare style advocated by socialist realism, has as its aim the narrowing of 'the range of thought'[3], that is, the reduction of human consciousness to a peculiarly restricted language.

The grounds for Orwell's criticisms of the Marxist treatment of language and consciousness, where he does not consider them as simply invalidated by their expedient use, place him within the empiricist tradition exemplified by Locke's An Essay Concerning Human Understanding and, contemporary with Orwell, by A.J. Ayer's Language, Truth and Logic (1936)[4], though there is no evidence of any direct derivation. Orwell shares with this tradition the concept of language as an instrument of expression, rather than as constitutive of consciousness. Two further important similarities stem from this shared concept of language: there is a suspicion of language which

---

1. For instance, Alick West, Crisis and Criticism (1937), pp. 97-105.
2. NEF, p.250.
3. NEF, p.54.
4. Crick, p.325 records Orwell's personal acquaintance with A.J. Ayer, and Ayer's noting of Orwell's complete lack of interest in philosophy.

is not referential, does not have a verifiable meaning, and, consequent upon this, a claim that disputes can be clarified, if not resolved, by the elucidation of the terms of the dispute.[1] Orwell's definition of language in these terms is sharpened by his opposition to Communist language and arguments.

In 'The Prevention of Literature', Orwell perceives two threats to intellectual liberty: the general pressure of the growth of monopoly capitalism, and the totalitarian tendencies of the English Communist intelligentsia; in Nineteen Eighty-Four, these two threats are ambiguously combined. His sense of this dual threat leads to a curious omission from 'The Prevention of Literature': liberty of the intellect is defended without much reference to its customary partner, liberty of conduct. The historical growth of social restrictions upon individual autonomy of action, recorded in Coming Up For Air, is not as open to change by persuasion as the totalitarian tendencies of the English intelligentsia are. Liberty of the intellect can, therefore, be defended from its intellectual critics, whilst - though in 'The Prevention of Literature' this is apparent only in its omission - freedom of action is felt to be constrained by other pressures.

'The Prevention of Literature' defends intellectual liberty from the Marxist attack upon it as a form of 'individualism'. A good deal of the Marxist writing of the 1930s is concerned to attack individualism, and, specifically, the 'bourgeois illusion' that liberty consists in the absence of restraints imposed by society. At the heart of this attack upon individualism is the contention that this idea of liberty of expression and of conduct is closely associated with economic liberty.

---

1. A.J. Ayer, Language, Truth and Logic (1936), passim and especially pp. 40-65; and John Locke, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1690), Book III, 'Of Words'.

This concept of liberty is seen as peculiar to capitalism, and as incompatible with communism.[1] The association of capitalism and the Protestant and liberal stress on the primacy of the individual conscience extends beyond Marxist writing of this period: it is, for instance, the basic thesis, albeit heavily qualified, of R.H. Tawney's influential book, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (1926), though there is no evidence that Orwell was directly familiar with this work.[2] A similar association is made by V.F. Calverton in The Passing of the Gods (1934) which was reviewed by Orwell for The Adelphi: he acknowledges Calverton's Marxism and notes his argument for 'the simultaneous and allied development of Christianity and capitalism, with their individualist stress.'[3] If an indivisible association between civil and economic liberty is accepted, if both types of liberty are taken to be part of the 'bourgeois illusion', then the central value of liberalism, freedom of individual thought and conduct, is incompatible with socialism.

---

1. The theme of 'individualism' is far too widespread in the Marxist writing of this period to be fully documented. As Orwell notes in 'The Prevention of Literature', Polemic, No.2 (March 1946), 4-14, it is used simply as a term of abuse. Examples of this can be found in Left Review: a review of Back from the U.S.S.R. repeatedly attacks 'Gide the Individualist' for his emotional attachment to non-conformity, Pat Sloan, 'The Two André Gides', Left Review, III (1937), 242-244. James Hanley, after being praised for his attention to detail in Grey Children (1937), is criticised as 'a dogmatic individualist, who appears to hate all forms of organisation - Labour Party, Communist Party, I.L.P., and social service centres - about equally.', T.L. Hodgkin, 'Novels and Social Change', Left Review, III (1937), 690-692 (p.691); this is quite unfair to Hanley's book. Stephen Spender, Forward from Liberalism (1937) is attacked on similar grounds, Randall Swingler, 'Spender's Approach to Communism', Left Review, III (1937), 110-113, and specifically for the inadequacy of his idea of individual freedom. More substantial accounts of the 'bourgeois illusion', of personal liberty independent of society, are contained in Christopher Caudwell, Illusion and Reality (1937), which takes as its epigraph Engels's aphorism, 'Freedom is the recognition of necessity', and in Alick West, Crisis and Criticism (1937), pp. 52-53 and passim.

2. Ross Terrill, R.H. Tawney and His Times: Socialism as Fellowship (1974), provides the fullest available account of Orwell's relations with R.H. Tawney, and passim, notes some of the similarities and differences between their thought.

3. Review of The Passing of the Gods by V.F. Calverton, Adelphi, X(1935), 315.

Where Orwell makes this collocation of Puritanism, liberalism, and capitalism, it need not, of course, be directly derived from Marxism, though considering the prevalence of Marxist thought in England in this period, and his interest in this work, it is likely to be connected with it. A particularly important instance of this collocation occurs in 'Inside the Whale': 'What is quite obviously happening, war or no war, is the break-up of laissez-faire capitalism and of the liberal Christian culture.'[1] Examples of this association recur in Orwell's work during the 1940s: a similar passage to that quoted from 'Inside the Whale' occurs in a talk broadcast in 1941, 'Literature and Totalitarianism': 'It is obvious that the period of free capitalism is coming to an end ... With that the economic liberty of the individual, and to a great extent his liberty to do what he likes, to choose his own work, to move to and fro across the surface of the earth, comes to an end.'[2] In this passage, Orwell is reiterating a principal theme of the earlier Coming Up For Air: since the late Victorian and Edwardian period, the possibilities for individual choice and fulfillment have been narrowing: 'in this life we lead - I don't mean human life in general, I mean life in this particular age and this particular country - we don't do the things we want to do.'[3] There is no room for the liberal values of individual autonomy and privacy, nor liberty and rationality, in the economically collective society of Nineteen Eighty-Four, though it is not only the economic basis of Oceanic society which defeats them. Orwell's tendency to accept the ambivalent status of liberty places him in a crucial dilemma, of which he becomes increasingly conscious from 1939 onwards: the liberal values to which he is committed cannot be reconciled with socialism, cannot survive the passing of capitalism.

---

1. 'ITW', ITW, p.184.
2. 'Literature and Totalitarianism', Listener, XXV (1941), 882.
3. CUFA, p.99

The sense that the writer is necessarily a liberal and an autonomous individual is evident in both 'Inside the Whale', and in his journalism of the 1940s. More general statements of the relation between liberalism and literature also occur in Orwell's work during the 1940s. The argument of 'Inside the Whale', that literature is dependent upon individual intellectual independence, is taken up again in 1941, in 'Literature and Totalitarianism': 'We live in an age in which the autonomous individual is ceasing to exist - or, perhaps one ought to say, in which the individual is ceasing to have the illusion of being autonomous. Now, in all that we say about literature, and (above all) in all that we say about criticism, we instinctively take the autonomous individual for granted.'[1] The rephrasing of the loss of individual autonomy in terms of the end of an illusion is a sign of qualified assent to the Marxist thesis that bourgeois freedom is a disguise for a real absence of liberty; in general, however, bourgeois freedom is taken to be real. The distinction made between criticism and literature needs to be understood in the context of Orwell's work as a whole: criticism is taken to be always dependent upon individual intellectual honesty, whereas some forms of literature, particularly verse, can be properly composed by a group rather than an individual.[2] A close sense of the relation between liberalism and literature is also apparent in another article in 1941, 'English Writing in Total War': 'We are accustomed to talking about 'eternal values' in connection with literature, but in fact literature as we know it is the product of liberal capitalism and may be inseparable from it.'[3] Two aspects of this comment are worth noting: first, that the tension between the aesthetic, and here moral pole, represented by 'eternal values',

---

1. 'Literature and Totalitarianism', Listener, XXV (1941), 882.
2. Orwell frequently makes this distinction between prose and verse. One of the most important instances is in 'The Prevention of Literature', Polemic, No.2 (March 1946), 10: 'above all, good verse, unlike good prose is not necessarily an individual product.'
3. 'English Writing in Total War', New Republic, 14 July 1941, p.57.

and a view of literature as the product of a particular society, is present here, and, secondly, that the double-edged status of liberalism, its simultaneous association with both capitalism and literature, is also apparent.

A more extended statement of a similar dilemma occurs in Tribune in 1944: 'if one thinks of the artist as an Ishmael, an autonomous individual who owes nothing to society, then the golden age of the artist was the age of capitalism ... Laissez-faire capitalism is passing away, and the independent status of the artist must necessarily disappear with it.'[1] Prose literature in general, and the novel in particular, are, for Orwell, most closely dependent upon individual honesty and sincerity. The novel is, therefore, tied up with these liberal values and with the capitalist era: in 'Inside the Whale' it is characterised as 'practically a Protestant form of art; it is a product of the free mind, of the autonomous individual.' This view of the novel is used to explain the absence of fiction of any value from the English literature of the 1930s: the atmosphere of political orthodoxy is foreign to the writing of novels, 'the most anarchical of all forms of literature.'[2] A similar view of the novel as a form is evident in a later article in Tribune: the novel is 'essentially a post-Reformation form of literature at which on the whole Catholics have not excelled.'[3] The idea that the novel is the characteristic form of the capitalist era is present in Marxist criticism of this period.[4] Orwell's sense of the close connection between literature

---

1. 'As I Please', Tribune, 8 September 1944, pp. 10-11.
2. 'ITW', ITW, p.173.
3. 'As I Please', Tribune, 23 June 1944, p.12.
4. For example, David Daiches, Literature and Society, p.143; Christopher Caudwell, Illusion and Reality, p.21; Ralph Fox, The Novel and the People (1937), passim.

and liberalism is also intensified by observation of the effects on literature of the development of Fascism and Soviet Communism.

Whilst defending intellectual liberty in 'The Prevention of Literature', 1946, Orwell continues to make the association between liberalism and prose literature. This association is at the core of the essays argument: 'Prose literature as we know it is the product of rationalism, of the Protestant centuries, of the autonomous individual .... In the future it is possible that a new kind of literature, not involving individual feeling or truthful observation, may arise, but no such thing is at present imaginable. It seems much likelier that if the liberal culture that we have lived in since the Renaissance actually comes to an end, the literary art will perish with it.'[1] It is important to note how many crucial concepts and terms are collocated in this passage: rationalism, Protestantism, the autonomous individual, and individual feeling and observation, many of the values at the core of Orwell's work, are all connected; they are then implicitly included in the term 'liberal culture'. At an earlier date, in 'Inside the Whale', he had been prepared to speculate on the culture which will arise at the end of liberalism, now this speculation is largely refused and it is asserted that literature will simply come to an end. This change of emphasis, the refusal to speculate beyond liberalism, confirms an underlying shift of attitudes: the commitment to liberalism is more firmly and extensively stated, even whilst it is acknowledged to be historically rooted and in historical decline; the problem of survival remains unresolved, except by persuasion. At times, as at this point, Orwell tends to share, though

---

1. 'The Prevention of Literature', Polemic, No.2 (March 1946), 11.

never to any great extent, the pervasive notion of the overriding importance of the likely effect upon culture in the evaluation of political developments and decisions. It should be clear from this survey that he is disturbed by the ambiguous status of liberal values and their association with literature, and that, in his journalism and critical writing, this sense is most frequent during the early 1940s, but continues and evolves as late as 'The Prevention of Literature' and Nineteen Eighty-Four.

Earlier Orwell's response at a political level to the complicated issue of liberalism and individualism, and their incompatibility with contemporary forms of socialism, was traced: there was a prolonged attempt, which remained only an attempt, to redefine socialism in terms which included and safeguarded the values of liberalism. There is a parallel response on a more literary plane to the particular dilemma posed by the association of liberalism with capitalism, and with the survival of literature: an account of the function of the writer is developed which includes a distinction of a man's activity as a writer from his activity as a citizen.

This distinction begins to be properly developed in 'Inside the Whale', but can be connected with the earlier distinctions of temperament, Tory or anarchist, from political commitment, to socialism, in The Road to Wigan Pier. The split between temperament and actions advocated develops into the separation of the writer and the citizen, of truth to inner feelings from the necessities of public action. In 'Inside the Whale', Orwell asserts that 'On the whole the literary history of the thirties seems to justify the opinion that a writer does well to keep out of politics.' Some uncertainty or reservation is revealed by the use of 'seems', and

the grounds for the assertion are immediately particularised: 'For any writer who accepts or partially accepts the discipline of a political party is sooner or later faced with the alternative : toe the line, or shut up.'[1] It is conformity to the discipline and doctrine of a political party which Orwell regards as deadly to the writer who, as a liberal in his capacity as a writer, must defend his own intellectual autonomy; self-motivated political action and argument is permissible, as it does not interfere with the writer's independent judgment. Like any other man, the writer shares in the general loss of autonomy of conduct recorded in Coming Up For Air and 'Inside the Whale'; unlike other men, the writer is intimately attached to autonomy of thought and freedom of expression. In 'Inside the Whale', freedom of thought is separated from freedom of conduct, the temperament and values of the writer from the public action in which he is involved as a citizen: an injunction to passivity of action coexists with a defence of intellectual independence. The strength of the injunction to passivity in 'Inside the Whale' is likely to be connected with Orwell's political stance in the immediate pre-war period: the equation of 'bourgeois democracy' with Fascism does not leave much room for constructive action from within bourgeois democracy.[2]

A later article in Tribune in 1946, after Orwell had accepted the value of defending British democracy, is critical of Miller's passivity: 'those who talk in the same vein as Miller always take care to stay inside bourgeois-democratic society, making use of its protection while disclaiming responsibility for it: on the other hand, when a real choice has to be made, the quietist attitude never seems to survive.' Orwell's

---

1. 'ITW', ITW, p.172.
2. I am assuming the dating of the composition of 'ITW' argued for in the Appendix.

own more positive position at this date is evident in a further comment on Miller's stance: 'Either one must genuinely keep out of politics, or one must recognise that politics is the science of the possible.'[1] Orwell's attitude to Miller's quietism changes, but the distinction, nascent in 'Inside the Whale', between a man as a writer and as a citizen, between the free intelligence and the man acting and acted upon, is developed during the 1940s.

A distinction between the temperament and values of a writer and the political stances he is forced to adopt is made in 1944 with regard to Anatole France: 'one ought not really to class him as a Socialist. He was willing to work for Socialism, even to deliver lectures in it in draughty halls, and he knew it was necessary and inevitable, but it is doubtful whether he subjectively wanted it .... In a crisis he was ready to identify himself with the working class, but the thought of a Utopian future depressed him ....Temperamentally he was not a Socialist but a Radical.'[2] There is a revealing verbal echo of this comment, which adds to the evidence that Orwell's political position and self-image were similar to that attributed to France, in his most extended development of this distinction of temperament from allegiance, in an essay written in 1948, 'Writers and Levathan': '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 <u>not as a writer</u>. 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

---

1. 'Words and Henry Miller', <u>Tribune</u>, 22 February 1946, p.15.
2. 'As I Please', <u>Tribune</u>, 23 June 1944, p.11.

else, he should be prepared to deliver lectures in draughty halls.' The writer should not subordinate his writing to a political party as this will involve him in dishonesty; at the same time a writer can, if he is so motivated, write about politics and urge people to political action, but this must be done from an independent position. A man's responsibilities as a citizen are sharply distinguished from his responsibility to himself as a writer: 'It is reasonable, for example, to be willing to fight in a war because one thinks the war ought to be won, and at the same time to refuse to write war propaganda.'[1] The distinction of the writer from the citizen is not, as Orwell acknowledges, very satisfactory: it requires a division of a man's activities, almost of the man himself, where, in practice, they are likely to be forced into contact with each other.

It is possible that Orwell is here drawing upon his experiences as an employee of the British Broadcasting Corporation during the Second War: in his work for the Indian service, he had tried to preserve his intellectual independence and, as he was to advocate in 'Writers and Leviathan', to avoid mention of areas in which there was disagreement between his opinions and the demands of political necessity.[2] However, in general, the activities of the writer and the citizen are divided from each other to a greater extent in 'Writers and Leviathan' than is consistent with the fact of his earlier employment with the B.B.C.: the extreme duality advocated in 'Writers and Leviathan' may be partly a reaction from his experience of the wartime propaganda of the B.B.C.

The distinction of The Road to Wigan Pier between a man's political

---

1. 'Writers and Leviathan', Politics and Letters, No.4, Summer 1948, pp. 39-40. Orwell's article was one of a series, 'Critics and Leviathan', in Politics and Letters.
2. See 'B.B.C. Internal Memorandum', CEJL, II, No.38, pp. 244-245.

temperament and the loyalties he is forced to adopt, becomes, in 'Inside the Whale', a general distinction between the value of freedom of thought to which the writer is necessarily committed, and the determination by society to which he must submit. In 'Writers and Leviathan', the distinction emerges most clearly: a man's intellectual independence as a writer is distinguished from his co-operation as a citizen with a group, whether this group be a state or a political party.

The creation of this dichotomy of the writer and the citizen enables Orwell to resolve the dilemma felt over the ambivalent value of liberalism: liberalism had been seen both as essential to literature and as associated with capitalism. His perception of the historical situation is also important: laissez-faire capitalism was taken to be nearing its end, though Orwell later retreats from the apocalyptic phrophecies of 'Inside the Whale', and with the end of capitalism, liberal values would also disappear. In a response to both the double-edged status of liberalism and to the historical threat to individual independence, he breaks the association between liberalism and capitalism by separating freedom of thought from freedom of action, the writer from the citizen. The distinction of freedom of thought from freedom of action, upon which this resolution is founded, is tenuous. Indeed, Orwell himself persistently questions elsewhere in his work how far freedom of thought can survive the disappearance of freedom of action, a freedom which had been enjoyed under capitalism. It should also be recognised that this is a considerable diminution of the original liberal idea of individual autonomy. Orwell himself is not entirely satisfied with it but presents as the best available solution: 'To suggest that a creative writer, in a time of conflict, must split his life into two compartments, may seem defeatist or frivolous: yet in

practice I do not see what else he can do.'[1] The distinction itself can threaten the values which it is intended to preserve: it tends to break down the single continuous self on which Orwell's moral and intellectual values ultimately depend. The writer's commitment to intellectual independence is balanced against the necessities of public action, rather than reconciled with them.

The separation of the writer from the citizen is also entirely opposite to the Marxist demand that the artist should unite his writing with his political life and break from his bourgeois attachment to independence. Christopher Caudwell provides a firmly stated instance of this demand in Illusion and Reality. In a criticism of Day Lewis, Auden and Spender, he calls for assimilation, not mere alliance, with the proletariat: 'They announce themselves as prepared to merge with the proletariat, to accept its theory and its organisation, in every field of concrete living except that of art. Now this reservation - unimportant to an ordinary man - is absolutely disastrous for an artist, precisely because his most important function is to be an artist. It leads to a gradual separation between his living and his art - his living as a proletarian diverging increasingly from his art as a bourgeois.'[2] For Caudwell, this separation leads to distortion of both the artist's writing and his life. Starting from some shared assumptions and problems, Orwell's liberalism, his unswerving commitment to intellectual independence, drives him to an opposite position. This disagreement points to an important contradiction in his work: between the methods he uses in his criticism and the values he endorses.

---

1. 'Writers and Leviathan', Politics and Letters, No.4, Summer 1948, p.40.
2. Caudwell, pp. 318-321; quotation, p.321.

The separation of the writer and the citizen is crucial to an understanding of Orwell's work as a whole, and of the profound contradictions within it. The particular formulation of the writer and the citizen is connected with the attempt to preserve the values of liberalism for the writer; it is also related to a series of conceptual divisions within his work. Some of these divisions are explicitly stated by Orwell and others are implicit. The most fundamental of these distinctions, often reiterated in various forms and contexts, is between the inner and outer vision and self, between the self as it knows itself and the self as it is known to others. This distinction roughly corresponds to the contrast, within Orwell's work and, generally, between liberal and Marxist thought, between the establishing of personal identity through reflection on sensation, thought, and memory[1], and the treatment of personal identity through its social manifestation in terms particularly of social class.

A further division, which stems from this contrasting treatment of identity, is between the self in stasis, arrested at a point of time, and the self as it continues to be changed by society[2]. The creation of a continuity between these versions of the self, between the private self and the public action it undergoes, is often problematic: the connection of motive and action is sometimes obscure in Orwell's fiction and documentary work. For instance, the explanation for the presence of the witness-narrator in the documentary work is often perfunctory. Motivation is a continual

---

1. The treatment of identity in Orwell's work is discussed in Chapter 3.

2. Orwell makes this distinction in connection with Dickens's omission of work from his novels: 'Dickens sees human beings with the most intense vividness, but he sees them in private life, as 'characters', not as functional members of society; that is to say, he sees them statically.' ('CD', ITW, p.56). A similar distinction forms part of Orwell's image of himself in 'Why I Write' in the contrast between his 'nature' and the changes society has forced upon him, Gangrel, No.4, October 1946, pp. 5-10.

problem in Orwell's fiction: episodes often originate in accidents, and are only loosely connected with each other.[1] The tension between private and public enters into Orwell's accounts of his process of composition: private, pre-linguistic experience is translated into socially shared language and literary forms which are liable to corrupt the meaning of the experience, but which are also indispensable to its communication.

For an understanding of Orwell's work, the most important of this series of distinctions is that between values and action. It is never stated in these terms by Orwell but is implicit in the creation of the distinction between a man as a writer and as a citizen. The ethical values to which he is committed remain fairly constant throughout his career as a writer, though they are refined and more sharply defined as his work develops: he is always committed to a belief in freedom of conscience and intellect, in the value of pragmatic judgment, sincerity, integrity, compassion, tolerance and privacy, all vaguely covered by the term 'decency'. The political stances taken up to preserve these values are subject to alteration, and, in the case of Orwell's attitude to war against Fascism, sudden alteration. They often bear an oblique relation to his constant ethical values: they do not proceed directly from these values, but are designed to preserve them. Occasionally, actions clearly at odds with a particular ethical value are advocated in order to protect other values: for instance, the argument of 'A Hanging', 1931, against capital punishment is contradicted by the proposal, at a much later date, of The Lion and the Unicorn (1941) that a socialist government will 'shoot traitors.'[2] It is also difficult

---

1. Crick, p.167 points out that A Clergyman's Daughter tends to break down into a series of studies of closed societies, but does not make a general point from this. Coming Up For Air depends on a series of accidents and misinterpretations for its action: in this case it is part of the explicit concern for the impersonality of modern methods of communication, the radio and the newspaper.
2. L&U, p.112.

to see how the intolerant and intemperate tone of much of his early war-time journalism stems from the simultaneous commitment to rational judgment and persuasion: his journalism of this period is intended to preserve these values; it does not embody them.

Commentators on Orwell's work have found it difficult to establish a consistent political position, or a coherent political development, from his political writings, or have simply found this work superficial and unsatisfying.[1] If the distinction between the writer and the citizen, and the related distinctions from which this final formulation grows, and with which it is connected, had been given proper attention, the source of this difficulty would have been recognised. Most important of all, this distinction enables Orwell to be committed to the values of liberalism as a writer, without endorsing the economically individualist values often associated with liberalism. It also enables him to remain temperamentally liberal, and liberal as a writer, and, simultaneously, to accept the paramount need for socialism, to write independently on behalf of socialism. Before the duality of writer and citizen became rigid, it allowed him to join, though not to submit to, organisations, such as the I.L.P. and the B.B.C., which would help protect the values to which he remained committed. The extent of the implicit and explicit divisions in Orwell's work, between values and methods, temperament and commitments, make it pointless to search for a unity or coherence which does not exist, and criticism is mistaken if it does. At the same time, it ought to be recognised what an uneasy and unstable balance he has contrived, at least in theory, between his life as a writer and as a man in society. There are similar tensions in his work between his ethical values and his political commitments, and critics have been correct in pointing to these difficulties.

---

1. For instance, Dwight Macdonald, Partisan Review, March 1942, pp. 166-169, in Critical Heritage, pp. 191-194; and George Woodcock, The Writer and Politics (1948), pp. 120-124.

There is independent development in Orwell's proposals for political action. In general, however, it is crucial to recognise that the political measures he advocates are designed to guarantee certain values: the political measures advocated do not necessarily stem directly from these ethical values, and the values apparently implied by the measures advocated are secondary to the firmly and consistently held ethical values. To speak of Orwell as a liberal or as a socialist is misleading: the fashioning of a distinction between the writer and the citizen allows him to be simultaneously, though uneasily, committed to both sets of values. If any formulation is to be chosen,it would be best to speak of him as a liberal committed to socialism.

It has been possible to arrive at this description of Orwell's political position by examining his response to Marxism. He was seen to be largely without direct knowledge of Marx's own writings but quite well acquainted with contemporary English Marxism. His response to this work is complex and mixes approval with criticism, objecting to the subordination of literature to political ends but endorsing a more sophisticated version of its technique of analysis of class attitudes. The most important resemblance lies in the adoption of a similar critical method rather than in specific debts, although there are also several instances of these. Literature is discussed in terms of the writer's position in society, with special attention to the historical development of social classes, and far more attention is paid to social and political content than to form. Despite the prominence given to these considerations, aesthetic merit is usually reserved a place outside of them. The conflict between methods and values to which this reservation testifies is also suggested by a comparison of Orwell's defence of the writer's intellectual independence with the Marxist demand that the writer should unite his art with his political

life as a man in society. In its turn, this conflict can be connected to his complex political position with its advocacy of socialist measures to preserve or vivify essentially liberal values.

CHAPTER 3

THE IDEA OF THE WITNESS IN ORWELL'S WORK

1. Introduction

The previous two chapters have concentrated on the political and critical content of Orwell's work and have traced the chronological development and interrelation of the various strands within these areas. Little attention has yet been given to the forms of literature which he uses and to which the previous analysis can be connected. The strongest element of his relation to liberalism, from which other components originated, was a commitment to a liberal idea of self. This commitment made itself felt in his treatment of liberal figures, and its strength and its complexity were also discernible in the distinction of the writer from the citizen, the attempt to preserve the writer's liberal sanity and judgment. This idea of the self is also closely connected to the forms of his writing, to the type of narration and the character of the narrator, to the methods of observation and types of reasoning employed. It also influences his more explicit aesthetic statements on the relation between thought and language, between expression and sincerity, and particularly between style and honesty in political writing. Its influence is especially evident in the character of the witness narrator of his reportage of the 1930s.

