

THE EXPRESSION OF GEORGE ORWELL'S RACIAL AND SOCIAL ATTITUDES

DAVID WALTON.

PhD Thesis, Brunel University, 1981.

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

Variable print quality

ABSTRACT

This thesis is intended to show the importance of racial attitudes in the development and work of George Orwell. He grew up in an environment where race and class roles were firmly and hierarchically established. His early training reinforced these orthodoxies, and Burmese Days as well as other writing shows he understood the unity and necessity of these traditional attitudes in maintaining the status quo. Other experiences, however, sowed the seeds of heterodoxy and support for the underdog.

He took to Burma two mutually incompatible forms of training: one urged him to serve the Empire, the other, eventually to oppose it. The crisis of Empire is discussed and how it coincided with an unsought personal crisis of Orwell's own as a result of which the hollow tyranny of imperialism became clear to him. Burma was an empirical watershed, where experience belied ideology and he heeded the former.

Burma was the key which unlocked fact from myth and his changing attitude to Empire is reviewed in this light. The similarities of race and class are discussed; particularly training, form and purpose. It is argued that Orwell abstracted the essence of racial oppression and identified it (and its implications) in other forms, and his two major satires are seen to bear this out.

The irrationality of racial (imperial) myths are seen to have much in common with contemporary political behaviour: Socialist 'doublethink' about Empire paving the road to totalitarianism, and the in-group/out-group urges of Anglo-India being related to patriotism and nationalism. Antisemitism is included as an example of irrationality which clearly had racial and political significance. Finally an attempt has been made to show that Orwell's racial outlook is part of a coherent world-view, and that the implications are currently relevant.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 - Outline of Victorian and Edwardian Racial Attitudes. 1-18.

CHAPTER 2 - Childhood Attitudes to Race. 19-64.

CHAPTER 3 - Burma: Background. 65-127.

CHAPTER 4 - Burma: Crisis. 128-167.

CHAPTER 5 - The Empire. 168-197.

CHAPTER 6 - The Impact on Orwell; The Linking of Race and Class. 198-227.

CHAPTER 7 - The Impact on Orwell; Race and Class in Animal Farm and Nineteen
Eighty Four. 228-261.

CHAPTER 8 Irrationality in Race and Politics. 262-292.

CHAPTER 9 - Antisemitism: An example of Social Irrationality. 293-343.

CHAPTER 10 - Conclusion: The Synthesis and Significance of Orwell's Views. 344-
380.

NOTES - 381-440.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - 441-451.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 - Outline of Victorian and Edwardian Racial Attitudes. 1-18.

CHAPTER 2 - Childhood Attitudes to Race. 19-64.

CHAPTER 3 - Burma: Background. 65-127.

CHAPTER 4 - Burma: Crisis. 128-167.

CHAPTER 5 - The Empire. 168-197.

CHAPTER 6 - The Impact on Orwell; The Linking of Race and Class. 198-227.

CHAPTER 7 - The Impact on Orwell; Race and Class in Animal Farm and Nineteen
Eighty Four. 228-261.

CHAPTER 8 Irrationality in Race and Politics. 262-292.

CHAPTER 9 - Antisemitism: An example of Social Irrationality. 293-343.

CHAPTER 10 - Conclusion: The Synthesis and Significance of Orwell's Views. 344-
380.

NOTES - 381-440.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - 441-451.

CHAPTER 1: OUTLINE OF VICTORIAN/EDWARDIAN RACIAL ATTITUDES.

It would be appropriate to start our considerations of Orwell's racial (and social) attitudes by looking at the general climate of opinion on race that he grew up with. At the same time it would be helpful to mention some of Orwell's biographical details so that his own family traditions can be contextualised within the general framework.

It is also necessary to point out that one of the key concepts - that of race - is a contentious and somewhat elusive one. Race, racism (racialism) and racist are words that have altered in significance with time and place, and have also been used with varying degrees of specificity. An encyclopaedia has defined racism as "the theory or idea that there is a causal link between inherited physical traits and certain traits of personality, intellect, or culture and, combined with it, the notion that some races are inherently superior to others." This seems straightforward, but one needs to be aware of a deeper complexity. The definition continues: "The term racism has no necessary relation to biological or anthropological definitions of race, a division of a species. Racist ideas are often indiscriminately extended to apply to such nonbiological and nonracial groupings as religious sects, nations, linguistic groups, and ethnic or cultural groups" (1). This catalogue of indiscriminate extension had great significance for Orwell, as we shall see when we come to look at his attitude

/

to what he called 'nationalism'.

The term race has^{also} been used to denote different regional groups, social groups etc. in a way which hardly emphasises the inherited aspect; to which, indeed, it is scarcely relevant. Phrases like 'the Yorkshire race', 'the servant race' and so on, were used to denote a class or type, and people were (and still are) referred to as being 'a race apart', merely on the strength of their behaviour or attitude - real or imagined. In other words, the term was used to indicate category, with enormous variations of significance and purpose. Of course in Victorian/Edwardian times it was applied to the 'races of man' - as a subdivision of species - and this is how we will largely be considering it in this opening chapter. The flexibility of the term should, however, be borne in mind throughout the thesis.

The growth of European colonialism saw social distinction based solely on racial considerations assume an importance which it had never before achieved in historic times. Previously relations with non-whites had been cordial, curious and respectful, indeed once the Spaniards had decided that the Indians of the New World had souls to save, it was assumed that all men were of one species and should be treated accordingly (2).

Unfortunately imperial demands, as expressed in the slave trade, began

to conflict with European man's estimation of himself as an enlightened Christian with mercantile leanings. He could no longer see himself as a civilised believer in a merciful God, at the same time as he transported and worked fellow humans to death more brutally than animals. In order to accommodate this irreconcilable theory and practice, an elaborate 'doublethink' evolved whereby some humans were more equal than others, and deserved to be. It led to the dehumanisation of the victims, for, as Montesquieu sarcastically remarked:

It is impossible for us to suppose these creatures to be men, because, allowing them to be men, a suspicion would follow that we are not Christian (3).

Britons had a tradition of xenophobia, and were imbued with the Judeo-Christian significance of colour: black for evil, white for goodness and purity. For several hundred years the economic exploitation of races had been sanctioned by a range of shibboleths, some more seriously developed than others.

However, it was not until the latter half of the nineteenth century that such beliefs became an orthodoxy reinforced by the prevailing developments in science and technology. Modern taxonomy had begun with Linnaeus's Systema Naturae in 1735; here four categories of men were listed, red, black, white and yellow, but in no significant order. However, as the demand for universal order and hierarchy proceeded they were found in two conflicting views of man: monogenesis and polygenesis

Monogenesis, deriving from the old Adamite creation, held mankind to have been formed in one place, but to have evolved along different paths in accordance with local environmental needs. Polygenesis maintained that men had been separately created and that existing races were the descendants of these old creations. It was an inegalitarian theory, maintaining that the races had been created unequally, hence the superiority of the successful white race was a predestined fact of life

(4). The varying complexity of languages was cited as further proof of the polygenetic theory. The sandy foundations of this doctrine collapsed in the tremors of post-Darwinian science, but its essential conclusion, that the white and black races deserved to be where they were, found a secure base in that very movement which had razed the old house. Unwilled by Darwin, the arguments that he had set in motion were attached to every aspect of life.

The middle to late Victorian era saw a rapid, significant reappraisal of the world and man's place in it that roughly coincided with the industrialisation and urbanisation of society. This change, which one might describe as the application of science to the world stretches from the Renaissance to the present day. However, industrial Britain appeared to be a model of scientific principles in action, against which the views of economists, biologists and physicists acquired the status of precise disciplines. Also new 'sciences', such as ethnology, sprang

up, rooted in the desire to explain everything in precise, measurable terms; to bring order where previously chaos and prejudice had reigned. The Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland was founded in 1871, and it claimed that until then the study of man had been the "leavings" of other disciplines, "the favourite playground of dilettanti of varying degrees of seriousness (5). The triumph of rationalism was manifested in the scientification of life. Not only would society now be ruled by railway timetables and factory hours, but man's outlook would be conditioned to need a similar ordering in all aspects of life. Marx and Engels were explaining the social equation, while the Society for the Propagation of Useful Knowledge was publishing facts and figures with an almost religious fervour. Gobineau, possibly the best-known nineteenth century racial theoretician, certainly believed that his 'research' and interpretation had helped history to "join the family of the natural sciences", and removed it from the realm of arbitrary speculation (6).

In this melting-pot, Darwin's The Origin of Species may have seemed an innocent ingredient added to forge a sounder, more realistic view of the world. However, the development of Social Darwinism provided exactly the justification which the exploiting elements needed in order to appear neither hypocritical nor oppressive. The theory evolved to justify the practice, but the practice flourished and lent increasing weight to the theory. Milner argued that:

There is a sense in which it was necessary for certain ideologies concerning black people to develop among the public at large, in order to reconcile humanitarian religious beliefs with the actual treatment black people were receiving...the common thread that runs through nearly all racial theory of this time is the fundamental assumption of the current inferiority of black people. (7)

One should also mention other influential writers that evinced the same tone and direction, such as Lyell, Carlyle and Spencer. The historian, Joachim Fest, emphasised the influence of Social Darwinism on the young Hitler, describing it as "one of the classical ideologies of the bourgeois age", adding that,

The imperialistic practices of robust capitalistic aggrandizement of the period could be justified as part and parcel of inescapable natural law. (8)

Orwell was certainly aware of the significance of social Darwinism. In an introduction to Love of Life and Other Stories, written in 1945, Orwell discussed this outlook in relation to Jack London:

London had been deeply influenced by the theory of the Survival of the Fittest. His book, Before Adam...is an attempt to popularise Darwin...In the nineteenth century Darwinism was used as a justification for laissez-faire capitalism, for power politics and for the exploiting of subject peoples. Life was a free-for-all in which the fact of survival was proof of fitness to survive: this was a comforting thought for successful business men, and it also led naturally, though not very logically, to the notion of 'superior' and 'inferior' races...When London was writing, a crude version of Darwinism was widespread and must have been difficult to escape. He himself was even capable at times of succumbing to racial mysticism. He toyed for a while

with a race theory similar to that of the Nazis...(9)

Particularly interesting is Orwell's contention that during the Edwardian era - when London was writing and Orwell was growing up - a simple Darwinism was widespread and "must have been difficult to escape". This quotation from Orwell belongs, chronologically, later in our argument, for it shows his mature awareness of the forces that helped to shape his background. At this stage we can see it as a useful confirmation of the reality of such moulding forces, however.

In the competitive, yet stable, world of Victorian capitalism, the stability was reinforced by the belief that the successful deserved to be where they were because of their very success. This applied across the range of Victorian experience. The working class in the North of England deserved their long hours and intolerable living conditions; the Negroes of Africa and the Hindus of India deserved their subservience because that was what their capacities entitled them to. The natural selectivity that determined their progress had ordained that they make way for the successful, superior grades of man; that in particular meant the English bourgeoisie, and in general the white man.

The conclusion of this attitude among the less restrained elements of imperialism led to horrors that the most hard-boiled Darwinian preferred to forget. A recently publicised example can illustrate this. The Sunday Times told the pitiful

story of the 'Last Tasmanian':

...the doctrine of the Survival of the Fittest, then becoming generally accepted, seemed belatedly to justify the destruction of the Tasmanians; a superior race of beings had overcome a backward people, as superior races had overcome the backward all over the rest of the world thousands of years ago.

Then followed the sorry history, which hardly needs comment:

...of murder and rape; of Sunday afternoon manhunts; of indescribable tortures. An aboriginal baby was buried up to its neck in sand and its head was kicked off in front of its mother. A woman, repeatedly raped, was made to wear round her neck the severed head of her husband. There were stories of flesh being cut from the bodies of living men and fed to dogs.

These facts published in the magazine of June 21 1978, illustrate the unacceptable face of imperialism. It was partly such brutalisation that led Empire apologists to construct a moral purpose that would constitute a code worth believing in and working for. From this sprang the idea of the responsibility of the white race to care for and elevate the coloured ones. This doctrine was practically turned into Holy Writ by that doyen of the late Victorian/Edwardian jingoists - Kipling. Orwell called him "the prophet of imperialism in its expansionist phase". He went on, half ironically, to say that imperialism was "forcible evangelising":

You turn a Gatling gun on a mob of unarmed 'natives', and then you establish 'the law', which includes roads, railways and courthouses.

The people Kipling spoke for, his "official admirers",

...were the 'service' middle class, the people who read Blackwoods...The Blimps set Kipling on a pedestal. (10)

Kipling's moral imperative was not only in response to the brutalising side of Empire. It was also a faith required by the service employee, who saw the wealth generated by commerce and industry, and lacking the means to emulate the prosperity of the 'boxwallah', sought a lofty reason to despise him - ironically for the very reason which underlay imperialism. The life of the Anglo-Indian service class was often so unenviable that at times the level of myth creation needed to sustain it touched quite remarkable heights. This is not to doubt the sincerity of many of those who took part and often, literally, sacrificed themselves to it.

This moral purpose gave rise to some paradoxes which, if a lifetime's service had not authenticated them, would have had the appearance of the meanest cynicism. Curzon, for example, held a paternalistic view of Empire:

...remember that the Almighty has placed in your hand the greatest of his ploughs, in whose furrows the nations of the future are...taking shape, to drive the blade a little forward in your time, and to feel that somewhere among the millions you have left a little justice or happiness or prosperity, a sense of manliness or moral dignity...a dawn of intellectual enlightenment or a stirring of duty where it did not exist before. (11)

But he practised racial discrimination which undermined all the fine sentiments:

...the highest ranks of civil employment in India must...be held

by Englishmen, for the reason that they possess, partly by heredity, partly by upbringing, partly by education, the knowledge of the principles of government, the habits of mind and the vigour of character which are essential to the task. (12)

India provided obvious and irrefutable evidence of past civilisation and achievements. The language, learning and philosophy; the buildings, art and what was left of the sciences all spoke of a sophistication that seemed incompatible with the status of an inferior nation. The first Europeans had introduced themselves as equals. With the collapse and fragmentation of the Mughal Empire, however, the British found it increasingly necessary to protect their trading interests from the competitive French and the rapacity of undisciplined local rulers. The East India Company's priorities were commercial. It fought a constant battle with those who believed that moral superiority and not money-making was the only justification for colonialism. The same battle between those who only needed a crude Darwinian justification for their role and those who demanded something deeper is apparent. As we mentioned earlier with Kipling, those people who went out to India, neither to trade, nor to convert the natives, required a *raison d'être* somewhere in between, and selfless dedication in the running of Empire provided it.

The Mutiny of 1857 proved a watershed in Anglo/Indian relations, and gave

birth to British India. The Mutiny was widely held to be an act of ingratitude.

In comparison with Africans, much had been expected from Indians, and the disillusionment was reflected in the fact that shortly after 1857 it was common to find:

'Indian Niggers' spoken of with a coarse contempt and vulgar hatred. (13)

Views of the Indian, already stereotyped, acquired another dimension in the latter half of the nineteenth century:

one was the stereotype of the tractable, mild Hindu, the other (directly influenced by the events of 1857) depicted the cruel, scheming Oriental, who needed...strong government. (14)

Meanwhile, as another, more flamboyant writer put it, the Mutiny had:

...tainted British attitudes towards coloured people. It was one of the few imperial events which had gone down into the English folk - myth...It was a favourite horror story. The British saw it in terms of cowering white ladies in fetid cellars; goggle-eyed Indians, half blood-mad, half-lustful, creeping upon sweet English children in lace pantaloons... Something sour went into the Empire. (15)

The hand of the Social Darwinian school gained strength.

Indian society itself was, however, in a wider sense racist, and the

British who traced the lighter-skinned higher castes back to the Aryan invaders and the darker-skinned lower castes to the conquered Dravidians, found a further justification for the views that they carried of their own relationship with the Indians (16). The Encyclopaedia Britannica of 1881 described the Aryans as "august" and "splendid", and traced the lineage of both Western Europeans and Aryan Indians to the same common stock in Central Asia. Language and religion and achievement were cited as cultural examples of a similar genesis (17).

It is certainly true that the Aryan-descended Northerners corresponded closely with European notions of physical beauty. Their culture was held in higher esteem than that of the Southern Indians. This recognition of similarity was an ambiguous privilege, for when people see a correspondence with themselves they are not only pleased, but also liable to sense competition. Thus it was harder to maintain a racist approach towards these light-skinned Northerners, but imperial dictates ensured that it was doubly and viciously reinforced. Perhaps General Dyer would not have set such a draconian example if the *melee* he encountered had been in the South rather than in Amritsar (18).

We can summarise the racial hierarchy of the Victorians and Edwardians as follows: first came the English, followed by other 'white' nations; underneath these came the Indians, with the Aryans preceding the Dravidians; at the bottom came the African Negro, who was widely regarded as being deficient in morals, intelligence and the arts of civilisation.

Where did Orwell fit, chronologically and psychologically, in this picture? Orwell was born (as Eric Arthur Blair) on the 25th of July 1903, at Motihari in Bengal, just at the end of the great imperial heyday. Both his parents' families had strong imperial connections. His paternal antecedents had a tradition of service, while his maternal ones were involved in commerce.

Orwell's great-great grandfather, Charles Blair, (1743-1802) was a wealthy, slave-owning, plantation and estate magnate in Jamaica. He married Lady Mary Fane, second daughter of the Earl of Westmorland. By Orwell's day, the Blair family fortunes had been reduced to "shabby gentility", but these earlier glories were not forgotten and Orwell's sister had a portrait of Lady Mary - probably the sole-surviving artefact of that era in the Blairs' possession. The decline was gradual, however, and the tenth Earl was a cousin and godfather to Orwell's grandfather, Richard Arthur Blair.

Richard Arthur Blair, alas, was a younger son and did not benefit from the estate revenues. Indeed, he only managed to be at his Cambridge College for one year. He was forced, therefore, to earn his living in the service of Empire. He was ordained a Deacon by the Bishop of Calcutta in 1839, and a priest by the Bishop of Tasmania in 1854. Professor Crick points out that this was "very much the period of Cobbett's jibe that the Empire was a system of out-door relief for the indigent sons of the British aristocracy" (19). He did not make a good (i.e. wealthy) marriage to redress his fortune, but was nevertheless given a comfortable 'living' as the incumbent of Milborne St. Andrew in Dorset. This was bestowed by another cousin, Sir John Michel, who had, incidentally been a Major-General in India. It is interesting that Orwell paints an unpleasantly convincing portrait of a priest (called Hare - which was the maiden name of Richard Arthur's wife), who has aristocratic connections, and who went to the same Cambridge College as Orwell's grandfather, in A Clergyman's Daughter.

Orwell's father, Richard Walmsley Blair, was also a younger son and was born in 1857 - the year of the Indian Mutiny. He was even more impoverished

and started his service in the Opium Department of the Government of India on the 4th of August 1875 as Assistant Sub-Deputy Opium Agent Fifth Grade. The opium trade had been legalised fifteen years previously, and will be referred to in the next chapter. He had a very modest, undistinguished career, moving stations annually for nearly twenty years. None of his postings were regarded as 'good' ones. He served in India at the same time as the Tenth Earl of Westmorland, although by now the connection had been completely atrophied.

Orwell's mother, Ida Mabel Limouzin, had an English mother and a French father. The Limouzin family had been in Moulmein, Burma, practically since it became British in 1826. The family had engaged in the teak trade and had, at one time, been very wealthy indeed. However, again the family fortunes had declined; this time on account of unsuccessful rice speculation. Orwell's grandmother (whom Orwell met in Burma and appeared somewhat to despise) was a 'character' in Moulmein society, wearing Burmese costume while hardly speaking a word of the language.

The Blairs, Orwell claimed, belonged to the lower end of the upper-middle class. He believed that this class embraced the £300 to £2,000 a year

range of incomes. His father's retirement pension in 1911 was, in fact, £438. 10s; comfortable enough, but scarcely adequate to match up to the high traditions of earlier generations. He explained that families such as his owned no land, "but they felt that they were landowners in the sight of God and kept up a semi-aristocratic outlook by going into the professions and the fighting services rather than into trade." On the Blairs' income notions of gentility were "purely theoretical". In theory one knew all about servants and how to tip them, one knew how to order good clothes and also how to order good food, whereas in practice one never had servants, or the money to patronise "a decent tailor or a decent restaurant." One knew how to shoot and ride, but in practice one hadn't the means.

It was this that explained the attraction of India... the people who went there as soldiers and officials did not go there to make money; they went there because in India, with cheap horses, free shooting, and hordes of black servants, it was so easy to play at being a gentleman. (20)

Orwell explained the atmosphere in Burma:

...the all-important thing was not whether you had been to one of the right schools but whether your skin was technically white.

Europeans in Burma were "regarded as being all of the same class. They were

'white men', in contradistinction to the other and inferior class the 'natives'" (21).

The privileges of Anglo-India didn't travel well, indeed there was a virtual metamorphosis on the lengthy boat journey home. Back in England such families were in an equivocal position, caught between their pretensions and economic reality. The Blair family home was full of Indian, and later Burmese, artefacts, and his father certainly gravitated towards fellow retired Anglo-Indians in Henley and Southwold; "poor prosing old wrecks... littered about in all stages of decomposition, all talking and talking about what happened in Boggleywallah in '88" (22). Orwell gives a merciless parody of an Anglo-Indian household (retired) in Coming up for Air:

As soon as you set foot inside the front door you're in India in the eighties...it's a sort of little world of their own that they've created, like a kind of cyst. (23)

Orwell came from a family, then, which had had intimate connections with the Empire, and in a real psychological sense needed the outlets that it afforded, as well as the material ones. All the indications are that his relations were conventional, Kipling-admiring people; the type

who believed that they were serving a higher interest by shouldering

'the white man's burden'. This was the racial/social provenance into which

Orwell was born.