Orwell's response to the idea of self found in the Marxism known to him is more ambivalent. He was seen to be dissatisfied with the treatment of subjective motivation by Marxism, with its reduction of the self to

economic or class motives. At the same time, his literary criticism in particular uses a method refined from Marxism and emphasises the influence of society, including its economic class structure, upon the self and upon belief. This idea of a social self contrasts with the self associated with liberalism, both in his work and outside of it, which values independent judgment achieved by standing apart from society. The meanings Orwell attaches to the variants of 'liberal' themselves showed movements from a social to an ahistorical emphasis, with, for example, 'nineteenth-century Liberal' and 'liberal' at either extreme. The witness narrator of the reportage tends to move between two analogous perspectives, from involvement in the reported action to detachment and judgment, and attempts to combine these two perspectives at points in the narratives. The perspective of detachment and judgment is part of Orwell's idea of liberalism, and can be connected to some of its other important components, such as fairness and objectivity. Observation from the outside can be particularly closely linked to the conception of truth as something outside the self, something to be discovered, which is also found in his idea of liberalism. This method of observation does have the danger that the distance between the observing subject and reported world can inhibit sympathy between them. In turn, involvement in the reported action, and the presentation of the witness as having a particular position in society, can be associated with the social self found in Marxism. Important aspects of liberalism and Marxism, then, meet each other in the witness narrator. Analysis of the nature of their encounter, whether they are comfortably or awkwardly combined, or whether they give way to each other in turn, should therefore extend an understanding of the relation between liberalism and Marxism in Orwell's work.

There has been some critical discussion of the importance of the activity of the witness within Orwell's work. Mary McCarthy touches on this when she asserts that his writing was most 'delicate and exact' in his early period, when he was a '"pure" recording instrument.'[1] Raymond Williams offers a similar but more developed argument. He contrasts Orwell's 'documentary' works with his novels of the thirties: within both forms there is an intermediary who has experiences similar to Orwell's own, yet in the novels the figure of the intermediary, of Dorothy or of Comstock, is not himself, and, particularly in A Clergyman's Daughter, and, to a lesser extent, in Keep the Aspidistra Flying, is largely passive. In the 'documentary' works the figure of the intermediary observer is Orwell, 'a successfully created character in every real sense.' The creation of this observer in 'Shooting an Elephant' enables Orwell to write 'directly and powerfully about his whole experience' in a '"non-fictional" form' in Homage to Catalonia and The Road to Wigan Pier.[2] Williams differs from McCarthy in the emphasis on the character of the intermediate observer and in his preference for the documentary work of the later thirties: McCarthy's criticism of the persona of Orwell is coupled with a preference for the earlier work, associated with Down and Out in Paris and London, in which this persona is not fully developed. Alex Zwerdling points to the education of the innocent, ignorant witness of 'A Hanging' and discerns a similar process in Orwell's development from innocence to knowledge in The Road to Wigan Pier. The reader's experience is analogous to that of the witness: the reader moves from innocence to knowledge through Orwell's intense reports of experience.[3]

However the critical attention to Orwell's use of the witness has been

---

1. Mary McCarthy, The Writing on the Wall (1970), p.167.
2. Raymond Williams, Orwell, pp. 47-53.
3. Alex Zwerdling, Orwell and the Left (1974), pp. 133-136.

insufficient. There is a lack of a coherent account of the development of the concept of the witness in his work, particularly with regard to the shorter journalism. Nor have the various implications of this concept, its relation to Orwell's liberalism and characteristic methods of argument, to the visual bias of his imagination and observation, and to his preference for realism and transparent prose, been adequately examined.

2. Orwell and the documentary movement

To some extent, the digressive and purportedly autobiographical narrator of much of Orwell's work can be fairly associated with the essay as a form. Yet this type of narration is most fully represented in his longer works of reportage, rather than his essays. In view of their historical context, it might also be thought that the activity of the witness is simply an aspect of the documentary form, and specifically of the documentary movement of the 1930s. However, there is no evidence to show that Orwell considered himself part of this documentary movement, and his use of similar forms differs substantially from that proposed and enacted by this movement.

The chronology and character of Orwell's references to 'documentary' are revealing. There is a casual and implicit reference to the documentary film, in The Road to Wigan Pier: 'In Wigan the competition among unemployed people for the waste coal has become so fierce that it has led to an extraordinary custom called "scrambling for the coal" which is well worth seeing. Indeed I rather wonder that it has never been filmed.'[1] Apart from this Orwell does not refer to 'documentary' until 1940, after

---

1. WP, p.101. Erik Barnouw, Documentary: A History of the Non-Fiction Film (New York, 1974), pp. 85-100 gives an account of the British documentary film in the 1930s.

the composition of the longer pieces of autobiography and reportage of the 1930s. These references are generally disparaging; Orwell defends his own method of treatment of popular culture, the examination of typical texts, by contrast in 'Boys' Weeklies': 'probably the content of these shops is the best available indication of what the mass of the English people really feels and thinks. Certainly nothing half as revealing exists in documentary form.'[1] In 1946 Orwell refers more sympathetically to 'documentary': 'It is questionable whether Mr Mark Benney's book should be described as a novel, though it is cast in fiction form. Perhaps documentary novel, counterpart of the documentary film, would be the right name for it.'[2] The use of the term 'documentary novel' is tentative and, apparently, new to Orwell. The term can be loosely used to describe some of his work of the thirties yet it is clear that he did not consider it as 'documentary' at the time. Indeed, no generic term can be traced in his writing for those works of the 1930s, from 'A Hanging' (1931) to Homage to Catalonia (1938), which can be grouped together by their form.

A specific aspect of the concern for documentary in the 1930s, which receives some attention from Orwell, is Mass Observation. Though this movement was organized in early 1937[3], he does not refer to it until 1940. He then comments on the limitations of its method of observation, of civilian morale in wartime England, which 'is bound to be coloured to some extent by preconceived opinions'[4], in this case the failure to allow for patriotism; yet the work of Mass Observers, or something of that kind, is of vital importance, especially in wartime. In his subsequent journalism

---

1. ITW, p.90.
2. 'Black Country' (Review of Charity Main by Mark Benney), Observer, 10 March 1946, p.3.
3. See Samuel Hynes, The Auden Generation: Literature and Politics in England in the 1930s. (1976), p.279.
4. 'We are Observed'. T&T. XXI (1940). 225-226.

Orwell uses information gathered by Mass Observation to confirm his own experience or arguments with regard to such subjects as the common misunderstanding of official language[1], the 'elaborate social ritual'[2] of Northern pubs, or the relation between changes in material standards and the birth-rate.[3] The information from Mass Observation is used in confirmation of, or in addition to, Orwell's own judgment; it is not used as independent evidence and is in particular instances found unsatisfactory: Orwell refers to 'a brief inadequate survey' of anti-semitism in England 'made by Mass Observation a year or two ago.'[4]

Apart from his final discussion in 1947 of Mass Observation he offers little other comment on its methods. In this article Orwell reiterates earlier comments on Mass Observation: the value for democracy of a government being informed of public opinion by such an organisation, and the common misunderstanding of official language which it has revealed. He also shows some suspicion of the manner in which its surveys are financed, and refers to comments made at its inception suggesting some early acquaintance with it.[5] Orwell does show a greater, though still limited, knowledge of Mass Observation than other aspects of the documentary movement, and shares its interest in the temper and habits of the masses. Yet Orwell's own method of investigation is substantially different from that of Mass Observation: he prefers to treat society indirectly through the analysis of a characteristic text rather than directly through interviews and surveys; alternatively, he prefers to rely upon his own observations.

---

1. 'Propaganda and Demotic Speech', Persuasion, Vol.II, No.2, Summer 1944, pp. 14-18.
2. Review of The Pub and the People by Mass Observation, Listener, XXIX (1943), 89
3. See 'On Housing', Tribune, 25 January 1946, p.15.
4. 'Anti-Semitism in Britain', Contemporary Jewish Record, VIII (1945), 166.
5. 'As I Please', Tribune, 28 March 1947, p.12.

In connection with Orwell's relation to the documentary movement it is interesting to examine the periodical Fact's criticisms of Orwell. In its first number, in April 1937, the editors of Fact compared their intentions with those of the French Encyclopedists. For Fact the contemporary political and economic system of Britain did not work, and the purpose of the journal was 'to show how this is, and from that information to provide knowledge - the knowledge of how to make a much more fundamental change than the French Revolution.'[1] The documentary form was particularly, though not exclusively, suited to this purpose and a later issue of Fact in July 1937 on the theme of revolutionary writing includes an essay by Storm Jameson, one of the editors, on documents. Storm Jameson demands that the exploration and documentation of poverty should be undertaken, 'for the sake of the fact, as a medical student carries out a dissection .... His mind must remain cool; he must be able to give an objective report, neither superficial nor slickly dramatic.' For her, there is no value in middle-class writer's spiritual introspection, nor in the self-conscious attitude of such a writer to working-class life, which she parodies: 'What things I am seeing for the first time! What smells I am enduring! There is the woman raking ashes with her hands and here I am watching her.' Rather the document should be free of atmosphere and of an explicit writer's consciousness, should encompass society and express connections between apparently widely separate things; it need not, as socialist literature in general does not need to, concern itself exclusively with working-class life. Finally, such writing should be 'the literary equivalent of the documentary film.' For her, Orwell has begun this difficult task in the first half of The Road to Wigan Pier.[2]

---

1. 'Ourselves', Fact, No.1, April 1937, pp. 6-8.
2. 'Documents', Fact, No.4, July 1937, pp. 9-18 (pp. 11-12).

The criticisms of the second part of The Road to Wigan Pier implicit in these demands for the documentary form are explicit in an earlier review by Storm Jameson of The Road to Wigan Pier. Here she criticises Orwell's excessive interest in his own state of mind, in 'his load of personal spiritual needs and impulses', though the first half of The Road to Wigan Pier is praised as 'a social document as vivid, bitter and telling as one could have asked.' Orwell's excessive concentration on his own state of mind is related by Jameson to his personal history, to the distance 'between the public schoolboy turned Socialist and the socialist worker.' This concentration, as well as the triviality, despite their truth, of his attacks on middle-class socialists, places Orwell partly in collusion with the society to which Fact is opposed: she contrasts him with the authors of the other books under review: 'As enemies of society these three fall into as many grades. Hannington is Public Enemy No. 1 - he is always liable to find himself in gaol. R.M. Fox goes to jail in wartime. George Orwell has not yet, I think, been inside.'[1] With Fact we are dealing with a more politically radical aspect of the documentary movement than that associated with film, particularly with Grierson, and Mass Observation. However, the conclusions on Orwell's relation to the documentary movement are similar: it remains clear that he cannot be considered as a self-conscious part of it; his work in similar forms develops prior to Fact and to Mass Observation. The differences between Fact's criteria for documentary and his own work point to a further conclusion: that, although aspects of The Road to Wigan Pier are praised, neither this work as a whole, nor his other kindred pieces of the 1930s, can be fairly described as documentary in the particular sense given it by Fact.

---

1. 'Socialists Born and Made', Fact, No.2, May 1937, pp. 87-90.

It is possible to find some closer near-contemporary analogues to The Road to Wigan Pier than either the documentary film or Mass Observation provide. J.B. Priestley's English Journey (1934), Edwin Muir's Scottish Journey (1935), and Ellen Wilkinson's The Town that was Murdered: The Life-Story of Jarrow (1939) are all concerned with the state of Britain. In both Priestley's and Muir's books the narrator travels and investigates a series of communities: a movement essentially similar to that of Orwell as the narrator of The Road to Wigan Pier. In addition to this similarity, Muir resembles Orwell in his stress on the necessity of socialism in order to prevent further economic depressions; Muir's socialism differs from Orwell's, however, in his emphasis on the fundamentally economic nature of the problem, and of its possible solution, in contrast with Orwell's sense of the need for personal moral change. Muir refuses to investigate slums as he objects to the thrill of horror and of cold disgust such accounts are likely to arouse in their readers, but, like Orwell, he gives an account of dole money.[1] Priestley lacks Muir's and Orwell's sense of a quest and the strength of their concern for socialism, though like Orwell he gives notes on the unemployed and interests himself in their life. In a similar way to Orwell's train journey in The Road to Wigan Pier, Priestley's travel is accompanied by reflection on the contrasting states of England, of suburban and industrialised areas[2]. Ellen Wilkinson differs from Priestley, Muir, and Orwell in writing consistently from within a community; accordingly the narrator is mostly static and the treatment of Jarrow is historical without much concentration on the narrator's own experiences. The notion of typicality, which in The Road to Wigan Pier specifically includes the narrator, is here taken by the community: 'Jarrow has become the classic example of a stricken town.' Ellen Wilkinson concludes with a plea

---

1. Edwin Muir, Scottish Journey (1935), passim (p.116).
2. J.B. Priestley, English Journey (1934), pp. 280-284, 406-412, and passim.

for worker's control[1], Orwell with a call to the dispossessed middle-class.

The Town that was Murdered was published after The Road to Wigan Pier, and, though this is not true of the works of Priestly and Muir, there is also no evidence that they had any direct influence on Orwell. However, these and other works, such as James Hanley's Grey Children: A Study in Humbug and Misery (1937), an account of unemployment among coal-miners in South Wales, do indicate a general interest in the literature of social investigation, combined with political consciousness, in England in the 1930s.[2] Orwell's own work shows that he shared this general interest with these writers and with the documentary movement, but not that he was directly indebted to them, nor that they were the stimulus to this interest.

3. The development of the witness in Orwell's work

Before dealing with the various implications of the concept of the witness, it is useful to trace the chronological development of this concept within Orwell's career. The development of the witness is more immediately evident in Orwell's journalism and longer semi-autobiographical works than in his fiction. The concept emerges very early in his writing; in 1928 and 1929 he acts as a witness to imperialism in Burma, and to domestic poverty, counterposing his observation to middle-class indifference: 'Ainsi, le bourgeois aisé d'Angleterre qui ne connait rien - et préfère ne rien connaître - de la vie des pauvres, n'apprend-il rien qui puisse l'arracher à l'indifference où il se complait.'[3] Some of Orwell's earliest published

---

1. Ellen Wilkinson, The Town that was Murdered: The Life-Story of Jarrow (1939), pp. 269 and 284.
2. Orwell reviewed Grey Children in 'Our Own Have-Nots', T&T, XVIII (1937), 1588.
3. 'La Grand Misère de l'Ouvrier Brittanique - 1. Le Chomage, traduit de l'Anglais par Raoul Nicole', Progrès Civique, No.489, 29 December 1928, pp. 1726-1728.

writing in English takes the form of a report upon poverty, as with 'The Spike', 1931, which was adapted to form part of Down and Out in Paris and London. The narrator-witness of 'The Spike' is identified within the narrative as a 'gentleman'. The distance of the narrator from the tramps, implicit in his social position, finds its equivalent in the occasionally self-conscious literary tone and allusions of the report: 'emptiness of belly leaves no speculation in their souls. The world is too much with them .... a tramp's only tobacco is picked-up cigarette ends, and, like a browsing beast, he starves if he is long away from the pavement-pasture.' The narrator is partly implicated in the world on which he reports by the final action towards him which interrupts the recurrent distance of the tone with a note of disgust: 'And he put four sodden, debauched, loathely cigarette ends into my hand.'[1] Here there is a hint of the characteristic pattern of Orwell's subsequent reportage : the transition from innocence to guilt of the narrator, who becomes implicated in the world which he is observing.

'A Hanging', 1931, opens in a similar manner to 'The Spike' with a specific notation of place and of time and with impersonal description in which the character of the observer is implicit rather than explicitly realised. The witness of 'A Hanging' becomes an explicit presence at the point of implication in the guilt of the hanging through participation in the action: 'It was several minutes before someone managed to catch the dog. Then we put my handkerchief through its collar and moved off once more, with the dog still straining and whimpering .... I watched the bare brown back of the prisoner marching in front of me.' The witness of 'A Hanging' is also the point of moral judgment of 'the unspeakable wrongness of cutting

---

1. 'The Spike', Adelphi, II (1931), 24-33 (pp.28-30 and 33).

a life short when it is in full tide.' Not only is the narrator implicated in the action essential to the hanging but also in the common mood of the other participants, 'the same thought was in all our minds', culminating in the communal drinking.[1] The witness of 'A Hanging' differs from that of 'The Spike' in its clearer involvement in the events observed; the absence of distance, or disguise, in the action is matched by a greater assurance of tone, free from the recurrent literariness of 'The Spike'.

In 'Shooting an Elephant', as in 'A Hanging', the narrator is implicated in the guilt of an imperialism of which he disapproves on moral grounds, and to which he acts as a focus for judgment; in both cases, also, the implication is by taking part in a form of execution. In contrast, however, in 'Shooting an Elephant' the narrator's actions are central to the story and the process of implication, the forcing of guilt upon him is a principal subject: 'And suddenly I realized that I should have to shoot the elephant after all. The people expected it of me and I had got to do it; I could feel their two thousand wills pressing me forward.' In 'The Spike' and 'A Hanging' the narrator is largely undefined, in 'Shooting an Elephant' he has a practical office and function and his 'feelings ... are the normal by-products of imperialism; ask any Anglo-Indian official, if you can catch him off duty.'[2] Earlier the analogy between the witness' transition from innocence to guilt and the reader's transition from ignorance to knowledge of the events of the narrative was noted; at the heart of the witness's development, and, by analogy, the reader's,in 'Shooting an Elephant', and 'A Hanging' is his moral implication in the events he describes. The witness acts as a surrogate for the reader:

---

1. 'A Hanging', Adelphi, II (1931), 417-422 (pp.418-420).
2. 'Shooting an Elephant', New Writing, No.2, Autumn 1936, pp. 1-7 (p.2).

the rhetorical scheme of these narratives attacks the protected indifference with which Orwell has been concerned.

The brevity of these reports, confined to a single incident, does not require the witness to have a developed character. For instance, there is no explanation of the presence of the narrator in 'The Spike', whereas when the same material is adapted to form a part of Down and Out in Paris and London such an explanation is necessary though it is contrived and unsatisfactory. The narrator of Down and Out in Paris and London remains reticent, though it reveals itself to be an 'old public school boy'.[1] In this it contrasts with the 'I' figure of the second part of The Road to Wigan Pier which is explicit about its disgust at imperialism and the motives for the journey which is at the centre of the book.

The structure of Down and Out in Paris and London tends to be simply picaresque, often consisting of stories interpolated without much reference to the surrounding material, such as those told by 'Charlie, one of the local curiosities.' The picaresque structure is undoubtedly partly a result of the difficulties which Orwell had in finding a publisher for his original manuscript. In response to letters of rejection from the publishers Jonathan Cape, he added material describing his experiences in England, though they had to undergo considerable alterations in order to fit in with the exigiencies of the plot, particularly in the episodes involving 'B'. A further explanation for the loose picaresque structure of Down and Out in Paris and London, and for the undeveloped nature of its 'I' figure, is available. The first person narrative, which emerges fully with The Road to Wigan Pier and Homage to Catalonia, is not yet fully developed. At the end of Down and Out in Paris and London the

1. DaO, p. 215.

narrator admits that he, as yet, has not 'seen more than the fringe of poverty'[1]; the lack of deep involvement makes the relation of the 'I' figure of Down and Out in Paris and London to poverty dissatisfyingly vague; it escapes from poverty through 'B' too easily.

It is interesting to contrast the escape from poverty in Down and Out in Paris and London with the movement away from the world of the work, of industrialisation and revolution, in The Road to Wigan Pier and Homage to Catalonia. In these later works the journey occurs by train; there is a simple, physical equivalent to Orwell's detachment from the world in which he has been a sympathetic and involved visitor. In Down and Out in Paris and London the narrator claims at points to be unconditionally involved with poverty, to have no immediate means of escape: 'So, though I came near to starving in the following weeks, I was hardly ever without a roof. It was now absolutely necessary to find work.' Yet the reader's sense is that he is interested in the poverty he encounters rather than unconditionally involved in it. This sense tends to be confirmed by the concluding statements of interest in the poverty he has left: 'Some day I want to explore that world more thoroughly.'[2] This unresolved conflict in the relation to poverty in Down and Out in Paris and London, between the claim to be unconditionally involved in poverty and the sense of interest, rather than an involvement in it, reveals itself particularly in its ending. There is not a simple physical equivalent to the movement away from the world of work, as there is in the later works; the transition from apparent involvement to interest is abrupt and awkward. In Down and Out in Paris and London the undeveloped 'I' figure is associated

---

1. D&O, pp. 12 and 288. See Crick, pp. 132-133 for some account of the development of Down and Out in Paris and London prior to publication.
2. D&O, pp. 29 and 287-288.

with a loose picaresque structure and some unresolved attitudes to the subject of poverty; an interesting implication of this is that the method of writing of the later, and, by contrast, more coherent, long first-person narratives seems to have required the creation of a fuller literary identity.

The witness of The Road to Wigan Pier is far more fully autobiographically defined, though his history is stated to be typical. The narrative method, of the central 'I' figure encountering the world of work, re-enacts the journey of Orwell as an isolated observer meeting unknown experience. Unlike the earlier Down and Out in Paris and London there is a congruence between the apparent relation of the 'I' figure to the world of work and the implied, underlying attitude towards his experience. The separation from the world encountered is acknowledged, rather than disguised: 'I went among them as a foreigner, and both of us were aware of it.' Orwell is here discussing the difference between his acceptance by social outcasts and his want of intimacy with the typical working class, but the underlying point remains: that in The Road to Wigan Pier his conditional involvement with industrialisation and poverty is acknowledged rather than as presented as an unconditional involvement. In addition to the observation and recording of experiences in the north of England, the narrator of The Road to Wigan Pier also presents himself as a witness of documents: 'I have before me five pay-checks belonging to a Yorkshire miner.'[1] Here also is a precursor of a central theme of Nineteen Eighty-Four, of documentary proof as a basis for history, a method of argument Orwell connects with liberalism, which is there frustrated by totalitarian control.

The witness of Homage to Catalonia has both common points with, and substantial differences from, that of The Road to Wigan Pier. Both books

---

1. WP, pp. 188 and 40.

share with the earlier first-person works the initial specification of time and place. Again the narrator is largely undefined at first, and, in a similar way to the earlier work, is presented as innocent and as making decisions from immediate experience: 'I had come to Spain with some notion of writing newspaper articles, but I had joined the militia almost immediately, because at that time and in that atmosphere it seemed the only conceivable thing to do.'[1] The slight falsity of tone here, the perfunctory description of motives which are in fact more fully accessible through memory, does point to some distortion for rhetorical effect; indeed, at other times, Orwell states that he went to Spain with the intention of fighting.[2] In general, however, the prevention of P.O.U.M.'s case in Homage to Catalonia demands a historical accuracy which is not required to the same extent in the earlier works, and which is most evident in the sections dealing with the political situation in Spain, rather than in the experiences peculiar to Orwell.

In Homage to Catalonia the witness's innocence has particular characteristics not realised elsewhere, notably a tendency to romanticisation of war: 'she was carrying a baby, which ... had perhaps been begotten behind a barricade.' The impression of this tendency is strengthened by the style of the references to military action, for instance, as 'not bad fun in a Boy Scoutish way.' The innocent witness undergoes a process of education, of 'being in some degree disillusioned', though still retaining the same manner of reasoning from observation and experience. The final effect of the education is not 'disillusionment and cynicism ... not less but more belief in the decency of human beings.'[3] Despite the loss of some illusions the

---

1. HtC, p.3.
2. For instance, in his preface to the Ukrainian edition of Animal Farm, CEJL, III, No.110, pp. 402-406 (p.403).
3. HtC, pp. 15, 49 and 312-313.

opening epiphany of the encounter with the Italian militiaman is retained in the poem in 'Looking Back on the Spanish War' in 1942. The concluding image of this poem, 'the crystal spirit'[1], is particularly important for its conflation of the revolutionary ardour of the Italian militiaman with Orwell's simile for the recording of observation, for the witness's function: 'Good prose is like a windowpane.'[2]

The development of this image in Nineteen Eighty-Four is revealing. The crystal paperweight which Winston buys is emblematic of his relation with Julia: 'The paperweight was the room he was in, and the coral was Julia's life and his own, fixed in a sort of eternity at the heart of the crystal.'[3] It is also evidence of the past, providing the possibility of objective history, and associated with Winston's memory of his childhood. The destruction of the paperweight is coincident with breaking of the window, also emblematic of the form of vision to which Orwell is attached, and with the separation of Winston and Julia, which leads to their mutual betrayal, the destruction of the 'crystal spirit' between them. It is also co-incident with the beginning of the process of the destruction of Winston as a witness, the loss of his hold through memory upon social and his own personal history. The importance of the witness to Orwell is revealed in its breakdown: the crushing of individual observation and integrity within Nineteen Eighty-Four is accompanied by the loss of other fundamental values, privacy and love, which have been partly comprehended by the emblem of the paperweight.

---

1. 'Looking Back on the Spanish War', England Your England, p.176; written Autumn 1942 according to the editors of CEJL, II, p.267.
2. 'Why I Write', Gangrel, No.4, Summer 1946, p.9.
3. NEF, p.148.

4. The relation of Orwell's idea of the witness to liberalism

Many of the features of Orwell's modes of recording observation embodied in his use of the witness can be closely linked to his idea of liberalism. The idea of a self making judgments from its own observations, advancing through experience and investigation to knowledge, is common to both. It is the activity and strong presence of this self, its function as a focus for moral realisation, that distinguishes his reportage from the neutral concentration on situations demanded by Fact. Similarly, personal judgment of society or criticism of a text is preferred to, or at least granted the same status as, information derived from Mass Observation. The use of the witness to convey an understanding of political situations is comparable to a tendency which Orwell identifies in Dickens's liberal outlook, that of an insight into society in largely moral terms: similarly, the witness acts as a moral focus through which an understanding of political situations is realised. There is also an important difference here. In 'Charles Dickens', the moral bias of Dickens's insight into society is felt, at points in the essay, to be a limitation; accordingly, Orwell's reportage of the 1930s includes an increasing amount of political discourse and comment, a process which is also discernible in his fiction and which continues in the 1940s. In Homage to Catalonia the political discourse, particularly the account of the conflicts in Barcelona, is offered as history, or as material for future historians, and the connection between personal observation and history is again made in Nineteen Eighty-Four, partly through the emblem of the paperweight. As a term and as an idea, history is closely associated with liberalism in Orwell's work, and it therefore is a middle term in which liberalism and the witness are connected to each other.

Although they share these crucial common points, Orwell's use of the witness and his sympathy for liberalism have markedly different chronologies. The character of the witness is most fully realised in the longer works of reportage of the 1930s, particularly The Road to Wigan Pier and Homage to Catalonia, whereas his sympathy for liberalism gathers more strength in the 1940s. Historical and biographical circumstances help to explain the virtual termination of the witness narratives of the 1930s. The conditions of the Second War would tend to preclude foreign experience of the type that formed the basis for works such as Down and Out in Paris and London. There was also no longer the need to gather material in order to write, a process particularly evident in the early 1930s. In the 1940s Orwell turned to forms, discourse or fiction, which did not require this preliminary exploration, or relied upon memory or uncontrived experience for short narratives.

An important explanation from within his work can be found in the nature of his sympathy for liberalism. In 'Inside the Whale', the writer is declared to be necessarily a liberal as a writer and this is contrasted with his constrained scope for action as a man in a non-liberal society. The split between thought and activity persists, in various forms, throughout the 1940s and culminates in the separation of the writer from the citizen. It is a separation which works against the combination of narrative and discourse, of recorded activity and thought, which characterises his reportage of the 1930s. Even within this work there is a tendency for the discourse to be separated from the narrative: for instance, observations of the north of England are assigned to the first part of The Road to Wigan Pier, and autobiography and political argument to the second; and political analysis and personal narrative are divided into separate

chapters in Homage to Catalonia. In those shorter works of the 1930s, in 'Shooting an Elephant' and 'A Hanging', in which discourse is not separated from narrative, the figure of the narrator is less developed, and is either passive, or has its actions largely determined by other people. The witness narrative of the 1930s develops towards a combination of discourse and narrative, of thought and activity in the narrator, but does not fully achieve this in a lengthy form. The terms of Orwell's articulated commitment to liberalism preserve and fix the passivity embodied in some of the narrators, whilst simultaneously asserting freedom of thought, and this division precludes further development of the character of the witness.

Despite their seeming disparity, then, the chronology of the development of the witness and of Orwell's explicit commitment to liberalism are mutually connected. The affinity of the character of the witness to his idea of liberalism points to the strength of liberal strains in his writing before they became fully articulated. This implicit sympathy for liberalism was also evident in the commendatory, though scattered, references to radicalism in particular, and in the tendency to define socialism in terms of liberal values. The explicit commitment into which these tendencies grew was of such a nature, often concentrating, for instance, on the historical isolation of liberalism, as to work against the energetic combination of personal narrative and discourse towards which the witness narratives had developed. Nevertheless the patterns of observation and argument of the witness narratives continue within different forms and re-emerge, for example, in Orwell's views on political writing.

The role of the witness also represents a practical resolution of a central problem of Orwell's liberalism. His acceptance of the Marxist thesis of

the overriding influence of economic life upon social and cultural values created an acute ambivalence in his liberalism: it was seen to be associated with capitalism, admitted to be historically relative and vulnerable to decline, but also urged as absolutely necessary to the continuance of decent political and social conduct. This basic tension between historically relative and ahistorical viewpoints manifests itself in many areas and, despite attempts to resolve it, remains open. In his literary criticism, for instance, a writer's work was seen to be often studied in terms of the writer's social and historical location, but its aesthetic worth felt to lie outside this analysis. There is a resemblance in selection and focus between the critical treatment of a writer's life and the presentation of the witness's biography: an indifference to the purely personal is matched by an interest in the privileged insight into society which the writer's class position offers him. In The Road to Wigan Pier, Orwell defends 'writing a certain amount of autobiography' from this basis: he considers himself to be 'sufficiently typical of my class, or rather sub-caste, to have a certain symptomatic importance.' This conviction is reasserted throughout the second part and his concluding appeal to the dispossessed middle class, and for Socialist propaganda which does not affront this class, depends upon it: 'If I were a solitary anomaly I should not matter, but what is true of myself is true of countless others.'[1] The witness's social and historical relativity is admitted, but, rather than searching for an ahistorical value outside of this, it is made the source of its strength.

The witness's typicality has further characteristics. It is not typical in the sense of being either average or the representative of society as

---

1. WP, p.153.

a whole. Rather, it embodies many of the qualities of a particular social class at a crucial position in history. In this respect, it is again similar to Orwell's critical treatment of a writer's biography: much of the interest of Dickens, Gissing, or Wells, is asserted to lie in their exemplification of different stages of the development of the English middle class. This aspect of the typicality of the witness is particularly pronounced in The Road to Wigan Pier in which it is presented as, in many respects, a typical member of the lower middle-class, a class whose pivotal role in the possible transition to socialism is emphasised in this work, and pursued outside of it. Orwell's claim in The Road to Wigan Pier to have been observing 'the most typical section of the English working class'[1] has been criticised as factually inaccurate, and the miners and pits he deals with to be special cases, or at least atypical.[2] Yet, even if this criticism is allowed, they can be seen as typical in an analogous sense to the witness: the miners too have a pivotal position, in this case an economic one, in the production of coal for energy on which industry, culture, and leisure are seen to depend. The witness of 'Shooting an Elephant' is also explicitly typical, though of colonial administrators rather than the domestic English middle-class. The witness's position is often that of an intermediary, as a member of a 'buffer-class' between two larger groups in The Road to Wigan Pier, or acting between the colonial adminstration and native people in 'A Hanging' and 'Shooting an Elephant'. Formally too, the witness acts as an intermediary between the reader and the reported experience, and the language often aids this process by rendering the strange into familiar terms.

So the witness's social position, and inevitable relativity, is given a

---

1. WP, p.153.
2. See, for instance, Klitzke, p.182.

pivotal position within the narratives, both by their form and by the relation of the witness to the society reported. The potential tension between the liberal practice of disinterested observation and the Marxist thesis that consciousness is determined by economic and social forces, a tension more apparent in Orwell's later work, is resolved by the combination of these two viewpoints within these narratives. However, this is not a full resolution of Marxist and liberal viewpoints: the resolution occurs only within the narratives and the witness's observation, despite its strength, remains relative.

As a consequence of its relativity, the status of the witness's testimony and of personal observation as a source for history also remains unresolved. Only individual observation is a certain source of information, but it is inescapably biased by the observer's position; a passage in Homage to Catalonia gives precise terms to this ambivalence: '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.'[1] Personal observation can be reduced to mere relativity: the totalitarian, non-liberal society of Nineteen Eighty-Four denies Winston Smith's memory and observation any value as history. Indeed, the aspects of that society, its treatment of political history and of science, which particularly devalue personal testimony are parodies of Soviet Marxism; the earlier implicit approach to a synthesis of some aspects of Marxism and liberalism is there destroyed.

There are, then, a number of important connections between the role of the witness in Orwell's work and his idea of liberalism. Both, for instance,

---

1. HtC, p.313.

have been seen to treat personal experience and testimony as a source for history. The nature of Orwell's characteristic types of observation and argument can be further amplified by looking at the ideas of language, at the treatment of memory and personal identity, and at the relation between the approach to and the content of observation in his work. An analysis of these topics can show their political implications for his work and how they are connected to its liberalism and use of Marxism.

5. Ideas of language

Orwell's characteristic manner of observation and argument enters into his views on language; it is proposed that the critic, act as a witness to the quality of language of the writing and hence to the quality of thought. This critical approach both limits and sharpens his treatment of political writing; often he attends to its manner as well as to its substance.

The essay 'Politics and the English Language' is particularly revealing. Important to an understanding of the limitations of Orwell's views on language is the central argument of the essay that 'the present political chaos is connected with the decay of language', and the corresponding and crucial claim that, 'if you simplify your English, you are freed from the worst follies of orthodoxy.' The tests of language are largely pragmatic, consisting of simple rules and a saving appeal to the writer's sensibility: 'Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous.' Here the reader is appealed to as a judge; elsewhere within the essay the reader is rhetorically invoked as a witness to Orwell's own practice: 'Look back through this essay, and for certain you will find that I have

again and again committed the very faults I am protesting against.'[1] Orwell's argument here gives him criteria for identifying misleading, particularly insincere, political language; it does not enable him to criticise, nor to create, developed political thought; freedom from folly does not, of itself, give rise to coherent thought. The argument is conducted by a series of examples, though there is some discrepancy between the types of examples and the conclusions drawn from them: the conclusion is concerned with political language, yet of the five passages quoted only two are directly concerned with politics, though many of the shorter examples could be drawn from political writing.

There are some more basic confusions and omissions in Orwell's argument. It is easy to accept Orwell's conclusion that bad, or needlessly imprecise, language can reveal insincerity or misleading orthodoxy, and also to accept his assertion that if 'one gets rid of these habits on can think more clearly'. Even here there is some obscurity: Orwell's own process of thought is described as occurring prior to language: 'Probably it is better to put off using words as long as possible and get one's meaning as clear as one can through pictures or sensations.'[2] If this account of the priority of thought to language is accepted, and it is certainly characteristic of Orwell, then the eschewal of these habits cannot create nor enable clearer thought, but simply makes the clearer expression of thought possible. Two contradictory ideas of language are being employed: there is the explicit idea of language as an instrument for the expression of thought which is already formed; at the same time, language is implicitly credited with an active influence on the formation of thought, an influence which it cannot have if it is

---

1. 'Politics and the English Language', Horizon, XIII (1946), 252-265 (pp. 262-264).
2. 'Politics and the English Language', p.264.

simply an instrument. If language is limited to its definition as an instrument of thought, then the valid remainder of Orwell's argument in this essay is largely critical rather than creative.[1]

It is possible, however, to draw several false corollaries from Orwell's main conclusions. From the conclusion that poor expression can denote confused or insincere thought, it is possible to assert falsely that poor expression always denotes this failure of thought. A further extension of this logically false deduction is possible: that poor expression exclusively denotes a failure of thought, that only insincere thought can be poorly expressed. Several more positive, though still false, corollaries can be made from this premise. It follows correctly from the exclusive association of poor or misleadingly orthodox thought with poor expression, that thought which is not of this type cannot be poorly expressed. Two further, though incorrect, corollories can be drawn from this: that clear and thorough thought cannot be poorly expressed; and that clear and thorough thought must be well expressed. If clear and thorough thought is then exclusively associated with clear expression, then clear expression becomes a sufficient test of clarity and thoroughness of thought. These corollaries are arrived at by a series of false oppositions, by taking the opposite of insincere and misleadingly orthodox to be clear and thorough, rather than, correctly, as not-insincere and not-misleadingly orthodox; and by taking the opposite to poor expression as clear expression rather than, correctly, as not-poor expression.

---

1. Brian Wicker, 'An Analysis of Newspeak', Blackfriars, XLIII (1962), 272-285 makes several similar points about Orwell's treatment of language and of identity. However, his conclusions, particularly where he tries to establish his own Catholic position are rather different. Nor does he allow for the political context and reference of Nineteen Eighty-Four when he argues that Winston's isolation is largely a product of an empirical definition of the self.

The last of the positive corollaries, that clear expression always denotes clear and thorough thought, is the most important and the most tempting. It confers on the critical approach of 'Politics and the English Language' a capacity for the judgment and creation of thorough thought, which is not warranted by its proven conclusions. These false corollaries have been adduced to show by comparison how close Orwell comes to making them, and also how, in this essay and elsewhere, he deals with the judgment of insincere thought, but neglects, except in a series of false implications, the judgment and creation of complex or developed thought.

The unspoken development of Orwell's argument in 'Politics and the English Language' is revealing. Initially a conditional relationship between orthodoxy and language is postulated: 'Orthodoxy of whatever colour, seems to demand a lifeless, imitative style [whose use induces] ... a reduced state of consciousness, if not indispensable, ... at any rate favourable to political conformity.' These qualifications are eroded until orthodoxy is necessarily associated with deceptive language: for instance, there is an obscured transition from the qualified, 'the worst follies of orthodoxy', to orthodox 'political language'[1], though both, potentially distinct, categories are treated as if they were the same term.

In his other writing of this period, the mid-1940s, Orwell does state some of the false implications of the argument of 'Politics and the English Language': that clear language can only be produced by penetrating thought, and that such thought cannot be orthodox: 'To write in plain, vigorous language one has to think fearlessly, and if one thinks fearlessly one cannot be politically orthodox.'[2] The implication that plain language is a guarantee

---

1. 'Politics and the English Language', Horizon, XIII (1946), pp. 261 and 265.
2. 'The Prevention of Literature', Polemic, No.2 (March 1946), p.9.

of political unorthodoxy, and hence of penetrating thought, is present but left unspoken. There is a further difficulty over the opposition of orthodoxy and of fearless, penetrating thought; logically the opposite to orthodox thought is simply 'non-orthodox' thought which need not, of its own nature, be penetrating or fearless. However Orwell's idea of orthodoxy as the acceptance of unresolved contradictions[1] makes this opposition, unorthodox thought being the refusal to accept unresolved contradictions, more acceptable, if tending to be tautological: orthodoxy is then, by definition, unacceptable to examination.

The manner of 'Politics and the English Language' reveals the limits of his characteristic method of argument: the movement from acute observations on particular passages to general argument is awkward and partly obscured. The substance of the essay also testifies to the limits of its methods and of the notion of sincerity, which is centred upon individual moral sense; the terms of Orwell's account of the authenticity of language are more fitted to the judgment of the validity of the recording of a series of sensations, or of simple events, than to the judgment of complex political thought. The latter area of judgment is obscured: it is not dealt with explicitly and the absence of consideration of this area is not stressed. The series of false, but tempting, implications which appear to cover this area of judgment are occasionally approached by Orwell, as the study of his arguments has shown.

These criticisms of the argument of 'Politics and the English Language' are moderated by its historical context: an approach which insists on the need for moral judgment at every point of an argument is a necessary

---

1. See 'Writers and Leviathan', Politics and Letters, No.4, Summer 1948, 36-40 (p.39).

corrective to the dishonesties and confusions of Communist writing of the 1930s and 1940s, with which Orwell is partly concerned. Given this reservation, the essential criticisms remain. 'Politics and the English Language' is not an isolated case, it represents a condensation of themes which run throughout Orwell's writing of the 1940s. The approach it advocates lends itself to iconoclasm and criticism, without necessarily any further base for this criticism other than an insistence on the moral implications of expression. At the same time it is falsely and contradictorily implied that this approach will yield political ideas with a positive content beyond an absence of stupidity and moral equivocation.

6. Ideas of the self

So far the relation between the method of observation and the method of argument has been examined. These methods can be connected with another characteristic of Orwell's writing: what might be called an empirical notion of self, of a self which defines itself by the validity of its immediate sensations. Orwell is occasionally explicit about this sense of self: 'I have a sort of belly-to-earth attitude and always feel uneasy when I get away from the ordinary world where grass is green, stones hard etc.'[1] Elsewhere he is less self-conscious than this, but the idea of the importance of valid physical sensation permeates his work. The capacity for such valid sensation is threatened by modernity in The Road to Wigan Pier, by 'the frightful debauchery of taste that has already been effected by a century of mechanisation .... In the highly mechanised countries, thanks to tinned food, cold storage, synthetic flavouring matters, etc., the palate is almost a dead organ.'[2] This theme of the

---

1. 'Letter to Henry Miller', 26 August 1936, CEJL, I, No.84, p.228.
2. WP, p.236.

debauchery of taste, and of the difficulty of valid sensation is enacted in Coming Up For Air: 'The frankfurter had a rubber skin, of course, and my temporary teeth weren't much of a fit. I had to do a kind of sawing movement before I could get my teeth through the skin .... But the taste! .... It was fish!' The difficulty of obtaining valid sensation is enacted by the obstruction of the skin; the falsity of taste is characteristic of the tendency of objects within Orwell's fiction to interrupt their user's intentions. As so often, in the style of the essayist, Orwell subsequently explicates the action: 'It gave me the feeling that I'd bitten into the modern world and discovered what it was really made of.'[1] Validity of sensation, like so many of the values with which it can be associated - personal observation and judgment, and thereby with liberalism - is threatened within Orwell's work by modernity.

Accompanying this sense of the modern corruption of taste is a recurrent concern for the deprivation of other forms of physical sensation, and of contact with nature: 'There are now millions of people, and they are increasing every year, to whom the blaring of a radio is not only a more acceptable but a more normal background to their thoughts than the lowing of cattle or the song of birds.'[2] Such a corruption of taste allows the progress of mechanization, to whose effects Orwell, particularly in his earlier writing, is vehemently opposed. This theme of loss of contact with nature is taken up in Coming Up For Air, again in connection with the corruption of taste by modernity: 'That's the way we're going nowadays. Everything slick and streamlined, everything made out of something else. Celluloid, rubber, chromium-steel everywhere, arc-lamps blazing all night, glass rooves over your head, radios all playing the

---

1. CUFA, pp. 32-33.
2. 'Pleasure Spots', Tribune, 11 January 1946, p.11.

same tune, no vegetation left, everything cemented over, mock-turtles grazing under the neutral fruit-trees.'[1] The manner of the treatment of modernity is by a series of details rather than directly by general statement, though the details are clearly then made characteristic of the more general category of modernity. The concern for the loss of contact with nature culminates in the essay 'Pleasure Spots' in which it is argued that abstraction from 'natural' sense-impressions, as well as the loss of a sense of solitude, reduces the authenticity of the self: 'Much of what goes by the name of pleasure is simply an effort to destroy consciousness. ... For man only stays human by preserving large patches of simplicity in his life, while the tendency of many modern inventions - in particular the film, the radio and the aeroplane - is to weaken his consciousness, dull his curiosity,'[2]. Within Orwell's writing then, there are recurrent suggestions that mechanization is removing the self from the sources by which it can properly define itself. The manner of self-definition which is threatened is empirical, through sensation, rather than essential, through an immediate sense of being.

In Nineteen Eighty-Four, Winston Smith senses freedom through the validity of simple realities and by reasoning from them: 'The solid world exists, its laws do not change. Stones are hard, water is wet, objects unsupported fall towards the earth's centre.' Within the novel taste is corrupted by ersatz products, whereas Winston's memory of his childhood is associated with the smells and tastes of proper coffee and chocolate. The defeat of Winston's rebellion, part of the 'Obliteration of the Self'[3],

---

1. CUFA, p.33.
2. 'Pleasure Spots', Tribune, 11 January 1946, p.10.
3. NEF, pp. 82 and 198.

occurs by means of physical sensation, the extremity of pain, and is accompanied by the loss of his discriminating sense of taste. So the definition of self through valid sensation which informed Orwell's earlier work is also apparent in the defeat of such a conception of self in Nineteen Eighty-Four.

7. Memory and the idea of the witness

In the preceding section it was shown that the self in Orwell's writing often validates itself through sensation. Another characteristic means of self-validation is through memory. Both means of validation are autonomous and private, and simultaneously refer to and create an observing and recording self. Besides these common features, sensation and memory are associated with each other in Orwell's work: memory is often aroused by sensation. Memory therefore implies a self similar to that implied by the tendency for the self to define itself through its own sensations. It also guarantees the continuity of this self through time; through it, the self is able to recall past experiences peculiar to itself. Sensation was seen to be liable to obstruction or confusion, memory is always an unreliable instrument: the self upon which Orwell's individualist ethical values depend therefore has a potentially unstable basis. It is also worth noting at this point that the guaranteeing of the self's continuity through time by memory, and the rejection of an innate or essential self, is a classic empiricist argument, found for instance in Locke.[1]

George Woodcock has pointed to the number of instances of involuntary memory in Orwell's work[2]; this indicates that past experience is not

---

1. See, for instance, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1690), Book II, Chapter 27, 'Of identity and diversity'.
2. George Woodcock, The Crystal Spirit: A Study of George Orwell (1967), p.266.

only open to be reclaimed, but that memory also exerts a continuous pressure upon the self, moulding and informing its observation. The influence of memory can also be discerned in Orwell's own concept of himself, in the stress on the importance the writer's early temperament in 'Why I Write', and in the sense there of the self as something created and retained by memory, of his 'nature' as 'the state you have attained when you are first adult.'[1] So the importance of memory and the concept of a private, autonomous self are mutually related. In connection with the strong tendency in Orwell's work of the 1940s to retain autonomy of thought whilst acknowledging the loss of independence of action, it is relevant to note that the means by which the self verifies its own existence, through sensation and memory, rather than activity, are also largely passive and imply a private realm of thought, but not necessarily an independence of action: the implicit method of self-definition contributes to explicit divisions elsewhere in his work.

The emphasis on memory in Orwell's work has other implications not immediately connected with this concept of self. It affects, for instance, his nostalgia for the Edwardian period, with which his childhood memories are associated. This nostalgia influences his treatment of class and his choice of images for national unity, evident in the Edwardian atmosphere of 'The Art of Donald McGill', and plays its part in producing what George Woodcock has described as his 'interest in a working-class culture that was already moribund among the people.'[2] The act of memory is also implicit in the form of Orwell's works of reportage: the experiences which form the content of these works are recalled and reconstructed in language. This process, the recalling and writing down of past events, is also

---

1. 'Why I Write', Gangrel, No.4, Summer 1946, p.8.
2. Woodcock, p.25.

analogous to the general precedence of thought and sensation to language in his work.

There is an association between sensation and memory, particularly involuntary memory, in Orwell's work. In Coming Up For Air Bowling's involuntary recall of his childhood is partly prompted by King Zog's name, but also by 'some sound in the traffic or the smell of horse-dung or something.' The content of Bowling's memories is recurrently sensual: 'predominantly it's that sweet, dusty, musty smell that's like the smell of death and life mixed up together. It's powdered corpses, really.'[1] 'Looking Back on the Spanish War' begins with this association between memory and sensation: 'the physical memories, the sounds, the smells and the surfaces of things.'[2] Although the content of Winston's memory of his childhood in Nineteen Eighty-Four is visual, 'a series of bright-lit tableaux', it is associated with particular sensations: 'the smell of roasting coffee - real coffee, not Victory Coffee - came floating out into the street. Winston paused involuntarily. For perhaps two seconds he was back in the half-forgotten world of his childhood.' Another passage also shows the capacity of sensation, particularly smell, to arouse particular memories: 'The smell was already filling the room, a rich hot smell which seemed like an emanation from his early childhood ...."It's coffee," he murmered, "real coffee."'[3] There is, then, a repeated association within Orwell's work between memory and sensation, particularly between peculiarly authentic sensation and the prompting of memory.

The associative nature of memory in Orwell's work is not confined to an

---

1. CUFA, pp. 36-37.
2. 'Looking Back on the Spanish War', England Your England', p.151.
3. NEF, pp. 7, 83 and 142.

association between memory and sensation; events and experiences often recall other experiences independent of this particular form of association. In Homage to Catalonia there are several instances of this process, of association of different aspects of the Spanish War: 'It was a little like being in the trenches again; several times I caught myself, from force of habit, speaking of the Civil Guards as 'the Fascists'.'[1] This associative memory is apparent outside of Homage to Catalonia: certain of Orwell's experiences of the Second War take him 'straight back to the end of the last war', or, in other cases, he finds himself 'mentally back in The Spanish War.'[2] Its influence is also suggested by a passage in 'My Country Right or Left': 'part of the reason for the fascination that the Spanish Civil War had for people of about my age was that it was so like the Great War.'[3] Within Homage to Catalonia there is also a different form of associative memory: experiences of the Spanish War recall events which belong to the narrator's history; 'I never even thought of firing. Instead, my mind lept backwards twenty years, to our boxing instructor at school, showing me in vivid pantomime how he bayoneted a Turk at the Dardanelles.' An ambulance journey prompts a similar association and arouses a childhood memory: 'Bang, bump, wallop! It took me back to my early childhood and a dreadful thing called the Wiggle-Woggle at the White City Exhibition. They had forgotten to tie us into the stretchers.'[4] Both passages also show a rhetorical technique comparable to that used throughout the first part of The Road to Wigan Pier: the making of the strange accessible to the reader by comparing it to the more familiar.

---

1. HtC, p.177.
2. 'War-time Diary: 28 May 1940 - 28 August 1941', CEJL, II, No.57, pp. 369-370.
3. 'My Country Right or Left', Folios of New Writing, No.2, Autumn 1940, pp. 36-41 (p.39).
4. HtC, pp. 122 and 254.

There is also a similarity between the characteristic content of Orwell's recording of memory and of observation, evident in their particularity. In 'Looking Back on the Spanish War' a specific memory is offered as an incident 'characteristic of the moral atmosphere of a particular moment in time'[1]; here the notion of typical detail is present. Orwell's description, from childhood memory, not from recent observation, of a working-class home in The Road to Wigan Pier suggests typicality through remembered detail: 'on winter evenings after tea, when the fire glows in the open range and dances mirrored in the steel fender, when Father, in his 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.' Here the recording of detail has become more overtly typical; the particular 'father' has been generalised into the abstract 'Father'. This can be attributed in part to the pressure of Orwell's sentimentality, to the need to exclude detail which would disrupt the vision, but it can also be attributed to the temporal distance of the memory: 'the memory of working-class interiors - especially as I sometimes saw them in my childhood before the war, when England was still prosperous -'.[2] The need for some degree of typicality in the recording of detail can be shown by its antithesis; Winston's attempt to compare pre-revolutionary and contemporary life in Nineteen Eighty-Four is frustrated by the 'old man's memory [which] was nothing but a rubbish-heap of details.'[3] A similarity in content, in the balance between typicality and detail, thus exists between Orwell's recording of memory and of more recent observation.