CHAPTER 2: CHILDHOOD ATTITUDES TO RACE

1

Before we look at the racial attitudes Orwell imbibed, we will consider his views on the importance of childhood influences. His reactions to his own early life were not always passive and conforming. Often, he nursed an emotion for a period, then rounded on the teaching that had produced it with a strength that must have surprised those familiar with the earlier personality. Who could guess that the withdrawn junior at St. Cyprian's would write 'Such, Such Were the Joys', or that the aloof Etonian would become the literary editor of Tribune?

Orwell had no doubt about the importance of early influences determining a person's outlook in later life, nor in the freedom that such influence had. In 'Such, Such Were the Joys', he concluded that the weakness of the child was that it began with a blank sheet,

"It neither understands nor questions the society in which it lives, and because of its credulity other people can work upon it..."

He invited readers to search their own childhood and recall the trivialities that caused suffering (1). To a literate child, reading was an important source

of information. Orwell had a lifelong affection for comics and the celebratory essay, 'Boys' Weeklies', produced this penetrating comment,

"...the worst books are the most important, because they are usually the ones that are read earliest in life. It is possible that many people who could consider themselves extremely sophisticated and 'advanced' are actually carrying through life an imaginative background which they acquired in childhood from (for instance) Sapper and Ian Hay." (2)

This is no accidental example, for Orwell wrote eight years later,

"There was the joy of waking early on summer mornings and getting in an hour's undisturbed reading (Ian Hay, Thackeray, Kipling and H.G.Wells were the favourite authors of my boyhood)..." (3)

The wider cultural environment tends to unify the experience of large numbers of people, or a whole society. Despite Orwell's protests against generalising national characteristics, he practised it himself. The Lion and the Unicorn undermined this idea, claiming that such characteristics are elusive and trivial, but at the same time furnished examples - of the English. He also gave a litany on the indelibility of such influences,

"...Above all it is your civilisation, it is you. However much you hate it or laugh at it, you will never be happy away from it for any length of time. The suet-puddings and red pillar-boxes have entered into your soul. Good or evil, it is yours, you belong to it, and this side the grave you will never get away from the marks it has given you." (4)

Conditioning implies prejudice, but this need not be the final outcome, for

although he acknowledged the ineradicability of the experience, it was one's understanding of and relationship to such conditioning that was crucial. Orwell believed that a moral effort was necessary to rise above blind response to one's training.

An example of this is Orwell's attitude to Swift. He read Swift very young, avidly and uncritically. As Orwell matured and developed his own outlook, he found himself in considerable disagreement with Swift. In 'Politics vs. Literature' he analysed Swift's misanthropy, at the same time supplying the reason for his affection for the writing,

"...In a political and moral sense I am against him, so far as I understand him. Yet curiously enough he is one of the writers I admire with least reserve, and Gulliver's Travels, in particular, is a book which it seems impossible for me to grow tired of. I read it first when I was eight - one day short of eight, to be exact, for I stole and furtively read the copy which was to be given me the next day on my eighth birthday - and I have certainly not read it less than half a dozen times since." (5)

That Orwell's vividly recalled childhood acquaintance with the author was crucial here is explained in the essay he wrote on Dickens. Orwell had the same youthful association with the two writers; the details of the reaction varied, but not its outcome. Orwell liked Swift's writing from the start, and developed a distaste for his outlook afterwards. He didn't care for Dickens at first, but the later

affection was profound, perhaps narcissistic. Orwell asked the question "Why do I care about Dickens?" and analysed the complexity of the answer,

"...the complicating factor is his familiarity. He happens to be one of those 'great authors' who are ladelled down everyone's throat in childhood. At the time this causes rebellion and vomiting, but it may have different effects in later life. For instance, nearly everyone feels a sneaking affection for the patriotic poems that he learned by heart as a child...What one enjoys is not so much the poems themselves as the memories they call up. And with Dickens the same forces are at work...a thing that is absorbed as early as that does not come up against any critical judgement." (6)

The pleasurable early associations of childhood authors can ensure their enjoyment in later life, whether we approve of the content or not, This does not mean an abdication of critical judgement however, as Orwell has shown in summarising his feelings for Swift. It allows approval and disapproval for the various aspects of a writer to be held in equilibrium. This is a necessary balance and its loss results in perverse and confused judgement. Orwell was to be particularly concerned with the fudging of critical criteria in later essays such as 'The Prevention of Literature' and 'Writers and Leviathan'.

Orwell was altogether scathing of people who refused to take account of their prejudices in their outlook on life. This, as he saw it, led to a state of mind which was incapable of understanding itself, and was a positive barrier

to social and intellectual progress. It was part of the disease that underlay the ineffectuality of the bourgeois intelligentsia,

"Look at any bourgeois socialist. Look at Comrade X...(who)... is an Old Etonian. He would be ready to die on the barricades, in theory anyway, but you notice that he still leaves his bottom waistcoat button undone. He idealizes the proletariat, but it is remarkable how little his habits resemble theirs... I have never met (a bourgeois socialist) who had picked up proletarian table manners...Why not?...It can only be because in his heart he feels that proletarian manners are disgusting. So you see he is still responding to the training of his childhood, when he was taught to hate, fear and despise the working class."

The triviality of this approach was so far wide of the mark, that Orwell spelt out the real cost of the solution,

"The fact that has got to be faced is that to abolish class distinctions means abolishing a part of yourself...All my notions...of good and evil, of pleasant and unpleasant, of funny and serious, of ugly and beautiful - are essentially middle class notions; my taste in books and food and clothes, my sense of honour, my table manners, my turns of speech, my accent, even the characteristic movements of my body, are the products of a special kind of upbringing." (7)

This is hardly an exaggeration of the effects of social conditioning that Orwell grew up with. One must first recognise this before the problem becomes apparent; until the facts of one's own conditioning have been faced no start can be made.

There are many examples in Orwell's fiction that prove his awareness

of the significance of childhood experiences. We will mention two of them. In

Burmese Days, Flory had a birthmark that was crucial to his psychological development (8). It inhibited him and acted as a permanent reminder of his alienated status, finally it damned him in the eyes of Elizabeth and was his undoing.

"He thought of some of the early effects of the birthmark. His first arrival at school, aged nine; the stares and, after a few days, shouts of the other boys; the nickname Blueface.. was changed to Monkey Bum.....A boy does not start his career nicknamed Monkey-Bum without learning his lesson." (9)

In A Clergyman's Daughter, Dorothy's sexual frigidity is one of her main characteristics. Orwell attempted some unconvincing psychoanalysis to explain this,

"...though her sexual coldness seemed to her natural and inevitable, she knew well enough how it was that it had begun. She could remember, as clearly as though it were yesterday, certain dreadful scenes between her father and her mother - scenes that she had witnessed when she was no more than nine years old. They had left a deep, secret wound in her mind. And then a little later she had been frightened by some old steel-engravings of nymphs pursued by satyrs. To her childish mind there was something inexplicably horribly sinister in those horned semi-human creatures...she had grown out of the fear...but not out of the feeling associated with it. The satyr had remained with her as a symbol...It was not a thing to be altered, not to be argued away." (10)

It is with some confidence that we can assume the influences of Orwell's

childhood played an important part in his development. The general climate of views and opinions provided the diet upon which his mind fed and composed itself, and his own individual experiences determined what balance and significance each ingredient had.

11

As we have seen, Orwell acknowledged the profound, lifelong effects of early conditioning. His writing demonstrates the truth of this in many ways, as commentators have pointed out. We will now consider some of the racial attitudes that he picked up in childhood. We will later trace how they developed, as awareness brought other factors to bear upon them, and the accumulation of other experience modified them.

We know that Thackeray was one of Orwell's favourite childhood authors (11), and we can assume that the young Orwell read much of his work. In the essay on Dickens, Orwell drew attention to Dickens' lack of vulgar nationalism, surprising for someone of his era, and commented on Thackeray's considerable endowment with it. The British are traditionally xenophobic, and it has long been part of their mythology that they are superior to all foreigners. This can be seen, Orwell believed, in the list of insulting nicknames that they invent for a group of people

as they become conscious of them. Although this is an international habit, Orwell fondly believed that the British excelled in it. This gave rise to a system of hierarchy (12). Colonised peoples were naturally inferior, by social Darwinian definition, and rivals were seen in mocking stereotypes. The British were "hearts of oak", "sturdy islanders", but the French were ridiculous, vain, cowardly and boastful (13). Orwell noted that Thackeray was steeped in this tradition, which was a crude, even humorous form of racism. The one historic fact that stuck in Thackeray's mind was the battle of Waterloo, a kind of recurring leitmotif in his work. He believed the English were invincible because of,

"...their tremendous physical strength, due mainly to living on beef." (14)

This fact allowed Thackeray to write passages of enormous nationalistic bombast, mainly directed against England's current rivals - the French (15). The snippet of chauvinism about beef-eating was not lost on Orwell. The opening page of Burmese Days, relates a memory of the youthful U Po Kyin who was watching the British march into Upper Burma, after the third Anglo-Burmese War in 1885.

"He remembered the terror he had felt of those columns of great beef-fed men, red-faced and red-coated...He had taken to his heels after watching them for a few minutes. In his childish way he had grasped that his own people were no match for this race of giants." (16)

Orwell cited The Quarterly Review of the 1830's as an example of "what boasting really is" (17). He referred to the same publication in The Road to Wigan Pier in a discussion of regionalism, itself a form of nationalism. At school he had always been taught that the southern races were effete and corrupt. This attitude which allowed North-South rivalry to flourish, was such a marked trend that Orwell felt able to offer a historic explanation for its genesis;

"When nationalism first became a religion, the British looked at the map and...evolved the pleasing theory that the further north you live the more virtuous you become. The histories that I was given as a little boy generally started off in the naivest way by explaining that a cold climate made people energetic while a hot one made them lazy...This nonsense about the superior energy of the English...has been current for at least a hundred years. 'Better it is for us', writes a Quarterly Reviewer of 1827, 'to be condemned to labour for our country's good than to luxuriate amid olives, vines and vices.' 'Olives, vines and vices' sums up the normal English attitude towards the Latin races. In the mythology of Carlyle, Creasey etc, the Northerner...is pictured as a hefty, vigorous chap with blond moustaches and pure morals, while the Southerner is sly, cowardly and licentious." (18)

It is obvious that Orwell was subjected to those same mythological ideas. He has also introduced the notion of the racial stereotype, which involves moral character judgements under the umbrella of physical appearance. This notion of racial stereotyping will be dealt with later. In the retrospective essay on his prep-school days, he remembered that among the beliefs given to him at St. Cyprian'

was,

"...a contempt for foreigners and the working class." (19)

Another early influence were the boys' weekly papers or "penny dreadfuls" (20). In his essay about them, he was at pains to point out the reactionary political viewpoints that they expressed. He saw this as a sinister manifestation of the power of the press lords, who had a vested interest in encouraging the Edwardian, conservative world-view that they represented. He wrote that people went on reading them into later life (21), and that they contained "deliberate incitement to wealth fantasy" (22). This, he concluded, was a conscious policy and part of the reactionary fabric of society (23). A further characteristic that Orwell brought out in the comics was their attitude to foreigners. Although he didn't spend long on this, he recognised its significance,

"In reality their basic political assumptions are two: nothing ever changes, and foreigners are funny. In the Gem of 1939 Frenchmen are still Froggies and Italians are still Dagoes... Inky, the Indian boy, though a rajah, and therefore possessing snob appeal, is also the comic babu of the Punch tradition... Hun Lung, the Chinese boy... is the nineteenth century pantomime Chinaman, with saucer-shaped hat and pidgin English. The assumption all along is not only that foreigners are comics who are put there for us to laugh at, but that they can be classified in much the same way as insects." (24)

The phrase at the end contained a potent concept for Orwell. It epitomised the

ultimate reduction of human beings, which both horrified and fascinated him, and it crops up frequently in the context of his views on racial attitudes. The racial stereotypes that these papers contained were so limited and consistent that Orwell made a list of them (25). He noted that the working class figures appeared to suffer from the same two-dimensional cut-out quality. The significance of this will be investigated when we consider the relationship of race and class that Orwell made during his life. There is an appendix which deals with Orwell's tendency to stereotype, particularly racially, and one can assess how far he was practitioner of the habit for which he criticised others.

We have mentioned the racial content of imperialism that was necessary to the Victorian/Edwardian mind's assessment of its imperial role. This combined with contempt for other foreigners to form a tight-knit island community. Within this community, the exploiting classes constituted a smaller, tighter group; the greater the external odds, the closer the internal atmosphere became (26). Orwell summarised this feeling soon after his delineation of racial stereotyping in 'Boys' Weeklies',

"The year is 1910 - or 1940, but it is all the same. You are at Greyfriars, a rosy-cheeked boy of fourteen in posh, tailor-made clothes, sitting down to tea in your study on the Remove passage after an exciting game of football which was won by an odd goal in the last half minute. There is a

cosy fire in the study, and outside the wind is whistling. The ivy clusters thickly round the old grey stones. The King is on his throne and the pound is worth a pound. Over in Europe the comic foreigners are jabbering and gesticulating but the grim, grey battleships of the British Fleet are steaming up the channel and at the outposts of Empire the monocled Englishmen are holding the niggers at bay. Lord Mauleverer has just got another fiver and we are all settling down to a tremendous tea of sausages, sardines, crumpets, potted meat, jam and doughnuts...Everything is safe, solid and unquestionable. Everything will be the same for ever and ever. That approximately is the atmosphere." (27)

Although this is a tour de force of parody and instant panorama that Orwell was so good at (28), it is also a deep, nostalgic evocation of an emotionally significant part of his boyhood. There are elements of its pervading genius, the sense of security, continuity etc, that he regarded as fundamental to himself and to the English character (29). There are several things in this passage which will help in throwing light on Orwell's own personality needs.

First of all his own undisguised interest and affection for this atmosphere, and for the boys' comics generally, is interesting in the light of what he said about the average reader elsewhere in the essay. Answering his own question, "Who reads the Gem and Magnet?", he stated that long-term readers were,

"...boys at very cheap private schools...designed for people who can't afford a public school, but consider the council schools 'common'." (30)

He continued,

"The sons of shopkeepers, office employees, and small business and professional men, - obviously it is this class that the Gem and Magnet are aimed at." (31)

He conceded other readers ranging from factory boys to British Legionnaires, but

his choice of main readership is the very one that he belonged to economically.

His prep-school fees were subsidised,

"...otherwise my parents couldn't have afforded to send me to so expensive a school." (32)

If he had not won a scholarship to Eton, he could not have gone. So Orwell the Etonian, and it is Eton that he claims Greyfriars is modelled on (33), is in reality expressing his own alienation from the inner sanctum and his desire to be part of it, by his keen understanding and following of that very romance which he is exposing. To be more specific, it is Orwell's celebration of that area where he had gained social acceptance, by being amongst his peers at school. According to his own account he felt far less sure of his position in society out of that context, because of straitened finances, and therefore the importance of the Greyfriars' atmosphere would have been correspondingly enhanced,

The picture is an authentic 'amity-group' portrait (34), graded into several geographical distinctions. Firstly there is the Englishman holding the "niggers at bay", i.e. defending the largest unit, the British Empire. Within

that, the battleships guard the channel and protect the island fortress from the ridiculous, but slightly sinister foreigner. Finally there is the study with its cosy fire and the wind symbolically whistling outside. The whale has grey stone walls and ivy clusters thickly over it, but at least you are snugly in its belly. The degree of companionship is close because the external threat is great. This necessitates the formation and use of blanket stereotypes (of course in such a short extract he had to compress, but the principle holds good). Foreigners are "comic", and the Empire consists of "niggers". Any recognition of individuality would be fatal to the careful, contrived unity of the in-group. Within, however, we have Lord Mauleverer and his generously provided tea, which is listed in Dickensian detail. One can't help but be reminded of other passages in Orwell where the roles are reversed and he is the outsider and sees the in-group for what it is.

On his return to Barcelona from the rigours of the front, he noticed the changed atmosphere of the city since his last visit and the fact that the rich were cramming themselves in the hotels, while the poor suffered badly from high food prices (35). He commented that,

"A fat man eating quails while children are begging for bread is a disgusting sight." (36)

In Keep the Aspidistra Flying, Comstock is the alienated Orwellian protagonist

but it was Orwell, the author, who pilloried his weak friend Ravelston,

"He ordered the grilled rumpsteak he had been thinking of, and a half bottle of Beaujolais. The...waiter...brought the smoking steak. Ravelston cut it open. Lovely, its red-blue heart! In Middlesborough the unemployed huddle in frowsy beds, bread and marge and milkless tea in their bellies. He settled down to his steak with all the shameful joy of a dog with a stolen leg of mutton." (37)

In The Road to Wigan Pier, he recorded an experience with a sympathetic,

disillusioned colonial official. The pair sat up through an overnight train

journey in Burma, condemning the British Empire with accuracy and familiarity.

There was a price for this rebellion though, for,

"We had been speaking forbidden things, and in the haggard morning light...we parted as guiltily as any adulterous couple." (38)

What the passage about Greyfriars demonstrates is that Orwell understood and had experienced, albeit tenuously, the attractions of being part of an elite in-group, where the closeness within is a function of the hostility without. The precariousness of his position there accounts for both his curious attachment and obsession with the mythical picture it calls up, and his search for a new role and identity outside the in-group. This is first worked out self-indulgently in the fiction, but later led him to widened experiences such as in Spain. There he genuinely

felt, for the first time, a sense of comradeship with a broader, universal group - the international exploited working class. It is one of the intriguing aspects of Orwell, which ties in with his views on the significance of early conditioning, that he never completely escaped the spell of such things as this tight-knit coterie atmosphere, as expressed in the boys' weeklies.

Kipling was another writer, like Thackeray, for whom Orwell acknowledged an early, pleasurable acquaintance (39). We have mentioned Kipling's role as a spiritualiser of Anglo-Indian duty. However honourable this may have been, Orwell conceded that it was no use pretending that Kipling was civilised and that he disapproved, or was even objective about, beating a "nigger" to get money from him, for example (40). There is no need to detail exactly what Kipling stood for. Orwell corrected some misconceptions of him as a power-worshipper or populariser of Cecil Rhodes, but at the same time acknowledged his true greatness and contribution. The things he chiefly valued Kipling for were his epigrammatic, unforgettable style, and the fact that he stood for genuine responsibility, which when Orwell wrote about him was in short supply. It is worth taking a small diversion here to examine Orwell's changing attitude to Kipling. It illustrates how he reacted to a formative influence, and gives a microcosm of how his ideas and outlook changed with the times, yet retained original elements.

In 1936 Orwell summarised his fluctuating feelings for Kipling,

"I worshipped Kipling at 13, loathed him at 17, enjoyed him at 20, despised him at 25, and now again rather admire him."

(41)

Apart from whimsical preference what could affect a person's assessment of a writer so? In the case of Kipling it was Orwell's awakening understanding of the imperial context and his own position within it, and his own growing social enlightenment. The worshipping at 13 would have been the natural reaction of a boy of Orwell's background brought up to admire and participate in the Empire that Kipling had written about. At 17 Orwell went through a superficially radical stage (42), and it would have been consistent in his general rejection to include Kipling as one of the "old men" responsible for the hypocritical orthodoxy of the age in which Orwell found himself an adolescent. At 20, Orwell was beginning his career in the Burma Police, and would have been influenced by the tastes and orthodoxy of those he was junior to. Not only that, but a perfectly usual homesickness and nostalgia would have made him turn again to the favourites of home and boyhood. In Kipling's case he would have combined the two tendencies, and with the growing sophistication of early manhood, his worship would have changed into enjoyment.