The difficulty of memory, its potential inaccuracy, is often elsewhere a concern of Orwell's. These difficulties, the obstructions to accurate

---

1. 'Looking Back on the Spanish War', England Your England', p.158.
2. WP, pp. 149-150.
3. NEF, p.93.

recall, are analogous to the witness's difficulty of obtaining authentic sensation and of establishing objective truth through personal observation. The content of Winston Smith's memory in Nineteen Eighty-Four is unreliable and limited: 'nothing remained of his childhood except a series of bright-lit tableaux, occurring against no background and mostly unintelligible.'[1] In the context of a consideration of his memories of his own childhood Orwell remarks on the 'deceptiveness of visual memory'[2], suggesting that the limitations of Winston Smith's memory are characteristic of a general difficulty of memory. Memory in 'Such, Such Were the Joys' is also unreliable - 'one's memories of any period must necessarily weaken as one moves away from it' - yet it offers access to experiences otherwise denied to an adult. The obstruction to this access, to getting inside the child's experience, are imaged in terms of submersion and transparency: 'And here one is up against the very great difficulty of knowing what a child really feels and thinks. A child which appears reasonably happy may actually be suffering horrors which it cannot or will not reveal. It lives in a sort of alien under-water world which we can only penetrate by memory or divination.' As this image implies the content of the resurrected memory of 'Such, Such Were the Joys' is often visual: 'If I shut my eyes and say 'school', it is of course the physical surroundings that first come back to me; the flat playing field with its cricket pavilion and the little shed by the rifle range, the draughty dormitories, the dusty splintery passages, the square of asphalt in front of the gymnasium, the raw-looking pine wood chapel at the back. And at almost every point some filthy detail obtrudes itself.'[3] The disruption of the visual distance of the observer by the intrusion of images of physical disgust is similar to the

---

1. NEF, p.7.
2. 'As I Please', Tribune, 14 March 1947, p.10.
3. 'Such, Such Were the Joys', CEJL, IV, No.86, pp. 334, 366 and 347.

implication of the narrator in the world of the report. The evidence for the analogy between memory and observation is reinforced by the use elsewhere of similar images of transparency, of glass or aquarium panes, for both the process of observation and for obstructions to sympathetic observation. This memory, like the observation of the travelling narrator, is a means of access to otherwise unobtainable experiences, but this process is difficult, particularly with regard to getting 'inside' the remembered or observed experience, and memory is also potentially unreliable.

The similarities between the processes of observation and of memory are accompanied by a similarity between their functions. Both serve to retain and establish objective truth and history, and oppose its corruption, particularly its corruption by totalitarian methods. Within Nineteen Eighty-Four, in a satire on the Soviet treatment of history, the Party manipulates memory, demanding that Winston Smith should '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 forget it again:'. Winston Smith is first isolated by his memory and perception - 'Was he, then, alone in the possession of a memory?'[1] - and then, in his final defeat, his memory is withdrawn from him. Memory, like observation, is insufficient by itself for the retention of objective truth; it is necessary to record it. Orwell's writings constitute a recording of memory and of observation; the works of reportage are closest to a simple recording of observed and remembered experience. Within Nineteen Eighty-Four, the process of recording is represented: Winston Smith is a diarist, and also attaches importance to actual evidence, to newspaper articles, as

---

1. NEF, pp. 38 and 61.

corroboration for his memory.

The use of memory also has similar limitations to the use of observation. Memory only allows direct access to the self's own experiences: the difficulty of access to experience outside of the self remains. One aspect of this difficulty is apparent in the divide between the 'thinking-man' and the 'common man', references to which are frequent in Orwell's writing: the 'thinking man', the liberal self, is not capable of intuition: 'And he was born knowing what I had learned /Out of books and slowly.'[1] The final isolation of the witness in his writing, the isolation of Winston Smith in Nineteen Eighty-Four, is partly implicit in this original difficulty of access to experience outside of the self, in the tendency to the imprisonment of the self within its own sensations and memory.

Memory is also important to Orwell as an author: the content of much of his work can be identified as basically autobiographical, though his experiences may be ascribed to, and altered by, a character in a novel, such as George Bowling in Coming Up For Air or Gordon Comstock in Keep the Aspidistra Flying; alternatively, experiences may be more directly mediated through a witness narrator. Memory plays its part in the conception of Orwell's fiction, though a greater distance of time between the experience and its recording seems to be required by the indirectness of fiction compared to reportage: 'I have a novel dealing with 1945 in my head now, but even if I survive to write it I shouldn't touch it before 1950. The reason is not only I can't see the events of the moment in perspective, but also that a novel has to be lived with for years before it can be written down, otherwise the working-out detail, which takes an immense time and can only be done at odd moments, can't happen.'[2]

---

1. 'Looking Back on the Spanish War', England Your England, p.176.
2. 'Letter to T.R. Fyvel', CEJL, IV, No.153, pp. 496-497 (p.497).

Within the larger remembered experiences of Orwell's reportage and fiction there are particular instances of memory which mimic the inclusive form. In Homage to Catalonia, the atmosphere of the early part of the narrative is re-entered through the narrator's memory, partly as a rhetorical contrast to the return to post-revolutionary Barcelona, but it also provides an instance of this type of memory in which the past is evoked as a series of stories centred round the self: 'In my memory I live over incidents that might seem too petty to be worth recalling. I am in the dug-out at Monte Pocero again, on the ledge of the limestone that serves as a bed, and young Ramón is snoring with his nose flattened between my shoulder-blades. I am stumbling up the mucky trench.'[1] In Coming Up For Air Bowling's recall of his past often takes a similar form, of a self around which a series of remembered details are accumulated: 'I could smell the corpse-smell. In a manner of speaking I can smell it now. I'm back in Lower Binfield, and the year's 1900. Beside the horse-trough in the market-place the carrier's horse is having its nose-bag.'[2] In this way the act of memory, like the process of observation, partly determines the form of Orwell's works. This determination is most marked in the first-person reportage. In the novels, as well, particular passages enact the overall method of recording experience.

An examination of the role of memory within Orwell's work strengthens the evidence for the notion of self which was apparent in the use of observation, and of argument from observation. The function of memory within Orwell's writing also implies the continuity of this self, revealed also in Orwell's concept of himself as a writer, of his 'nature' as formed by early experience and retained by the memory of these experiences. The process of

---

1. HtC, p.141.
2. CUFA, p.41.

memory is often similar to, or combined with, the process of observation, and is thus an aspect of the witness's activity, though a complex and occasionally self-contradictory aspect.

So far, Orwell's characteristic method of observation has been described and analysed, and this method of observation has been shown to be associated with a tendency to empirical methods in argument. These empiricist tendencies, like the method of observation, are centred upon an observing and judging self. In this concentration upon the self an empirical notion of the self can be discerned, a concept of the self as capable of autonomous definition through the authenticity of its sensations and observation. The influence of this definition of self is also apparent in the stress upon memory, another form of self-definition through the retention of past observation and sensation. This method of self-authentication is capable of frustration in the absence of valid stimuli, and, with regard to memory, the process of authentication is inherently unreliable. The method of observation and definition of self also influences the typical form of Orwell's reportage.

The relation between the method of observation and the content of the recorded observation has not yet been fully studied. The partial determination of content by the method of observation is evident in some simple ways. The method of observation from outside is accompanied by an attention to the surfaces of objects, and by a strong visual sense. These characteristics, of visualisation and of superficiality, are important to Orwell's definition of 'realism'. They also produce a problem which he associates with realism - of how to get inside a character, rather than to reproduce the external characteristics which are immediately open to observation. The method of observation also influences the content in a

more subtle and complicated way; Orwell's simile for writing - 'Good prose is like a window pane.'[1] - enters into the content of what is observed. This barrier, the 'window pane', between the observer and his subject can both inhibit the observer's sympathy or appear to encourage it. The tone of passages in which this barrier is part of the recorded observation, the presence and type of sympathetic communication, requires closer study.

8. The visual content of Orwell's observation

There is some evidence that Orwell perceived his own process of thought as primarily visual. In an early review in The Adelphi in 1934 he makes an interesting distinction between types of thinking: 'The other [interesting issue] is a discussion of the difference between visualising and non-visualising thinkers. It is not generally realised, or is commonly forgotten, that the process of thought differs vastly in different people; some people think chiefly by a series of visual images, others almost entirely abstractly. Mr Roberts seems to suggest that the visualising type of mind is necessarily a more primitive type than the non-visualising - a very disputable suggestion, for the power of visualisation is possessed in addition to the power of abstract thought. But it is interesting to see the subject raised.'[2] The advantage which Orwell ascribes to the visualising thinker can be taken to imply that he considers himself to be one; that he should take up this point raised by Michael Roberts's Critique of Poetry also suggests that he has a quite acute sense of himself as a visualising thinker.

---

1. 'Why I Write', Gangrel, No.4, Summer 1946, pp. 5-10 (p.9).
2. Review of Critique of Poetry by Michael Roberts, Adelphi, VII (1934), 468.

In 'Politics and the English Language' Orwell was seen to demand that thought should take place before its translation into language; the content of this pre-linguistic thought is strongly visual: 'When you think of a concrete object, you think wordlessly, and then, if you want to describe the thing you have been visualising, you probably hunt about till you find the exact words that seem to fit it.' An analogous method is advocated for abstract thought, whose meaning should be, in so far as this is possible, worked out through 'pictures and sensations.'[1] Visualisation is therefore not limited to concrete thought but also occurs, more unexpectedly, with abstract thought. In 'New Words' there is the argument, familiar in Orwell's work, that thought and emotion are prior to language and that language is inadequate for their expression. Accompanying this is the suggestion that film, the medium of moving rather than static pictures, may be able to give visual expression to 'the now nameless feelings that men have <u>in common</u>', through its 'powers of distortion, of fantasy, in general of escaping the restrictions of the physical world.'[2] Throughout 'New Words' the influence of Conrad, particularly of the 'Preface to <u>The Nigger of the 'Narcissus'</u>'[3] is evident: the literary nature of this influence helps to indicate that, when discussing the visual bias of Orwell's thought, it is the thought revealed in his work, not a purely personal or private characteristic, which is at issue. A similar, though less fully developed point about film is made in a review of Henry Miller's <u>Black Spring</u> in which Orwell argues that its attempt to use words 'to invade what is really the province of the film' is not completely successful because of the limitations of language.[4]

---

1. 'Politics and the English Language', <u>Horizon</u>, XIII (1946), 264.
2. 'New Words', <u>CEJL</u>, II, No. 1, pp. 10-11.
3. In <u>The Nigger of the 'Narcissus'</u> etc. (London, J.M. Dent, 1950), pp. vii-xii. Compare Orwell's argument and phrases with Conrad's sense of the artist's appeal to the 'conviction of solidarity that binds together the loneliness of innumerable hearts', and his task, 'before all to make you see.' (pp. viii and x).
4. 'Some Recent Novels', <u>NEW</u>, IX (1936), 396.

Orwell's sense of his thought as visual predisposes him to forms of writing which include some stress on visualisation. In order to develop this point it is necessary to examine instances of visualisation within his writing. The moments of visualisation in 'Charles Dickens' and in 'Lear, Tolstoy and the Fool' are crucial to the argument of both essays. In 'Lear, Tolstoy and the Fool' visualisation establishes the similarity between Lear's act of renunciation and Tolstoy's: 'Shut your eyes and think of King Lear, if possible without calling to mind any of the dialogue. What do you see? Here at any rate is what I see: a majestic old man in a long black robe, with flowing white hair and beard, a figure out of Blakes's drawings (but also, curiously rather like Tolstoy)'.[1] The rhetorical injunction to the reader draws attention to the subsequent visualisation. The visualisation is from the imagination, the inner life, and the insufficiency of language implied by the need for visualisation is accompanied by an attempt to exclude speech, the dialogue of King Lear, from the image; though, of course, the injunction to visualisation is conveyed through language. The emphatic conclusion to 'Charles Dickens', often quoted as a description of Orwell himself, takes the form of a visual image: 'When one reads any strongly individual piece of writing, one has the impression of seeing a face somewhere behind the page. It is not necessarily the actual face of the writer .... What one sees is the face that the writer ought to have. Well, in the case of Dickens I see a face ... of a man of about forty, with a small beard and a high colour.'[2] Here again, the visualisation is imaginary and inner, rather an actual description of Dickens. In both essays discourse is insufficient by itself for Orwell's purpose; a resort to a description, by means of language, of visual inner life is required for coherence and emphasis.

---

1. 'Lear, Tolstoy and the Fool', Polemic, No.7 (March 1947), 2-17 (p.7).
2. 'CD', ITW, p.85.

Moments of realisation for characters within Orwell's fiction are also often visual. In Burmese Days, Flory's realisation of his attachment to Burma takes a visual form: 'Scenes like these - the sallow evening light, the old Indian cropping grass, the creak of the cartwheels, the streaming egrets - were more native to him than England.' The symbolism of Burmese Days, as well as other direct reports of Flory's consciousness, is frequently visual, particularly in the case of Flory's birthmark, and the loss of it with death: 'the birthmark had faded immediately, so that it was no more than a faint grey stain.'[1] The witness's observation shares this bias towards sight, particularly, as with some of the essays and the fiction, at crucial points. Moments of recapitulation and emphasis within the works of reportage, in which memory and observation are combined, are often strongly visual, as, for instance, in The Road to Wigan Pier: 'That scene stays in my mind as one of my pictures of Lancashire: the dumpy, shawled women, with their sacking aprons and their heavy black clogs, kneeling in the cindery mud and the bitter wind, searching eagerly for tiny chips of coal.'[2] Thus crucial passages in Orwell's writing, both of recorded observation and of imagination, are, in many cases, biased towards visual descriptions or evocations, in preference to an appeal to other senses.

In conclusion, the visuality of Orwell's conception of inner life predisposes him towards forms of writing which will accommodate visualisation. Such visualisation as does occur is often at crucial points where discursive language is felt to be inadequate. With regard to the works of reportage, the stress on sight implies a certain distance between the witness and the observed world. Within the novels, despite their passages

---

1. BD, pp. 78 and 312.
2. WP, p. 104.

of visual emphasis, this distance between the witness and the observed world is not apparent, as the witness is not explicitly present.

The role of the visual sense in Orwell's writing can be contrasted with the role of other senses: touch, taste or smell are almost never a means to sympathy in his work. Except where they arouse the narrator's memories, they are usually a source of oppression or disgust, as for instance with Dorothy's sexuality in A Clergyman's Daughter, or the response to the Brookers' lodgings in The Road to Wigan Pier. In an intensification of this, they can help to produce confinement, pain and fear, a process suggested by the titles of Coming Up For Air and Inside the Whale, and carried further in Winston's confinement in Nineteen Eighty-Four. These other senses are often the means by which the witness narrator is brought closer to the world of the report, whereas the concentration on sight sustains a greater distance. It is again worth noting that the visual sense is privileged above others in empiricist philosophy, implying both the distance between the observer and the observed and the apparent self-evidence of truth.[1]

9. Superficial content of Orwell's observation

George Woodcock in The Writer and Politics points to the 'essentially superficial nature of Orwell's work'[2], the attention to detail, the clarity and vividness of his prose. Woodcock considers this superficiality to be, ultimately, an important limitation upon Orwell's writing, leading to a lack of deeper understanding and imaginative sympathy in his work, and incapacity to create characters in fiction wholly outside of himself. The tendency to superficiality in this sense has some connection with the

---

1. See, for instance, John Locke, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1690), Book 1, Chapter 9, 'Of perception'.
2. George Woodcock, The Writer and Politics (1948), pp. 111-124 (p.113).

visual emphasis of Orwell's observation and imagination; the stress on appearance inherent in visualisation merges into an interest in surfaces. A distinction between a tendency to description of appearances, and a tendency to description of processes has been seen in Orwell's criticism of Dickens. Despite his reservations in the case of Dickens, the bias of Orwell's critical sympathy, which has clear implications for his practice, is towards the representation of appearance rather than of processes. This sympathy is evident in his judgment of Samuel Butler: 'Yet Butler's books have worn well, far better than those of more earnest contemporaries like Meredith and Carlyle, partly because he never lost the power to use his eyes and to be pleased by small things.'[1]

Orwell's remarks on Samuel Butler, as often happens in Orwell's criticism, can be taken as a model for himself as a writer. Indeed the account of his own 'nature' in 'Why I Write' is strikingly similar: 'So long as I remain alive and well I shall continue to feel strongly about prose style, to love the surface of the earth, and to take a pleasure in solid objects and scraps of useless information.'[2] Throughout Orwell's writing there is evidence of this pleasure in detail and appearances. Within the visual stress of Animal Farm there are instances of this: 'She was between the shafts of a smart dogcart painted red and black, which was standing outside a public-house. A fat red-faced man in check breeches and gaiters, who looked like a publican was stroking her nose and feeding her with sugar. Her coat was newly clipped and she wore a scarlet ribbon round her forelock.'[3] Orwell's images for Spain in Homage to Catalonia have been shown to often consist of an accumulation of details: his

---

1. 'As I Please', Tribune, 21 July 1944, p.10.
2. 'Why I Write', Gangrel, No.4, Summer 1946, p.9.
3. AF, p.35.

childhood memory of America is recorded in a similar manner: ' a boy sitting in a white washed stone schoolroom. He wears braces and has patches on his shirt, and if it is summer he is barefooted. In the corner of the school room there is a bucket of drinking water with a dipper.'[1] Within Orwell's writing, then, his superficiality is apparent in the accumulation of details for rhetorical effect in various passages.

It is possible to use this analysis of Orwell's techniques of description and evocation to strengthen the argument that his work is not directly connected with the contemporary documentary movement. Chris Pawling in 'George Orwell and the Documentary in the Thirties' notes the lists and tables in The Road to Wigan Pier and argues that, although Orwell never came into contact with the Russian revolutionary political writing of the twenties which emphasised didacticism through the presentation of facts, he is instinctively moving in this direction.[2] There is an intention to persuade in these lists and tables, but in view of Orwell's tendency to accumulation of details, it is also reasonable to treat the lists of The Road to Wigan Pier as an extension of this trend. There are also literary analogues for this technique in Daniel Defoe's A Journal of the Plague Year[3] and particularly Jack London's The People of the Abyss which, apart from its other similarities to The Road to Wigan Pier, also uses lists and tables within an autobiographical narrative.[4] Furthermore, Orwell was familiar with London's writing, and refers to The People of the Abyss in The Road to Wigan Pier.[5]

---

1. 'Riding Down from Bangor', Tribune, 22 November 1946, p.20.
2. Chris Pawling, 'George Orwell and the Documentary in the Thirties', Literature and History, No.4, Autumn 1976, pp. 81-93.
3. A copy of Daniel Defoe, A Journal of the Plague Year (London, Cassell, 1909) is included amongst the books definitely owned by Orwell in the Orwell Archive at ORWELL L 10 DEF.
4. Jack London, The People of the Abyss (1903), pp.203-207 and 295-297. Like the Left Book Club Edition of The Road to Wigan Pier it contains photographs which are not closely connected with the narrative, but are on the theme of urban poverty.
5. WP, p.72.

The recording of detail is partly controlled by the images intended to be evoked. In The Lion and the Unicorn this process of control is explicit in the commentary upon the list presented: 'The clatter of clogs in the Lancashire mill towns, the to-and-fro of the lorries on the Great North Road, the queues outside the Labour Exchanges, the rattle of pintables in the Soho pubs, the old maids biking to Holy Communion through the mists of the autumn mornings - all these are not only fragments, but characteristic fragments, of the English scene.'[1] The detail recorded is not simply that observed, even that observed by an explicitly positioned and partial observer, but that which corresponds to the demands of typicality, or, in some cases, the observation is smothered under typicality.

The influence of Orwell's characteristic methods of observation and description can be seen in his definition of 'realism' with reference to the novel. In an article on Tobias Smollett, he advances one definition '"Realism" ... has at least four current meanings, but when applied to novels it normally means a photographic imitation of everyday life. A "realistic" novel is one in which the dialogue is colloquial and physical objects are described in such a way that you can visualise them.'[2] Orwell's definition of realism is in accord with the bias of his observation with its stress on visuality, concreteness, and detail.

From the argument of this section, then, it is clear that the method of observation from the outside, and the related visual bias of observation and imagination, partly determine the content of Orwell's writing, with its attention to appearances, surfaces and detail. The attention to

---

1. L&U, p.11.
2. 'Tobias Smollett: Scotland's Best Novelist', Tribune, 22 September 1944, p.15.

details and to surfaces can also be linked to the nature of Orwell's proposals for political change. His idea of socialism tends to concentrate on surface features, on social atmosphere in general, and on reforms of particular areas, for example, the abolition of the House of Lords, rather than on change or analysis of the structure of society, although this is a matter of emphasis, not of exclusion.

10. Inner and outer vision

Orwell's criteria for the form of the novel, which he states in his later essay on George Gissing, show both some common points with, and some divergences from his earlier definition of realism in the novel. Plausible motivation is a condition of a true novel: 'A novel, in this sense, is a story which attempts to describe credible human beings, and - without necessarily using the techniques of naturalism - to show them acting on everyday motives and not merely undergoing strings of improbable adventures.'[1] This idea of the novel shares with the earlier definition of realism the need for the inclusion of everyday life, though here Orwell is concerned with motivation rather than representation. The passing reference to the 'techniques of naturalism' is not amplified, but its meaning would seem to be identical to the earlier definition of realism as 'the photographic imitation of everyday life.' The distinction Orwell is making than becomes clear: the novel can be, but does not have to be, realistic in this sense.

The further definition of the novel adds the need for characterisation to the related and continuing need for motivation: 'A true novel, sticking to this definition, will also contain at least two characters, probably

---

1. 'George Gissing', London Magazine, VII (June 1960), 40.

more, who are described from the inside and on the same level of probability.'[1] Clearly there is no logical contradiction between the criteria for the novel and for realism in the novel. There is, however, evidence of conflicting tendencies, both strongly felt: Orwell demands that the novel gives an inner account of motivation and character, whereas his idea of realism concentrates on an external view of objects. The bias of his critical sympathy and of much of his own writing is towards this external view. The tension between the subjective and the external view is implicit in his first-person works with the narrator acting as a witness to the external world. One of Orwell's principal criticisms of Marxism is the failure of its emphasis on class and economic interest, on the external view, to account for subjective motivation; his idea of liberalism, in contrast, includes independent judgment and freedom from external determination. The tension between inner and outer vision in his work is therefore analogous to that between liberalism and Marxism. Transitions in his writing between the two types of vision should indicate how far they have been integrated with each other, and, by analogy, cast some light on the relation between his liberalism and his use of Marxism.

Although Orwell's distinction between inner and outer vision does not occur only in his criticism of other writers and is connected with the bias of his own practice, it is a recurrent theme of his criticism. It occurs in a defence of his discussion of Dickens and work in 'Charles Dickens': 'What I should have said was that when Dickens gives a detailed description of someone working, it is always someone seen from the outside.'[2]

---

1. 'George Gissing', London Magazine, VII (June 1960), 40.
2. 'Letter to Humphrey House', 11 April 1940, CEJL, I, No.166, p.531.

In 'Charles Dickens' itself, a similar, though slightly more complicated, distinction occurs in a discussion of Dickens's treatment of childhood, which also illustrates the tendency for there to be a specifically situated reader in Orwell's criticism: 'Dickens has been able to stand both inside and outside the child's mind, in such a way that the same scene can be wild burlesque or sinister reality, according to the age at which one reads it.'[1] Through his memory of his childhood reading of Dickens, Orwell perceives an inwardness in his treatment of childhood which is absent from the treatment of work. It is not clear whether this quality of inwardness in the treatment of childhood is directly available to the adult reader. Whether this is so or not, Orwell retains a memory both of the inwardness of Dickens's treatment of childhood and of the transition from inwardness to externality in his reading experience. In 'Such, Such Were the Joys' he attempts to reverse this transition, to get inside the child's mind from his position as an adult; again the means of this transition is through memory. It would therefore be fair to link inner vision with memory, and thereby with liberalism, with which both memory and the establishment of personal identity through memory were seen to be connected.

The importance Orwell attaches to an inner view of situation and character in the novel makes the writer's own autobiography crucial: the writer's experience of a particular society at a point in history gives him access to these experiences from the inside, but denies him other experiences, and thereby affects and limits his representation of them. The assumption that autobiographical experience is crucial is a necessary basis for Orwell's critical technique of analysis of writer's work in terms of his experience

---

1. 'CD', ITW, p.25.

of class and society, and hence has a bearing upon the treatment of proletarian literature. In the case of Dickens again, his treatment of work is asserted to be limited by his social position, but at least he is firmly situated within English society, 'whereas a writer nowadays is so hopelessly isolated that the typical modern novel is a novel about a novelist.'[1] A similar criticism of modern writing is made with reference to Graham Greene's The Heart of the Matter: 'it is not easy for most modern writers to imagine the mental processes of anyone who is not a writer.'[2] This sense of a limitation to modern writing is apparent elsewhere in Orwell's criticism; the novelist is trapped within his own literary sensibility. Part of the attraction of Henry Miller's writing for Orwell is that it is free from this limitation: 'The interest of "Tropic of Cancer" was that it cast a kind of bridge across the frightful gulf which exists, in fiction, between the intellectual and the man-in-the-street.' An aspect of Orwell's interest in Joyce, revealed in the same review in 1936, is his capacity for 'standing both inside and outside the ordinary man.'[3] These passages reveal how a perception of the inherent externality of visually biased imagination and observation merges into a problem of the treatment of class. The writer is taken to be customarily of middle-class origin, likely to be isolated even within this class. Hence, given the bias of Orwell's notion of observation towards appearance and personal experience, the writer can generally only give an external account of experiences, for instance, of manual work or political oppression, outside of his habitual milieu. In order to get 'inside' these alien experiences the writer must make an unusual and difficult act of sympathy.

---

1. 'CD', ITW, p.54.
2. 'The Sanctified Sinner', New Yorker, 17 July 1948, pp. 66 and 69-71 (pp.70-71).
3. 'Some Recent Novels', NEW, IX (1936), 396.

It is, however, possible to write from inside these experiences other than by this act of sympathy. The class-barrier which isolates most writers from poverty and labour was seen not to exist for writers who are of proletarian origin and who preserve their original viewpoint. The experience of colonialism, like that of labour and poverty, is generally alien to the writer: 'no one capable of describing the atmosphere of the tropics is willing to stay there long enough to absorb it. Hence the rarity of good novels about the Far East, which can only be written by people who are in some way anomalous, like Joseph Conrad.'[1] The experience of totalitarianism is likewise closed to English writers through their protected social situation: 'There has been nothing resembling, for instance, Fontamara or Darkness at Noon, because there is almost no English writer to whom it has happened to see totalitarianism from the inside.'[2] The experiences closed to the English writer, or only available in their outward form, are crucial historical experiences: 'Hunger, hardship, solitude, exile, war, prison, persecution, manual labour - hardly even words.'[3] The position of these writers within crucial situations, which are generally closed to the writer because of his origins and sensibility, is a matter of chance or of personal anomaly, not a consequence of willed investigation in the manner of Orwell's explorations of poverty. They share the passivity of other members of these situations, but are distinguished from them by their ability to move outside these experiences, and are thereby enabled to record them.