Twenty five, however, saw his return to England and the decision to

quit his job in Burma. This will be discussed later, and it is enough to know that,

"I hated the Imperialism I was serving with a bitterness which I probably cannot make clear." (43)

Naturally the "household god" of the Anglo-Indians would be one of the first and most hated idols to be cast down. A sensitive person cannot shrug off his sensibilities and pretend to share the outlook of the insensitive. It is a measure of Orwell's sensitivity that a decade after his return from Burma he should feel the need to admit to striking servants and coolies, and then to apologise or at least offer an explanation for his actions, which were probably at that late date as common as they had been in Orwell's day (44). However, there is no doubt as to how Orwell viewed these actions, nor as to his attitude to Kipling's condoning of them,

"Kipling is a jingo imperialist, he is morally insensitive and aesthetically disgusting." (45)

It is interesting to examine the wording of this pithy condemnation. "Morally insensitive" we can agree with, this was made poignant by Orwell's own peculiar sensitivity; but "aesthetically disgusting" seems an inaccurate if not deliberately misleading comment. The last thing one would gather about Kipling's work from Orwell's description is that it was aesthetically lacking. Dedicated to

an unworthy subject maybe, but aesthetically agreeable for all that. I believe this is an attempt to justify dislike of something in a particular category (morality), by imputing a shortfall in an unrelated field (aesthetics). He did the same thing in Burmese Days with U Po Kyin (46). There can be no doubt about Orwell being aware of Kipling's colour prejudice, and the intrinsic role this played in bolstering up Empire. In a review of The Civilisation of France, in May 1932, he referred to the Frenchman's admirable lack of colour prejudice and noted that the English seemed free of it before the eighteenth century,

"Therefore the growth of this nasty emotion is in some way connected with our recent history, and for all we know the French may soon possess it to the full Kipling power." (47)

At 33, Orwell had become disgusted in his turn by the hypocrisy of the Left in British politics, and their failure to accept either the responsibilities of Imperialism or the consequences of dismantling it. This feeling never left him, and he subsequently acknowledged his admiration for Kipling's moral strength in at least owning up to where he stood and taking what followed (48). By the time Orwell wrote his main essay on Kipling in 1942, not only was he disillusioned with socialist hypocrisy, but he also realised that the world was speeding irrevocably away from the one he had been brought up in and which Kipling described. He dismissed the charge of fascism against Kipling, as he was later to do against P.G. Wodehouse

(49), by claiming that Kipling was pre-Fascist, his whole mentality was that of the period 1885-1902 (50). For all his jingoism he had a common decency; he had definite humility (51), and a belief in a power greater than might. Although he did not kneel before the altar of power, Orwell believed he would have understood the appeal of dictators (52). The facts of Kipling's personality, as Orwell analysed them, included a streak of brutality and sadism (53) and an uncivilised quality which enabled him to be in certain places and write about them in the way that he did. Dismissing the idea that we would have had greater colonial literature if Gissing or Hardy had had Kipling's opportunities, Orwell said that such an accident couldn't happen as civilised men tend to stay near the centres of civilisation (54), and (echoing his subject's aphoristic skill,)

"It took a very improbable combination of circumstances to produce Kipling's gaudy tableau, in which Private Ortheris and Mrs. Hauksbee pose against a background of palm trees to the sound of temple bells, and one necessary circumstance was that Kipling himself was only half civilised." (55)

We might add that it was an equally improbable set of circumstances that furnished Orwell with the material of his first publications. Orwell concluded that although Kipling's outlook was equivocal, it was not totalitarian (56).

Obviously there is a sympathy for Kipling's outlook on Empire, and

part of the reason for this was Orwell's early exposure to such a view. For the myth of Anglo-Indian service to be effective it had to be sincerely believed in, and there is no doubt that Orwell's family traditions and childhood provided that framework of belief. The disillusion that followed the practical experience of Empire was akin to a loss of faith. It is no accident that Orwell wrote one of his early novels with this as a major theme. Of course in A Clergyman's Daughter the faith referred to is Anglicanism, but Orwell was investigating the consequences of a loss of any faith, and his conclusion that it was sometimes better to continue in the old ways, even though the essential core of faith had gone, was an admission that one's early background and beliefs have so shaped and interpenetrated one, that one could not finally cast them off. He retained a loyalty to the Anglo-Indian credo, even during his most radical period in the thirties, and expressed an understanding of it. He called it "sentimental, ignorant and dangerous", but not despicable, and those that ran it "overworked" and "gentlemen" (57). Professor Ayer told me that Orwell had,

"...a respect for the practical achievements of the nineteenth century English administrators in India." (58)

Malcolm Muggeridge detected something Kiplingesque in his character and writing (59). Orwell acknowledged that Kipling, like himself when he went out to Burma,

"never had any grasp of the economic forces underlying imperial expansion." (60)

His imperialism was a naive belief in the constructive role of the white administration, and while Orwell could be lacerating about hypocrisy, he could never bring himself to condemn a sincerely held opinion, no matter how unreal. It is a mark of Orwell's generosity and the respect he had for truth, that honestly-held wrong opinions received less criticism from him than insincere 'correct' ones (61).

Another feature of Kipling that impressed Orwell was his ability to knock out a telling phrase. He tried to minimise his admiration for this quality by describing it "snack bar wisdom" (62), but an example he quoted betrayed him - "The Road to Mandalay" (63). This met^amorphosed into The Road to Wigan Pier, and Orwell hinted at the title's etymology on page 106, when he began.

"The road from Mandalay to Wigan is a long one..."

Much of Kipling's poetry is gnomic, and the universality of its sentiments means that sooner or later you will experience the same thoughts yourself. When this happens there will be a ready-made phrase to verbalise it. Orwell quoted the line,

"He travels fastest who travels alone."

And commented that although the statement may not be true, it is a common thought, well-expressed, and is therefore liable to be seized on (64). He poked a little

fun at an instance of this in print, Where Middleton Murray had quoted the lines,

"There are nine and sixty ways
Of constructing tribal lays,
And every single one of them is right."

Orwell explained,

"He attributes these lines to Thackeray. This is probably what is known as a 'Freudian Error'. A civilised person would prefer not to quote Kipling - i.e. would prefer not to feel that it was Kipling who had expressed his thought for him."

(65)

In a review of Beggar my Neighbour in 1943, Orwell quoted Nehru quoting Kipling, and was amused by the irony, saying that the wheel had come "full circle" (66).

(67)

Orwell quoted Kipling again in May 1944, and later admitted that he had fallen into the same trap as Middleton Murray, two years previously,

"...I quoted an Indian proverb...and erroneously said that it had been translated by a friend of mine. Actually the verse I quoted comes from Kipling. This illustrates something I have pointed out elsewhere - that Kipling is one of those writers whom one quotes unconsciously (68).

Finally some of the debt he owed Kipling can be perceived in his writing. He claimed Kipling was the first English writer to develop the picturesqueness of the Indian scene (69). This found ample echo in Burmese Days, where Orwell said,

"...the descriptions of the scenery aren't bad." (70)

In fact they are excellent and the Burmese scene stayed vividly with Orwell (71).

Also the descriptions of enjoyable Nature Club rambles, in 'Such, Such Were the Joys', have an affinity with the Westward Ho! adventures of Stalky and Co. (72).

To summarise Orwell's changing relationship with Kipling: he was one of those influences that came before critical judgement was awakened; he was therefore absorbed whole. As Orwell's outlook changed, flippantly at school, then after personal experience in Burma, Kipling was reassessed and his shortcomings were admitted. However, Orwell's disgust at the selfrighteousness of the bourgeois Left also forced him to admit that Kipling had responsibility, which his own contemporaries lacked. He moved into a position of loyalty to his old class, partly because of shared background and understanding of their problems, but also because their patriotic responsibility, at its worst,

"...is a comelier thing than the shallow self-righteousness of the left-wing intelligentsia." (73)

Nor must one forget Orwell's genuine feeling for Kipling as a poet; this fits in with a development of Orwell's, his dislike of elitism stemming from schooldays. He believed that the existence of Kipling's poetry was a sign of the,

"...emotional overlap between the intellectual and the ordinary man. The intellectual is different from the ordinary man, but only in certain sections of his personality, and even then not all of the time." (74)

That this was written in a book edited by Eliot demonstrates that Orwell felt it

necessary to dissociate himself from Eliot's reactionary outlook. In venturing this opinion Orwell drew out the populist implications of certain art forms, which Kipling exemplified, but Eliot would not have thanked him for doing.

Finally there is a clue about the Blair family's attitudes to Burma, in a correspondence with Miss Tennyson Jesse after he had reviewed her book Story of Burma. He was forced to defend criticisms he had made, and said that she had omitted important elements of British activity in Burma. There was no mention of the economic exploitation of the Burma Oil Company, for example; nor did she acknowledge the "disgusting social behaviour" of the British,

"My grandmother lived forty years in Burma and at the end could not speak a word of Burmese - typical of the ordinary Englishwoman's attitude." (75)

It is unlikely that such an attitude would have bypassed the young Orwell, though the significance of it was not strike him until afterwards. We will look at his changing attitudes in Burma later, and much of the evidence will be drawn from Burmese Days, for, as he said in the same correspondence with Miss Jesse,

"Much of it is simply reporting what I have seen." (76)

early exposure to an idea and its absorption in an uncritical way. He saw this as a fundamental element in education, or indoctrination. Hence he felt that anything that tended to implant harmful ideas, especially in children, should be rooted out by every conscientious person. Racism, with its patronising stereotypes was such a harmful idea.

(71)

Orwell wrote an article on this in 'As I Please', 1947, and it is worth quoting at length because it shows Orwell's understanding and concern about the issues of indoctrination and racial stereotyping, and it throws some incidental light on Orwell's own unconscious position with regard to the latter. He was discussing a recent child's illustrated 'travel alphabet', with examples;

- J for the Junk which the Chinaman finds
Is useful for carrying goods of all kinds.
- N for the native from Africa's land
He looks very fierce with his spear in his hand.
- U for the Union Jacks Pam and John carry
While out for a hike with their nice Uncle Harry.
The 'native' in the picture is Zulu dressed only in some
bracelets and a fragment of leopard skin. As for the Junk,
the detail is very small, but the 'Chinamen'...appear to be
wearing pigtails...Is it really necessary in 1947, to teach
children to use expressions like Native and Chinaman? The
last named word has been regarded as offensive by the Chinese
for at least a dozen years. As for 'native', it was being
officially discountenanced even in India as long as 20 years
ago.

It is no use arguing that it is childish...to feel insulted
when...called a 'native', we all have these feelings in one

666

form or another. If a Chinese wants to be called a Chinese and not a Chinaman, if a Scotsman objects to being called a Scotchman, or if a negro demands his capital N, it is only the most ordinary politeness to do what is asked of one. The sad thing about this alphabet book is that the writer obviously has no intention of insulting the 'lower races'. He is merely not quite aware that they are human beings like ourselves. A 'native' is a comic black man with very few clothes on; a 'chinaman' wears a pigtail and travels in a junk...This unconsciously patronising attitude is learned in childhood and then, as here, passed on to a new generation of children."

Orwell has outlined the process that most people are subjected to at some stage of their lives. Some of his observations deserve comment and will be followed up. One should add that his ideas about the development of race prejudice (stereotyping in children have been confirmed by social psychologists from his own to the present day. Much that Orwell recognised as shaping his own emotional conditioning is to be found in several books written during the time that Orwell was in Burma. Fear and disgust of a particular group, originating from parental attitudes and reinforced by appearance, smell, habits and so on, have been researched and discussed at some length (78).

Although he cited the example of a Scotsman preferring that title to Scotchman, he was not above using the latter as a conscious insult himself. In Burmese Days, Flory claimed that the Empire was merely an excuse to give trade monopolies to "gangs of Jews and Scotchmen." (79). In a letter to Anthony Powell

he wrote that he was glad to see Powell made a point of calling them,

"... 'Scotchmen', not 'Scotsmen' as they like to be called. I find this a good easy way of annoying them." (80)

Another friend claimed that Orwell put him up to "Scot-baiting" in his editorial work (81). That he used Scotsman when referring to something he cared for, and Scotchman to express disapproval, is born out by the contextual use of the terms.

When discussing Smollett, whom he admired, he called him a Scotsman (82); but in a letter to Eleanor Jaques, he showed his dislike for a bogus mystic 'Scotchman' (83). In The Road to Wigan Pier, Orwell claimed that a Scotsman staying in the same lodging house was a bore, and thereafter referred to him as "the Scotchman" (84)

Orwell made no secret of his dislike of Scotland, as late as 1940, in particular the "Celtic, romantic side of Scottish life..." (85). He also offered an explanation that had its roots back in St. Cyprians. Orwell suffered the agonies of alienation at prep-school, primarily because his sensitivity was nourished by economic insecurity, inferiority, indebtedness to the headmistress and his failure to resolve the contradictions between the law and his inability to keep it. A Scottish cult was the focus of this paradox in the standard of values (86), where the beauty and desirability of the country had become mixed up with "the invigorating effects of porridge, Protestantism and a cold climate." (87). Orwell

later realised that this was a fraudulent cover for the true appeal of Scotland, which was, in reality, a rich man's paradise, where only the huntin', shootin' and fishin' brigade could afford to take their leisure. With shrewd insight he noted that the pretence of Scottish superiority was a cover for the guilty English who had occupied the land and turned the Scots into servants (88).

It was tied up with hateful memories of the headmistress, who claimed Scottish ancestry, gave her child a Gaelic name (a thing Orwell hated in himself and advised others against (89)) and encouraged the "pretty" children to wear kilts of their ancestral tartan. The innocence of this snobbishness didn't alter the fact that it stood for a private paradise which,

"a few...initiates could talk about and make outsiders feel small." (90)

Now Orwell is on the outside of the coterie, a sensation he disliked and compensated for, as we suggested in the context of boys' weeklies. Orwell himself had Scottish ancestry (which he disliked), and he retired to a Scottish island to spend what he hoped would be his family years (his sister and then his adopted son went to live in Scotland too). There is a love-hate relationship here that is more characteristic than he would care to admit. David Astor explained some of Orwell's dilemma to me when he remarked that Orwell had no time for Scottish nationalism,

"...he suspected it of being small and exclusive...what he liked was the English (culture) which had a broader character than the Scottish - less self-conscious." (91)

At the same time he relished the spartan simplicity of Highland life. Astor had introduced him to Jura, and was surprised when Orwell made arrangements to live th

"He was Mr. Blair up there...he felt he couldn't arrive as Orwell, so he arrived as Blair. He was very well-liked and respected on Jura...He was more Scottish than he realised, because they like straightforward dealings...The reason he stayed there was because he had this simplicity..." (92)

Although Orwell had resolved some of the issues in later life, he still couldn't shake off the accompanying emotions, even if he had reduced them somewhat. In Tribune, in 1947, he discussed the virulence of Scottish nationalism, and explained it in an epigrammatic class analysis; an Anglicised upper class ruled a Scottish working class, speaking with a different accent and even language. He concluded that this was the most dangerous kind of class division in England (93) as it included elements of race and class. We will meet this later.

On Jura his life was closer to that of the peasants than the Anglicised classes. He harvested, kept a pig (94), learnt slaughtering and caponising, respected the proper agricultural use of land (95). He found out about the crofting life and identified with ^{it} against the feudalism of the landowners. He believed the crofters would be comfortable if only they had the deer and the

landlords off their backs (96).

His attitude to Scotland exemplifies the change from the closed prejudice of childhood to a profound understanding of the complex issues involved and a consequent siding with the underdog. Even the unpleasant associations of his early exposure served to guide his understanding of the socio-economic causes of Scottish nationalism, and formed a rational base for his dislike of the snobbery at St. Cyprian's. The danger of the coincidence of race and class division that he referred to became apparent in some of the letters he received from Scottish nationalists;

"...please don't refer to us as Britons. There is no such race. We are Scots and that's good enough for us. The English changed their name to British; but even if a criminal changes his name he can still be known by his finger prints."

Orwell wondered if there was "race theory" in the latter, and admitted,

"the writer hates us as bitterly as a devout Nazi...a Jew." (97)

There is racism here, and throughout the letter. It would have been impolitic for Orwell to comment too unfavourably on this aspect for this would only have exacerbated the nationalists' feelings. He was pointing out the underlying causes of such feeling, as he was later to do with Imperialism.

Another example of unconscious patronisation, learned in childhood, is calling people by a name they do not like, and here lies the distinction between

'Chinaman' and 'Chinese'. Orwell believed that people's wishes should be respected in such matters - even the British weren't free of it (98). Nomenclature is bound up in a very real way with racial stereotyping; it involves ascribing a number of characteristics to a race - usually derogatory, sinister or funny. These aspects are united and subject to immediate recall under the umbrella of the insult nickname of one's own choosing (as opposed to the subject's preferred name). Orwell's attitude to the Chinese was born of this condition, but later changed.

There is an interesting passage in Down and Out in Paris and London, where Orwell compared his actual experience of tramps with the prejudiced image he had been given in childhood, and parallels this with that of "Chinamen".

"These prejudices are rooted in the idea that every tramp, ipso facto, is a blackguard. In childhood we have been taught that tramps are blackguards, and consequently there exists in our minds a...typical tramp...repulsive, rather dangerous, who would die rather than work or wash, and wants nothing but to beg, drink and rob hen-houses. This tramp-monster is no truer to life than the sinister Chinaman of the magazine stories, but he is very hard to get rid of. The very word 'tramp' evokes his image." (99)

Orwell has given an authentic analysis of stereotyping, applicable to tramp and Chinaman and many more that he acquired in his childhood. Because of the early exposure involved and its accompanying emotional state, it allows words such repulsive, dangerous and sinister to be used with no effort; the whole bundle is

subject to automatic recall by the key word - tramp, Chinaman etc. Only Orwell's courageous personal experience enabled him to break the vicious circle and reflect objectively on such matters.

'Boys' Weeklies' showed the significant formative influence of comics on Orwell; in it he analysed their picture of Wun Lung, the Chinese boy. He is,

"the nineteenth century pantomime Chinaman...saucer-shaped hat, pigtail and pidgin English...Foreigners...can be classified in much the same way as insects...A Chinese is invariably portrayed with a pigtail. It is the thing you recognise him by
(100)

Later, he remarked that action in the comics is always at the ends of the earth, including such exotic places as "Chinese opium dens" (101). He added that,

"If a Chinese character appears, he is still the sinister pig-tailed opium-smuggler of Sax Rohmer; no indication that things have been happening in China since 1912 - no indication that a war has been going on there for instance."

Orwell's father worked in the Opium Department of the Government of India from 1876 to 1912 - the same year that the Republic succeeded the last Emperor, after the revolution of 1911. It may seem a long gap between Orwell and opium-smuggling Chinese, but it is surely likely that Orwell's father discussed his work with his son - if only when he was persuading Orwell to join the Burma Police. It is therefore probable that Orwell had some of these early stereotypes of the Chinese reinforced by his father. Orwell's father was an old-style Imperial officer who

believed in his duty, and would have been an appropriate candidate for fostering such racial stereotypes as his work in the Empire demanded.

In a favourable review of a book by a Chinese author, in 1945, Orwell traced the changing attitudes of the British to the Chinese,

"The conception of the Chinese as both wicked and comic...is perhaps...connected with the Opium Wars and commercial penetration generally...amused patronage...was to be one of the normal attitudes for nearly a hundred years...It is only in the last few years that the Chinese have begun to be regarded as human beings, and perhaps the obsolescence of the word 'Chinaman' marks the change of outlook." (102)

His observation about the origin of the racial stereotypes dating from the Opium Wars (1840, 1856) is interesting. These wars were fought with considerable arrogance by the British, forcing the Chinese to import Indian opium, against their laws and wishes. The Indian Government's Opium Department would have been steeped in this unsavoury history, and the use of derogatory images for the non-human victims (the Chinese) would have helped shield the conscience of the British. Orwell noted the continuity of prejudice down to a refined patronisation. He saw the replacement of the word 'Chinaman' by 'Chinese' as a healthy symptom and a desire to see the Chinese as human beings, not 'types'.

According to Orwell's Tribune article, 'Chinaman' had been offensive since before 1937, yet we find in a review of December 1937, that Orwell referred

to a 'Chinaman', and that the 'hero' of the book was,

"the very type of the oriental, narrowly dutiful, abysmally ignorant, brutishly industrious...a peasant." (103)

In this review Orwell appeared to be subscribing to an undifferentiated view of the Chinese. In Down and Out in Paris and London, all references are to 'Chinamen' (104). and in The Road to Wigan Pier, Orwell claimed that,

"we would fight to the last...sooner than be ruled by Chinamen" (105)

We will examine his handling of a fictional Chinese character in Burmese Days. For the main appearance of the Chinese, Li Yeik and his household are being visited by Flory and Elizabeth; the visit is hoped to strengthen the latter's relationship, yet has forebodings of failure. They enter Li Yeik's shop, with its deceptively European appearance. This at first reassures Elizabeth (106) after the oriental babel, heat and dust of the bazaar. Here one feels that events will be allowed to take a more European course, and reconciliation will follow. The description of Li Yeik, however, is the standard type that Orwell was to write about in the essay on boys' weeklies; he is an old, bent-kneed man,

"dressed in blue, wearing a pigtail, with a chinless yellow face, all cheek-bones, like a benevolent skull...with nasal honkings...intended for Burmese."

It comes as no surprise when we learn that there was a "cool sweetish smell of

opium" (107). The Chinese women have their feet bound and deformed horribly; Flory offers the unconvincing explanation that, although the custom is dying in China, it is still acceptable in Burma. The pigtail is another anachronism (108). Yet despite the predictable descriptions of the Chinese, Orwell introduced an element raised them above the native population. Li Yeik's two Burmese concubines enter and immediately take an embarrassingly personal interest in Elizabeth. They wish to examine her undergarments, in the naivest possible way. The curiosity of the Burmese girls is in marked contrast to the behaviour of the Chinese family who, apart from the demands of hospitality on Li Yeik, behave as if nothing had happened. Elizabeth queries whether they should ever have set foot in the shop and Flory replies that it is alright with the Chinese, who are a favoured race,

"they're very democratic in their ideas. It's best to treat them more or less as equals." (109)

Flory, in his ineffectual and well-meaning way, is trying to close the gap between the races and acknowledge the individuality and qualities of the Chinese. Elizabeth thinks them "absolutely disgusting people" (110), a judgement brought on by the sight of the baby making water on the floor. To the Chinese it was too normal to be noticed, but it shocks Elizabeth into the realisation that she does not belong in this 'native' world. Her disgust infects the others and the outing

ends in failure.