The relevance of these critical remarks of Orwell's to his own practice requires explanation. Orwell's personal experience of colonialism in Burma is most similar to his account of the inwardness of these writers'

---

1. 'Travel Round and Down', T&T, XVII (1936), 1453. Orwell makes some similar comments on E.M. Forster's A Passage to India in 'Some Recent Novels', NEW, IX (1936), 296.
2. 'Arthur Koestler', CE, pp. 130-131.
3. 'ITW', ITW, p.171.

experiences: his entry into Burma was not in order to explore its society and then to record the exploration. In both 'A Hanging' and 'Shooting an Elephant' the witness remains within the recorded world at the end of the narrative. In Burmese Days, although Flory's critical distance from the colonial society provides an equivalent to Orwell's own exit from it, Flory is finally absorbed through his death within this society. In this sense, the forms which Orwell uses to record his Burmese experiences reflect the unconditionality of his experiences there. With regard to the latter part of Burmese Days, this argument is not conclusive: there are similar patterns of rebellion and reabsorption in the other novels whose settings were more temporarily explored by Orwell.

In his later exploration of crucial situations, there is a willed entrance into passivity, a deliberate sharing of the experience of poverty, of war in Spain, or a deliberate observation of the effects of the depression in Northern England. Yet Orwell sees passivity, not such a willed entrance into passivity, as 'inherent in working-class life. A thousand influences constantly press a working man into a passive role. He does not act, he is acted upon.'[1] A similar conflict, here between willed and involuntary involvement, arises with the Spanish War, and there is some suggestion in his writings after Homage to Catalonia that Orwell is becoming increasingly aware of this difficulty: 'Good war books are nearly always written from the angle of a victim, which is just the average man in relation to war. What vitiated the outlook of most of the foreigners in Spain and especially the English and Americans, was the knowledge at the back of their minds that they would probably succeed in escaping from Spain in the end.'[2] It is unclear whether Orwell includes

---

1. WP, p.49.
2. 'The Spanish War', Adelphi, XVI (1939), 125-126.

himself with the majority of the foreigners in Spain. Whether he would do so or not, the problem indicated is resolved formally in Homage to Catalonia and in The Road to Wigan Pier by the recording of the narrator's entrance into and exit from the investigated world, of the movement inside and then outside the experience. In Down and Out in Paris and London this movement is not acknowledged, and in some of the shorter pieces of reportage it is not developed. The distinction between inner and outer vision has been shown to be connected with the visual, outward bias of Orwell's idea and practice of observation. In its turn the problem associated with this distinction, particularly the difficulty of getting inside passive or alien experiences, influences the type of witness narrator. As the narrator cannot, by his willed entrance into these experiences, be typical of those to whom they are customary, he is made typical of the implied readership, and thus has a significance denied to the atypical individual.

It is clear, then, that there are movements between inside and outside perspectives upon the investigated world by the witness narrator. Yet even while inside this world, the narrator's observation remains inherently biased towards appearance. However, within the narrative there are also movements towards sympathetic, inward treatment of people observed. Given the bias of the narrator towards appearance, and the tendency towards the enclosure of the observing self within its own sensations, such a sympathetic movement is likely to be difficult. There are several instances of attempts at such a movement in The Road to Wigan Pier: Orwell's description of a girl seen from a train is well known: 'I had time to see everything about her - her sacking apron, her clumsy clogs, her arms reddened by the cold. She looked up as the train passed, and I was almost near enough to catch her eye. She had a round pale face, the

usual exhausted face of the slum girl who is twenty-five and looks forty, thanks to miscarriages and drudgery; and it wore, for the second in which I saw it, the most desolate, hopeless expression I have ever seen. It struck me then that we are mistaken when we say that "It isn't the same for them as it would be for us," and that people bred in the slums can imagine nothing but slums. For what I saw in her face was not the ignorant suffering of an animal. She knew well enough what was happening to her - understood as well as I did how dreadful a destiny it was to be kneeling there in the bitter cold, on the slimy stones of a slum backyard, poking a stick up a foul drain-pipe.'[1] Within this passage there is a movement from external, visual detail to an inward account of the girl's own consciousness. This transition is not simple, and there are several curious features about the account of the girl's mind. Although the episode is presented as a report of a particular incident, the girl is described in rather general terms: despite the apparent act of sympathy, particularity of the object is limited. A considerable distance is interposed between the observer and the object of his observation: he does not quite catch the girl's eye, and is enclosed within a train which is moving away from the girl's environment and which allows him only a brief view of her. The girl's consciousness is not allowed independence, but is created by the transference of the narrator's consciousness to her. The apparent act of sympathy, then, is more nearly one of a reification signalled by the distance between the observer and the observed, and by the related refusal to grant independent consciousness to the object of observation; instead there is a transference of feeling which requires an object which is passive and not individualised.

---

1. WP, p, 18.

The passivity which Orwell considers characteristic of poverty, therefore, is confirmed, and exaggerated, by the method of recording observation which tends to limit the autonomy of feeling in the object of observation. There is a similar tendency in the opening of Homage to Catalonia: the Italian militiaman is barely given independent life and there is a felt need for distance if the original image is to be retained:[1] 'I also knew that to retain my first impression of him I must not see him again.' As in the episode in The Road to Wigan Pier, there is a movement from an outward view, evident in the initial description, to an apparent inwardness and mutual understanding: 'He was a tough-looking youth of twenty-five or six, with reddish-yellow hair and powerful shoulders .... As he 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.'[2] The reification of the object of observation is also apparent in the idealisation of the Italian militiaman. Their communication takes place primarily outside of language, and though this is obviously inevitable, it has further implications. In Orwell's writing, thought and feeling are generally validated by being tested in language, although they originate prior to language: hence communication without language is a deceptive type of contact. It is telling that the communication between Winston Smith and O'Brien in Nineteen Eighty-Four, which is identified within the narrative as a deceptive and false form of contact, is, like that between the narrator and the militiaman in Homage to Catalonia, based on a sense of non-verbal mutual understanding. The internal evidence for the falsity of this transition from an outward

---

1. Alex Zwerdling, Orwell and the Left (1974), pp. 122-123 also comments on this.

2. HtC, pp.1-2.

to a sympathetic vision is strengthened by a later comment by Orwell: although his remarks are nominally limited to the Spanish people they indicate the difficulty of communication: 'Looking back on casual contacts with peasants, shopkeepers, street-hawkers, even militiamen, I now suspect that great numbers of these people had no feelings about the war whatever, except a wish that it were over.'[1] As with the instance from The Road to Wigan Pier, the transition from outward attention to appearances to a sympathetic inward vision is, upon examination, unsuccessful. Yet there is no evidence that Orwell is aware of these failures: they occur at crucial points of the narrative and the episode from Homage to Catalonia is repeated elsewhere in similar tones.[2] These instances demonstrate how the content of the recorded observation is affected by the form of the observation, by its tendency to concentrate upon appearance, and by the tendency of the observer towards self-enclosure and distancing from the object observed.

The distinction between inner and outer vision, therefore, permeates Orwell's criticism and affects his own investigation and observation. The distinction stems from the idea of the witness, particularly from the visual bias of Orwell's notion of observation, and the consequent attention to detail and appearance, which does not allow for an inward vision of characters apart from the observer. The experiences generally denied to the external observer are crucial to Orwell's thought and politics - experiences of labour, poverty, and oppression. Particularly in his criticism, Orwell uses this distinction between inner and outer vision self-consciously. Yet there are points in the reportage where he does not appear to be fully aware of the implications of this distinction for

---

1. 'The Spanish War', Adelphi, XVI (1939), 126.
2. Compare 'Looking Back on the Spanish War', England Your England, pp. 175-176.

his own writing. These instances of attempted transition from an outward to an inward, sympathetic vision also demonstrate the determination and limitation of content by the method of observation.

The difficulties in the movement from outer to inner vision in Orwell's writing are relevant to the relation between Marxism and liberalism in his work, a relation which is developing at the same time as, and subsequent to, The Road to Wigan Pier and Homage to Catalonia. The external account of people, of their class, work and nationality, is connected to, but by no means fully integrated with, an account of their subjective character and motivation. Marxism was seen to concentrate on these external conditions, on class and historical situation, and to be considered by Orwell to be deficient in its treatment of motivation, whereas his idea of liberalism emphasised more subjective qualities, for instance, of intellectual freedom. Orwell's use of Marxism and his idea of liberalism were seen to intersect at points and to affect each other, but also to be two separate and contradictory ideas. The relationship between inner and outer vision is analogous to that between liberalism and Marxism in his work, and is also similar in its content. This similarity reinforces the case that liberalism and Marxism do relate in this way in Orwell's writing, that they affect each other but are also dissonant. The final distinction between the writer and the citizen, produced in part by the interaction of Marxism and liberalism, also corresponds to the distinction of inner from outer vision, of a subjective view of motivation and character from an external account of a physical and social situation.

11. Prose like a windowpane: aesthetic and content

In Orwell's distinction between inner and outer vision there is the idea of a barrier to the transition between these two perspectives. In some cases, Orwell reproduces an equivalent to this barrier in the recording of observation, where he attempts to move from an outer to an inner perspective. This equivalent takes various forms: in the simplest case it is present as the insertion of a distance between the observer and the object of observation, even when this distance is ostensibly denied. In other cases this equivalent occurs as an actual barrier between the observer and the observed: in the instance from The Road to Wigan Pier this barrier takes the form of a windowpane which permits observation but prevents closer contact. This transparent barrier between the observer and the object of observation frequently occurs in Orwell's writing. At these points there is evidently a close relation between the content of the recorded observation and the method, or aesthetic, of Orwell's observation and prose. The source of this relation is clearest in Orwell's well known metaphor for his writing: 'Good prose is like a windowpane.'[1] The implications of this metaphor are also important. Given this quality of prose, the reader can be considered to see the observed object, or the recorded experience, through the prose. Orwell, as observer, sees the object without language and then interposes transparent language between the reader and the perceived object. In analogous fashion an actual transparent barrier, the equivalent to the barrier of language, is interposed between the observer and the object in the recording of observation.

There are several further implications of the metaphor of the windowpane

---

1. 'Why I Write', Gangrel, No.4, Summer 1946, p.9.

for prose which can be made without reference to specific examples. First, the metaphor is connected with the visual bias of Orwell's accounts of imagination and observation: it emphasises clarity of vision. In the reportage the reader's experience of reading is analogous to the author's recording of experience: the vision of objects through prose. Thus the earlier analogy between the witness's progression from innocence to experience and the reader's similar progression is accompanied by an analogy between the position of the reader and that of the narrator recording past experiences. In some cases, the presence of a barrier between the observer and his object disrupts the intended representation of sympathy. However, this barrier can take a necessary form rather than a disruptive one: in essays such as 'The Art of Donald McGill', 'Boys' Weeklies', and 'The Decline of the English Murder'[1], a typical text is interposed between Orwell and his underlying subject, the moral and social atmosphere of England. Some critics have found these essays to be Orwell's most satisfying work[2], but have not accounted for their merit in this way.

The presence of a barrier between the observer and the observed is clearly connected with the tendency of the witness to an enclosure within its own sensations; this tendency of the witness was made apparent in the discussion of Orwell's empirical definition of the self. The impulse towards passivity is also part of this tendency to self-enclosure: it takes the form of a desire to get inside situations which enforce passivity, to get 'inside the whale'. Yet from this self-imposed passivity there arises a further problem: how to reconcile passivity with the activity of observation. In his treatment of Henry Miller, in which Orwell is

---

1. Horizon, IV (1941), 153-162; Horizon, I (1940), 174-200; and Tribune, 15 February 1946, p.10.
2. Raymond Williams, Orwell (1971), p.86 touches on this preference.

exploring his own role as a writer, this dilemma is resolved through an image: 'Miller himself is inside the whale. All his best and most characteristic passages are written from the angle of Jonah, a willing Jonah. Not that he is especially introverted - quite the contrary. In his case the whale happens to be transparent.'[1] Inside a transparent whale: capable of observation and of autonomy of thought but protected from contact and essentially passive. Images of submersion and of enclosure, recur in Orwell's writing, but the emphasis of these images is more generally on passivity than on observation. A closer analogue to the combination of enclosure and observation imaged in 'Inside the Whale' is provided by the frequent placing of the observer in Orwell's writing within trains, detached and protected from the object of observation. This detachment implicit in the episode of the girl seen from a departing train has already been discussed. Elsewhere in The Road to Wigan Pier the train journey acts as a protected environment, as 'an interregnum, a kind of temporary death', which allows Orwell to safely 'damn[ed] the British Empire'[2]; this sense of protection strengthens the evidence for detachment from the girl. The same phrase to describe detachment through travel occurs in both The Road to Wigan Pier and in 'Such, Such Were the Joys': 'The train bore me away'[3]: train-journeys in Orwell's writing are characteristically a means of detachment and of self protection.

So far the concern has been with the witness of the reportage. This means of detachment and self-protection is exemplified and at its most forceful in this work, but it is also present in the novels. Bowling in Coming Up For Air has an increased capacity for judgment while on trains,'a feeling of being able to see things in a better perspective than usual.'[4]

---

1. 'ITW', ITW, p.58.
2. WP, pp. 232 and 177.
3. WP, p.18; 'Such, Such Were the Joys', CEJL, IV, No.86, p.364.
4. CUFA, pp. 273-274.

For Dorothy in A Clergyman's Daughter the perspective of a train-journey enables her to formulate her crucial loss of faith: 'She was still looking out of the window. The train had drawn clear of the eastern slums and was running at gathering speed past willow-bordered streams and low lying meadows .... Something had happened in her heart, and the world was a little emptier, a little poorer from that minute.'[1] In one of Orwell's accounts of his journey to Spain the train journey prompts a crucial insight: 'And it struck me that the motives of the polyglot army that filled the train, and of the peasants with raised fists out there in the fields, and my own motive in going to Spain, and the motive of the old taxi-driver in insulting me, were at bottom all the same.'[2] Clearly, therefore, the train journey provides a harmonious setting for the self characteristic of Orwell's writing, with its need for detachment and protection, and for a perspective from which to formulate judgments. The contradictions which arise from this need do not make themselves as acutely felt in the novels, where there is not a conflict between the witness's effort at sympathy and the simultaneous interposition of detachment and distance.

Glass is also used as an image for class barriers in the fiction, often to denote the protection and enclosure of the monied class: 'A stream of cars hummed easily up the hill. Gordon eyed them without envy. Who wants a car, anyway? The pink doll-faces of upper-class women gazed at him through the car window. Bloody nit-witted lapdogs.'[3] In The Road to Wigan Pier this use of glass-barriers as an image for class-differences is more prominent and explicit: 'Whichever way you turn this curse of class-difference confronts you like a wall of stone. Or rather it is not so much like a stone wall as the plate-glass pane of an aquarium; it is so

---

1. ACD, p.291.
2. 'As I Please', Tribune, 15 September 1944, p.11.
3. KAF, p.65.

easy to pretend that it isn't there, and so impossible to get through it.'[1] Despite this extreme difficulty of penetration, Orwell does attempt to cross this barrier, to move from an outer to an inner vision, in the description of the 'working-class interior' in a crucial passage at the conclusion of the first part of The Road to Wigan Pier. However, this attempt at sympathetic closeness betrays itself: the description of the interior is distanced and reified by the generalisation of its details, the tendency to sentimentality and stasis. There is also a nostalgic distance induced by the lapse of time since the original vision.

Where the attention of The Road to Wigan Pier to surfaces and impressions is replaced by an attempt at sympathy, there is a disruptive but unacknowledged distance inserted within this sympathy. This distance is inherent in Orwell's prose aesthetic, in the tendency to interpose, between the observer and his object, a barrier equivalent to the transparent prose interposed in the act of writing. It is also inherent in the witness's tendency to enclosure within its own sensations: the witness is capable of recording its own impressions and sensations but not of easy, or convincing, movement away from its circle of sensations.

The destruction of the 'crystal spirit' in Nineteen Eighty-Four has been accounted for. Elsewhere in Nineteen Eighty-Four, a windowpane barrier is interposed between Winston Smith and the object of his observation, particularly at points where there is a suggestion of solidarity between them. The 'old woman['s] pegging the bloomers on the line', seen in imagination by Bowling in Coming Up For Air from the protected perspective of a train,[2] recurs several times in Nineteen Eighty-Four from a similar

---

1. WP, p.188.
2. CUFA, p.29.

perspective through Winston's consciousness: 'he strolled across to the window .... As he looked at the woman in her characteristic attitude, her thick arms reaching up for the line, her powerful mare-like buttocks protruded, it struck him for the first time that she was beautiful. ... The solid, contourless body, like a block of granite .... The mystical reverence that he felt for her .... If there was hope, it lay in the proles!'[1] As well as the distance of the observation, and the barrier between the observer and his object, there is some stereotyping. In addition to this the picture is characteristically static and there is an element of animality, 'mare-like buttocks',and reification, 'like a block of granite', in the description. At the same time there is affection and admiration in the portrait. However, the suggestion of solidarity, and of hope, is disrupted by the intrusion of a distance, and of other related elements, into the observation. This distance is not accidental, although it remains unacknowledged within the text, but the product of an inherent tendency of Orwell's method of recording observation.

In conclusion, Orwell's method of observation, and the prose aesthetic to which it gives rise, can be seen to influence the content of what is recorded. This influence is apparent both in the reportage, which purports to record observation directly, and in the more indirect fictional forms. As the method of the presentation of observation is closely adapted to the recording of impressions and appearances, the transition from this customary outer vision to an empathetic, inner treatment is particularly problematic. At several crucial points where this transition is attempted elements of distance and of reification, a barrier between the observer and the observed, disrupt and complicate this transition to empathy. Yet the authorial rhetoric does not seem to take account of this disruption.

---

1. NEF, pp. 220-221.

At these points, therefore, there is a strong, and apparently unconscious, determination of content by the underlying aesthetic and method of observation.

12. Conclusion

There are, then, many connections between Orwell's political thought and context and the forms of his writing. Although an analysis of form pays more attention directly to his writing than to its historical context, it still depends upon a knowledge of this context. Orwell's ideas on language, and the relation of his reportage to the documentary movement, for instance, can only be fully understood by studying the historical situation. Equally, the various tones of his work, intolerant and aggressive, or nostalgic, are related to historical developments.

The role and character of the witness in Orwell's reportage is intimately connected with his idea of liberalism. The fair assessment of a situation upon the evidence found by an independent observer is a shared value. The establishment of personal identity in Orwell's work by sensation and memory can also be seen as part of liberalism. This type of fair assessment and identity both depend upon evidence presented to the senses and to the mind, and can be described as empirical: in Nineteen Eighty-Four both the 'empirical habit of thought'[1] and personal identity sustained by evidence are crushed.

These methods of thought can have dangers. It is difficult to arrive at general ideas: evidence can be fragmentary and partial, or only valid for

---

1. NEF, p.190.

the isolated observer. The witness of the reportage, partly escapes these restrictions by using its position to give its observation and arguments the force of being representative of an important part of society. Some of the dangers of fragmentation do still emerge. Generalisations, of which there are many in Orwell's work, are sometimes insecurely connected to particular observations: the division of The Road to Wigan Pier into separate parts of observation and political exhortation is an example of this tendency. An analysis of Orwell's ideas on language also showed how these methods of judgment are better suited to an iconoclastic than creative role. What is actually offered by 'Politics and the English Language' is a framework for evaluating the moral integrity of political discourse; it does not offer a set of positive political values beyond this, but this negative centre is partly concealed. At other points in his work there is a more explicit mixture of agnosticism and conviction, a refusal of absolute values while strongly urging a course of action.

The establishing of personal identity by sensation and memory has the danger that the self can become isolated, trapped within the circle of its own sensations, and that the self will be opposed to society. The distance between the observing subject and observed world can disrupt attempts at empathy. Some evidence of this, in difficult transitions from outer to inner perspectives and in a tendency to reify the object of observation, was seen in crucial passages from The Road to Wigan Pier, and Homage to Catalonia. In these passages, then, there is a conflict between Orwell's liberalism in his method of observation and the impulse to compassion and involvement, the basis of his socialism.

This conflict points to the lack of a full resolution of liberal and Marxist ideas of the self in the character of the witness. The different

chronologies of the development of the witness in Orwell's work and of his relation to liberalism, although they can be related to each other, also suggest that the partial resolution of these two ideas in the witness was not fully consciously realised. The political debate grows in self-consciousness in the late 1930s after the witness narratives. Orwell does not seem to have had a generic term for these works and this also suggests some lack of self-consciousness about their form. The absence of a generic term can be related to the fluctuation of forms and intentions in his writing of the early and mid-1930s. This, in turn, can be compared to the complexity and confusion of his political thought at this time, with its debate between socialism and other beliefs, Tory, anarchist, and liberal. That the form of the witness narratives and the treatment of personal identity should embody some of the conflict between liberalism and Marxism in his work does indicate how fundamental these two poles are to it.

APPENDIX

A note on the dates of the essays in Inside the Whale

These has been no critical attempt to specify the dates of composition of the three essays, 'Charles Dickens', 'Inside the Whale', and 'Boys' Weeklies', which go to make up Inside the Whale. The collection as a whole was begun in late May and finished by mid-December 1939.[1] In The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters pieces are usually arranged in order of publication except where the time lag between the dates of composition and of publication is unusually large, in which case the date of writing is preferred.[2] Inside the Whale is placed according to its date of publication, immediately after a letter dated 8 March 1940, and the original order of the essays, 'Charles Dickens', 'Boys' Weeklies', then 'Inside the Whale', is retained. Frank Richards's reply to 'Boys' Weeklies' is interpolated between that essay and 'Inside the Whale', and 'Inside the Whale' is the only essay of the original three which the editors do not explicitly state to have been written in 1939.[3] Crick's biography neither contradicts nor adds anything to these dates; it does, however, state that in early September Orwell had intended to finish Inside the Whale within a few weeks of the outbreak of war, but, in fact, did not complete it until December.[4] A letter from Orwell to Geoffrey Gorer gives the reasons for this delay: he had at first intended to take four months over Inside the Whale, but his father's death on 28 June 1939 had interrupted the work which, when it was resumed, was again interrupted

---

1. Ian Angus, 'Appendix II: Chronology', CEJL, I, pp. 543-551 (p.550).
2. The Editors, 'A Note on the Editing', CEJL, I, pp. xxi-xxiii (p.xxi).
3. 'Charles Dickens', CEJL, I, No.162, pp. 413-460; 'Boys' Weeklies', CEJL, I, No.163, pp. 460-484; 'Frank Richards Replies to George Orwell', CEJL, I, pp. 485-493; 'Inside the Whale', CEJL, I, No.164, pp. 493-527.
4. Bernard Crick, George Orwell: A Life (1980), pp. 258-259.

by the outbreak of war in September 1939. As a result, the book took six or seven months to write, a period roughly corresponding to the interval from May to December.[1] The external evidence therefore does not give any direct pointers to the order of composition of the essays, but does make it possible to divide the writing into three periods: from late May to late June, July and August, and finally from some time in September to mid-December, the last period being the longest of the three and considerably greater than was anticipated near its beginning in September.

Textual evidence from the essays does give some indication of their dates of composition, and also of some later local revisions to take account of both historical events and of changes in Orwell's views. A footnote to 'Boys' Weeklies' states that a passage noting the absence of references to the European situation in the Gem and Magnet was written 'some months before the outbreak of war' and that up 'to the end of September 1939 no mention of the war had appeared in either paper.' 'Some months' suggests the period from late May to late June, rather than July or August, while the footnote itself must have been written after the end of September 1939. The passage immediately following the footnote, from 'That does not mean that these papers are unpatriotic - quite the contrary' to 'one of the reasons why left-wing political parties are seldom able to produce an acceptable foreign policy', may well be an interpolation or a substantial revision of an existing passage. Although it continues the examination of the political assumptions and attitudes of the magazines, it partly reverses the direction of the argument, 'quite the contrary', and, more tellingly with its image of English patriotism as 'family loyalty', and its hit at the foreign policies of left-wing parties, has more in common

---

1.'Letter to Geoffrey Gorer', 10 January 1940, CEJL, I, No.159, pp.410-411.

with Orwell's early wartime work, particularly The Lion and the Unicorn and 'The Art of Donald McGill', than it does with his earlier equation of bourgeois democracy with Fascism and his consequent opposition to war nominally against Fascism. A passage a few lines later offers clear evidence of some local revision: 'The mental world of the Gem and Magnet, therefore, is something like this: The year is 1910 - or 1940, but it is all the same.' The reference to 1940 shows that this passage was written in that year, or in late 1939 when it was clear that publication would be delayed until then. It contrasts with the specification of date slightly later in the essay: 'But now turn from the Gem and Magnet to the more up-to-date papers which have appeared since the Great War.' The phrase 'since the Great War' suggests that this passage was written before the start of the Second War.[1] Some conclusions can now be drawn on the dating of 'Boys' Weeklies'. The essay as a whole was completed before the outbreak of war and was at least half-complete by late June 1939. When it became clear that it would not be published until 1940, a footnote was introduced and some adjacent passages were revised, quite possibly at the same time. These revisions were merely local and contrast in their themes and dates with the rest of the essay which seems to have been left untouched.