Orwell is doing two things in this passage. He is responding to the stereotypical images of childhood, as evidenced in the descriptions and, to some extent, the activities of the Chinese; on the other hand he is tentatively pointing out their difference from the Burmese girls. They are worthy of respect because their self-esteem is great. The democratic flavour of their ideas, for instance, stands in contrast to the masochistic, hierarchical view of society that Veraswami holds. Their behaviour bears this out too, for, although engaged in predictable occupations, aimless grinning, cigarette rolling etc, they do them independently, not turning to the Europeans for approval. Paul Potts significantly recalled that Orwell preferred Chinese to Indians (111), and this may not be an arbitrary choice, for what he admired in people was self-sufficiency and the ability to get on manfully. He despised self-pitying attitudes that blamed others and refused to take responsibility. We shall see that this was a characteristic he detected in some Indian nationalists, and he did not conceal his contempt. He showed the same preferences in a letter to Jack Common, in 1938, when he talked of the difficulty of making local contacts in Marrakech (112). It is clear from the tone of the letter that he admired the Arabs for their lack of kow-towing. This anticipates his views on a dangerous ingredient of totalitarianism, for

people with low self-esteem are less likely to resist subjugation. He believed this applied to working class Europeans as much as to colonial victims. It is a recurrent theme from his first to his last book.

The Chinese hold a middle ground in Burmese Days. They are neither the invisible natives, nor more rounded individuals, such as Europeans. It is arguable if Orwell ever avoided character typification for more than the central character per book (see appendix on stereotyping).

If we move on from Burmese Days, we find Orwell's attitude to the Chinese undergoing further change. In The Lion and the Unicorn, 1940, Orwell suggested a 6 point programme of war aims, one of which was a declaration of alliance with China, and other victims of fascism (113). Further on in the same piece he acknowledged that no one should be expected to do our fighting for us,

"except the Chinese, who have been doing it for 3 years..."

(114)

He admired the way that the Chinese had stood up to the Japanese invasion, and cited them as a model for how India might act if she were invaded. He noted that there was a populist political movement in China which enabled the ordinary peasant to be mobilised into action (115). In an angry debate with 3 pacifists in Partisan Review, in 1942, Orwell accused them of ignoring China in their considerations of the outcome of the war (116). In his 1942 war-time diary, he

wrote about the Indian nationalists' lack of responsibility in wanting to conclude a separate peace with Japan and abandoning their loyalty to China (117). He re-emphasised this more firmly in his diary 3 weeks later (118). In The English People, 1944, Orwell cited as an example of the Englishman's sympathy with the underdog, their siding with the Chinese against the Japanese (119). In 'As I Please', in July 1944, he attacked the hypocrisy of the anti-civilian bombing lobby, pointing out that the Japanese had been bombing undefended Chinese cities since 1931, and not a murmur had been raised (120). He attacked Middleton Murray for writing that the average Chinese expected to be conquered by the Japanese, and said that this was an outmoded, racist way of thinking that also justified British rule in India; "In any case the moral is 'Don't help the Chinese.'" (121)

In The Manchester Evening News, 1945, under the headline 'China Saved the World', Orwell reviewed Shanghai Harvest, by R. Farmer, which set out the sufferings of the Chinese at the hands of the Japanese and its importance in relation to the rest of the world. He also noted that Mr. Farmer had had some of his horrifying photographs published in America as long ago as 1938, and wrote,

"(they) would really have shocked the world had the victims been Westerners instead of humble Chinese." (122)

One can see Orwell's growing awareness of China as a military and political power, also as a valuable ally that had been shamefully neglected by the West. It is

hardly surprising to come upon this final jotting, in a manuscript notebook, less than a year before his death;

"I read recently...that in Shanghai(now full of refugees) abandoned children are becoming so common on the pavement that one no longer notices them. In the end, I suppose, the body of a dying child becomes simply a piece of refuse to be stepped over. Yet all these children started out with the *expectation* of being loved and protected and with the conviction which one can see even in a very young child that the world is a splendid place and there are plenty of good times ahead." (123)

This comes at the end of a passage on the changing attitudes to children (from the indifference of Victorian times to twentieth century concern). He queried whether one could ever be the same again if one stepped over an abandoned child without helping it. Malcolm Muggeridge said that anyone who had lived in Asia had done something of the sort. It should be remembered that he had been looking after his adopted son Richard for a number of years, and was extraordinarily fond of him. David Astor recalled that the only time he had ever seen Orwell approach anger had been when he (Astor) had enquired whether Richard would be sent back to the children's home following Eileen Blair's (Orwell's wife) death. David Astor said that Orwell was devoted to Richard and managed "marvellously" with him.

So here we have the end of another aspect of Orwell's racial attitudes.

The reader of the Gem, who grew up with the picture of the pigtailed, sinister

Chinaman has changed to the sensitive person who commented feelingly on the plight of Chinese children in a newspaper report and accepted the Chinese "as human beings like ourselves". This was reflected by his dropping of the totemic word 'Chinaman' in favour of 'Chinese' (124). With reference to the original Tribune article, one can detect a deliberate search for misrepresentation and oversimplification. He admitted that the picture of the junk, for example, had small detail and that the Chinaman "appears" to be wearing pigtails. However, one must not be too picky, the point is that Orwell has become aware of the nature of racial stereotyping, and is doing his best to end it.

1V

Another factor to consider about the racial attitudes current in Orwell's childhood was the value judgement attached to different colours. We have mentioned this in the first chapter, but it is worth raising again, for Orwell was influenced by these associations. Nobody has satisfactorily explained why black is connected with evil and white with good, yet it has been so in many societies and over many centuries. It may even be linked to human personality structure (125). The convention was adopted by Christianity and became embedded in European thought. The Devil was associated with black and God with white.

Romances of the Crusades portrayed the enemy as black, and those that tortured Christ. This tradition runs through English literature (126), and popular sayings like "The devil damn you black", or people having their "faces blacked".

In 'Such, Such Were the Joys', Orwell related the discomfiture that accompanied his bed-wetting at school, and the savage punishments that followed. Later he discussed the improving lot of children as a result of the growth of psychological knowledge, but related an incident notable for its barbarity and colour consciousness. A vicar's daughter with the same bed-wetting problem was taken to a large garden party, and to punish her for this "dreadful deed",

"her father introduced...her to the whole company as a little girl who wetted her bed: and to underline her wickedness he had previously painted her face black." (127)

Here is a literal association between blackness and wickedness. While Orwell was horrified and saddened by the mentality that could cause a child such anguish, there is no indication that the colour-association was anything other than normal. An acquaintance of Orwell has doubted the veracity of the anecdote (128) but, leaving that aside, it undeniably shows his familiarity with the theme.

In a correspondence in Time and Tide, an angry Lieutenant-Colonel replied to Orwell's implication that people had sent their disobedient servants to the jailer for 15 lashes, and finished his letter with the appeal, "must we

•

have our faces blackened as well?" (129). In Down and Out in Paris and London, Orwell recorded a scene in which an old-age pensioner and a docker were quarrelling. The docker was taunting the pensioner who had lost his supply of bread and marge, which meant that he would starve except for charity (130). The pensioner was beside himself with grief and rage, and after a paragraph of swearwords, unfortunately bowdlerised, he concluded,

• "You...you...you...BLACK BASTARD." (sic)

This was the climactic insult and the only one the publisher had allowed after 11 earlier expurgations. In Burmese Days, U Po Kyin plans to disgrace Veraswami. With Orwellian humour, U Po Kyin states that,

"The blacker I can paint him, the more glorious my own conduct will appear." (131)

Later on Veraswami comments that U Po Kyin is intriguing "to blacken my character" (132). Orwell has a positive fetish about Veraswami's colour, and many of the references are supplied by the narrator (133). Veraswami's portrayal as a racial stereotype is discussed in the appendix.

One other example, near the end of his life, will suffice to demonstrate Orwell's familiarity with colour as an emotive symbol. In Nineteen Eighty Four, after Winston had been reintegrated into Oceanic society, he was allowed to while away his days in the Chestnut Tree Cafe. As he sipped a gin and idled with a chess

set, he mused fatalistically on the predestination of life, in particular the victory of Oceania over a rival power and, by association, his own capitulation to Big Brother. The chess game symbolically concretised his thoughts,

"'White to play and mate in two moves.' Winston looked up at the portrait of Big Brother. White always mates, he thought with a sort of cloudy mysticism. Always, without exception, it is so arranged. In no chess problem since the beginning of the world has black ever won. Did it not symbolise the eternal, unvarying triumph of good over evil? The huge face gazed back at him, full of calm power. White always mates."

The chess pieces became the fighting forces, and Winston's strategy Big Brother's; the white knight cuts off the black forces and they are surrounded. The symbolism continued until two important events occurred. The Oceanic victory was announced, and Winston recognised his love for Big Brother. After the latter Winston's soul was "as white as snow", and he was "walking down a white-tiled corridor, with the feeling of walking in sunlight." (134). This mystical speculation echoes Orwell's prep-school days, where he first encountered Meredith's "Armies of Unalterable Law", and he felt an identification with the underdog. In Oceania, if white has triumphed, it is ironic, for the message of the book is that evil has won in every respect. It is probable that as Orwell instinctively sided with the downtrodden, he aligned himself with black and its connotations.

Another point made earlier was the Darwinism adopted by the political

and business community, round the turn of the century to justify their domination in national and world affairs. Orwell understood the significance of these views in their own day (his childhood), and that the threat of fascism had grown out of and superceded them. As Orwell is often revealing in his fiction, it is worth noting the picture he drew of typical racial and imperial Edwardian attitudes in Coming Up For Air. George Bowling reminisced about his childhood, and the Boer War came up in a conversation between his father and Uncle Ezekial;

"He (Uncle Ezekial) was a real old nineteenth century liberal ...and one of the very few people in Lower Binfield who stuck to the same opinion all through the war. He was always denouncing Joe Chamberlain and...'the Park Lane riff-raff'...'Them and their far-flung Empire! Can't fling it too far for me...' And then Father's...quiet, worried, conscientious...voice, coming back at him with the white man's burden and our dooty to the pore blacks whom these here Boars treated something shameful. For a week or so Uncle Ezekial gave it out that he was a pro-Boer and a little Englander and they were hardly on speaking terms. They had another row when the atrocity stories started. Father was very worried by the tales he'd heard, and he tackled Uncle Ezekial about it. Little Englander or no, surely he could not think it right for these here Boars to throw babies in the air and catch them on their bayonets, even if they were only nigger babies?" (135)

There is evidence that Orwell was giving authentic opinions, to the point of insisting on incorrect spelling to simulate the original pronunciation (136). If Orwell was so fastidious about this, we can assume that the actual arguments were not spurious. What is notable about these two attitudes to Empire is the absence

of any expansionist Conservatism. Parts of Coming Up For Air are Orwell's most idealistic social portrait and a hateful view of Empire could not have found a resting place in Edwardian Lower Binfield. Instead we are given the Liberal attitude, even the Little Englander stance, and the voice of conscientious conservatism, mumbling the shibboleths of Kipling. The latter concern qualified with "even if they were only nigger babies". Orwell approved these two views as the only defensible ones at the time. The imperialist is apologetic, the anti-imperialist brazen. While Uncle Ezekial was healthily uninfluenced by atrocity stories, it cannot be said that he had any sympathy for the "pore blacks", and it is fitting that we are told a few pages on that he could quote Carlyle "by the yard". Father, for all his imperialism, has more humane feelings, but even he cannot really conceive of the blacks as human beings. Orwell has given us the best views of Empire current before the Great War, and they were indifference or patronisation. The attitude to other foreigners was similar to Thackeray's, they were "dirt" (137).

We can assume that Orwell was familiar with the racial attitudes of his childhood. I think it is also reasonable to say that he accepted these views uncritically on the whole, and it was not until later that he came to appreciate the role that they had played in shaping his peculiar world views and acceptance of society.

CHAPTER 3: BURMA: BACKGROUND

1

At any time in Orwell's life there would be difficulty in distinguishing racial attitudes from imperial ones. For the Edwardian, the two concepts were inextricably bound together. We now come to where they were identical; his Burmese days, corresponding with the mid *nineteen twenties*.

The Burma Police was a natural career choice for Orwell, with his family background (1), and we can assume he took commensurate ideas and feelings about Empire with him. However, his own personality reacted with the critical stage that British Imperialism was going through at that time and led to a remarkable change in this outlook.

In this section we will look briefly at the history of Anglo-Burmese relations; the social and racial situation in Burma as a result of that contact; the crisis that the Indian Empire was undergoing as a result of social change in England and the application of Liberal policies to India; Orwell's own coincidental crisis of personality owing to the unsuitability of his job; and finally, try and assess how these factors related to each other.

First Burma; what sort of country was it? How did it come to be part

of the British Indian Empire; did its people differ from Indians? These and other questions are relevant to our consideration. Burma, like India, was a country with a history of proud civilisation. Its cultural and trading activities extended far beyond the first European visitors; the Portuguese, Dutch and later English were impressed by what they saw (2). Coincidental with the first Europeans, the Burmese monarchy was undergoing a renaissance and the Toungoo dynasty incorporated other ethnic groups, the Mons and the Shans, into their kingdom. Strong monarchy helped prevent Burma from suffering the early incursions and European settlements that India or the Indies had. Also Burma was geographically in a backwater, relative to the main East Indian trade routes. Because of this, trade was modest, and the concessions granted to Europeans were smaller and more equal than elsewhere. English contact was mainly via offshore island bases, and trade negotiators were frequently sent out from India, where the British had been long established.

Throughout these early encounters the Burmese maintained great pride in their identity and traditions. The English were forced to obey court etiquette, removing their shoes, kneeling in the royal presence, and so on, often unwillingly (3). Burmese provocation, such as the destruction of the British trading-post on Negrais Island in 1795, and the murder of its occupants,

often went unpunished owing to remoteness from India, and the low priority that the British accorded Burma. Such events, combined with the small British presence and the Burmans' fanatical pride, gave the Burmese an exaggerated belief in their own invulnerability and British impotence. Orwell referred to a bizarre example of this in an Observer review of 1946;

...for centuries the Burmese had remained exceptionally ignorant of the outside world. It is curious to reflect that in 1820...a Burmese army was sent to invade India, with orders to bring back the Governor-General in chains, and, if necessary to march on and capture London. (4)

The Burmese were insulted that they had to treat with the East India Company, later the Government of India, and demanded direct representation with the British crown.

When the British had consolidated their position in India and driven out the French, they turned to Burma. British India already bordered the Burmese kingdom in Assam and Kachin, and the Victorian Conservative Imperialist policy of engaging in small border wars and annexations (5) ensured that the status quo would not last. The Burmese, by their negotiations with the French, and their parochial, chauvinistic outlook, were not the people to encourage a diplomatic approach to British imperial ambitions.

Events took their course, and the first Anglo-Burmese war of 1824 ceded the coastal strips of Arakan and Tenasserim to the British. The rest of Lower Burma was taken in 1852 (the great delta areas of the Irrawaddy), and in 1885 Upper Burma was annexed, and the whole joined to British India. Throughout the wars and the negotiations before and after, the Burmese maintained an incredible aloofness, ignoring the British case and presence. An example of Burmese insensitivity to their position was supplied by King Thibaw. In 1878, with Burma already halved, he tried to impose a half million rupee fine on a British company for illegally extracting teak. The fine was excessive and uncollectable, and expansionist elements in the Government of India could not believe their luck at such a ready-made excuse for securing the rest of the country. Thibaw's flirtation with the French won moderate British opinion to the side of aggression.

The result of this admirable but foolish Burmese attitude, was that even during the most secure days of the Raj in their country, Burmans behaved as if the British simply weren't there, or at best were unwelcome invaders (which was true). Orwell recognised this when commenting on unacceptable aspects of his job there; .

...it was a double oppression that we were committing. Not only were we hanging people and putting them in jail, we were doing it in the capacity of unwanted foreign invaders. The Burmese themselves never really recognised our jurisdiction. The thief whom we put in prison did not think of himself as a thief justly punished, he thought of himself as the victim of a foreign conquerer. The thing that was done to him was merely a wanton meaningless cruelty. His face, behind the iron bars of the jail said so clearly." (6)

It was an attitude the Burmese never lost and, having gained their independence, never showed the slightest desire to retain any ties in the Commonwealth.

Almost a hundred years before Orwell went to Burma, an anguished Burman had complained to the British Resident, Colonel Burney, that English and Burmese customs varied totally,

You write on white; we on black paper. You stand up, we sit down (kneel or bow); you uncover your head, we our feet in token of respect. (7)

These differences, and those of temperament combined with Burmese pride and British arrogance to ensure that the two peoples never really understood each other. The mutual respect that often developed in India was rare in Burma. This distanced the two communities. The gap was widened by the British policy of importing cheap Indian labour. We will deal with this in a moment.

As a final insult to Burmese sensibilities, their country was not even governed in its own right, but as part of the Indian Empire. The British

abolished the Burmese monarchy; they would have preferred a protectorate system, but all potential candidates had been murdered on Thibaw's accession. The abolition shocked the country and resulted in five years of heavy fighting, even where the British had ruled for years. They employed 32,000 troops and 8,500 Military Policemen - mostly Indians. This subordinate role to a country which the Burmese despised, and lacked affinity, was exacerbated by the movement of Indians into their country, under the British aegis.

It was objectively untrue that Burma had nothing in common with India. Buddhism; architecture, such as the magnificent temples at Pagan; writing; the concept of royalty and its trappings (the white umbrella), all owed their origin to India. The fact that the Burmese felt nothing in common with Indians is a sign of their xenophobic introversion.

The way that the British took over Burma, and the Indian association with this, however, ensured that the rift between Burman and Indian was irreparable. The Indians were regarded as the camp followers of the British. They came in three capacities: as coolies, virtually slaves in the 'maistry' systems (8); as traders and financiers, the latter particularly the province of the Chettyars, whose capital enabled the expansion of Burmese agriculture around the turn of the century; as government employees, clerks, prison warders, soldiers

doctors and so on.

The Burmese objected to the labourers on a number of grounds. There were too many and threatened the integrity of the Burmese race. One of the later claims of the Nationalists was that,

"Besides taking our country and our property, they take our sisters. The Burmese nation will become extinct." (9)

This objection applied to all Indian immigrants, but because labourers were the most numerous, they roused stronger feelings in the public mind. The British naturally tried to allay such fears (10). Then Indians worked too cheaply and undermined Burmese wages and living conditions. The facts certainly bear out the charge of poor pay and low living standards. Orwell remembered the degradation in which coolies lived. While inspecting some caravan sites in Wigan, he recalled,

"I have never seen comparable squalor except in the Far East.. I was immediately reminded of the filthy kennels in which I have seen Indian coolies living in Burma. (11)

This wasn't just a subjective reminiscence. Even the British Government when Orwell was in Burma reported this state of affairs, and duly did nothing about it. Their report is worth quoting for its Dickensian description of squalor;

In one room where we counted fifty coolies, the number allowed by regulation was nine. The conditions were indescribable. Every inch of the floor space is occupied by a sleeping human being and others are to be found on shelves...along the

walls...The exhalations from overcrowded, sweating humanity lying actually on top of one another and breathing the same foul atmosphere over and over again must be sufficient to turn the strongest stomach. (12)

This foreshadows Orwell's disgust at the living conditions of the unemployed in England. Orwell saw the connection between the worsening position of the Burmese peasantry and unlimited Indian immigration. In a 1929 newspaper article he maintained that Burmese wages were not rising as fast as the cost of living, because the British had allowed,

...hordes of Indians to enter the country quite freely and these, coming from a land where they were quite literally dying of hunger, are prepared to work for next to nothing and so present a formidable competition for the Burmese. (13)

However, itinerant labourers never exceeded a million, or 6% of the population, and the resident figure was a third of this. These statistics ignore Indian concentration in certain areas, which alarmed the Burmese; Rangoon, for example, was virtually an Indian city. Seasonal immigration was so popular to Burma that the British waived the usual indenture system of Government sponsored emigration from India (14), in favour of the private enterprise Maistry system. This ensured the degradation of Indian labour in Burma. The contemptuous Burmese name for Indian was 'Kala' (15).

Indian traders and middle men were joined by some Chinese, in this

capacity. However, the Indians were physically a more identifiable group and excited Burmese envy. These Indians provided a valuable link in the economy which the Burmese were either unwilling or unable to do. The Chettyars and their farm capital were a precondition to economic advance, comparable to the growth of the banking system in western Europe. However, the Burmese were bound to see many of their people in financial thrall to Indian money-lenders. When the British legal system directed that defaulting Burmese surrender their land, Indian and British oppression became firmly associated in the hatred of the Burmese.

The Indians in Government employ constituted a tiny fraction of the population. However, many posts were of an unpopular nature. Soldiers were used to put down Burmese rebels; Police were used to arrest Burmese and the Jailers to hold them; Clerks were often in an influential position. One of the few professions that might have been widely approved, medicine, was largely staffed by Indians. In 1931, 58% of registered practitioners of British medicine were Indians. Dr. Veraswami would not have been an exceptional person, nor would his rivalry with U Po Kyin have been rare. This is soundly observed xenophobic ambition, and the calumny that the poor doctor excites from the British and Burmese was often the lot of the wretched Indian in Burma. Even on the merits of service the doctor was often misunderstood, as an extract from Burmese Days indicates;

Flory is watching the Burmese patients filing past Veraswami's desk,

The doctor had a way of asking them whether they had suffered from venereal diseases - an ungentlemanly and pointless question - and sometimes he horrified them still more by suggesting operations. 'Belly-cutting' was their phrase for it. The majority of them would have died a dozen times over rather than submit to 'belly-cutting'. (16)

The injured pride of the Burmese turned to hatred of the oppressors.