'Inside the Whale' also bears evidence of some local revisions, also in the form of interpolations. A reference to the Russo-German pact, 23 August 1939, stands out from its context: 'The years 1935-9 were the period of anti-Fascism and the Popular Front, the heyday of the Left Book Club, when red duchesses and 'broadminded' deans toured the battlefields of the Spanish war and Winston Churchill was the blue-eyed boy of the Daily Worker. Since then, of course, there has been yet another change

---

1. 'Boys' Weeklies', ITW, pp. 108-109.

of 'line'. But what is important for my purpose is that it was during the 'anti-Fascist' phase that the younger English writers gravitated towards Communism.' The reference to the pact, 'another change of line', is perfunctory, though obviously necessary, and disrupts Orwell's rhetoric. The implications for the Communist mentality of the sudden change of allegiance are also left unexplored, although his later work shows a persistent interest in this area. An allusion towards the end of the essay to the start of the Second War shows similar traces of having been introduced after the completion of the essay: 'While I have been writing this book another European war has broken out. It will either last several years and tear Western civilisation to pieces, or it will end inconclusively and prepare the way for yet another war which will do the job once and for all. But war is only 'peace intensified'. What is quite obviously happening, war or no war, is the break-up of laissez-faire capitalism and of the liberal-Christian culture.'[1] The publication in 1940 of a discussion of the relation between historical changes and social and intellectual temper would demand some acknowledgement of the effects of war. Such an acknowledgement is provided but it is brief and unsatisfactory: despite its capacity to 'tear Western civilisation to pieces', war is given no observable role in the decline of liberal culture; the idea of war as an agent for social change, important in The Lion and the Unicorn, is largely omitted here. The case of 'Inside the Whale' is therefore similar to that of 'Boys' Weeklies': that it was completed before the start of the Second War, probably before the Russo-German pact, and that historical events and the delay in publication required some local revisions. In both cases, these revisions are not fully integrated with their respective essays and must have been made after the outbreak of war. The remainder of 'Inside the Whale' bears evidence of its pre-war

---

1. 'Inside the Whale', ITW, pp. 166 and 184.

composition and does not give signs of revision at a later date. The original composition of 'Inside the Whale' can therefore be assigned to July and August 1939.

Most of the writing of 'Charles Dickens' must then have taken place between September and December 1939. Further evidence can be adduced for this dating. It is by far the longest essay of Inside the Whale and the period thus allowed for it is proportionately longer than that assigned to the other two essays; if its length was partly unanticipated, this would help to explain the extra time taken to finish Inside the Whale beyond what was planned in early September. In addition, its themes and tone have more in common with Orwell's other early wartime writing than they do with his rather negative political position immediately before the war. This connection is particularly evident from its conclusion with its celebration of English cultural unity and of nineteenth-century liberalism. Indeed, it is possible to discern a thematic progression in 'Charles Dickens' which corresponds to a likely outline of the chronological development of Orwell's thought during its composition: the essay opens with some criticism of the inability of Dickens's predominantly moral perception to comprehend the wrongness of the economic system 'as a system'[1] and concludes with an eulogy to his moral and intellectual position. The essay was begun either when Orwell was fiercely critical of English bourgeois democracy, or more probably, immediately after his abrupt change in late August 1939 to support for war for democracy against Fascism. As his commitment to English democracy gathers substance, so the essay moves from a tempered and questioning criticism of Dickens's political attitudes to a final celebration of his moral and intellectual temper and of the English culture with which he associates them.

---

1. 'Charles Dickens', ITW, pp. 13-14.

So a combination of biographical and textual evidence has made it possible to assign dates of composition to the essays of Inside the Whale. 'Boys' Weeklies' was written first; 'Inside the Whale' next and was substantially, if not entirely, complete by the outbreak of war; 'Charles Dickens' was the last and was begun in late August or in September 1939. It is tempting, though it cannot be proven, to refine this dating and assign each essay to a distinguishable period in Orwell's life: 'Boys' Weeklies' to the period up to his visit to his parents' home in Southwold on 24 June 1939; 'Inside the Whale' to the time from after his father's funeral to his visit to L.H. Myers on 24 August 1939; and 'Charles Dickens' to the period from September to December 1939.[1] 'Boys' Weeklies' and 'Inside the Whale' show traces of later revision. Both essays are revised in a similar way and to a similar purpose: brief comments on public events which have occurred since the original composition of the essays are introduced where they will best fit in with the existing argument, and, in the case of 'Boys' Weeklies' some changes in Orwell's political views are also incorporated. In neither case does the remainder of the text betray any sign of having been revised to this end, the revisions remain merely local, and, indeed, are identifiable because they are at odds with the rest of the essay. They may well have been introduced in order to avoid the awkwardness of a preliminary explanation of the dates of the essays and of the subsequent historical changes in Inside the Whale. In view of their mutual similarity, it is reasonable to suppose that the revisions to both essays were made at the same time, quite possibly in December 1939 when the collection as a whole was complete.

The identification and dating of the revisions to 'Boys' Weeklies' and 'Inside the Whale' serves to explain some internal discrepancies and

---

1. See Ian Angus, 'Appendix II: Chronology', CEJL, I, pp. 543-551 (p.550).

curiously undeveloped points in these essays. The dating of the original composition of the essays has more substantial implications. It helps to account for differences of mood between the essays that go to make up Inside the Whale: the acuteness of the pessimism of 'Inside the Whale' can be connected with Orwell's negative and rather isolated political position immediately before the war, while the growing optimism of 'Charles Dickens' can be related to his increasing appreciation of the values of English democracy and liberalism. The absence of a sense of desperation in 'Boys' Weeklies' when compared to 'Inside the Whale' can be partly explained by the differences in their subjects, but can also be fairly ascribed to its earlier date of writing, before the further intensification of the public crisis which forms the context for 'Inside the Whale',

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Intellectual and historical background

Note: This section has usually been preferred for those books and articles which are of interest both for their account of the intellectual and historical context and as criticism of Orwell's writing.

Ayer, A.J. — Language, Truth and Logic (1936)

Barnouw, Erik — Documentary: A History of the Non-Fiction Film (New York, 1974)

Barbusse, Henri — One Looks at Russia first published Paris, 1930, English translation by Warre B. Wells (1931)

Bédarida, Francois — A Social History of England, 1851-1975, translated by A.S. Forster (1979)

Beer, Maurice — A History of British Socialism Vol.2 (1940)

Bergonzi, Bernard — The Situation of the Novel (1970)

Reading the Thirties: Texts and Contexts (1978)

Berki, R.N. — Socialism (1975)

Berlin, Isaiah — Four Essays on Liberty (1969)

Bernal, J.D. — 'Belief and Action', Modern Quarterly, n.s. I (1945), 44-59

Bradley, Ian — The Optimists: Themes and Personalities in Victorian Liberalism (1980)

Brown, Alec — The Fate of the Middle Classes (1936)

Bourne, George — Memoirs of a Surrey Labourer (1910)

Lucy Bettesworth (1913)

Brady, Robert A. — The Spirit and Structure of German Fascism (1937)

Brockway, A. Fenner	'Pacifism and the Left-Wing'(1938)
Bullock, Alan and Maurice Shock eds.	The Liberal Tradition from Fox to Keynes (1956)
Burnham, James	The Managerial Revolution; or, What is Happening in the World Now (New York, 1941)
Calder, Angus	The People's War: Britain 1939-45 (1969)
Calverton, V.F.	The Passing of the Gods (1935)
Canovan, Margaret	G.K. Chesterton: Radical Populist (1977)
Caudwell, Christopher	Illusion and Reality: A Study of the Sources of Poetry (1937)
	Studies in a Dying Culture (1938)
Caute, David	The Fellow-Travellers: A Postscript to the Enlightenment (1973)
Ceadel, Martin	Pacifism in Britain 1914-45: The Defining of a Faith (Oxford, 1980)
Charques, R.D.	Contemporary Literature and Social Revolution (1933)
Chesterton, G.K.	Charles Dickens (1906)
	Stories, Essays and Poems (London, J.M. Dent, 1935)
Clark, Jon and others	Culture and Crisis in Britain in the Thirties (1979)
Cobbett, William	Rural Rides (1830)
Cole, Margaret	The Story of Fabian Socialism (1961)
Common, Jack	The Freedom of the Streets (1938)
Connolly, Cyril	Enemies of Promise (1938)
Conrad, Joseph	The Nigger of the 'Narcissus' first published 1897, in The Nigger of the 'Narcissus', 'Typhoon' and Other Stories (London, J.M. Dent, 1950)
Cowling, Maurice	The Impact of Hitler: British Politics and British Policy 1933-40 (Cambridge, 1975)
Crick, Bernard	Political Theory and Practice (1975)
Crossman, Richard	The God That Failed (1950)
Cummings, E.E.	Eimi (New York, 1933)

Currie, Robert — Industrial Politics (1979)

Daiches, David — Literature and Society (1938)

Davies, W.H. — The Autobiography of a Super Tramp (1908)

Dodd, Philip — 'The Views of Travellers: Travel Writing in the 1930s', Prose Studies, V (1982), 127-138

Doyle, Brian — 'The Necessity of Illusion: The Writings of Christopher Caudwell.', Literature and History, VI (1980), 235-248

Eastman, Max — Artists in Uniform: A Study of Literature and Bureaucratism (1934)

Eagleton, Terry — Criticism and Ideology (1975)

Eliot, T.S. — A Choice of Kipling's Verse with an Essay on Rudyard Kipling (London, Faber and Faber, 1941)

Ellis, Havelock — My Life (1940)

Empson, William — Some Versions of Pastoral (1935)

Ford, G.H. and Lauriat Lane eds. — The Dickens Critics (New York, 1971)

Forster, E.M. — Two Cheers for Democracy (1951)

Fox, Ralph — The Novel and the People (1937)

Fussell, Paul — Abroad: British Literary Traveling Between the Wars (Oxford, 1980)

Gide, Andre — Afterthoughts: A Sequel to Back From the U.S.S.R. translated by Dorothy Bussy (1938)

Back From the U.S.S.R. translated by Dorothy Bussy (1937)

Gilbert, James — 'Literature and Revolution in the United States: The Partisan Review', Journal of Contemporary History, II (1967), 161-176

Gissing, George — Charles Dickens: A Critical Study (1898)

Critical Studies of the Works of Charles Dickens (New York, 1924)

New Grub Street (1891)

The Odd Women (1893)

Gloversmith, Frank ed. — Class, Culture and Social Change: A New View of the 1930s (Brighton, 1980)

Gouldner, Alvin W.	The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology (1971)
Green, Julian	Personal Record: 1928-1939 translated by Jocelyn Godefroi (1939)
Green, Martin	A Mirror for Anglo-Saxons (1957)
Greene, Graham	Journey Without Maps (New York, 1936)
Greene, Graham ed.	The Old School (1934)
Gross, John	The Rise and Fall of the Man of Letters: Aspects of English Literary Life since 1800 (1969)
Hamilton, Ian	The Little Magazines: A Study of Six Editors (1976)
Hanley, James	Grey Children: A Study in Humbug and Misery (1937)
Henderson, Philip	Literature and a Changing Civilisation (1935)
	The Novel Today (1936)
	The Poet and Society (1939)
Hewison, Robert	In Anger: Culture in the Cold War 1945-1960 (1981)
	Under Siege: Literary Life in London 1939-45 (1977)
Hill, Christopher ed.	The English Revolution 1640: Three Essays in Interpretation (1940)
Hobhouse, L.T.	Liberalism (1911)
Hoggart, Richard	The Uses of Literacy (1957)
Hollander, Paul	Political Pilgrims: Travels of Western Intellectuals to the Soviet Union, China and Cuba (New York, 1981)
House, Humphry	The Dickens World (1941)
Hyman, S.E.	The Armed Vision: A Study in the Methods of Modern Literary Criticism (New York, 1948)
Hynes, Samuel	The Auden Generation: Literature and Politics in England in the 1930s (1976)
Jackson, T.A.	Charles Dickens: The Progress of a Radical (1937)
Jameson, Fredric	Marxism and Form (1971)

Joad, C.E.M.	Journey Through the War Mind (1940)
Jupp, James	The Radical Left in Britain 1931-1941 (1982)
Koestler, Arthur	Darkness at Noon (1940)
	The Invisible Writing: An Autobiography (1954)
	The Yogi and the Commissar and Other Essays (1945)
Krupskaya, Nadezhda K.	Memories of Lenin 2 Vols., translated by E. Verney (1930)
Laski, H.J.	Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time (1943)
	The Rise of European Liberalism: An Essay in Interpretation (1936)
Leavis, F.R.	For Continuity (Cambridge, 1933)
	The Great Tradition (1948)
Leavis, Q.D.	Fiction and the Reading Public (1932)
Lewis, C. Day ed.	The Mind in Chains: Socialism and the Cultural Revolution (1937)
Lewis, John	The Left Book Club: An Historical Record (1970)
Lindsay, Jack	After the Thirties: The Novel in Britain and its Future (1956)
Locke, John	An Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1690)
Lodge, David	The Novelist at the Crossroads (and other Essays on Fiction and Criticism) (1971)
" "	*The Modes of Modern Writing: Metaphor, Metonymy*
London, Jack	The Iron Heel (New York 1907) *and the Typology of Literature (1977)*
	The People of the Abyss (1903)
Lukes, Steven	Individualism (Oxford, 1973)
Lyons, Eugene	Assignment in Utopia (1938)
Maccoby, S. ed.	The English Radical Tradition 2nd edition (1966)
MacDonald, Dwight	The Responsibility of Peoples and Other Essays in Political Criticism (1957)
MacIntyre, Stuart	Little Moscows: Communism and Working-class Militancy in Inter-war Britain (1980)
MacKenzie, Norman	Socialism: A Short History revised edition (1966)
MacNeice, Louis	Modern Poetry: A Personal Essay (1938)

MacNeice, Louis — The Strings are False (1965)

Mander, John — The Writer and Commitment (1961)

Mann, Thomas — Order of the Day: Political Essays and Speeches of Two Decades (New York, 1942)

Manning, D.J. — Liberalism (1976)

Margolies, David N. — The Function of Literature: A Study of Christopher Caudwell's Aesthetics (1969)

Marx, Karl — Capital: A Critique of Political Economy Vol.1, translated by Ben Fowkes (Harmondsworth, Penguin; London, New Left Review, 1976)

Early Writings translated by Rodney Livingstone and Gregory Benton (Harmondsworth, Penguin, in association with New Left Review, 1975)

Mass Observation — First Year's Work, 1937-38, by Mass Observation edited by Charles Madge and Tom Harrison (London, 1938)

McCarthy, Mary — On the Contrary (1962)

Mill, John Stuart — Autobiography edited by Jack Stillinger (Oxford, U.P., 1969)

'On Liberty', in Three Essays: On Liberty, Representative Government, The Subjection of Women (Oxford, U.P., 1975), pp.5-141

Mirsky, Dmitri — The Intelligentsia of Great Britain translated by Alec Brown (1935)

Morris, William — Political Writings edited by A.L. Morton. (London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1973)

Three Works: News from Nowhere, The Pilgrims of Hope, The Dream of John Ball with an introduction by A.L. Morton (London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1968)

Muir, Edwin — Scottish Journey (1935)

Mulhern, Francis — 'The Marxist Aesthetics of Christopher Caudwell,' New Left Review, No.85, May-June 1974, pp.37-58

The Moment of 'Scrutiny' (1979)

Murry, Middleton John — The Necessity of Communism (1932)

Nevinson, H.W. — Visions and Memories (1944)

Nevinson, H.W. ed. — England's Voice of Freedom: An Anthology of Liberty (1929)

North, Joseph ed. — New Masses: An Anthology of the Rebel Thirties (New York, 1969)

Oldershaw, Lucien ed. — England: A Nation: Being the Papers of the Patriots' Club (1904)

Ould, Herman ed. — Freedom of Expression: A Symposium (1945)

Page, Norman — Speech in the English Novel (1973)

Paine, Thomas — Common Sense (1776)

Rights of Man (1791-92)

Pelling, Henry — The British Communist Party: A Historical Profile (1958)

Popular Politics and Society in Late Victorian Britain (1968)

A Short History of the Labour Party 4th edition (1972)

Pelling, Henry ed. — The Challenge of Socialism 2nd edition (1968)

Pierson, Stanley — British Socialists: The Journey from Fantasy to Politics (1979)

Pimlott, Ben — Labour and the Left in the 1930s (Cambridge, 1977)

Priestley, J.B. — English Journey (1933)

Read, Herbert — A Coat of Many Colours: Occasional Essays (1945)

To Hell With Culture and Other Essays on Art and Society (1963)

Rees, Goronwy — A Bundle of Sensations: Sketches in Autobiography (1960)

'The Legacy of Stalin', in Brief Encounters (1974), pp.170-175

Reid, Fred — 'The Disintegration of Liberalism, 1895-1931', in Michael Bell ed., The Context of English Literature 1900-1930 (1980), pp.94-125

Reynolds, Stephen — A Poor Man's House (1908)

Reynolds, Stephen and Bob and Tom Woolley — Seems So: A Working-class View of Politics (1911)

Richards, I.A. — Practical Criticism: A Study of Literary Judgment (1929)

Rieff, Philip	'English Intellectuals and Politics in the 1930s', in Philip Rieff ed., On Intellectuals: Theoretical and Case Studies (New York, 1969) pp.196-247
Russell, Bertrand	Power (1938)
	The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism 2nd edition (1949)
Smith, David	Socialist Propaganda in the Twentieth-Century British Novel (1978)
Spender, J.A.	The Government of Mankind (1938)
	Last Essays (1944)
Spender, Stephen	Forward from Liberalism (1937)
	'The New Realism: A Discussion' (1939)
	The Struggle of the Modern (1963)
	The Thirties and After (1978)
	World Within World (1951)
Steiner, George	Language and Silence: Essays 1958-66 (1967)
Stevenson, John and Chris Cook	The Slump: Society and Politics during the Depression (1977)
Stokes, Eric	The English Utilitarians and India (Oxford, 1959)
Strachey, John	The Coming Struggle for Power (1932)
	The Strangled Cry (1962)
Struve, Gleb	25 Years of Soviet Russian Literature (1918-1943) (1944)
Swingler, Randall	'The Right to Free Expression', Polemic, 5 September 1946, pp.45-53
Symons, Julian	The Thirties: A Dream Revolved (1960)
Tawney, R.H.	Equality 3rd edition (1938)
	Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (1926)
Terrill, Ross	R.H. Tawney and His Times: Socialism as Fellowship (1974)
Thomas, Hugh	The Spanish Civil War revised edition (1965)
Tomlinson, G.A.W.	Coal-Miner (1937)

Trilling, Lionel — The Middle of the Journey (1948)

Trollope, Anthony — An Autobiography first published 1883 (Oxford, U.P., 1950)

Trotsky, Leon — The Revolution Betrayed translated by M. Eastman (1937)

Upward, Edward — In The Thirties (1962)

The Rotten Elements (1969)

Waites, Bernard — 'The Language and Imagery of Class in Early Twentieth-Century England (c.1900-25)' Literature and History, No.4, Autumn 1976, pp.30-55

Watson, George — The English Ideology: Studies in the Language of Victorian Politics (1973)

The Literary Critics: A Study of English Descriptive Criticism (1962)

Politics and Literature in Modern Britain (1977)

Wells, H.G. — Experiment in Autobiography 2 vols. (1934)

The History of Mr. Polly (1910)

Tono-Bungay (New York, 1908)

Werskey, Gary — The Visible College (1978)

West, Alick — Crisis and Criticism (1937)

One Man in His Time: An Autobiography (1969)

Wilde, Oscar — 'The Soul of Man Under Socialism' first published 1891, in De Profundis and Other Writings (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1973)

Wilkinson, Ellen — The Town That Was Murdered: The Life-Story of Jarrow (1939)

Willey, Basil — Nineteenth Century Studies: Coleridge to Matthew Arnold (1949)

Williams, Raymond — Culture and Society 1780-1950 (1958)

Marxism and Literature (Oxford, 1977)

Wilson, Edmund — Axel's Castle: A Study in the Imaginative Literature of 1870-1930 (1931)

The Wound and the Bow: Seven Studies in Literature (Cambridge, Mass., 1941)

Winegarten, Renée	Writers and Revolution: The Fatal Lure of Action (New York, 1974)
Wood, Neal	Communism and British Intellectuals (1959)
Woodhouse, Michael and Brian Pearce	Essays on the History of Communism in Britain (1975)
Zhdanov A. and others	Problems of Soviet Literature: Reports and Speeches at the First Soviet Writers' Congress edited by H. Scott (1935)

2. Periodicals surveyed and articles cited

The Adelphi

Vols. I-XIII (October 1930-September 1937)

Murry, J.M.	'Prologue to Russia'	II (1931), 351-353
" "	'The Isolation of Russia and the Way Out'	III (1932), 195-205
	'Shakespeare on Money', translated from Karl Marx, Nationalökonomie und Philosophic	V (1932), 2-6
Marx, Karl	'From the "Introduction to a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law"'	V (1933), 391-393
Todd, Judith and Donald Fraser	'The Middle Class Proletariat'	VI (1933), 48-53
Julier, E.C.	'The Ethical Stimulus to Revolution'	IX (1935), 265-270

Fact

Numbers 1-16 (April 1937-July 1938)

	'Ourselves'	1, April 1937, pp. 6-8
Jameson, Storm	'Socialists Born and Made'	2, May 1937, pp. 87-90
" " "	'Documents'	4, July 1937, pp. 9-18

Freedom Defence Committee Bulletin

Numbers 2-7 (February/March 1946 - Autumn 1948)

	'The Amnesty Campaign'	2: February-March 1946, p.1
	'Freedom of the Park'	2: February-March 1946, pp.6 and 8
	'Letter to the Press'	7: Autumn 1948, p.1
	'Anti-Communism: The American Witch-hunt'	7: Autumn 1948, pp.2-3
	'F.D.C. Statement on Civil Service Purge'	7: Autumn 1948, pp.2-3

Left Review

Volumes I - III (October 1934-May 1938)

	'Writers' International (British Section)'	I (1934), 75
	'From Lewis Grassic Gibbon', in 'Controversy: Writers' International (British Section)'	I (1935), 179
West, Alick	'Mirsky's One-sided Picture'	I (1935), 324-328
Rickword, Edgell	'Review of Philip Henderson, Literature'	II (1935), 41-44
	'"International Writers in London." Report by Derek Kahn of the recent conference of the International Association of Writers for the Defence of Culture'	II (1936), 481-490
Lehmann, John	'Should Soviet Writers Keep to Their Art?'	II (1936), 881-885
" " "	'The Seven Soviet Arts'	III (1937)

Left Review continued

Jackson, T.A.	'Dickens the Radical'	III (1937), 88-95
Swingler, Randall	'Spender's Approach to Communism' (Review of Forward from Liberalism by Stephen Spender)	III (1937), 110-113
Jackson, T.A.	'The Moscow Trial'	III (1937), 116-118
Kahn, Derek	'The Road to Wigan Pier'	III (1937), 186-187
Sloan, Pat	'The Two André Gides'	III (1937), 242-244
Williams, W.H.	'A Working Class Epic' (Review of Cwmardy by Lewis Jones)	III (1937), 428-429
Lehmann, John	'The Seven Soviet Arts'	III (1937), 558-560
Hodgkin, T.L.	'The Individual and the Group'	III (1937), 627-629
" " "	'Novels and Social Change' (Review of Grey Children by James Hanley)	III (1937), 692-694
	'Editorial'	III (1938), 957-960

New Writing

Numbers I - II (Spring - Autumn 1936)

'Manifesto'	I (Spring 1936)

Polemic

Numbers 2 - 7 (March 1946 - March 1947)

'Editorial' (Unsigned)	2 (March 1946), 2-3

Polemic continued

'Editorial' (Unsigned)		5 (September-October 1946) 2-4

Tribune

October 1942 - September 1945

3. Pamphlets cited from Orwell's collection held in the British Library

Adler.	'The Witchcraft Trial in Moscow' (Commission of Enquiry into the Conditions of Political Prisoners, 1936)	BM 1899 ss. 8(40)
Eastman, Max	'The End of Socialism in Russia' (1937)	BM 1899 ss. 3(30)
Johnson, Hewlett Dean of Canterbury	'Marxism and the Individual' (Marxism Today Series, 1943)	BM 1899 ss. 14(13)
Klingender, F.D.	'Marxism and Modern Art: An Approach to Social Realism' (Marxism Today Series, 1943)	BM 1899 ss. 14(14)
	'Stalin-Wells Talk: The Verbatim Record and a Discussion by G. Bernard Shaw, H.G. Wells, J.M. Keynes, Ernst Toller and Others' (1934)	BM 1899 ss. 5(7)
Trotsky, Leon	'The Death Agony of Capitalism' (1938)	BM 1899 ss. 3(1)
Trotsky, Leon	'I Stake My Life' (Fourth International, 1937)	BM 1899 ss. 3(53)
Trotsky, Leon	'The Lesson of Spain' (W.I. Press, 1937)	BM 1899 ss. 3(34)
Workers' International Press	'Summary of the Final Report of the Commission of Enquiry into the Charges made against Trotsky in the Moscow Trials' (1938?)	BM 1899 ss. 4(46)

4. Books cited from the Orwell Archive at University College London

Caudwell, Christopher	Illusion and Reality: A Study of the Sources of Poetry 2nd. edition (1947)	ORWELL N 10 CAU
Defoe, Daniel	A Journal of the Plague Year (London, Cassell, 1909)	ORWELL L 10 DEF
Marx, Karl	Capital, introduction by G.D.H. Cole, translated from the 4th German edition by Eden and Cedar Paul, 2 vols., Everyman's Library, 1934 reprint (London, J.M. Dent, 1930)	ORWELL N 10 MAR

5. Criticism on Orwell

Alldritt, Keith — The Making of George Orwell: An Essay in Literary History (1969)

Ashe, Geoffrey — 'A Note on George Orwell', Commonweal, LIV (1951), 191-193

Atkins, John — George Orwell (1954)

Beadle, Gordon — 'George Orwell and Charles Dickens: Moral Critics of Society', Journal of Historical Studies, II (1969-70), 245-255

Benson, Frederick R. — Writers in Arms: The Literary Impact of the Spanish Civil War (1968)

Buddicom, Jacintha — Eric and Us: A Remembrance of George Orwell (1974)

Burgess, Anthony — The Novel Now: A Student's Guide to Contemporary Fiction 2nd. edition (1971)

Calder, Jenni — Chronicles of Conscience: A Study of George Orwell and Arthur Koestler (1968)

Cohen, L.J. — The Diversity of Meaning (1962)

Common, Jack — 'Orwell at Wallington' with a comment by Eileen M. Aird, Stand, XXII, No.3 (1981), 32-36

Connolly, Cyril — 'George Orwell' in Previous Convictions (1963), pp.317-319

Cosman, Max — 'George Orwell and the Autonomous Individual', Pacific Spectator, IX (1955), 74-84

Crick, Bernard — 'Coming Up to Orwell', New Statesman, LXXXII (1971), 478-479

George Orwell: A Life (1980)[1]

'How the Essay Came to be Written', TLS, 13 September 1972, pp.1039-1040

'Introduction' in The Lion and the Unicorn (Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1982)

---

1. The second edition of George Orwell: A Life, published in 1981, was collated with the first. A number of changes were found, including both corrections and insertions; these changes do not alter Crick's account as a whole and nor do they significantly affect this thesis.