The loss of their kingdom in 1885 had shattered national morale, which did not recover for another thirty to forty years. The Indians who accompanied the British were tarred with the same imperial brush, as they were the bulk of the occupying forces.

11

It is worth emphasising the crucial role of Indians in Burma, for it helped shape Orwell's attitude to Indians, as opposed to his views on Indian independence. Orwell was aware of their significance in Burma, and we will look at their role in his novel, Burmese Days. The book can be regarded as authentic, individual observation of what was happening there in the 1920's - Orwell certainly regarded it as such (17).

As usual, Orwell starts with concrete details, to establish his ground; in this case the demographic statistics of Kyauktada,

...about four thousand, including a couple of hundred Indians, a few score Chinese and seven Europeans. There were also two Eurasians.

The proportion of Indians, around 5%, is the average for Burma. It is an interesting pyramid, in which the smaller the number, the greater the power, except for the Eurasians. The first Indian is the Club mali, who is described in terms which reduce him to the status of his botanical surroundings, in contrast to an Englishman who appears next (18). We meet him again looking like a beast of burden and offering simplistic thoughts (19). Flory's mali is even more of a curiosity, he is described as lymphatic, half-witted and unable to communicate (20). He does nothing but unskilled manual labour and gesticulating (21).

The Club butler is described with canine imagery (22), treated like a dog, shouted at for using long sentences (23), argued over like a piece of furniture, and subjected to arbitrary kickings (24). However, at critical moments, he is accepted by the Europeans. After the Kyauktada earthquake, he bounces in and out of the lounge recalling anecdotes of previous tremors,

'So far from snubbing him, the Europeans even encouraged him to talk. There is nothing like an earthquake for drawing people together. One more tremor...and they would have asked the butler to sit down at table with them. (25)

Also when the Club is attacked by a Burmese mob, he is treated like the Europeans (26)

This behaviour follows the pattern of the amity group in 'Boys' Weeklies'. When there is sufficient external threat, people band together into a tight-knit community to maintain morale and improve their chances of survival. Even obvious prior differences are abandoned, including racial distinctions, once vital to the Club/imperial hierarchy. This reveals a function of racism. It is a psychological device used for social stratification, and its prompt alteration in emergencies demonstrates this utilitarianism. There are exceptions, and the psychopathic racism of Ellis is of a more personally-related order. The switching of allegiances (in-group/out-group criteria) foreshadows the manipulated schizophrenia of Nineteen Eighty Four, and proves the pattern not the symbols to be the emotional essence.

The Military Police in Kyauktada are Indians (27), and the clownlike behaviour of their fat subadhar is matched by his lack of initiative. When the rioters attack the Club, the police get embroiled, like extras in a Chaplin film (28). It takes the deglamourised Flory to control the mob properly. The contrast between the Indian police, "...straggling back...their pagris gone...their puttees trailing yards behind them," and the dispersing Burmese, "...young men leaping gracefully...like...gazelles," is sharply drawn, to the detriment of the Indians. The appearance of Veraswami is pure comedy,

A small white-clad figure extracted itself...and tumbled limply into Flory's arms. It was Dr. Veraswami, with his tie torn off but his spectacle miraculously unbroken... 'there is at least one man who bears the mark of this, I think!' He held out a small fist for Flory to see the damaged knuckles.

(29).

This contrasts with the relaxed U Po Kyin, a picture of "studious negligee".

Although the Indians are not drawn with hostility, they conform to the pattern of stereotypical incompetence current during Orwell's period in Burma.

The most degraded human being in the book is Old Mattu, who looks after the European church. Orwell describes him with obvious disgust and implies that his wretched physique matches his mentality (30). He has earth-coloured skin and begs in sign language. The most outspoken condemnation is voiced by Veraswami, who calls him a degenerate in mind and body, Orwell's narration reinforces this view (31). Orwell speaking through Veraswami's mouth may seem more acceptable, but we should not be misled by this. Orwell had an ambivalent attitude towards Indians, as we shall see later. In the church where Mattu fans the Europeans, a "mournful dark Indian of uncertain race" stood humbly in the background (32).

Flory's earliest memories of Burma include Indians. When he abandons his long leave, he is met by his Indian servants. They give him sweetmeats and garlands of marigolds, flowers for which Indians have an extraordinary affection (33).

His evocation of homecoming was peculiarly peaceful,

The light of...evening was...kind. At the gate an old Indian, the colour of earth, was cropping grass...the wives of the cook and the mali (both Indians) were kneeling in front of the servants' quarters, grinding curry paste on the stone slab

The affection for this scene, and the Indians in it, made him realise that his deepest roots lay there (34). Orwell repeated this elsewhere, and obviously the Burmese scene stayed with him (35), Indians and all.

In the Kyauktada jail an Indian coolie squatted, covered with ring-worm, like a coat of mail (36). This is not the only time that Orwell expressed disgust at the health of Indians (37), and it was an aspect which upset him badly. A pleasanter picture is presented by some of the comic Indian servants (38) whose curiosity is annoying, but whose conversation recalls the Kiplingesque in Orwell (39). Orwell is guilty of propagating Anglo-Indian myths for which the correspondent in Time and Tide chided him (40), and which he usually dismissed, as in the case of the Old Havildar's concern for virgins and rupees (41)

The Lackersteen's butler is a "stork-like" Indian, with large white eyeballs who squints (42). An Indian barber, who dry shaves the Indian coolies for a pittance, gives Flory a haircut after his scissors are sterilised (43). Indian warders guard the convicts as they labour (44). In the bazaar, Flory and Elizabeth see some Dravidian women pounding turmeric (45). To the narrow, over-

worked mind of Mrs. Lackersteen, Indian heterodoxy is translated into a sexual threat (46). Flory sees a file of wretched Indian 'sweepers', starveling outcastes with feeble, bent limbs, carrying sewage;

"...draped in earth-coloured rags, they were like a procession of shrouded skeletons walking." (47)

Later, four of them carry a dead coolie wrapped in sacking to a shallow jungle grave (48). They are "earth-coloured", indistinguishable from their background, and resemble sub-humans from a medieval picture of Hell. Whether their burden is excrement or a dead colleague, Orwell's handling of them is the same. They are burying refuse. Orwell's picture is a factual recording of their disgusting but necessary function. Because they are an unpleasant part of the background, they are always in the distance, rather like ants marching across a path (49).

In contrast Verall's Sikhs are tall and insolent. They "eye Flory without much favour", and treat him contemptuously, but in Verall's eyes they are no better than coolies (50), he views Indians with disdain (51). The book-wallah is another "earth-coloured" Indian, and Orwell poked a bit of fun at the Bible with him (52). "Dravidian starvelings" ferried Maxwell's murdered body across the river to the Club (53). The station master is a babu Indian, and we meet two Indian grass-wallahs on the platform (54).

Dr. Veraswami is an important Indian figure in the book;

Indians are an important part of the scene in Burmese Days, and their portrayal is socially, historically accurate. Their work was mainly connected with the British; usually the invidious go-between role between the local people and the rulers, that earned them the hatred of the one and the contempt of the other. There is also the division between the black Dravidian, either a coolie or a figure of fun, and the lighter-coloured Aryan (arrogant like Verrall's Sikhs). We mentioned this in the opening chapter, and Orwell reflects the general view of the first as "Damn black swine who've been slaves since the beginning of history" (55), and the arrogant Aryans who plainly see themselves as superior to Flory.

Orwell employed animal symbolism for the Indians (dog, bird, caterpillar, grass-hopper, stork etc) but this should not be exaggerated, for he also applied it to the Burmese and Europeans (56), in this his most stylistically mannered book.

We will now turn to the general crisis that British Imperialism was going through, and its particular application to Burma. We have seen that the Burmese were unwilling colonial subjects. But, owing to the trauma of subordin-

•
-ation to a strong military power, they failed for many years to formulate a significant response to the British. We must first look elsewhere for the causes that were to alter the Imperial climate in Burma. We must turn to Indian Nationalism, and also to England.

Although it would be a gross oversimplification to conceive of the Indian Empire as ever being stable, it is, nevertheless, true that from the 1880's to the turn of the century a quiescence prevailed. During this time the British were contented with their role, however shortsightedly, and there was satisfaction that it was an honourable, necessary one. The vast majority of Indians were unaltered by the British presence, and the educated ones, like Gokhale, worked loyally for the development of their country. The Indian Congress, founded in 1885, was dedicated to evolutionary politics. However, there was change; Tilak (later Gandhi) began to advocate a rapid approach towards involvement in government as did vernacular newspapers such as the Marathi Kesari and the Bengali Yugantur. Dismayed by the slowness of the British response and the gulf between words and actions of Liberal statesmen, in England and India, terrorist activity began on Indian city streets.

The British reforms slowly began. Morley, head of the India Office, appointed Indians to several high posts, including the India Office council in

Whitehall, in 1909. The Morley-Minto reforms of 1909 - more hampered by Viceroy Minto than encouraged - allowed democratically elected Indians for the first time onto certain administrative councils in British India. It was a small beginning, in numbers and scope of action, but it was decisive. It threw feelings on both sides into focus. The British Conservatives and administrators regretted giving in to Indian demands, while for genuinely radical reformers such as Morley, it didn't go far enough. The conservative Indian Congress members welcomed it as a useful first step, while the militants felt it to be derisory. This set the tone for the reception of all subsequent reforms - too little, too late. It applied to George V's reunification of Bengal in 1911, after its unpopular division by Curzon in 1905. Also the Nationalist movement had acquired mass appeal. Out of the hands of moderates, the Congress had attracted wider support, including Hindu revivalists. These people felt a duty to publicise their hopes for a new, reformed India to the widest audience, and they gathered a mass movement, which the charismatic Gandhi was later to have as a matter of course.

The First World War had dramatic effects everywhere, including India. Because of her wartime sacrifices (57), India confidently expected substantial political concessions. Some Sikhs had tried to emigrate to Canada, as fellow

members of the British Empire, but had been refused entry because of their colour. They came back embittered revolutionaries. Two principal Congress moderates, Gokhale and Mehta, died and were replaced by revolutionary figures.

In England the aftermath of war led to a revulsion against Conservative, Edwardian politics and ideas. There was growing demand for reform at home, and the organisation of working people led to a growth of their consciousness. This optimism prevailed until the General Strike, and was finally killed by the Depression. In other words, the time was ripe for reform, in India and England.

Montagu, Secretary of State, toured India, promised reform and wrote his report in 1918. This became the basis for the Government of India Act, 1919, which included the innovation of 'Dyarchy' (58). This was put into practice for a ten year experimental period. Meanwhile, caught between the growing awareness of local Nationalists, and Whitehall politicians finally alive to calls for reform, were the Anglo-American administrators. They still had to run the Empire, despite change, but now with a double disadvantage. Firstly, the British Government were reluctant to allow flexibility and initiative, previously the norm. Ever since the telegraph had reached Asia in the 1890's, the tendency had been for centralisation from Whitehall, now the legendary 'red-tape' tied officials hand and foot. They also had to cope with a more aware people, many of them

demobilised soldiers. Their position became increasingly uncertain, and the old confidence, expressed by Kipling, was wearing thin. The Suez Canal, opened in 1869, had enabled British women to join their men, and the aloofness of the British steadily grew. This introversion was most sacredly expressed in the Club, which took on an aspect of sanctuary that in the heyday of Empire it had lacked. This is relevant for when we consider Orwell's handling of social life in Burmese Days.

Not all Anglo-Indians retreated into uncertainty, however, and General Dyer took an initiative that was to have far-reaching repercussions. I have mentioned his action in Amritsar (59), which was a watershed in British-Indian relations. The Anglo-Indians backed Dyer to a man, including his superiors. At home, however, reaction was different. Liberal opinion was shocked, and the Hunter Commission eventually found Dyer guilty of exceeding his duty, and he was relieved of his post. An unofficial collection raised thousands of pounds, and he was presented with a jewelled sword inscribed "The Saviour of the Punjab".

The Home Government's censure of Dyer had a profound effect on the Anglo-Indian community. Writing in 1936, C. Gwynn remarked on the impression made:

"It...is widely felt, that an officer who takes strong action which he genuinely considers is necessitated by the circumstances, cannot rely on the support of the government,

and that his career will be ruined. (60)

This frustration and change in morale are an important theme in Burmese Days;

'What can you do with all this red-tape tying your hands? Beggars of natives know the law better than we do. Insult you to your face and then run you in the moment you hit 'em... It's all this law and order that's done for us...Office babus are the real rulers of this country now. Our number's up.' 'I don't agree...' said Ellis. '...Look at Amritsar. Look how they caved in after that. Dyer knew the stuff to give them. Poor old Dyer! That was a dirty job. Those cowards in England have got something to answer for.'

There was a...sigh...that a gathering of Catholics will give at the mention of Bloody Mary...Mr. MacGregor...shook his head at the name of Dyer. 'Ah, poor man! Sacrificed to the Paget MP's, Well, perhaps they will discover their mistake when it is too late. (61)

Orwell has included the stifling effect of red-tape, and the home Government's 'treachery' in not supporting one of its workers in the field. Orwell's comparison of Catholics sighing for Bloody Mary reflects his fundamental disapproval, for he despised Catholics and their apologists (62). Immediately after this scene, Flory (the Orwellian protagonist) leaves, before he smashes the place up mentally. His frustration stems from the fact that he is party to the system.

The arguments about Empire are developed when rumours of a rebellion reach the Europeans' ears. The atmosphere is oppressive, as though a storm is about to break. The Europeans are in the mood for action;

'God, if they'd only break out and rebel properly for once!'

...But it'll be a bloody washout as usual...I've never fired my gun at a fellow yet...Eleven years of it...and never killed a man. Depressing.'... 'you can always get hold of the ringleaders and give them a good bambooing on the Q.T. That's better than coddling them up in our damned nursing homes of prisons.'

'Can't do that...nowadays. All these kid-glove laws...'

'Oh, rot the laws. Bambooing's the only thing that makes any impression on the Burman. Have you seen them after they've been flogged? I have. Brought out of the jail on bullock carts, yelling...'

'Let's hope they'll show a bit of fight for once. Then we'll call out the Military Police...Plug a few dozen of 'em - that'll clear the air.' (63)

Symbolically the weather is growing hotter, and we feel the isolation and frustration of the English, hemmed in by a hostile climate, population and legislation. Ironically, corporal punishment was one of the things that Orwell later admitted alienated him from the Imperial service. The "dirty work" of Empire was at odds with Orwell's childhood Kiplingesque ideals (64).

The effect of the Dyer affair was not simply on Anglo-Indian morale. It physically hampered the work of Empire so that it was not possible to carry out duties in a recognised, efficient way. An example of this was the Moplah rebellion in Calicut, just before Orwell went out to Burma. The Government of India was deeply conscious of the Amritsar aftermath, and when an armed rebellion developed in Southern India, its reaction was indecisive;

The Government of India...was unwilling to take the

responsibility of entrusting full martial law powers to soldiers...it feared there might be a political outcry.' (65)

As a result inadequate provision was made to carry out military duties. Insufficient troops were despatched, and the army was not allowed to hold normal summary courts martial and dispense immediate judgement. Consequently the rebellion dragged on with an unnecessary loss of life all round. Gwynn believed that the main lesson concerned the limitation of the army's power,

...the concensus of opinion that a mistake had been made in withholding these powers in the first martial law ordinance is striking... (66)

The frustration at not being allowed a free hand is apparent in the community at Kyauktada. After the murder of Maxwell, Ellis discusses retribution with the police officer, Westfield,

Never mind the bloody law. Whack it out of them. Torture them - anything.'

'Wish we could. My chaps know how to put the screw on a witness if you give 'em the word. Tie 'em down on an ant-hill. Red peppers. But that won't do nowadays. Got to keep our own bloody silly laws.' (67)

Although the tone may appear as parody, it is consistent with the speakers' characters, and reflects the nostalgic frustrations of those who believed in an Imperial 'golden age'. In The Lion and the Unicorn, Orwell gave a retrospective on the decline in Imperial initiative from the turn of the century to the 1920's.

He was concerned with the flabbiness that such strangulation produced, rather than the characteristic frustration of Burmese Days. He believed that the telegraph had centralised the Empire from Whitehall, and,

The one-time Empire builders were reduced to...clerks, buried deeper and deeper under mounds of paper and red tape. In the early twenties one could see...the older officials, who had known more spacious days, writhing impotently under the changes...From that time onwards it was...impossible to induce young men of spirit to take any part in imperial administration...the job of administering the Empire had ceased to appeal. (68)

Orwell believed that mediocrity now pervaded the Empire. If his picture was exaggerated, it was sincere.

It would be wrong to see the Amritsar massacre only from the Anglo-Indian viewpoint, however. To the Indians it marked a new stage in their demands for representation. They felt such anger and insecurity that they decided to press for full self-government. The condemnation of the English Government, coming so late after the endorsement of the Indian Government, was another case of too little too late, and, the Indians suspected, insincere (69). Equally unimpressive were the ensuing Chelmsford-Montagu reforms. The period following the war and through the twenties was a time of rising Indian Nationalism, and one of deep uncertainty, indeed anxiety, for the Anglo-Indians. How was this

reflected in Burma? What were the developments in the Burmese situation?

We have mentioned Burmese chagrin at their country's incorporation into the Indian Empire. To add insult to injury, when the Government of India Act, with 'dyarchical' representation was announced, it did not apply to Burma. Most officials felt that Burma was politically and economically too backward for democratic concepts that were out of keeping with its traditions and abilities. This was resented by the Burmese, and their educated people divided on the matter. One group pressed for inclusion in the reforms, and hence closer ties with India; the other pressed for full independence. After lying prone in the aftermath of 1885, the Burmese experienced a growing nationalist awareness in the post-war years, which the British managed to ignore. In 1908, U May Oung had said that unless they were prepared to meet and assimilate foreign culture, their,

...existence as a distinct nationality would be swept away, submerged and irretreivably lost. (70)

This feeling swelled, and climaxed after 1918. The Young Men's Buddhist Association was founded, and it became the political training ground for future Burmese leaders. It was loud in its call for dyarchy to be extended to Burma, and immediately struck a strongly nationalistic pose. Its Buddhist title should not obscure the fact that it was the main source of Burmese political agitation, and its young members were contemptuous of the British. Although

Orwell mentioned Buddhist antagonism and the horrible frustration he felt at their attitudes, he never recognised the validity of the movement; he saw them as a crowd of jeering, yellow faces, sneering and hooting at him, personally, from street corners;

The Buddhist priests were the worst of all...I thought that the greatest joy in the world would be to drive a bayonet into a Buddhist priests guts. Feelings like these are the normal by-products of imperialism. (71)

These feelings were certainly the by-products of this time, especially on people as sensitive as Orwell. In Burmese Days he explained why the Europeans were so ^{feelings of discontent} exacerbated by Burmese behaviour,

Living and working among Orientals would try the patience of a saint. And all of them...knew what it was to be baited and insulted. Almost every day...the High School boys...full of that maddening contempt that sits so naturally on the Mongolian face - sneered at them as they went past, sometimes hooted after them with hyena-like laughter. (72)

He didn't publicly credit them with a political role, and regarded them subjectively as a nuisance, like a schoolmaster who cannot understand why his rowdy pupils never pay attention. This is a patronising approach, and had a long term effect on how he assessed other nationalist movements. It is a serious, if understandable, myopia, in view of his personal experience, and it represents a rare failing in his otherwise sympathetic approach to the problem of imperialism.

Another important factor was Rangoon University, founded in 1920, which became the focus of nationalist activity. A student strike in 1921 had a profoundly unifying effect on politically aware Burmese. This should not have surprised the British, Burmese nationalism was not born in 1919, only its mode of expression changed (73). But it did. The pressure for reform after 1919 shook everyone, and grudgingly concessions were made. A modified form of dyarchy was introduced in 1923, but British guidance was dismally lacking. The autocratic Lieutenant-Governors were unresponsive to the new mood (74).

At local level the introduction of a token 'native' to the European Club was one suggestion, and we shall examine Orwell's treatment of this soon. It was into this situation that the young Orwell was posted. A country seething with injured pride and dawning political awareness. The British administrators were invidiously placed. Times had changed since Orwell's father had retired in 1912. The confidence and virtue had drained out of them.

1V

We will now consider Burmese Days in the light of these underlying facts. We will also refer to other works relevant to Orwell's time in Burma. After this we will examine Orwell's personal crisis as it emerged there. We will be covering Orwell's racial/imperial attitudes over the crucial stage of his

personal involvement in Empire; a stage that encompassed his transformation from politically (but not emotionally) conventional Etonian, to a slowly clarifying radical humanitarian.

There are several important threads woven into the novel, and although they overlap, it will help if they are listed separately. First, conventional racial/imperial attitudes; these include the superior role of the whites, and the inferiority of the natives. Secondly, the crisis of imperialism, peculiar to that time after the Great War and the twenties; this includes declining European confidence and the corruption of the sensitive, the rise of Burmese political awareness. Related to this are the social and psychological adjustments made in, for instance, allowing a native into the European Club. Thirdly, Orwell's interest in Burmese culture and environment, which is symptomatic of his personal needs and development. It will be argued that Burma coincided with and catalysed Orwell's developing personality; further there is the beginning of the debate, that climaxed in Spain - of how far the individual can relate to society. Fourthly there is his disillusionment with the myths, exploitation and hypocrisy of Empire.

Conventional racism, endemic in imperialism, assumed the inferiority of subject native peoples. Early in Burmese Days, we learn that U Fo Kyin plots to disgrace the Indian doctor, Veraswami. He categorically believes that Europeans

discount evidence, and that,

When a man has a black face, suspicion is proof. (75)

He repeats this (76), and Veraswami acknowledges the truth of it too, when he pines for election to the Club and the immunising prestige this will give him (77). Flory, the Orwellian protagonist, is embarrassed that Veraswami, though a friend, is not his social equal because of his black skin. However, Flory's friendship affords some kudos. Flory underlines the innate weighting of the system when he reacts to the doctor's friendly warning that U Po Kyin might even venture against the Englishman,

"...me? Good gracious, no one would believe anything against me. Civis Romanus sum. I'm an Englishman - quite above suspicion." (79)

Veraswami's reputation is slowly poisoned in the Europeans' minds. Flory knows that aloofness is his only acceptable course and familiarity with 'native' quarrels is detrimental (80). MacGregor's dilemma epitomises the nature of imperial 'justice';

Of course it was not a question of any overt act of disloyalty - that was quite irrelevant. The point was, was the doctor the kind of man who would hold seditious opinions? In India you are not judged for what you do, but for who you are. The merest breath of suspicion can ruin an Oriental...

(81)

Orwell was not tongue in cheek, he was recounting the official Anglo-Indian mind (which he shared), deciding a 'native' case. It foreshadowed the totalitarian

arbitrariness that eventually preoccupied him. Later, in Spain, Orwell experience the other side of the fence,

I was not guilty of any definite act, but I was guilty of 'Trotskyism'...It was no good hanging on to the English notion that you are safe so long as you keep the law.

This personal experience developed in him, and ten years later, in the essay on Swift, he wrote that the non-statutory nature of Houyhnhnm society illustrated,

...the totalitarian tendency...in a society in which there is no law...the only arbiter of behaviour is public opinion. But public opinion, because of the tremendous urge to conformity in gregarious animals, is less tolerant than any system of law. (83)

He reviewed An Interlude in Spain, in 1944, and highlighted this again,

The essential fact about a totalitarian regime is that it has no laws. People are not punished for specific offences, but because they are considered to be politically or intellectually undesirable. What they have done or not done is irrelevant. (84)

For Orwell this was a nightmare idea which he instinctively rejected at first.

The author of the book recounted how some British soldiers, just imprisoned, disbelieved the tales of arbitrary execution. As the truth dawned, however,

...they commented, not inaptly, 'Well, give me England every time.'

In Nineteen Eighty Four, when Winston is about to open his diary, we are told,

This was not illegal (nothing was illegal, since there were

no longer any laws), but if detected it was reasonably certain that it would be punished by death, or at least twenty five years in a 'forced labour camp.' (85)

The seminal idea of arbitrariness in Orwell's consciousness dated, then, from his experiences in Burma. He experienced similar emotions **at school**, but these were unconsciously absorbed, and his handling of the 'native' position in the British Empire shows his first awareness of this problem. Orwell needed the positive empiricism of Spain to turn his Burmese observations into 'reality' and it was only later that he could trace the notion back to his childhood.

Orwell demonstrates considerable psychological sophistication in the way that U Po Kyin convinces the Europeans of Veraswami's unreliability (86); this insight enabled him to portray the refinements of the Ministry of Love. U Po Kyin explains to his wife that proof will play no part in Veraswami's ruin; his guilt will be assumed by the Europeans, because, "That is how their minds work." (87). The temptation of belonging to the European Club lies at the root of U Po Kyin's behaviour (88). Veraswami fears for his reputation, which can be ruined by the slightest suspicion of disloyalty (89), and he impresses the racial irrationality of this on Flory (90). The Englishman, sitting uncomfortably on the fence, understands the feelings on both sides, and suggests the equally irrational remedy - that Veraswami should be elected to the Club. The doctor's delirious greeting of this suggestion underlines the potency of the emotions

95

involved, and the totemic symbolism of the racial attitudes ensures that as a Club member, he would be indistinguishable from the Europeans (91). Orwell understood the importance of irrationality in human affairs, and it was this understanding that prompted him to write Animal Farm as a necessary counter-myth to the intelligentsia's belief in Russian 'socialism'. He had argued about the facts inside Russia, ad nauseam, but still had not penetrated that emotional layer which governed men's outlook. Only the 'irrational' appeal of his allegory could hope to slip beneath the mind's defences.

The racism that produced the Club fetish (like an exotic Greyfriars) was equally impervious to reason. The doctor's proposed election does not go smoothly. However, Flory performs some quasi-heroics and Veraswami bathes in the reflected glory (92). Flory's now-influential voice, boosts Veraswami, for,

"At all times the testimony of one European can do an Oriental more good than that of a thousand of his fellow countrymen... (93)

The angry U Po Kyin turns his attentions on Flory. His fellow conspirators are horrified at this attempt to undermine a white man (94), but the scheme works and Flory eventually commits suicide. Veraswami is now bereft of European protection and soon falls prey to to the insidious exploitation of prejudice around him. No open accusation was ever made, but still,

...it was agreed that he was a scoundrel. By degrees the

the general opinion of him crystallised in a single Burmese phrase 'shok de'. Shok de means, approximately, untrustworthy, and when a 'native' official comes to be known as shok de, there is an end of him." (95)

Here is the first aspect of racism that Orwell illustrated in Burmese Days. The inequality, not before the law which doesn't enter into it but, before the court of white public opinion. A 'native' has less leeway in his behaviour and is judged guilty without the chance to prove himself innocent; he is ruined by rumour, whereas a white man is only ruined by visible proof. Also 'native' dependence on white patronage means vulnerability when the patron has gone. Race differences are related to class ones in the simple equation, black skin equals social inferior; this will be developed in a later chapter,

Another example of the double standards of racism is in the comparative treatment of Ma Hla May and Elizabeth. Both women are shallow, objectionable people, yet attractive objects of desire for Flory; they are preyed on by white male society and their behaviour is a function of this. However, we are meant to disapprove of them.

Ma Hla May is introduced as "the woman", and on entering, she kicks her sandals off, for, although allowed to tea as a special privilege, she couldn't

...wear her sandals in her master's presence." (96)

Flory had paid her parents three hundred rupees for her. His behaviour is

disgusting, treating her as a plaything, and when he,

'...had done with her he turned away, jaded and ashamed. (97)

Her strong spicy scent is emphasised, as is her glossy, exotic appearance,

She was like a doll...an outlandish and yet grotesquely beautiful one. (98)

She is portrayed as garish, simple and mercenary. Flory feels so disgusted at what he has done that he walks into the forest and undergoes a ritual ablution.

Critics have described the bathe in the sylvan, clear, bubbling pool as a baptismal experience, renewing Flory with vitality, but it follows his defilement with Ma Hla May, and is more of a ritual cleansing. No doubt ringing in his ears would be their parting words,

"Get out of this room!...I don't want you...after I've done with you.'

'That is a nice way to speak to me! You treat me as though I were a prostitute.'

'So you are. Out you go,' he said, pushing her out of the room by her shoulders." (99)

We are reminded of white patronisation as she only goes with Flory because of the prestige that attaches to being a 'bo-kadaw' - a white man's wife.

Meanwhile Elizabeth has entered the story. She seems the very object of desire to Flory, who is attracted by her innocent beauty;

He became conscious of the soft, youthful body pressed against his own, and the warmth breathing out of it; whereat

something seemed to thaw and grow warm within him. (100)

Even her name is not a random choice; Orwell wrote to a friend that if he wanted a girl to grow up beautiful, he would call her Elizabeth (101). The contrast with Ma Hla May is abrupt, and they meet face to face on Flory's veranda;

No contrast could have been stranger; the one faintly coloured as an apple blossom; the other dark and garish, with a gleam almost metallic on her cylinder of ebony hair... her tiny, stiff body, straight as a soldier's with not a curve in it except the vase like curve of her hips... For the best part of a minute neither of them could take their eyes from the other. (102)

It is interesting to examine the description of the two girls. Ma Hla May is presented in terms which are artificial, even industrial in their referents: she gleams like metal, her hair is a cylinder, her body is stiff and straight with a vase-like curve. Elizabeth, on the other hand, has a faint pastoral air, tastefully expressed. Flory threatens to break Ma Hla May's ribs with a bamboo if she makes a scene, and Elizabeth echoes Flory by comparing her to a Dutch doll (103). Even Flory's dog prefers Elizabeth to the Burmese girl (104). Ma Hla May's implicit racial and social inferiority do not entitle her to decent consideration, whereas Elizabeth's treatment agrees with the Edwardian bourgeois credo.

Flory woos Elizabeth in the politest manner. He attempts to reform his bachelor habits and defends her with feeling from the distasteful sexual

imputations of Ellis. The latter's outburst, which compared girls from England to joints of meat shipped out to be pawed and sniffed over (105), was as offensive to Orwell as it was to Flory. With 'native' girls, however, a different set of standards apply. This gap widened as more English women came to India. At one time, liaisons with native women were acceptable; but as the British became more isolated, prestige demanded such relationships be condemned. This led to unreal stances such as that of Lackersteen. His wife had caught him out with some Burmese women and now watched him closely (106). She also tries to end Flory's affair with Elizabeth by telling the latter of his Burmese mistress (107). Lackersteen, however, has no antipathy to 'native' company, male or female, and is forced into orthodox behaviour and "sound sentiment" by his wife and group conformity alone (108).

Living in Burma had corrupted Flory. He didn't volunteer for war service, because he couldn't give up his luxuries and Burmese girls (109). He remembered furtively seducing an Eurasian girl and the pathetic scented letters that she wrote when he abandoned her (110). The scented letters are redolent of a naivete that Ma Hla May displayed; after making love, she made the mistake of not leaving him alone - in the belief that she possessed occult powers over him (111). The sensuousness of 'native' women contrasts with the chastity of the

a view which

English, as Mrs. Lackersteen inculcates into Elizabeth (112). Orwell, in fairness, does allow an uncomplimentary 'native' opinion of Elizabeth to be expressed (113).

We are given much more of Elizabeth's background than Ma Hla May's, and hence understand her behaviour better; this may seem too obvious for comment, but elsewhere Orwell recognised the significance of such cultural bias. In a review of Mulk Raj Anand's The Sword and the Sickle, Orwell praised its lack of bitterness and remarked,

In the scene as the Indian sees it...the English hardly enter...European characters barely appear in the story..."(114)

In other words Burmese Days - or at least the majority of it - is written from a particular racial point of view too. This is not a pejorative comment, merely an observation about the nature of the bias.

Flory turns Ma Hla May out to make way for Elizabeth (115) in a distasteful scene, and Orwell cannot resist applying patronising feline imagery to her (116). There follows a highly emotive scene, laden with sado-masochistic possibilities, in which Ma Hla May pours out her fears, and pleads to remain Flory's mistress. He is obstinate, and she bows before him, weeping and anxiously looking for signs of mercy;

Then a dreadful thing, she stretched herself at full length, flat on her face...She crept, wormlike, right across the floor to his feet. Her body made a broad ribbon on the dusty floor. She lay prostrate in front of him, face hidden, arms extended, as though before a god's altar.

'Master, master,' she whimpered, 'will you not forgive me? This once, only this once! Take Ma Hla May back. I will be your slave, lower than your slave. Anything sooner than turn me away.'

She wound her arms round his ankles, actually was kissing his shoes. He stood looking down at her with his hands in his pockets, helpless. (117)

The subservience of the kept Burmese woman is vividly symbolised; totally dependent on her master's whim, she is reduced to wormlike status, and although Flory claims that it is "abominable", there is an expressionist intensity which underlines Orwell's keen interest in it. We learn that there is no love in Ma Hla May, despite this protestation, and that she acted from low motives (118). Flory's motives with her are too disgusting even to record. He has, after all, purchased the girl; and in his previous book, Orwell claimed to have learnt not to,

...expect a beggar to be grateful, when I give him a penny.
(119)

Burmese women are either lower than beggars in the anthropological scale, with no self-esteem, or infinitely higher and can respond to disgusting behaviour with love.

Flory pursues Elizabeth, but she cools towards him because of his relationship with Ma Hla May. Flory is distraught (120), and humbled in his turn. He acknowledges the truth of her accusation, and reviews his 'amours' like a drowning man,

...an endless procession of Burmese women, a regiment of ghosts, were marching past him in the moonlight...but they had no faces, only featureless discs. He remembered a blue longyi here, a pair of ruby earrings there, but hardly a face or a name. (121)

Flory has reduced the women to anonymous, arch^etypal sexual objects, depriving them of their most personal identity (names and faces) and dehumanising them. His contrition is not for abusing so many wretched people, but because it has caused him to lose Elizabeth. Ma Hla May appears like an avenging spirit, her face coated in powder,

sickly white in the moon...as ugly as a skull, and defiant. (122)

She extorts money from Flory in another distasteful scene, and Orwell couches her behaviour in canine imagery this time (123).

Flory is aggrieved by Elizabeth's attitude and resolves to explain that she shouldn't condemn him because of Ma Hla May, whom he had,

turned out of doors for Elizabeth's sake. (124)

His frustration, aided by jealousy, debases his feelings for Elizabeth until

only "filthy detail" is left (125). This is a measure of fateful revenge which, after a brief relapse into optimism (126), ends with the Burmese woman bringing about his downfall and suicide (127). Although the plot condemns Flory, Orwell's treatment of him doesn't; he is, on balance, 'more sinned against than sinning'.

We mentioned the physical contrast between Ma Hla May and Elizabeth. One aspect of it had always held significance for Orwell: a woman's complexion. A powdered face seems to have had a Proustian meaning for him. In Down and Out in Paris and London, he related an anecdote by one of the Rue Coq D'Or 'characters' about a poor country girl, forced into prostitution, unwillingly facing her first appointment. She had a dull child's face,

'coated with paint and powder. (128)

There follows a rape scene with the narrator glorying in the girl's degradation. In Keep the Aspidistra Flying, Gordon went on a drinking spree, and found himself in the prostitutes' twilight world, where,

The appalling faces of tarts, like skulls coated with pink powder, peered meaningfully from several doorways. (129)

He is robbed and thoroughly humiliated by one of them. In Nineteen Eighty Four, Winston wrote in his diary about an experience with a prostitute;

She had a young face, painted very thick. It was really the paint that appealed to me, the whiteness of it, like a mask, and the bright red lips. Party women never paint their faces.

(130)

He subsequently discovers that she is fifty and toothless, but he 'does it' nevertheless. Like so much in the novel, the conventional attitude has been inverted, and we are invited to recognise the heterodoxy of the activity, and hence accord it some approval. However, overall the symbolism shows that painted, powdered faces equal prostitution and distastefulness. In Burmese Days, Ma Hla May returns to plead, with her face coated,

...so thick with powder that it was like a clown's mask... she looked a drab. (131)

Her tears wash it off, but when we next see her, she has reapplied the powder (132). In the final scene, where she exposes Flory, her face is again grey with powder, like a screaming bazaar hag (133). The symbolism is clear. Powdered women are tarts; they are associated with commercial, unsatisfying sexual relationships. They are false (mask-like), aesthetically and morally repulsive. Perhaps it is the fusion of the moral and the aesthetic which is important, for it allows mutual reinforcement on two planes, and a wide perspective within which to condemn.

In contrast to Ma Hla May, Elizabeth is the perfection of English beauty

...her eyes were very clear pale blue, paler than a harebell...the smoothness of the skin around her eyes, like a petal. (134)

She is faintly coloured as apple blossom (135), and has a "flower-like skin" (136). To Verrall, she looks "a peach" (137). If not an English rose, she has affinities with an English orchard. The distinction of facial complexions between the two girls is significant for Orwell. One is associated with sordid instincts, the other with fresh, healthy feelings. The fact that neither is worthy is, in a way, incidental to our appreciation of them. Elizabeth also contradicts the notion that aesthetic and moral considerations are related. The nub of the differences between the two girls is summed up by Orwell in his 1939 essay on Dickens. He is discussing the suppressed class instincts of novelists which are sometimes inadvertantly revealed;

One thing that often gives the clue to a novelist's real feelings on the class question is the attitude he takes up when class collides with sex. This is a thing too painful to be lied about, and consequently it is one of the points at which the 'I'm not a snob' pose tends to break down. One sees it at its most obvious where a class-distinction is also a colour distinction. And something resembling the colonial attitude ('native' women are fair game, white women are sacrosanct) exists in a veiled form in all-white communities, causing bitter resentment on both sides. When this issue arises, novelists often revert to crude class

feelings which they might disclaim at other times. (138)

If, as seems probable, Orwell is writing an unconscious epitaph to Burmese Days, it is a reasonable speculation that the attitudes to Ma Hla May and Elizabeth are very much his own. Certainly in his case women and sexual matters are too painful to be lied about, but perhaps not ^{too painful to be} fictionalised.

Another aspect of racial/imperial attitudes is one which we might loosely include under the heading of culture/hospitality. Here the onus is on the socially inferior race to court the superior one, and for the superior to play down the attentions of the inferior. Closely allied are the attitudes towards cultural items of the other race. The socially inferior race places value on those of the superior, as social totems of acceptance and power; the superior clings more tightly to its cultural items, symbolic of exclusiveness simultaneously despising those of the lower race. With the vacillating exception of Flory, this is confirmed in Burmese Days.

When U Po Kyin discussed their social progress with his wife, she reminds him of their past achievements;

'How proud we were of our new wicker furniture, and your fountain-pen with the gold clip! And when the young English police-officer came to our house and sat in the best chair and drank a bottle of beer, how honoured we thought ourselves.

(139)

The fountain-pen is valued for its fetishistic association with white officialdom. The hybrid state of their accommodation reflects the same tendency, with teak trunks supporting the roof-tree over "Ingaleik fashion" veneered furniture, a picture of the royal family and a fire extinguisher. Lime and betel juice stained the floors (140). U Po Kyin is tired of associating only with Burmese ("poor inferior people") and eating food with his fingers like "a peasant" (141). Ma Kin's reply highlights the fetishistic quality of their English possessions,

'Look at those English chairs - I have never sat in one of them in my life. But I am very proud to look at them and think that I own them.' (142)

It is the attitude of the ambitious parvenu, which elsewhere Orwell deplored (143).

U Po Kyin's ambition is to enter the European Club, and his wife marvels at the dazzling prospect, which Orwell describes with cutting irony, full of wry amusement that the Burmese should find it attractive (144). However, the fact that such a grubby little place should excite their ambitions, underlines its associative significance. Orwell's description of the Club is anything but attractive: it is small and smells of earth oil; the library is mildewed, the billiard table "mangy" and covered with insects; the floors have "unhomelike" coconut matting on them (145). Only a dazzling prospect for the

socially underprivileged, and the company inside the Club is even worse than the surroundings.

Flory and Elizabeth are the subject of hospitable acts by local people on each of their outings together. When Flory takes Elizabeth to the "pwe" (a Burmese dance-drama) they have seats of honour, despite being unexpected, and are treated courteously, even obsequiously (146). The best dancer is brought on in their honour, but Elizabeth is obsessed by "the feral reek" of "the smelly native crowd". An iced sherbert drink given to her, tastes of hair oil. Elizabeth walks out, disgusted by the expedition and angry with Flory for arranging it,

...the very notion of wanting to rub shoulders with all those smelly natives - had impressed her badly. She was perfectly certain that that was not how white men ought to behave. (147)

The visit to Li Yeik's shop is also a case of hospitality from the one side being rudely snubbed by the other. We mentioned the scene in the previous chapter, and Elizabeth again sees the occasion as demeaning;

(this) constant striving to interest her in Oriental things struck her as only perverse...a deliberate seeking after the squalid...(148)

Elizabeth and Flory go on a shooting expedition, and are first entertained by a village headman - at whose expense Orwell has a little joke

(149). This meeting illustrates the two tendencies we have mentioned so far (encouragement by the 'inferior', and discouragement by the 'superior').

Elizabeth refuses to enter the headman's house, and the trappings of welcome are brought outside, including a specially prepared "double throne". She refuses tea, and insensitively sends for some of Flory's bottled soda water, even though the headman had offered to milk a cow for her benefit. The Burman feels abashed and eventually retires, feeling that his preparations have been insufficient. Flory gamely smokes the cheroots he has been offered (150), and after the shoot, he returns the generosity by giving the headman beer and some birds from the bag. Elizabeth resolutely refuses to respond to any overtures; her reaction reflects a mentality that feels continually threatened by aspiring native encroachment.

These attitudes are drawn to a head around Veraswami. He is a fanatical Anglophile (151), and carries his hospitality to incredible lengths (152). He has a,

passionate admiration for the English, which a thousand snubs from Englishmen had not shaken. (153)

Unfortunately the poor doctor lays himself open to these snubs. He and Flory have a close friendship, only marred by the other Europeans' disapproval (154).