Crick, Bernard — 'Lost Illusions' New Review, I (December 1964), 61-64

'The Nature of Biography and the Art of Orwell', Lecture, Goldsmiths' College, University of London, 27th May 1982

Deutscher, Isaac — Heretics and Renegades (1955)

Dyson, A.E. — 'Orwell: Irony as Prophecy', in The Crazy Fabric: Essays in Irony (1965), pp.197-219

Eagleton, Terry — Exiles and Emigrés (1970)

Empson, William — 'Correspondence', Critical Quarterly, I (1959), 157-159

'Correspondence': Christianity and 1984', Critical Quarterly, I (1959), 352

Ezard, John — 'Secret File Finally Clears P.G.', Guardian, 7th February 1981, p.26

Gollancz, Victor — 'Foreword' in The Road to Wigan Pier (1937) pp.xi-xxxiv

Greer, Martin — 'Orwell as an Old Etonian', Modern Fiction Studies XXI (1975), 3-10

Gross, Miriam ed. — The World of George Orwell (1971)

Hamilton, Kenneth — 'G.K. Chesterton and George Orwell: A Contrast in Prophesy', Dalhousie Review, XXXI (1951), 198-205

Heppenstall, Rayner — Four Absentees (1960)

Hitchens, Christopher — 'What People do not Want to Hear', New Statesman, 28 November 1980, pp. 20 and 22

Hoggart, Richard — 'Bernard Crick's Life of Orwell', Listener, 27 November 1980, pp.718-720

Speaking to Each Other: Volume II: About Literature (1970)

Hollis, Christopher — A Study of George Orwell (1956)

Homberger, Eric — 'A Social Theology: On Orwell', Encounter, XLIII, No.1 (July 1974), 70-73

Hoskins, Katharine Bail — Today the Struggle: Literature and Politics in England during the Spanish Civil War (Austin, 1969)

Howe, Irving — Politics and the Novel (London, 1961)

Howe, Irving ed. — Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: Text, Sources, Criticism (New York, 1963)

Hynes, Samuel ed. — Twentieth Century Interpretations of 1984 (New Jersey, 1971)

Iardella, Albert — 'The Impulse Behind the Phrase', Western Review, XV (1951), 147-151

Ingle, Stephen — 'The Politics of George Orwell: A Reappraisal', Queens Quarterly, LXXX (1973), 22-33

Jamal, Zahir — 'Orwell in Spain', Renaissance and Modern Studies, XV (1976), 54-64

Kateb, George — 'The Road to 1984', Political Science Quarterly, LXXXI (1966), 564-580

Klitzke, Robert — 'Orwell and His Critics: An Enquiry into the Reception of and Critical Debate about George Orwell's Political Works' (Ph.D., Birkbeck College, University of London, 1977)

Kubal, David L. — Outside the Whale: George Orwell's Art and Politics (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1972)

Lutman, Stephen — 'Orwell's Patriotism', Journal of Contemporary History, II (1967), 149-158

Maddison, Michael — '1984: A Burnamite Fantasy?', Political Quarterly, XXXII (1961), 71-79

McCarthy, Mary — 'The Writing on the Wall', in The Writing on the Wall and Other Literary Essays (1970), pp. 153-171

McDowell, Jenifer — '1984 and Soviet Reality', University of California Graduate Journal I, Fall 1962, pp.12-19

'George Orwell: Bibliographical Addenda', Bulletin of Bibliography, XXIII (1963) 19-24, 36-40 and 224-229

Mellichamp, Leslie — 'George Orwell and the Ethic of Revolutionary Politics', Modern Age (Chicago), IX (1965), 272-278

Meyers, Jeffrey — A Reader's Guide to George Orwell (1975)

Meyers, Jeffrey ed. — George Orwell: The Critical Heritage (1975)

Meyers, Jeffrey and Valerie — George Orwell: An Annotated Bibliography of Criticism (1977)

Miller, J.E. — 'George Orwell and Our Time' in John Singer ed., Million: Second Collection (1946), pp.51-57

N W — 'Orwell and the Anarchists', Freedom - Anarchist Review, XLII, No.2, 30 January 1981, pp.9-12

New, Melvyn — 'Orwell and Antisemitism: Toward 1984' Modern Fiction Studies, XXI (1975), 81-105

O'Brien, Conor Cruise — 'Orwell Looks at the World' in Writers and Politics (1965), pp.31-35

O'Flinn, J.P. — 'Orwell on Literature and Society', College English, XXXI (1970), 603-612

O'Flinn, Paul — 'Orwell and Tribune', Literature and History, VI (1980), 201-218

Parrinder, Patrick — 'George Orwell and the Detective Story', Journal of Popular Culture, VI (1973), 692-697

'Has Future a Man?', Times Higher Educational Supplement, 9 January 1981, p.9

'Minister of Truth', Cambridge Review, 9 May 1969, pp.340-344

Pawling, Chris — 'George Orwell and the Documentary in the Thirties', Literature and History, No.4, Autumn 1976, pp.81-93

Rankin, D — 'The Critical Reception of the Art and Thought of George Orwell' (Ph.D., Birkbeck College and University College, London University, 1965)

Rees, Richard — George Orwell: Fugitive from the Camp of Victory (1961)

Rieff, Philip — 'George Orwell and the Post-Liberal Imagination', Kenyon Review, XVI (1954), 49-70

Sandison, Alan — The Last Man in Europe: An Essay on George Orwell (1974)

Sedgwick, Peter — 'A Hard Man to Use', Guardian, 27 November 1980, p.9

Shearman, Colin — 'The Ghosts of Billy Bunter', Guardian, 3 January 1981, p.11

Small, Christopher — The Road to Miniluv: George Orwell, the State and God (1975)

Smith, Malcolm — 'George Orwell, War and Politics in the 1930s', Literature and History, VI (1980), 219-234

Smith, Marcus — 'The Wall of Blackness: A Psychological Approach to 1984', Modern Fiction Studies, XIV (1968-69), 423-433

Stansky, Peter and William Abrahams	Orwell: The Transformation (1979)
	The Unknown Orwell (1972)
Steinhoff, William	The Road to 1984 (1975)
Swingewood, Alan	'George Orwell, Socialism and the Novel', in Diane Laurenson and Alan Swingewood, The Sociology of Literature, pp.249-275
Symons, Julian	Critical Observations (1981)
Thirlby, Peter	'Orwell as a Liberal', Marxist Quarterly, III (1956), 239-247
Thomas, Edward	Orwell (1965)
Thompson, E.P.	'Outside the Whale', in E.P. Thompson ed., Out of Apathy (1960), pp.141-194
Voorhees, Richard J.	The Paradox of George Orwell (Lafayette, Indiana, 1961)
	'Some Recent Books on Orwell: An Essay Review', Modern Fiction Studies XXI (1975), 125-131
Wain, John	'George Orwell', I and II, in Essays on Literature and Ideas (1963), pp.180-213
Walsh, James	'George Orwell', Marxist Quarterly III, (1956), 25-39
Warncke, Wayne	'George Orwell as Literary Critic' (Ph.D., University of Michigan, 1965)
	'George Orwell's Dickens', South Atlantic Quarterly, LXIX (1970), 373-381
West, Anthony	'George Orwell', in Principles and Persuasions (New York, 1957), pp.164-176
Wicker, Brian	'An Analysis of Newspeak', Blackfriars, XLIII (1962), 272-285
Wilding, Michael	Political Fictions (1980)
Williams, Raymond	Orwell (1971)
	Politics and Letters: Interviews with New Left Review (1979)
Williams, Raymond ed.	George Orwell: A Collection of Critical Essays (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1974)
Willison, Ian and Ian Angus	'George Orwell: Bibliographical Addenda', Bulletin of Bibliography, XXIV (1965), 180-187

Woodcock, George	The Crystal Spirit: A Study of George Orwell (1967)
	'George Orwell, 19th Century Liberal', Politics, III (1946), 384-388
	'Orwell, Blair and the Critics', Sewanee Review, LXXXIII (1975), 524-536
	The Writer and Politics (1948)
Workman, Gillian	'Orwell Criticism', Ariel, III (1972), 62-73
Zeke, Zoltan and William White	'George Orwell: A Selected Bibliography' Bulletin of Bibliography, XXIII (1961), 110-114
	'Orwelliana', Bulletin of Bibliography, XXIII (1961), 140-144
Zwerdling, Alex	Orwell and the Left (1974)

6. Books by or including contributions by Orwell

Note: All references are to the editions detailed below. Selections of Orwell's published writings have not been included.

Down and Out in Paris and London (London, Gollancz, 1933)

Burmese Days (New York, Harper, 1934)

A Clergyman's Daughter (London, Gollancz, 1935)

Keep the Aspidistra Flying (London, Gollancz, 1936)

The Road to Wigan Pier (London, Left Book Club, 1937)

Homage to Catalonia (London, Secker & Warburg, 1938)

Coming Up For Air (London, Gollancz, 1939)

Inside the Whale (London, Gollancz, 1940)

The Betrayal of the Left by Victor Gollancz, George Orwell, John Strachey and others (London, Gollancz, 1941)

The Lion and the Unicorn (London, Secker & Warburg, 1941)

Victory or Vested Interest? by G.D.H. Cole, George Orwell and others (London, Routledge, 1942)

Talking to India, edited with an introduction by George Orwell (London, Allen & Unwin, 1942)

Animal Farm (London, Secker & Warburg, 1945)

Critical Essays (London, Secker & Warburg, 1946)

Love of Life and Other Stories by Jack London. Introduction by George Orwell (London, Paul Elek, 1946)

'James Burnham and the Managerial Revolution' (London, Socialist Book Centre, 1946)

The English People (London, Collins, 1947)

British Pamphleteers Vol.I, edited by George Orwell and Reginald Reynolds. Introduction by George Orwell (London, Wingate, 1948)

Nineteen Eighty-Four (London, Secker & Warburg, 1949)

England Your England (London, Secker & Warburg, 1953)

The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell, 4 Vols, edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (London, Secker & Warburg, 1968)

7. Journalism, poems and published letters by Orwell

Note: Items are listed in chronological order under the periodical in which they first appeared. Periodicals are arranged alphabetically. The titles of articles given here differ in some cases from those used in the text of the thesis: this list is adapted from the catalogue to the material held in the Orwell Archive at University College London, whereas the titles given in the text are taken from the original journalism.

Letters and articles by other people have been included where they have prompted a reply from Orwell or where they are of particular interest in relation to his own contributions.

Adelphi

(Review) A Good 'Middle' - Angel Pavement, by J.B. Priestley	1930: October
(Review) The Horrors of Cayenne, by Karl Bartz, translated by Beatrice Marshall	1930: December
(Review) The Two Carlyles, by Osbert Burdett	1931: March
(Review) Poverty - Plain and Coloured; Hunger and Love, by Lionel Britton; Albert Grope, by F.O. Mann	1931: April
The Spike	1931: April
(Review) The Good Earth, by Pearl S. Buck	1931: June
A Hanging	1931: August
(Review) The Civilization of France, by Ernst Robert Curtius	1932: May

Adelphi continued

(Review) Persephone in Hades, by Ruth Pitter	1932: September
(Review) Byron and the Need of Fatality, by Charles du Bos	1932: September
(Review) Phantom Fame, by Harry Reichenbach	1932: October
Poem: "Sometimes in the middle autumn days ..."	1933: March
(Review) Gogol, by Boris de Schloezer	1933: April
Poem: "Summer-like for an instant ..."	1933: May
(Review) Baudelaire, by Enid Starkie	1933: August
Poem: "A dressed man and a naked man ..."	1933: October
(Review) Criticisms and Opinions of the Works of Charles Dickens, by G.K. Chesterton	1933: December
(Review) Critique of Poetry, by Michael Roberts	1934: March
(Review) Further Extracts from the Notebooks of Samuel Butler, chosen and edited by A.T. Bartholomew	1934: April
Poem: "On a Ruined Farm Near the His Master's Voice Gramophone Factory ..."	1934: April
(Review) The Aesthetic of Stephane Mallarme, by Hasye Cooperman; Baudelaire, the Tragic Sophist, by G.T. Clapton	1934: July
(Review) Poems of Rainer Maria Rilke, trans. from the German by J.B. Leishman	1934: August
(Review) Mediaeval Religion, by Christopher Dawson	1934: November
(Review) The Ideals of East and West, by Kenneth Saunders	1934: December
(Review) Caliban Shrieks, by Jack Hilton	1935: March
(Review) The Victorians and their Books, by Amy Cruse	1935: August
(Review) The Life and Times of Henry Crabb Robinson, by Edith J. Morley	1935: October
Poem: St. Andrew's Day, 1935	1935: November

Adelphi continued

(Review) The Fate of the Middle Classes, by Alec Brown	1936: May
(Review) Walls Have Mouths, by W.F.R. Macartney	1936: November
Poem: "A happy vicar I might have been ..."	1936: December
Political Reflections on the Crisis	1938: December
Will Gypsies Survive? (Review)	1938: December
(Review) The Taming of Power	1939: January
(Review)	1939: February
Not Counting Niggers	1939: July
The Book Racket (Review)	1939: September
(Review) The Spanish War	1939: December
(Review) Ruth Pitter's Poetry	1940: February
(Review) Havelock Ellis	1940: May
(Review) England with the Knobs Off	1940: July
No, Not One	1941: October
(Review) Great Morning, by Osbert Sitwell	1948: July-September

B.B.C. Pamphlets No.2: Books and Authors

Bernard Shaw's Arms and the Man	(1946?)

B.B.C. Pamphlets No.3: Landmarks in American Literature

Jack London	(1946)?

Contemporary Jewish Record (afterwards Commentary)

Anti-Semitism in Britain	1945: April
The British General Election	1945: November
Britain's Struggle for Survival: the Labour Government After Three Years	1948: October

Controversy (afterwards Left Forum; afterwards Left)

Eye-witness in Barcelona	1937: August
S.O.S.	1938: October
Democracy in the British Army	1939: September
Questionnaire: Socialists Answer Our Questions on the War	1941: November

Daily Herald

Letter: The Sansom Case	1946: January 21

Dickensian

The Dickens Fellowship Conference	1940: September 1

Encounter

Letters of George Orwell to Cyril Connolly and others, 14 February 1936 - 28 July 1949	1962: January

Evening Standard

Don't let Colonel Blimp ruin the Home Guard	1941: January 8
Bare Christmas for the children	1945: December 1
The case for the open fire	1945: December 8
In defence of English cooking	1945: December 15
Banish this uniform	1945: December 22
Letter to the Editor: Evening Dress - Francis G. Bennett	1945: December 28
Just junk - but who could resist it?	1946: January 5
A nice cup of tea	1946: January 12
Songs we used to sing	1946: January 19
But are we really ruder? No.	1946: January 26
'Bad' climates are best	1946: February 2
The Moon under Water	1946: February 9

Focus

Arthur Koestler	1946

Fontaine

Grandeur et Decadence du Roman Policier Anglais	1944

Fortnightly

Bookshop Memories	1936: November

Forward

Europe's Homeless Millions	1945: April 21
Nuremberg and the Moscow Trials	1946: March 16

Freedom-Through Anarchism

The French Cooks' Syndicate	1945: September 8
Protest Campaign for Philip Sansom	1946: January 26
Freedom Defence Committee	1947: February 1

Gangrel

Why I Write	1946: Summer

G.K.'s Weekly

A Farthing Newspaper	1928: December 29

Henley and South Oxfordshire Standard

Poem: "Awake, Young Men of England"	1914: October 2
Poem: "Kitchener"	1916: July 21

Highway

Caesarean Section in Spain	1939: March

Horizon

The Lessons of War	1940: February
Boys' Weeklies	1940: March
Selected Notices: Finland's War of Independence, by Lieut.-Col. J.O. Hannula	1940: April
Frank Richards Replies to George Orwell	1940: May
Review: Jail Journey, by Jim Phelan	1940: June
Selected Notices: Poltergeists, by Sacheverell Sitwell	1940: September
The Ruling Class	1940: December
Review: Allenby, a Study in Greatness, by General Sir Archibald Wavell	1940: December
Comment	1941: March
Selected Notices: Home Guard for Victory! by Hugh Slater	1941: March
Wells, Hitler and the World State	1941: August
The Art of Donald McGill	1941: September
Review: The Forge, by Arturo Barea	1941: September
Why Not War Writers? A Manifesto	1941: October
Rudyard Kipling	1942: February
Selected Notice: The Sword and the Sickle, by Mulk Raj Anand	1942: July
Selected Notice: The Development of William Butler Yeats, by V.K. Narayana Menon	1943: January
Gandhi in Mayfair	1943: September
Selected Notice: Toothpaste in Bloomsbury	1943: November

Horizon continued

Raffles and Miss Blandish	1944: October
Politics and the English Language	1946: April
Questionnaire: The Cost of Letters	1946: September
(Orwell's reply to the questionnaire) The Three Best Books of 1947	1947: December

Junior

World Affairs, 1945	1945

Leader Magazine

Personal Notes: On Scientifiction	1945: July 21
Personal Notes: Funny, but not vulgar	1945: July 28

Left News

Fascism and Democracy	1941: February
Will Freedom Die with Capitalism?	1941: April

Life and Letters Today

Review of Books - The Dark Horse of the Apocalypse	1940: June
Review of Books - What Do Boys and Girls Read?, by A.J. Jenkinson	1940: July

Listener

(Review) Indian Mosaic, by Mark Channing	1936: July 15
(Review) The Open Air, by Adrian Bell	1936: December 2
(Review) Trials in Burma, by Maurice Collis	1938: March 9
Letter: Review of Homage to Catalonia,	1938: June 16
(Review) Teamsman, by Crichton Porteous	1939: November 23
(Review) Rudyard Kipling, by Edward Shanks	1940: April 25
The Listener's Book Chronicle: Folios of New Writing	1940: May 16
Indian Writing, Vol.I. (Review)	1940: June 6
The Writer in the Witness-Box: The Proletarian Writer. Discussion between George Orwell and Desmond Hawkins.	1940: December 19
The Frontiers of Art and Propaganda. The first of four talks on Literary Criticism by George Orwell.	1941: May 29
Literary Criticism II: Tolstoy and Shakespeare	1941: June 5
Literary Criticism III: The Meaning of a Poem	1941: June 12
Literary Criticism IV: Literature and Totalitarianism	1941: June 19
Rediscovery of Europe	1942: March
Points from Letters - Rediscovery of Europe - H.G. Wells; with letter from Orwell	1942: April 9
Too Hard on Humanity - an imaginary interview between George Orwell and Jonathan Swift	1942: November 26
(Review) An Unknown Land, Viscount Samuel	1942: December 24
The Listener's Book Chronicle: The Pub and the People, by Mass-Observation	1943: January 21

London Magazine

George Gissing	1960: June

Manchester Evening News

Life, People and Books: Freud or Marx?	1943: December 9
Life, People and Books: Interglossa - Make Do and Talk with 750 Words.	1943: December 23
Life, People and Books: Wise Ruler and Great Fighter.	1944: January 6
Life, People and Books: Why Machiavellis of Today Fall Down.	1944: January 20
Life, People and Books: All That is Best in Mark Twain.	1944: February 3
Life, People and Books: Elisabet Ney - Feminist and Mad Kings Sculptress.	1944: February 17
Life, People and Books: Elephantine Crossword or Masterpiece?	1944: March 2
Life, People and Books: Countryman's World	1944: March 23
Life, People and Books: Beneath Friendly Skies	1944: April 6
Life, People and Books: The English Ritual	1944: April 20
Life, People and Books: General de Gaulle	1944: May 5
Life, People and Books: An Irish Tragedy	1944: May 18
Life, People and Books: Are Books Too Dear?	1944: June 1
Life, People and Books: Colour Bar Candour	1944: June 15
Sweated Woman Labour	1944: June 29
Life, People and Books: Art and the Sciences	1944: July 13
Life, People and Books: The Lost Art of Keeping Diaries.	1944: July 28
Life, People and Books: English Fiction is at a Low Ebb.	1944: August 10
Life, People and Books: The Wretched Kaffirs	1944: August 24
Life, People and Books: How Long is a Short Story?	1944: September 7
Life, People and Books: The Changing Magic of T.S. Eliot	1944: October 5
Life, People and Books: How Can Civilisation Be Saved?	1944: October 19

Manchester Evening News continued

Life, People and Books: Trollope of Barchester	1944: November 2
Life, People and Books: A Pat on the Back	1944: November 16
Life, People and Books: A Champion of Freedom	1944: November 23
Life, People and Books: No Vacuum for the Artist	1944: November 30
Life, People and Books: The Fighting Pacifist	1944: December 7
Life, People and Books: Agate and Orwell; with Orwell's reply	1944: December 21
Life, People and Books: The Valley of the Fairies	1944: December 28
Life, People and Books: Discovering Adolf Hitler	1945: January 4
Life, People and Books: The Art of Authorship	1945: January 11
Life, People and Books: Conquer Nature or Care For It?	1945: January 25
Life, People and Books: China Saved the World	1945: February 2
Life, People and Books: A World of Sheep	1945: February 8
Inside the Pages in Paris	1945: February 28
The Political Aims of French Resistance	1945: March 7
The French Believe We Have Had a Revolution	1945: March 20
The French Election will be influenced by the fact that Women Will Have First Vote	1945: April 16
Now Germany Faces Hunger	1945: May 4
Life, People and Books: Test of the Historical Novel.	1945: June 7
Life, People and Books: The Hunter Home to Peace	1945: June 14
Life, People and Books: Quality as A War Casualty	1945: June 21
Life, People and Books: The Tales of Joseph Conrad	1945: June 28
Life, People and Books: Authors Deserve a New Deal	1945: July 5
Life, People and Books: Noisy, Dark Haired Foreigners	1945: July 12
Life, People and Books: A Basque in Hitler's Germany	1945: July 19

Manchester Evening News continued

Life, People and Books: Front Seat View of Politics	1945: August 2
Life, People and Books: They Throw New Light on India	1945: August 9
Life, People and Books: The Scientist Takes Over	1945: August 16
Life, People and Books: Personality Behind the Pen	1945: August 23
Life, People and Books: The Errors Leading Up To Hitler	1945: August 30
Life, People and Books: Why Families Are Smaller	1945: September 6
Life, People and Books: Poet from the Wild Hills	1945: September 27
Life, People and Books: What is a Novel?	1945: October 4
Life, People and Books: Talent Gone to Waste	1945: October 11
Life, People and Books: The Modern Short Story	1945: October 18
Life, People and Books: The Modern Stoics	1945: October 25
Life, People and Books: The Captain and the Prophet	1945: November 1
Life, People and Books: Are We Really Done For?	1945: November 8
Life, People and Books: "My Dear Watson"	1945: November 15
Life, People and Books: The Fascination of Escape	1945: November 22
Life, People and Books: Five Sets of Lodgers	1945: November 29
Life, People and Books: Bunter's Creator	1945: December 6
Life, People and Books: Diary of Disintegration	1945: December 13
Life, People and Books: Gaolbreaker's Shelter	1945: December 20
Life, People and Books: £3.13s. Worth of Pleasure	1946: January 3
Life, People and Books: Return of the Past	1946: January 10
Life, People and Books: The Edwardian Revolution	1946: January 17
Life, People and Books: The Intellectual Revolt (1)	1946: January 24
Life, People and Books: The Intellectual Revolt (2): What is Socialism?	1946: January 31
Life, People and Books: The Intellectual Revolt (3): The Christian Reformers	1946: February 7

Manchester Evening News continued

Life, People and Books: Pacifism and Progress	1946: February 14
Life, People and Books: Childhood in the South	1946: February 28
Life, People and Books: That Thing Called 'Culture'	1946: March 7
Life, People and Books: In Search of the Good Companions	1946: March 28
Life, People and Books: The Changing Face of War	1946: April 4
Life, People and Books: The Rhymes of an Antiquarian	1946: April 11
Life, People and Books: Lewis Changes His Mind	1946: April 18
Life, People and Books: Legacy from a House Painter	1946: April 25
Life, People and Books: How Long Have We Been Here?	1946: November 7
Life, People and Books: Doctor in a Dilemma	1946: November 14
Life, People and Books: Would Nelson Have Turned His Blind Eye?	1946: November 21

Manchester Guardian

Letter to the Editor: Espionage Trial in Spain: "Pressure from Outside"	1938: August 5
Letter to the Editor: "Cat-and-Mouse" Case	1946: January 18
Letter to the Editor: Indian Passengers	1946: January 31

Monde

La Censure en Angleterre	1928: October 6
Notre Galerie: John Galsworthy	1929: March 23

Nation

Brailsford on India	1943: November 20
Empire and India	1944: May 13

New Adelphi

Review: Herman Melville, by Lewis Mumford	1930: March-May
Review: Alexander Pope, by Edith Sitwell; The Course of English Classicism, by Sherard Vines	1930: June-August

New Directions

Inside the Whale	1940: March

New English Weekly

Letter to the Editor	1932: May 5
Review: The Spirit of Catholicism, by Karl Adam	1932: June 9
Letter on review (see above) - G.C. Martindale, S.J. Orwell's letter in reply	1932: June 23
Some Recent Novels	1935: August 1
Some Recent Novels	1935: September 26
Some Recent Novels	1935: November 14
Some Recent Novels	1936: January 23
Obituary on Rudyard Kipling	1936: January 23
Some Recent Novels	1936: March 5

New English Weekly continued

Some Recent Novels	1936: April 23
Recent Novels	1936: July 23
Some Recent Novels	1936: September 24
Some Recent Novels	1936: November 12
Views and Reviews: In Defence of the Novel, I	1936: November 12
Views and Reviews: In Defence of the Novel, II	1936: November 19
Propagandist Critics	1936: December 31
Spilling of the Spanish Beans, I	1937: July 29
Spilling of the Spanish Beans, II	1937: September 2
Back to the Twenties	1937: October 21
Letter from "The Booster"; Orwell's letter in reply	1937: November 4; November 11
The Lure of Profundity	1937: December 30
Eyes Left, Dress!	1938: February 17
Review by A. Romney Green: Delinquent Stars;	1938: April 14
Letter on review from B.J. Boothroyd;	1938: April 28
Letter from J.S. Collis;	1938: May 12
A. Romney Green's reply to Boothroyd;	1938: May 12
Letter from Orwell: Ends and Means.	1938: May 26
Impenetrable Mystery	1938: June 9
Authentic Socialism	1938: June 16
The Lure of Atrocity	1938: June 23
Stalinism and Aristocracy	1938: July 21
Views and Reviews: Franz Borkenau on the Communist International	1938: September 22
Views and Reviews: Two Franco Apologists;	1938: November 24
letter on review - E. Allison Peers;	1938: December 8
Orwell's letter in reply	1938: December 22
The Russian Regime	1939: January 12

New English Weekly continued

Current Politics: Outside and Inside Views	1939: June 8
Views and Reviews: Stendhal	1939: July 27

New Leader (Socialist Leader)

Night Attack on the Aragon Front - extracts of letters to John McNair from Orwell and others	1937: April 30
The "Daily Worker" and F.A. Frankfort, by John McNair	1937: September 17
That Mysterious Cart: George Orwell replies to F.A. Frankfort	1937: September 24
Why I Join the I.L.P.	1938: June 24
Spain: The True and the False	1938: July 8
Letter to the Editor: Cat and Mouse	1946: January 26
Civil Service Purge	1948: August 21
Letter: Freedom Defence Committee	1948: September 18

New Leader (New York)

Burnham's View of the Contemporary World Struggle	1947: March 29
Writers and Writing: The New Leader Literary Section; Orwell on Churchill: A Critic Views a Statesman	1949: May 14

New Republic

Letter: English Without Tears	1946: July 15

New Republic continued

Confessions of a Book Reviewer	1946: August 5
It Looks Different from Abroad	1946: December 2

New Road

Looking Back on the Spanish War	1943: (March?)