Even when Flory visits him at work in the hospital, Veraswami is the caricature of hospitality (155), and later adds fussiness to his hyper-enthusiasm (156). Orwell's portrayal of him contains an element of gentle mockery combined with genuine affection. Veraswami's attitude is not born solely from social ambition. His friendship with Flory is real enough, and found expression in unglamorous sacrifice as well as in precious ostentation (157). However, his overall portrait is a burlesque of the obsequious native seeking identity with British culture (158). In sharp contrast to the doctor's over-effusive warmth to Europeans, we are given their reaction to his potential membership of the Club,

'I suppose you'd like little Veraswami...chipping into our conversations and pawing everyone with his sweaty hands and breathing his filthy garlic breath in our faces. By God, he'd go out with my boot behind him if ever I saw his black snout inside that door. Greasy, pot-bellied little - !. (159)

Ellis feels that it is perversity to show any friendliness to an Asian (160), and accuses Flory of unforgiveable behaviour, obscenely pointing to Flory's habit of,

'Sitting down at table with him as though he were a white man, and drinking out of glasses his filthy black lips have slobbered over.' (161)

This latter image repelled Orwell, and he used it in A Clergyman's Daughter

(162) to express disgust at a character, apparently drawn from life (163).

He also hated sharing a bottle with farm workers on a train (164), and it was probably one of the most disgusting images he could use in this context. The other Club members endorse Ellis's opinion of excluding "black hides", although not everyone is so committed (165), no one offers dissent..

There were, then, diametrically opposed attitudes to hospitality between races. To the socially ambitious native, any attention from an Englishman was coveted; the opposite was true for the English. Any contact with a native was a step down the social ladder. This relates racial and class attitudes and gave Orwell a foundation for his social awareness. He never forgot the lessons that he learned in Burma, although it took him a long time to work out their full implications.

An instance of hospitality free from social and racial tensions is Flory's return through the jungle after his bathe in the pool. He requests a lift from a bullock cart driver, uses a polite form of address and gives the driver a "gift" when he sets him down. He feels thirsty and asks a village headman if the water is good. After polite mutual greetings, Flory enjoys a refreshing cup of tea. He thanks the headman, and they wish each other well. This little episode, symbolically after the revitalising bathe, stands out

from Flory's experiences with Elizabeth.

Another conventional aspect of racism in the book is the mythology of Anglo-India. This is an amalgam of half-baked scientific theory and rationalisation of unpalatable behaviour. We will trace some of these into Orwell's later writing, as this will enable us to follow up a small area of Orwell's outlook, which might otherwise be overshadowed.

The climate of Burma, and the tropics generally, is one of the hardest factors to come to terms with. It provided an opportunity for the British to develop a theory about the mysterious superiority of the European body over the Asian one. In Burmese Days, Orwell used the Eurasians, Francis and Samuel to propound such nonsense. They appear, wearing vast topis, and Francis couldn't resist the opportunity for passing on to Flory and Elizabeth his cherished beliefs;

'Not too much you are suffering from prickly heat, I trust? Pounded tamarind applied to the afflicted spot is infallible. Myself I suffer torments each night. Very prevalent disease among we Europeans.'

As if this were not enough, he launched into advice about heat-stroke,

'...wearing only terrai hat is not judicious in April, sir. For the natives all well, their skulls are adamant. But for us sunstroke ever menaces. Very deadly is the sun upon European skull.' (166)

Flory explained to Elizabeth that Europeans were supposedly more vulnerable than natives. Hence Francis's clumsy attempts to secure identity with Europeans.

Orwell later wrote about the efficacy of such myths in sustaining the climate for racism, which in turn allowed hierarchical exploitation, both in Imperialism and Fascism. In a Time and Tide article, March 1940, he drew together the threads linking these two systems of exploitation. He maintained that racism was the invention of conquering nations, and was a way of pushing exploitation beyond normal bounds, by pretending that the exploited were not human beings. In aristocratic societies, the power structure was often buffered by a racial difference (one is reminded of Orwell's race/class analysis of Scottish Nationalism);

...it is much easier for the aristocrat to be ruthless if he imagines that the serf is different from himself in blood. Hence the tendency to exaggerate race differences, the current rubbish about shapes of skulls, colour of eyes, blood counts...In Burma I have listened to racial theories which were less brutal than Hitler's theories about the Jews, but certainly not less idiotic. The English in India have built up a whole mythology turning upon the supposed differences between their own bodies and those of Orientals... there is no question that this kind of nonsense has made it easier for us to squeeze the juice out of India. (167)

This was written at the time of his opposition to the Popular Front against Fascism, when he believed that the old imperialisms were as evil as the new.

He later modified this view, but not the principles behind it. He continued to expose the evils of racism and relate them to exploitation.

In a Tribune article, October 1944, he pointed out that Wingate's 'chindits' wore soft hats and not traditional pith helmets when they were in Burma. This article illustrates precisely the point that we are investigating. Orwell writes about his exposure to this myth, and shows a mature understanding of its role in the sustenance of an oppressive hierarchy.

When I was in Burma I was assured that the Indian sun... had a peculiar deadliness which could only be warded off by wearing a helmet of...pith. 'Natives', their skulls being thicker, had no need of these helmets...But why should the sun in Burma, even on a...chilly day, be deadlier than in England? Because we were nearer the equator and the rays of the sun were more perpendicular...How about the early morning, when...the rays are parallel with the earth? It is exactly then, I was told, that they were at their most dangerous. How about the rainy season when one frequently does not see the sun for days at a time?...the old stagers told me...the deadly rays filter through the envelope of cloud just the same, and...you are in danger of forgetting it. Take your topi off in the open for one moment, and you may be a dead man...The Eurasian community, anxious to emphasise their white ancestry, used... to wear topis even larger and thicker than those of the British. My own disbelief in all this dated from the day when my topi was... carried away down a stream, leaving me to march all day without ill effects. But...other facts...conflicted with the prevailing belief...some Europeans...did habitually go bareheaded in the sun...cases of sunstroke...happened to Asiatics as well as to Europeans...The final blow was the

discovery that the topi...is quite a recent invention...In short, the whole thing was bunkum.

But why should the British in India have built up this superstition about sunstroke? Because an endless emphasis on the differences between the 'natives' and yourself is one of the necessary props of Imperialism. You can only rule over a subject race...if you honestly believe yourself to be racially superior, and it helps towards this if you can believe that the subject race is biologically different. ...The thin skull was the mark of racial superiority, and the pith topi was a sort of emblem of Imperialism. (168)

He had seen through the myth in Burmese Days, for Flory only ever wears a terrai hat (169); but it was only later that he incorporated the significance of it into the wider fight against hierarchical social oppression. He referred to it again in a footnote to 'Notes on Nationalism' in 1945 (170), where it took its place in the spectrum of ingredients that permitted division and exploitation. It was certainly not something that had ceased to matter as soon as he had left Burma.

Throughout this discussion of the 'sunstroke superstition', there have been references to half-castes, or Eurasians. They were important in the mythology of Empire. Their presence became an embarrassment to most Europeans. They were a reminder of unwise, 'unnatural' alliances; a threat to racial purity and hence to the position of the small British ruling caste. In order to discredit such alliances, half-castes were widely believed to be weedy

miserable creatures, infertile and degenerate. In Burmese Days, Elizabeth takes an instant dislike to them, and places their 'type' as the 'dago', the type that plays the "mauvais role" in films. They appear "dishonest" to her, and she believes them to inherit the "worst from both races" (171). Flory explains their predicament, and the emphasis on their white ancestry, "their sole asset". Francis always talks about his prickly heat, because only whites are supposed to suffer from it;

"It's the same with sunstroke. They wear those huge topis to remind you that they've got European skulls. A kind of coat of arms." (172)

Orwell unconsciously reveals a distaste for the Eurasians; he describes them as being shabbily dressed,

...with vast topis beneath which their slender bodies looked like the stalks of toadstools. (173)

A few pages later Flory comments that,

"We always talk of them as though they'd sprung up from the ground like mushrooms." (174)

Mushrooms or toadstools? Orwell and Flory agree on the appropriate fungal imagery. Elizabeth's floral comparisons appear on the next page. This is not the only time that Orwell fights down a prejudiced repulsion, he does the same with Indians and Jews, as we shall see.

In the Time and Tide article he mentioned that,

People of mixed blood...are supposed to be...detectable by mysterious peculiarities in their finger nails. (175)

As a reader of Kipling he would have been familiar with that writer's beliefs on the matter. In a Plain Tale(s) From the Hills, Kipling warned against mixed marriages,

It was obviously absurd that Peythroppe should marry her. The little opal-tinted onyx at the base of her finger nails said this as plainly as print. (176)

Not only was the 'evidence' in the finger nails, Kipling believed that half-castes looked degenerate. In another "Tale", a "poor, sickly weed...very black", had the chance to emulate his full-blooded betters (177). When he succeeds in dispersing a native riot, his heart was "big and white" in his breast. However, he wilts before an Englishman who comes to check on his deeds, "it was the white drop of blood in Michele's veins dying out..." (178).

There is a parallel between the Eurasian position in the Indian Empire and Orwell's lower-upper-middle-class family with pretension beyond its means.

Both are clinging to the totems of social superiority, and trying desperately to differentiate themselves from the class they fear to be swallowed up by.

Orwell compared a shabby-genteel family to a family of poor whites living in

a street full of Negroes, they are only left with their gentility (totems) to cling to (179). It is not surprising, therefore, that we learn of Orwell's awakening sympathy for Eurasians.

He first mentioned a Eurasian character in 'A Hanging', in 1931, and drew an uncomplimentary picture of flashiness and ingratiating (180). Ellis in Burmese Days, hates the presumption of Francis and Samuel, using these same pews as white men. Elizabeth thinks them impertinent and snubs them. In The Lion and the Unicorn, Orwell referred to them as indispensable go-betweens (181). In The Listener, June 1940, he reviewed a book of English writing by Indians, and was complimentary and encouraging, particularly about the contribution of Cedric Dover, a Eurasian (182). In The Manchester Evening News, Orwell again championed Indians who wrote in English, partly for the valuable boost it gave to Anglo-Indian relations. He called Cedric Dover's part the most interesting as it threw light on "the small but important Eurasian community". He regretted that other material on the subject was "light in the extreme" (183).

The Eurasians were not the only group to be racially stereotyped. Orwell demonstrated his awareness of other vulgar versions. Flory tried to interest Elizabeth in learning Burmese (Orwell knew the language). This displeased her, and roused suspicion of his orthodoxy. She is horrified by

119

the thought that he is advocating admiration of the Burmese, whose savage black faces make her shudder. She gazed at some Burmans and commented on their revolting ugliness. Flory replied that they had "splendid bodies", but Elizabeth isn't satisfied,

"...they have such hideous shaped heads. Their skulls kind of slope up behind like a tom cat's. And then the way their foreheads slant back - it makes them look so wicked."

She is even more offended by the women, because of the,

...hatefulness of being kin to creatures with black faces. "Aren't they too simply dreadful? So coarse looking: like some kind of animal." (184)

Orwell, the narrator, described the Burmese women as having "mare-like" buttocks, which was echoed by Elizabeth's animal comparison. Coincidentally, he had earlier described the native sub-inspector of police interrogating a suspect, advancing his head "tom-cat fashion" until he nearly touched the other man (185); so the tom-cat Burmans join the fungal Eurasians, as the narrator echoes his characters. Flory voiced the admiration that Orwell later put into The Road to Wigan Pier, when he gave a panegyric on the physical of the Burmese (186). Elizabeth's dehumanisation of them, and lack of involvement is the racist ideal, when decency is no longer required. Orwell often made this point in later considerations of imperialism/racism. From

being a harmless quirk in Burmese Days, the principle of racial stereotyping grew into an evil, and a contribution to the "world-wide problem of colour"(187)

A popular form of stereotyping with Anglo-Indians was the assumed ignorance of the natives. The Europeans at the Club treat the butler as a slave; they degrade him by insisting that he use a simplified language,

"Hey, butler! Bringing brandy for Lackersteen master!" (188)

They spell out how the butler should respond,

"Don't talk like that, damn you - I find it very difficult! Have you swallowed a dictionary? Please master, can't keeping ice cool - that's how you ought to talk. We shall have to sack this fellow if he gets to talk English too well. I can't stick servants who talk English." (189)

This is more than patronisation, it is a deliberate attempt to maintain the ignorance, and dependence, of the colonial subject. MacGregor found Orientals "charming", because they had no freedom (190).

In 'As I Please' Orwell discussed the pidgin English of Melanesia, and was amused yet disgusted by it, concluding that the people who first

formed (the language) were probably influenced by the feeling that a subject race ought to talk comically. (191)

The deliberate simplification of language fascinated Orwell. For a time he thought it valuable, in the form of Basic English, because it provided a

potential common tongue for peoples who spoke different languages. He even contemplated helping C.K.Ogden in this field. However, in Nineteen Eighty Four he reverted to the negative aspect of linguistic reduction. Here he acknowledged language as the tool of thought, without which conceptualisation was impossible. He first faced this in the essay, 'New Words', in 1940, when he advocated intelligently expanding the language to lessen the referential gaps in human experience. In Oceania, Syme, the philologist, set out Orwell's fears for the language - and hence for human cognitive capacity and freedom. Having established that his job was to eliminate words, he revealed the underlying motive,

"...the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought. In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it...Every year fewer and fewer words, and the range of consciousness always a little smaller...Has it ever occurred to you, Winston, that by the year 2050...not a single human being will be alive who could understand such a conversation as we are having now?" (192)

From being a primitive weapon of colonialism, reducing the subjects' intellectual response, it has grown to the ultimate surgery of independent thought

Not only were the natives maintained in ignorance, they were held to be innately incompetent too. In his book, Imperial Policing, C.Gwynn commented on the Hunter Committee's report of the Amritsar massacre, which highlighted

...the extraordinary inaction and lack of initiative.(193)

of the police under their Indian officers. He believed, echoing the enquiry, that this should never have happened, for,

In view of the commonly held lack of initiative among Indian officers in a crisis, it is somewhat surprising that no British official was placed with them. (194)

The confidence with which the myth is translated into factual statement is proof of its efficacy. We are reminded of the fairy-tale qualities of a "drop of white blood", when the police in Burmese Days find themselves in a riot without a European leader. The besieged Europeans realise that the police will not act without one;

"If only one of us could get to the police lines...A British officer to lead them!" (195)

Flory, in the strong, silent Englishman tradition, escapes, swims down the river, and emerges near the police lines. He sees that the police have been engulfed and are helpless in the reeking crowd. Flory finds the native officer in charge,

"Why did you not open fire?"

"I have no orders!"

"Idiot!" (196)

They struggle out of the crowd, get loaded rifles, and the subadhar shouts, that "the sahib will give the order" (197). The plain incompetence of the police is heightened by Orwell's farcical treatment of them. The message is

clear - don't trust a native to take the initiative; if something important is to be done, get an Englishman to do it.

The other side of native incompetence is Kiplingesque heroism, of which there is a low key touch in Flory's behaviour. People's reactions under ~~s~~iege bear out these two views. With the exception of the Lackersteens, the Europeans keep their heads and the Indian servants lose theirs. The butler rushes in and fearfully announces the mob outside,

"Sir, sir! Bad men come! Going to murder us all, sir!"

MacGregor rises like some mythical leader,

"This is some kind of disturbance! Butler, pick that lamp up. Miss Lackersteen look to your Aunt. See if she is hurt. The rest of you come with me." (198)

When MacGregor succeeds in antagonising the crowd outside, they are hit by flying rocks and retire to the Club; there MacGregor stood, in the middle of the room,

...yielding his righthand to Mrs. Lackersteen, who was caressing it, while a weeping chokrs clung to his left leg.

(199)

Ellis is cool-headed, but eaten up with hatred, while Flory is indifferent until he goes for help. Orwell, himself a physically brave man, admired this quality in others, and regarded cowardice as reprehensible, but in the case of Indian servants as probably inevitable. He portrays Veraswami as

courageous if ineffective.

There are other Kiplingesque touches in the book. Verrall, for example, is unattractive in the main, but has the irresistible fascination of a person who is spartan, self-assured and contemptuous of others. The opening description of him shows this ambivalence; he is "manifestly a cavalry officer", arrogant and "elegant as a picture", Flory feels uncomfortable with him right away (200). He is selfish, ill-mannered, cruel and insensitive. He uses Elizabeth, ignores the other Europeans, loathes the natives, is only concerned with his polo and ponies, and leaves behind debts and unfulfilled promises. He has romance and panache, though. The beautiful Arab horse he rides excites Flory's attention (201). His performance on the horse is even more remarkable; he moves off with a touch, "as easily as a centaur" and spears a peg. He repeats the performance, which,

...was done with matchless grace and...solemnity. (202)

Although gross in many ways, he has standards and virtues. He was not a vulgar social snob, but rather despised soft living, preferring an ascetic, brutal regimen (sleeping in silk pyjamas, but on a camp bed);

Horsemanship and physical fitness were the only gods he knew.

(203)

There is much that would appeal to Orwell; the good taste, chastely controlled, a devotion to higher values. The magic of his appearance works on Elizabeth.

As soon as she knows the outline of his background, she fantasises;

In his tanned face and his hard, straight body Elizabeth saw all the romance, the splendid panache of a cavalryman's life. She saw the North-West Frontier and the Cavalry Club - she saw the polo grounds and the parched barrack yards, and the brown squadrons of horsemen galloping with their long lances poised and the trains of their pagris streaming; she heard the...jingle of spurs and the regimental bands playing outside the messrooms while the officers sat at dinner in their stiff, gorgeous uniforms. (204)

Orwell knew the limitations of such romanticism, but he was honest enough to express his fascination with it. One must remember he was a product of militant public schooling (205), and a reader ^{of} Kipling. Malcolm Muggeridge believed that Orwell never satisfactorily resolved this dilemma, and in this he was like Kipli

The fact is...a tremendous struggle went on inside Orwell between one side of his character, a sort of Brushwood Boy side, which made him admire the insolence and good looks of Verrall, and a deep intellectual disapprobation of everything Verrall stood for...the same conflict existed in Kipling, who, however, settled it by coming down heavily on the Brushwood Boy side. Orwell settled it the other way, and came down heavy on the side of...anti-imperialism. Yet, in both...the conflict really remained unresolved. (206)

Mr. Muggeridge reiterated the point of Orwell's irresolution in a letter to me (207); and in his first volume of memoirs, Anthony Powell spoke of Orwell's

nostalgia for trousers that strapped under the boot (as his had done in Burma) (208). This conflict should not mask the fact that Orwell established his priorities and rejected Verrall's approach in favour of a more humane outlook, as I hope this thesis will demonstrate.

CHAPTER 4: BURMA: CRISIS

It is an oversimplification to claim that the period from the First World War to the thirties was the 'crisis' of imperialism. However, the coming together of events, people and feelings then, gave rise to a profound alteration of atmosphere in the British Empire. For the colonised it took the form of growing national consciousness and impatience with the ruling power; for the British it became a mood of self-doubt that eventually led them to prepare for peaceful withdrawal. This period was critical in Burma, and one Burman claimed that the darkest period of Anglo-Burmese relations was from the passing of the Government of India Act in 1919 to the Saya San rebellion in 1930, when they were "bitter enemies, each despising the other" (1). With Orwell this development was heightened by his peculiar sensitivity to oppression and the "expression of the human face": a legacy from his schooldays (2). Therefore, the general and the personal crises often slide imperceptibly into each other.

We will look first at Orwell's attitude to the Nationalists. The Nationalist movement had made strong headway after the First War, owing to Indian example, and because the Burmese were just acquiring that necessary

basis for dissent - a body of educated, disaffected young people.

Unhappily the studied indifference of the British ensured that their views were ignored, and ^{this} pushed them far beyond their original demands. Burma was arrogantly regarded as a very backward country, and the introduction of democracy was never seriously entertained until the damage was done. The exclusion of Burma from dyarchy was symbolic of this frame of mind and seen by the Burmese as a pointed insult.

Orwell's attitude to the Nationalists was, unusually, orthodox. He saw them as little more than 'noises off', and his references to them were invariably scathing, or tinged with a personal reaction against what he regarded as infringement of his freedoms. This is the overriding conclusion to be drawn from Burmese Days, and of his outlook until well into the 1940's. Orwell's attitude in the book is a personal protest against the system, and only later did he evolve an objective stance on national self-determination. Throughout Burmese Days, all references to the Nationalists are linked to the moral viciousness of U Po Kyin. Their paper is described as "a miserable rag", "villainously printed" on "blotting paper", consisting of stolen news and "weak Nationalist heroics" (3). Orwell succeeds in this first scene, in degrading Nationalist morals, poking fun at Government education, and

attributing only disgusting motives to them. It is typical dismissiveness that so alienated the Burmese.

The baseness of Nationalist sentiments and their ~~divisive~~ inadequacy are constantly reinforced throughout the book. Anything to do with Nationalism becomes a criterion of inferiority (4), and cowardly anonymous letters are automatically connected with it (5). The imprisoned newspaper editor ~~breaks~~ a hunger strike after 6 hours. A magician, portrayed as a travelling clown, foments discontent (this character seems to be based on fact)(6). To Mrs. Lackersteen 'Nationalism' is a sexual threat (7), and even Flory dismisses a potential rebellion as the "usual village Hampdens who won't pay their taxes" (8). The rebellion is a fiasco (9), and in a Dickensian epilogue, he lists the rebels' armoury, including "six home-made guns with barrels of zinc piping stolen from the railway", and similar useless items (10). Westfield regrets that the district is "as quiet as a bloody girls' school" (11)

Another element in Orwell's attitude is the resentment at the limitations placed on his personal freedom. While contempt was the currency of the Anglo-Indian community, this resentment was of Orwell's own minting. He talked about the constant "baiting", "sneering" and irritation of the young Burmese, most of whom were Nationalists (12). Students, Buddhist priests

and schoolboys were, in fact, the only politicised section of society when Orwell was in Burma. Because of the bureaucratisation of Anglo-Burmese relationships, one of the few ways of revenging oneself on this harassment was to affect sneering contempt. To the sensitive Orwell, this was a necessary, but distasteful, defence.