New Saxon Pamphlets, No.3

Poetry and the microphone	1945: March

News Chronicle

Letter: I Appeal ...	1949: March 3
Presenting the Future; No.4 in a series	1937: June 10

New Statesman

Hop-picking	1931: October 17
Common Lodging Houses	1932: September 3
Experientia Docet (Review)	1937: August 28
Letter: Class and National War	1937: September 4
Glimpses and Reflections (Review)	1938: March 12
On the Brink (Review)	1940: July 13

New Statesman continued

Current Literature: Books in General	1940: August 17
The English Civil War (Review)	1940: August 24
Holding Out (Review)	1940: September 14
History Books (Reviews)	1940: September 21
Wishful Thinking and the Light Novel (Review)	1940: October 19
Mis-Observation (Review)	1940: October 26
By-Words (Reviews)	1940: November 16
New Novels	1940: December 7
Guerillas (Review)	1940: December 14
New Novels	1941: January 4
Two Glimpses of the Moon	1941: January 18
The Peoples' Army (Review)	1941: February 15
New Novels	1941: February 22
Perfide Albion (Review)	1942: November 21
Pamphlet Literature	1943: January 9
War in Burma (Review)	1943: August 14

New Vision

Direct Rule may return to Burma	1944: Autumn

New Writing

Shooting an Elephant	1936: Autumn
Marrakech	1939: Christmas
My Country Right or Left	1940: Autumn

New Yorker

Young Man Out of His Time (Reviews)	1946: May 11
Books: The Final Years of Lady Gregory	1947: April 19
Books: The Sanctified Sinner	1948: July 17

New York Times Book Review

New Novels from Two British Writers: Mr Waugh Pays a Visit to Perilous Neutralia (Review)	1949: February 20
Mr Dickens Sits for His Portrait	1949: May 15

Now

How the Poor Die	1946: November

Observer

Mood of the Moment	1942: March 8
Mood of the Moment	1942: April 19
Books of the Day: An American Critic (Review)	1942: May 10
Portrait of the General (Review)	1942: August 2
Portrait of an Addict (Review)	1942: September 13
In the Darlan Country	1942: November 29
Three Years of Home Guard: Unique Symbol of Stability	1943: May 9
Where to Go - but how?	1943: August 15

Observer continued

Books of the Day: Paris is Not France (Review)	1943: September 12
Books of the Day: Revolt in the Urban Desert (Review)	1943: October 10
Out of Step (Review)	1943: November 7
Hidden Spain (Review)	1943: November 28
Wandering Star (Review)	1943: December 19
In the Firing Line (Review)	1944: January 2
Tapping the Wheels (Review)	1944: January 16
Chosen People (Review)	1944: January 30
A Hundred Up	1944: February 13
Utmost Edge (Review)	1944: February 27
Old Master (Review)	1944: March 26
Grounds for Dismay (Review)	1944: April 9
Power House (Review)	1944: April 23
All Change Here (Review)	1944: May 7
Vessel of Wrath	1944: May 21
Survey of 'Civvy Street'	1944: June 4
Behind the Ranges (Review)	1944: June 11
Temperature Chart (Review)	1944: June 25
Return Journey	1944: July 9
The Eight Years of War: Spanish Memories	1944: July 16
The Romantic Case (Review)	1944: July 23
Chinese Miracles	1944: August 6
The Children Who Cannot Be Billeted	1944: August 13
Puritan Poet (Review)	1944: August 20
Back to the Land (Review)	1944: September 3
New World (Review)	1944: September 17
Burma Roads (Reviews)	1944: October 1

Observer continued

Home Guard Lessons for the Future	1944: October 15
Indian Ink (Review)	1944: October 29
Poet and Priest (Review)	1944: November 12
Singing Men (Review)	1944: November 26
Spanish Prison (Review)	1944: December 24
Poet in Darkness (Review)	1944: December 31
Going Down (Review)	1945: January 14
Pen and Sword (Review)	1945: January 28
Occupation's Effect on French Outlook: Different Political Thinking	1945: March 4
Clerical Party May Re-emerge in France: Educational Controversy	1945: March 11
De Gaulle Intends to Keep Indo-China: But French Apathetic	1945: March 18
Creating Order Out of Cologne Chaos: Water Supplied from Carts	1945: March 25
Future of a Ruined Germany: Rural Slum Cannot Help Europe	1945: April 8
Allies Facing Food Crisis in Germany: Problem of Freed Workers	1945: April 15
Bavarian Peasants Ignore the War: Germans Know they are Beaten	1945: April 22
The Germans Still Doubt Our Unity: The Flags Do Not Help	1945: April 29
France's Interest in the War Dwindles: Back to Normal is the Aim	1945: May 6
Freed Politicians Return to Paris: T.U. Leader Sees De Gaulle	1945: May 13
Danger of Separate Occupation Zones: Delaying Austria's Recovery	1945: May 20
Obstacles to Joint Rule in Germany	1945: May 27
Uncertain Fate of Displaced Persons	1945: June 10
A Muffled Voice (Review)	1945: June 10

Observer continued

Man From the Sea (Review)	1945: June 24
Morrison and Bracken Face Stiff Fights: Heavy Poll Expected	1945: June 24
Liberal Intervention Aids Labour: Puzzle Blocks of Voters	1945: July 1
French Farce (Review)	1945: July 8
So Runs the World (Review)	1945: July 22
In Fields of Air (Review)	1945: August 5
Tale of a 'Head'	1945: August 19
Charles the Great (Review)	1945: September 2
Pity and Terror (Review)	1945: October 7
Profile - Aneurin Bevan (not signed)	1945: October 14
The Green Flag (Review)	1945: October 28
Cycle of Cathay (Review)	1945: November 11
Teller of Tales (Review)	1945: November 18
A Nipping Air (Review)	1945: December 2
Battle Ground (Review)	1945: December 16
Far Away, Long Ago (Review)	1946: January 6
Sensitive Plant (Review)	1946: January 13
How to Escape (Review)	1946: January 27
As I Was Saying (Review)	1946: February 10
Burmese Days (Reviews)	1946: February 24
Black Country (Review)	1946: March 10
Voice of Madrid (Review)	1946: March 24
Willow Pattern (Reviews)	1946: April 7
Why France Fell (Review)	1946: April 21
Go To The Ant (Review)	1946: May 5
Troubled Land (Review)	1946: November 10

Observer continued

Profile - Krishna Menon	1947: November 30
A Lost World (Review)	1948: February 1
Marx and Russia	1948: February 15
Men of the Isles (Review)	1948: February 29
Down Under (Review)	1948: March 14
Wilde's Utopia	1948: May 9
"Mr Sludge" (Review)	1948: June 6
Prime Minister (Review)	1948: July 4
A Questionable Shape (Review)	1948: July 18
For Ever Eton (Review)	1948: August 1
The Writer's Dilemma (Review)	1948: August 22
The Defence of Freedom (Review)	1948: October 10
Problem Picture (Review)	1948: November 7
Culture and the Classes (Review)	1948: November 28
Our Native Humour (Review)	1949: January 2
Exclusive Club (Review)	1949: February 6

Partisan Review

London Letter	1941: March-April
London Letter (dated April 15)	1941: July-August
London Letter	1941: November-December
Nicholas Moore vs. George Orwell (Letter from Nicholas Moore; Orwell's letter in reply)	1942: January-February
London Letter	1942: March-April
The British Crisis: A Letter from London	1942: July-August

Partisan Review continued

Pacifism and the War. A Controversy. (By Orwell and others)	1942: September-October
Letter: Social Credit and Fascism	1942: September-October
London Letter	1942: November-December
A Letter from England	1943: March-April
London Letter	1943: July-August
London Letter	1944: Spring
London Letter	1944: Summer
London Letter	1944: Fall
London Letter	1945: Summer
London Letter	1945: Fall
London Letter	1945: Winter
London Letter	1946: Summer
The Future of Socialism: IV - Toward European Unity	1947: July-August
Reflections on Gandhi	1949: January
Comment: A Prize for Ezra Pound	1949: April
Piece on award of Bollingen Prize to Ezra Pound	1949: May
Such, such were the joys	1952: September-October

Peace News

Letter to the Editor: Philip Sansom (from Orwell and others)	1946: January 18
Letter: Defenders of Freedom (from Orwell and others)	1947: February 7

Peace News continued

The Purge: FDC Outlines its Attitudes (from Orwell and others)	1948: August 27
Letter: For Freedom (from Orwell and others)	1948: September 17

Persuasion

Propaganda and Demotic Speech	1944: Summer

Plebs

Hanging Today	1947: June

Poetry

Points of View: T.S. Eliot; with Another Reading by Kathleen Raine	1942: October-November

Poetry Quarterly

Reviews: Herbert Read, A Coat of Many Colours: Occasional Essays	1945: Winter

Polemic

Notes on Nationalism	1945: October
The Prevention of Literature	1946: January
Second Thoughts on James Burnham	1946: May
Editorial	1946: May
Randall Swingler: The Right to Free Expression (annotated by George Orwell)	1946: September-October
Politics vs. Literature: An Examination of Gulliver's Travels	1946: September-October
Lear, Tolstoy and the Fool	1947: March

Politics

Russomania in England	1944: November
"Catastrophic Gradualism"	1946: September

Politics and Letters

Critic and Leviathan (5): Writers and Leviathan	1948: Summer

Progrès Civique

Une enquête du "Progrès Civique" en Angleterre: La grande misère de l'ouvrier britannique. 1. Le chomage	1928: December 29

Progrès Civique continued

Une enquête .... 2. La journée d'un "tramp"	1929: January 1
Une enquête .... 3. Les mendiants de Londres	1929: January 2
Comment on exploite un peuple. L'Empire britannique en Birmanie	1929: May 4

Progressive (Madison, Wisconsin)

Britain's Left-wing Press	1948: June

Saturday Book

Endpapers: Benefit of Clergy: Some Notes on Salvador Dali	1944: October (i.e. November)

Spectator

Young Writers (Review of New Writing and Daylight, ed. John Lehmann)	1943: July 30

Strand Magazine

Those Seaside Postcards	1943: August

Time and Tide

New Novels	1936: May 23
Treasure and Travel (Reviews)	1936: July 11
Real Adventure (Reviews)	1936: July 18
Five Travellers (Reviews)	1936: September 12
Travel Round and Down (Reviews)	1936: October 17
Desert and Islands (Reviews)	1936: November 21
Spanish Nightmare (Reviews)	1937: July 31
More News from Tartary (Reviews)	1937: September 4
Background to Travel (Review)	1937: September 25
Spain: Today and Yesterday (Reviews)	1937: October 9
Excursions in Autobiography (Reviews)	1937: November 6
Our Own Have-Nots (Reviews)	1937: November 27
Spanish Quintet (Reviews)	1937: December 11
Time-Tide Diary, by Sirocco; with letter from Orwell	1938: January 22; February 5
Terror in Spain (Reviews)	1938: February 5
The Spanish Tragedy (Reviews)	1938: July 16
About It and About (Reviews)	1938: August 12
Looking Before and After (Reviews)	1939: October 21
Good Travellers (Reviews)	1939: December 2
Moscow and Madrid (Reviews)	1940: January 20
Democrat and Dictators (Reviews)	1940: February 17
We Are Observed! (Review)	1940: March 2
Notes on the Way	1940: March 30
Notes on the Way	1940: April 6; April 13
Entre Chien et Loup	1940: April 13
Letter on 'Notes on the Way', April 6	1940: April 20

Time and Tide continued

Red, White and Brown	1940: May 4
Review of In Good King Charles's Golden Days, by Bernard Shaw (at New Theatre)	1940: May 18
Theatre (Reviews)	1940: May 25
Theatre: Review of Swinging the Gate, Ambassadors Theatre	1940: June 1
Mr. Joad's Point of View (Reviews)	1940: June 8
Theatre (Reviews)	1940: June 8
Theatre (Reviews)	1940: June 15
Letter to the Editor: Against Invasion	1940: June 22
Theatre (Review)	1940: June 22
Theatre (Review)	1940: June 29
Theatre (Review)	1940: July 13
Theatre (Review)	1940: July 27
Theatre (Review)	1940: August 3
Theatre (Review)	1940: August 10
Theatre (Review)	1940: August 17
Theatre (Review)	1940: August 24
Theatre (Reviews)	1940: September 7
Public Schoolboys (Review)	1940: September 14
Films: The Doctor Takes a Wife (Review)	1940: October 5
Fiction and Life (Reviews)	1940: November 9
Films: Waterloo Bridge (Review)	1940: November 23
Films: The Lady in Question (Review)	1940: November 30
At School and on Holiday (Reviews)	1940: December 7
Films: The Gay Mrs. Trexel (Review)	1940: December 7
Films: I Love You Again! (Review)	1940: December 14
Franco Spain (Reviews)	1940: December 21

Time and Tide continued

Films: The Great Dictator (Review)	1940: December 21
Films: A Date with Destiny (Review)	1940: December 28
Theatre (Reviews)	1941: January 4
Theatre (Review)	1941: January 11
Films: Brigham Young and Spellbound (Reviews)	1941: January 18
Films: Escape (Review)	1941: January 25
Theatre (Reviews)	1941: February 1
Films: Quiet Wedding (Review)	1941: February 8
Films: (Reviews)	1941: February 15
Films: (Reviews)	1941: February 22
Films: So Ends Our Night (Review)	1941: April 26
Theatre (Reviews)	1941: May 3
Films (Reviews)	1941: May 10
Films: Kipps (Review)	1941: May 17
Films: (Reviews)	1941: May 24
Films: (Reviews)	1941: May 31
Films: Escape to Glory (Review)	1941: June 7
Theatre and Films (Reviews)	1941: June 14
Films: (Reviews)	1941: June 21
Spaniard in Spain (Book Review)	1941: June 28
Theatre and Films (Reviews)	1941: June 28
Films: Western Union (Review)	1941: July 5
Theatre (Reviews)	1941: July 12
Theatre and Films (Reviews)	1941: July 19
Theatre (Reviews)	1941: August 2
Theatre and Films (Reviews)	1941: August 9
Films: (Reviews)	1941: August 16

Time and Tide continued

Films: South of Suez (Review)	1941: August 23
The Way of a Poet (Book Review)	1943: April 17

The Times

Letters:	Hotel Kitchens - Humbert Possenti	1933: January 31
	Hotel Kitchens - Orwell	1933: February 11
	Hotel Kitchens - St. Clair Thomson	1933: February 17
	Hotel Kitchens - Umberto Possenti	1933: February 21

Times Literary Supplement

Review of Homage to Catalonia;	1938: April 30
Orwell's reply in a letter; reviewer's reply.	1938: May 14
Letter replying to reviewer's reply to above letter (Orwell)	1938: May 28
Review (The Sword and the Sickle) by T.L.S. Reviewer;	1942: May 2
Orwell's letter on review	1942: May 23
Menander's Mirror: Poetry and Predjudice (by T.L.S. Reviewer)	1943: February 20
Letter on above review;	1943: March 6
Letters on Poetry and Prejudice - David Cecil, J.F. Head;	1943: March 20
Orwell's reply, and further letter from Alfred Douglas	1943: March 27
American New Writing	1948: April 17

Times Literary Supplement continued

Mainly About the Novel (Reviews)	1948: August 7
Contemporary Novelists (Reviews)	1948: October 2
The Freedom of the Press (proposed introduction to 1st. ed. of Animal Farm)	1972: September 15

Tribune

Napoleon's Retreat from Moscow: An N.C.O's Story (Review)	1940: March 29
From Bloomsbury to the Bowery (Reviews)	1940: April 12
Black Man's Burden (Reviews)	1940: April 26
Unwillingly to School (Reviews)	1940: May 24
The Male Byronic (Reviews)	1940: June 21
Reviews for Busy Readers	1940: July 5
Prophecies of Fascism (Reviews)	1940: July 12
A Soviet Farce (with a Socialist moral) (Reviews)	1940: August 9
Life in London's Underworld (Reviews)	1940: August 23
Propaganda in Novels (Reviews)	1940: September 13
The Home Guard and You	1940: December 20
Book Section: Thomas Hardy Looks at War	1942: September 18
Background of French Morocco	1942: November 20
The End of Henry Miller	1942: December 4
Letter "Henry Miller" - Nicholas Moore; Orwell's reply	1942: December 18
Book Reviews: Letter to an Indian	1943: March 19
Whitehall's Road to Mandalay by Robert Duval; Orwell's note on this article	1943: April 2
"Not Enough Money" A Sketch of George Gissing	1943: April 2

Tribune continued

Correspondence: 'Burma's Status' - "A Burmese Observer	1943: April 16
Letter "Burma"	1943: April 23
Speaking to Europe	1943: April 30
Letter: Nationalism	1943: May 14
Letter to an American Visitor, by Obadiah Hornbrooke	1943: June 4
Literature and the Left	1943: June 4
As One Non-Combatant to Another (A letter to 'Obadiah Hornbrooke')	1943: June 18
The Faith of Thomas Mann	1943: September 10
Who Are the War Criminals?	1943: October 22
Mark Twain - the Licensed Jester	1943: November 26
As I Please	1943: December 3
As I Please	1943: December 10
As I Please	1943: December 17
As I Please	1943: December 24
As I Please	1943: December 31
Correspondence: People's Convention - D.N. Pritt (with Orwell's reply)	1943: December 31
As I Please	1944: January 7
As I Please	1944: January 14
As I Please	1944: January 21
Poem: Memories of the Blitz	1944: January 21
Correspondence: Ezra Pound - Paul Potts	1944: January 28
As I Please	1944: January 28
As I Please	1944: February 4
Correspondence: Ezra Pound - Douglas Goldring; Sentimentality - Eileen E. Purber; Orwell's reply	1944: February 4

Tribune continued

Review: "Saints" (The Eagle and the Dove, by Victoria Sackville-West) - Charles Hamblett	1944: February 4
As I Please	1944: February 11
As I Please	1944: February 18
As I Please	1944: February 25
As I Please	1944: March 3
Correspondence: "Hello, Sweetheart" - Robert A. Lewis; with Orwell's reply	1944: March 10
As I Please	1944: March 10
As I Please	1944: March 17
Correspondence: Managerial Revolution - James Burnham; Orwell's reply	1944: March 24
As I Please	1944: March 24
As I Please	1944: March 31
As I Please	1944: April 7
As I Please	1944: April 14
As I Please	1944: April 21
Book Section: The Reader's Dilemma, by Arthur Koestler	1944: April 28
As I Please	1944: April 28
Correspondence: Population Statistics - i) Statistician; ii) G.W. Gower; Orwell's reply	1944: April 28
As I Please	1944: May 5
As I Please	1944: May 12
Correspondence: Inventions and Progress - J.F. Horrabin; Orwell's reply	1944: May 19
As I Please	1944: May 19
Letters: Chesterton - A.M. Currie; Orwell's reply	1944: May 26
As I Please	1944: May 26
As I Please	1944: June 2

Tribune continued

As I Please	1944: June 9
As I Please	1944: June 16
Correspondence: Humanising War? Vera Brittain; Orwell's reply	1944: June 23
As I Please	1944: June 30
Poem: The Little Apocalypse of Obadiah Hornbrooke	1944: June 30
Correspondence: Beachcomber and Shy - i) Anthony Sylvestre; ii) Orwell's reply; iii) H. McCormack	1944: July 7
As I Please	1944: July 21
As I Please	1944: July 28
As I Please	1944: August 4
Who Deserted Warsaw?	1944: August 11
As I Please	1944: August 11
What's Happening	1944: August 18
As I Please	1944: August 18
As I Please	1944: August 25
As I Please	1944: September 1
As I Please	1944: September 8
As I Please	1944: September 15
Tobias Smollett: Scotland's Best Novelist	1944: September 22
As I Please	1944: October 6
As I Please	1944: October 13
As I Please	1944: October 20
As I Please	1944: October 27
As I Please	1944: November 3
Books and the People: Money and Virtue - The Vicar of Wakefield, by Oliver Goldsmith	1944: November 10
As I Please	1944: November 17

Tribune continued

As I Please	1944: November 24
As I Please	1944: December 1
As I Please	1944: December 8
Oysters and Brown Stout	1944: December 22
As I Please	1944: December 29
As I Please	1945: January 5
Books and the People - A New Year Message	1945: January 5
As I Please	1945: January 12
As I Please	1945: January 19
As I Please	1945: January 26
As I Please	1945: February 2
As I Please	1945: February 9
As I Please	1945: February 16
Correspondence: Anarchist Trial - i) Herbert Read; ii) George Woodcock; iii) Orwell and others	1945: May 4
Correspondence: Orwell Misquoted - Paul Potts	1945: July 6
Correspondence: Why We Stink - Gladys Bing	1945: July 13
Correspondence: Orwell and the Stinkers - James E. Miller	1945: July 20
Correspondence: More Views on Stinkers - i) David Cole; ii) E.S. Fayers; Orwell replies	1945: July 27
Milton in Striped Trousers	1945: October 12
Correspondence: An Atom Dictatorship? - S.D. Wingate	1945: October 12
You and the Atom Bomb	1945: October 19
Correspondence: Atom Dictatorships? - J. Stewart Cook	1945: October 19
What is Science?	1945: October 26
Report on the State of Austria, by a Special Correspondent	1945: November 2

Tribune continued

Good and Bad Books	1945: November 2
Revenge is Sour	1945: November 9
Books: D.H. Lawrence's Short Stories	1945: November 16
Through a Glass, Rosily	1945: November 23
Correspondence: What is Science? (Orwell)	1945: November 23
Books: Escape or Escapism?	1945: November 30
Freedom of the Park	1945: December 7
The Sporting Spirit	1945: December 14
Books: Nonsense and Poetry	1945: December 21
Old George's Almanac (by Crystal-Gazer Orwell)	1945: December 28
Books: Freedom and Happiness	1946: January 4
Pleasure Spots	1946: January 11
Correspondence: Philip Sansom - Orwell and others	1946: January 18
The Politics of Starvation	1946: January 18
Books: On Housing	1946: January 25
The Cost of Radio Programmes	1946: February 1
Books: Books v. Cigarettes	1946: February 8
Decline of the English Murder	1946: February 15
Books: Words and Henry Miller	1946: February 22
Do Our Colonies Pay?	1946: March 8
Classics reviewed: The Martyrdom of Man	1946: March 15
Correspondence: Words and Henry Miller - Orwell	1946: March 15
In Front of Your Nose	1946: March 22
In Pursuit of Lord Acton	1946: March 29
Foreign Policies	1946: April 5
Some Thoughts on the Common Toad	1946: April 12
A Good Word for the Vicar of Bray	1946: April 26
Confessions of a Book Reviewer	1946: May 3

Tribune continued

As I Please	1946: November 8
As I Please	1946: November 15
As I Please	1946: November 22
Riding Down from Bangor	1946: November 22
As I Please	1946: November 29
As I Please	1946: December 6
As I Please	1946: December 13
Correspondence: "Those Newspapers" - Orwell	1946: December 13
As I Please	1946: December 20
As I Please	1946: December 27
As I Please	1947: January 3
Correspondence: Communists and Democrats i) K. Zilliacus; ii) Orwell replies;	1947: January 17
As I Please	1947: January 17
As I Please	1947: January 24
Correspondence: "Cryptos" - i) Paul Winterton; ii) K. Zilliacus, M.P.	1947: January 24
Correspondence: "Cryptos" - i) Orwell; ii) Geoffrey Ashe	1947: January 31
As I Pleased	1947: January 31
As I Please	1947: February 7
Correspondence: "Cryptos" - i) K. Zilliacus, M.P.; ii) Donald Bruce, M.P. In Darkest Germany - Tom Agar; Guess or Prediction - Orwell; Defence of Freedom - Orwell and others	1947: February 7
As I Please	1947: February 14
As I Please	1947: February 21
As I Please	1947: February 27
As I Please	1947: February 28
As I Please	1947: March 7

Tribune continued

As I Please	1947: March 14
As I Please	1947: March 21
As I Please	1947: March 28
As I Please	1947: April 4
Correspondence: Freedom Defence Committee - Orwell and others	1948: September 17
Correspondence: For Freedom in Spain - Orwell and others	1949: September 2
... by George Orwell (reprint of article of 3/1/47, as tribute at time of Orwell's death)	1950: January 27

University Observer

Political Writers: 1 - James Burnham	1947: Winter/Spring-Summer

Wiadomosci

Conrad's Place and Rank in English Letters (includes piece by Orwell)	1949: Kwietnia; Lipca (April; July)

Windmill

In Defence of P.G. Wodehouse	1945: July

World Digest

What is the English Character? 1947: October

World Review

From the Notebooks of George Orwell 1950: June