Orwell referred to this harassment in an article three years after Burmese Days. He described the mood against Europeans as "petty", yet "very bitter", resulting in insult rather than riot. As a police officer, he was "an obvious target", and "baited" constantly, even on the sports field. The "insults" and "sneering" wore him down, particularly as they were cowardly and consistent. The young Buddhist priests were "the worst of all", standing all day on corners to "jeer at Europeans" (13). The priests were indeed the leading xenophobes, but even in 1936 Orwell only credits them with apolitical malignity. However, some of the language he used to describe the Burmese gives a clue to his real feelings. Not only were they "sneering" and "hideous", but in some cases perfectly diabolical. When Elizabeth is travelling on the train, she catches torchlit glimpses of Burmese "hideous as demons". When she and Flory are watching the pwe dancer, he believes there is something "grotesque", "wilfully ugly" and "sinister" about her movements. Indeed, there is something

"diabolical in all Mongols" (14). Perhaps he was afraid as well as distressed by their behaviour, and because of his impotence, took refuge in distancing himself, which is consistent with the personal reaction of the novel. However, in 'Shooting an Elephant', he explained the emotional dilemma that this treatment created; he was caught between "hatred of the Empire" and "rage" against "the evil spirited little beasts who tried to make my job impossible". Part of his mind thought of the Raj as an "unbreakable tyranny", clamped upon "prostrate peoples", while another part,

thought that the greatest joy in the world would be to drive a bayonet into a Buddhist priest's guts. Feelings like these are the normal by-products of imperialism; ask any Anglo-Indian official, if you can catch him off duty." (15)

This honesty argues Orwell's reliability as a witness. Anyone who doubts or exploits the feelings recorded here, is denying Orwell's authenticity. If one cannot accept this, it is because one has not shared his experiences, and therefore is in no position to judge, *in my opinion*.

There is an episode in Burmese Days where Orwell vents feelings engendered by this pressure. This is where Ellis, maddened by heat, hatred and revenge attacks a Burmese schoolboy. This scene, by itself, is a valuable insight into cultural misunderstandings and antipathy. Ellis is brooding over

Maxwell's murder; it is stiflingly hot ("his prickly heat was beyond bearing"), and everything Ellis sees infuriates him. A Burman, who grunts with effort as he passes, pushes Ellis over a threshold into particularised mental violence;

If that swine, now, would only attack you! Or even insult you - anything, so that you had the right to smash him! (16)

The frustration of the European position is vigorously expressed. Ellis then has a positively cathartic cascade of violence, with "lovely sanguinary images"

Shrieking mounds of natives, soldiers slaughtering them. Shoot them, ride them down, horses' hooves trample their guts out, whips cut their faces in slices! (17)

This is Swiftian hatred that Orwell used more than once and admired for its intensity (18). Ellis meets five High School boys who grin "with deliberate insolence":

...a row of yellow, malicious faces - epicene faces, horribly smooth and young.

Ellis believes they will bait him over the murder and (because "all schoolboys" are Nationalists) see it as a victory. They grin "full" in his face, trying "openly to provoke him", knowing the law is "on their side",

Ellis felt his breast swell. The look of their faces, jeering at him like a row of yellow images, was maddening. (19)

Here we have the pejorative, fear-laden language; the categorical "rows" of *the assertion that* faces and "all schoolboys" are Nationalists; the frustration brought about by new laws and the paranoid sense of victimisation that gives such a fierce egotistical flavour to the passage. There is jealousy of the "horribly smooth" youthful faces, as a theme of the novel is Flory's loss of youth. Ellis challenged them, and they respond with, what he believes to be, impertinence, so he hits one of them on the head with a stick. The boy falls and the others hurl rocks at Ellis. A Burmese doctor later "blinds" the boy with a poisonous concoction (20).

This is an interesting episode in its own right, but a later article by a Burman, who met Orwell in Burma, lends it a possibly autobiographical status. This article was written 45 years after the incident it recalls, and one must bear this in mind when weighing it as evidence. Maung Htin Aung (21) states that in 1924, he was on the platform of a suburban railway station in Rangoon. There was a crowd of youthful Burmese there, when Orwell came down some steps to catch the train. Some children were fooling about and one bumped into Orwell, who fell heavily down the stairs. Orwell was furious and raised his stick to strike the boy over the head, checked, and caught him on the back instead. The young Burmese were angry, following Orwell into his first

class carriage and arguing with him. The writer connects this incident and the one in Burmese Days. There are two points worth commenting on. The writer describes Orwell as "tall" and "gaunt". Well tall he certainly was, but, according to a photograph of Orwell in the Burma Police (in the same publication), gaunt he was not. If anything he was chubby; the gauntness came later. Further, the image of Orwell striking his blow is reminiscent of Rayner Heppenstall's memory in Four Absentees, where he claims that Orwell attacked him with a shooting stick. Now, there is no objective proof, as far as I know, either way on these 'beating incidents', I am merely drawing attention to a similarity between them.

The Ellis incident is a vivid illustration of the personal provocation (albeit on a psychopathic subject) that colonists suffered, and it contrasts with Orwell's restrained comments elsewhere. ⁽²²⁾ It is a piece of psychological exorcism. Orwell found the Burmese Nationalists both irritating and ineffectual while he was in Burma. His attitude in Burmese Days is patronising contempt, and it didn't change for many years, but remained a blind spot on his political retina. In the novel they are a scurrilous undergrowth, a working in of background detail to the evil performances of U Po Kyin. It was ironic that Orwell should be caught between the millstones of oppressive colonialism and

rising nationalism, and this made him as much a 'victim' as the Burmese.

Indeed, his sympathy for the underdog was justifiably given to the Anglo-Indians who filled this role (23). Later, however, things altered, and although "Eric Blair disapproved", "George Orwell was sympathetic" towards them (24).

Another strand of the Imperial crisis was "the democratic spirit" that MacGregor noticed creeping into daily life. The dissemination of new social ideas following the Great War was almost unprecedented since Cromwell and the Putney Debates (25). The Bolshevik Revolution had created the same kind of watershed that followed the French Revolution. As a result, that most class-conscious section of society - the bourgeois "shock-absorbers" - took on a defensive, intolerant attitude, to distance themselves from their insubordinate 'inferiors'.

In the Empire, this class-consciousness became indistinguishable from race-consciousness. In Burmese Days Ellis declined to attend church-service because of the presumption of native Christians who "had the nerve" to mix with Europeans. He believed the missionaries had taught "bazaar sweepers" that they were "as good as" Europeans, "Please sir, me Christian same like master. Darned cheek." (26). This is wild exaggeration, for when the church is in use, the natives behave in no such way. Ellis is irritably voicing the

paranoia of the threatened.

Mrs. Lackersteen, a notoriously lazy woman (27), discussed the "shocking laziness" of servants and the "insolence" they picked up from newspapers and "dreadful Reforms",

In some ways they are getting almost as bad as the lower classes at home.

MacGregor regretted the "democratic spirit" that was abroad, and Mrs.

Lackersteen noted that before the War, 'natives' were "so nice and respectful".

She paid her butler a pittance, and he "loved her like a dog", but the only way to keep a servant now was to pay wages "several months in arrears".

MacGregor remembers the "fifteen lashes" for disrespectful servants, and everyone sighs nostalgically for the 'good old days' (28). The unmanageability of 'natives' and English servants are compared, (although Orwell believed most Anglo-Indians did not have servants at home (29)) and the "dreadful Reforms" blamed. The Great War is the watershed in this behavioural decline.

So strong is the group appeal here that Flory, who disagrees with it, and Maxwell, who hasn't any experience, heartily assent. The nostalgia is an important counterweight to insecurity and impotence. How much truth is expressed, and how much invention, is not easy to determine. Certainly, there

was a new spirit amongst some Burmese, but hardly domestic servants; the ones in Burmese Days, although lazy, are deferential to the point of masochism. The Europeans' attitude is partly bad conscience, and because of this, exaggeration and invention follow.

The turbulent rethinking of political philosophy from the mid-nineteenth century, meant that social relationships had to be maintained on different foundations. As feudalism yielded to capitalism, another authority had to serve in its place. Possibly events such as the Indian Mutiny, Marx's writings and the perennial fear of the mob (akin to racism), produced a belief which was useful for ^{re-}structuring relationships with the working class at home, and 'natives' in the Empire. *Banton and Harwood have suggested the*

The connections between class divisions at home and racial divisions overseas may have been more subtle than we yet appreciate.

Social aloofness grew, as people realised the untenability of innate class distinctions. Because economic differences increased, social behaviour had to take account of this. The lower classes were "supposed to smell" and were not permitted to use the same lavatories as their employer's families. The "unconscious fear of social equality" ensured that economic social barriers

replaced the old ones "rooted in the feudal conception of society". There may well have been,

...a connection between this growth of personal aloofness between the classes at home and the comparable increase in the sense of a necessary gulf between the white rulers and their black or brown subordinates. (30)

Orwell describes Flory as "Bolshie" in his more subversive moments, such as his friendship with Veraswami (31). When he supports the doctor, he is described as a "damn Hyde Park agitator" (32), and this soon becomes a "Daily Workerfull of blasphemy and sedition". Even Mrs. Lackersteen connects his unorthodoxy with "Socialism" (33), and when he proposes the doctor for the Club, this is greeted with "Downright Bolshevism" (34). However, when he is the hero of the hour, he could make "a speech in favour of Lenin" and get away with it (35). Although there is irony and vagueness in Orwell's usage of such words, it illustrates the connection between Flory's race-crossing and the growing awareness of the English working class. The threatened Anglo-Indian community see this as a conspiracy which will destroy all they stand for. This community is a similar coterie to the one mentioned in Chapter 2, but whereas the schoolboy one retained pleasant early associations, the European Club is merely seen as tawdry and life-denying.

The lower-upper-middle class, Orwell's own, were the ones who felt menaced, at home and abroad by changing social conditions. The importance of group-solidarity was correspondingly enhanced for them, hence their extreme reaction to Flory's class/race breaking activities. Although Flory prefers "ignoble ease" and does not seek conflict (36), this is not enough to save him from accusations of treachery, in a society where "hanging-together" is the motto and essential lifestyle.

Another critical symptom was the proposal to allow a native member into the European Clubs. This suggestion accompanied the introduction of the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms into Burma. The Liberal Government regretted that Europeans and natives had no common social meeting place. They worked together, but didn't mix socially. Maung Htin Aung related an experience which brings the poignancy of the situation home. In Rangoon, the Gymkhana Club played an annual game of rugby against a local regiment. The Gymkhana team was weak and his brother, a Cambridge blue, was asked to join it. Everyone arrived already changed and the game was played uneventfully. Afterwards, however, when they all went off to shower and change in the Club, the Burman was refused admission and had to go off by himself. He never received an apology, officially, for this behaviour (37).

When the issue is raised in Burmese Days, via an official circular, reaction is swift and malicious (38). The Europeans must "hang together" to prevent "sweaty", "pot-bellied", "garlic-breathing niggers" from entering. Even the knowledge that it's happening "all over Burma" doesn't cool tempers, but leads to a vicious, agonised appraisal of the British role. Are they there to rule "a set of damn black swine who've been slaves since the beginning of history" ? Or are they to treat the "dirty brutes" as equals and leave? (39) Although the extreme language is disputed, the underlying principles are not (40). Impervious racism, of the kind Orwell portrayed in the Club, always impressed him (41). It is a critical moment, when they need "to hang together" (42) and not give way. The Club is the symbol of white prestige and exclusiveness, and represents the tropical Greyfriars mentality. They have made "a perfect fetish" of keeping it so (43), and when white prestige is at stake, feeling runs even higher (44). As Flory explains to Veraswami,

...one daren't be loyal to an Oriental when it means going against the others. It doesn't do. (45)

When public opinion rather than law is the arbiter of behaviour, there is less tolerance (46).

MacGregor explains that the suggestion originated from those "who

interfere with us from above" (47), indicating that paranoia is not only concerned with threats from below. Flory's personalised rebellion is made (48) when he proposes Veraswami for the Club, and the strength of feeling that greets him is symptomatic. He is an "oily-swine" a "nigger's nancy-boy" etc (49), and a traitor for breaching white solidarity.

The issue of admitting a native to the Club is a reflection of the times we are dealing with. The English were less sure of their role than ever before, and the subject peoples were emerging from apolitical ignorance. Flory's dilemma is Orwell's: how to run a despotic government humanely. Orwell ^{elsewhere} remarked that colonial rule appeared "benevolent" and "necessary", because people often governed foreigners "better" than themselves,

But it is not possible to be a part of such a system without recognising it as an unjustifiable tyranny. (50)

British lack of confidence is dramatised in Burmese Days in a series of unlikely conversations between Flory and Veraswami, in which the expected roles are reversed; Flory indicting the Empire and Veraswami defending it. Flory questions the altruistic premise of imperialism, claiming that if it didn't pay, the British wouldn't stay there;

The official holds the Burman down while the business man goes through his pockets.

He instances timber, oil, mines, plantations, rice as examples of this (51). It is legal theft, with the trappings of civilisation to soften the reality. The doctor interprets all this as "a magnificent record of self-sacrifice", but Flory points out the effect this development has had in crushing Asian enterprise; muslins, seagoing ships, cannons, which were once produced, are no longer (52). Only independent Oriental countries, such as Japan, are really progressing. Veraswami maintains that impartial British justice and a sense of order are unarguably beneficial; but to Flory this is merely enlightened self-interest, providing a safe, legal framework for exploitation. Veraswami claims that even this is progress, and Flory debunks the whole Western concept of progress as "pink villas fifty yards apart" and "forests shaved flat" to produce "The News of the World" (53). This is authentic Orwellian anti-materialism, as expressed in The Road to Wigan Pier and Coming up for Air, which was later tempered by a realisation that reactionary conservatives used the same arguments for their own, quite different, purposes (54). He, therefore, later conceded the arguments for industrialisation, while maintaining an emotional aversion to it (see chapter 5).

Flory claims that the hypocrisy of Imperialism "corrupts" Anglo-Indians

making them "beastly" to the natives; things would be better if they thieved "without any humbug" (55). In practice this wouldn't have been easy, for the "doctrines of Imperialism" ("humbug") inspired the Anglo-Indian "as a justification of his existence" (56). A contemporary Burma hand, Maurice Collis, echoed this frustration, saying that the "primary function" of Imperialism was to promote British trade, which "made nonsense of the prime motives" that animated him. He described the horrifying revelation of meeting commercial people "in a body" on the boat to Rangoon. He found them "ignorant" and "prejudiced" about Burma, but most patriotic because of the "stream of profits" they returned, ensuring the "very existence of England". Collis, like Orwell, realised he was only there to safeguard this arrangement, and had been cynically chosen because his "liberal" temperament would "camouflage" this and "give England a better name" (57). Flory has a similar, bitter awakening to the fact that the Empire is a "benevolent despotism", "with theft as its final object" (58), which Orwell later admitted to be his own experience in The Road to Wigan Pier. Flory grows to hate his fellow administrators and lives his life "inwardly, secretly", in sterility (59). His temperamental inability to ignore his feelings and compromise is virtually the same as Orwell's; they are incapable of being part of an oppressive system *for long.*

Orwell describes Flory's "sterile world" with remarkable power.

It is "stifling", "stultifying"; free speech is "unthinkable", orthodoxy is inevitable, and friendship "can hardly exist"; life is all "lies", and "poisons him like a secret disease. He sees "young louts" kicking "grey-haired servants" agrees that Nationalists "should be boiled in oil", and eventually burns with "hatred" of his own countrymen, wishing their death. But the emotions are "insincere", for it is not Indians', but his own freedom, which is of concern; the Anglo-Indian is,

... a creature of the despotism, tied tighter than a monk or a savage by an unbreakable system of tabus. (60)

Even the rare 'real' contact is sabotaged, as Orwell made clear when he related the overnight train journey he shared with "a stranger" to Mandalay. The Anglo-Indians' continual "sense of guilt" and fear for his position constrain him from talking frankly, but occasionally, in "the right company", the "bitterness overflows". Orwell and the stranger, "damned the Empire... from the inside, intelligently and intimately", but in the "haggard morning light", they parted "as guiltily as any adulterous couple" (61). Despite the literary ornamentation of this anecdote, it expressed a widespread truth, according to Orwell, ^{who} claimed that the "majority" of Anglo-Indians were unhappy in their

role. Even the "gin-pickled old scoundrels high up in Government service"

remarked to him that,

"Of course we've no right in this blasted country at all." (62)

It is possible that Orwell was exaggerating the Anglo-Indian conscience, but not greatly. It is also true that few Anglo-Indian officials would have been as sensitive as Orwell himself; after all, how many other colonial servants have written a novel of disillusionment about their experiences, and turned into such radical reformers?

11

In order to gain a perspective on Orwell's personal crisis in Burma, it is necessary to go back to his childhood. It seems that the security of his family home, the love of books and the enjoyment of nature and the countryside were the most consistent, positive elements of his boyhood. From about the age of six, he was segregated from his 'lower-class' contemporaries and their interesting lifestyles, by ideological social training (63). His own family's circumstances were, however, straitened (64), and at his prep-school this helped alienate him and foster his "disagreeable mannerisms" of

146

loneliness (65). At Eton, his "lower-upper-middle class" background of genteel poverty, and the shallow Bolshevism that followed the Great War, led him into a 'no-man's land', where he seemed to spend,

...half the time in denouncing the capitalist system and the other half in raging over the insolence of bus-conductors. (66)

Perhaps this was "the inevitable fate of the sentimentalist", whose opinions changed into "their opposites at the first brush of reality" (67). After school, Orwell left for Burma, in the knowledge that although this was the Kiplingesque family tradition, he was suppressing his creative side by going (68)

So the Orwell that found himself at nearly twenty in Burma, was a sensitive, "half-educated", confused late adolescent. He was filled with a sense of decency, derived from the best of his education and liberal reading, and his own personal experience of suffering. All this enabled him, eventually, to sympathise with the victims of Imperialism, whether they were Burmans or Anglo-Indians. Evidence for Orwell's personal crisis in Burma will be drawn from Burmese Days, for, although it is fiction, much of it is emotional autobiography. Orwell said much of it was "simply reporting what I have seen" (69); and Stansky and Abrahams recorded a conversation that took place between Orwell and a director of Gallancz:

"How much of Burmese Days is actually based on fact?"
asked Collins.

"All of it," said Blair.

"All of it?"

"All of it."

Pause.

"Now than, about the characters. Would you say they are
drawn from life?"

"Yes."

"Well, one or two, or how many?"

"All of them."

"All?"

"All."

There are other references to its authenticity, which we will encounter. This does not imply a simple equation whereby Flory equals Orwell. Orwell has distributed his autobiographical details with some subtlety. Westfield is the novel's policeman, and some of his reactions are Orwell's. Although Ellis is a caricature he appears to magnify some of Orwell's violent frustration. Even Verrall, for all his two-dimensionalism, has a spartan quality which Orwell practised. However, Flory is an Orwellian protagonist; he is the only sensitive, live character, and while he may not duplicate Orwell's practical progress, he does so emotionally.

The first clue to his feelings is the mood of the novel, beginning with the Shakespearean frontespiece,

This desert inaccessible
Under the shade of melancholy boughs (71).

The novel, despite sunny passages, maintains an incorrigible pessimism. One must beware here, however, for at that time, Orwell wanted to write,

...enormous naturalistic novels with unhappy endings...full of purple passages in which words were used partly for the sake of their sound. And...Burmese Days...is rather that kind of book. (72)

However, the themes in it are Orwellian, and only fit into his overall output if they are autobiographical. Orwell was one of those writers who could only write from their own experience, and his inability to create more than one 'real' character per novel is a reflection of this 'egocentric' style.

All the European characters in the book are uninspired and second rate. Westfield is shallow and his conversation reflects this, down to the repeated Shakespearean misquotation (73). Maxwell's physique and personality are like a carthorse's; he is colourless and his main contribution to the plot is as a corpse. Macgregor, despite his joviality, is annoying. He is ponderous, repetitive, boring and paternalistic and Orwell cannot resist pillorying him (74), and giving him a description notable for its revulsion and vindictiveness. He is a "nasty old bladder of lard", wearing shorts which make his bottom "stick out" and "exposed" his "pudgy, dimpled knees", like a "homosexual" schoolmaster (75). This was a favourite 'Aunt Sally' figure for Orwell (76).

Ellis is a bullying, spiteful, psychopathic racist, who is redeemed by courage and the sincerity of his beliefs. Lackersteen lacks anything resembling a backbone. He is an early fat man stereotype (77), hedonistic and childlike. His dominating wife is a lazy, shallow, small-minded schemer; their niece Elizabeth is trivial and base.

Flory inwardly explodes at the "dull boozing witless porkers" who constitute the "godless" Club society, founded on "whisky, Blackwoods and the Bonzo pictures" (78). However, it was inevitable that Anglo-Indians should be as they were, for if they had been more like Forster (intelligently sensitive) rather than Kipling (consciously brutal) then the Empire would never have existed (79). Orwell could never do violence to his feelings without suffering horribly for it. He tried to subdue the symptoms of this sensitivity, and according to Hollis (who met him in Burma), he acted in the manner of Westfield, with a brusque illiberality which was almost certainly a cover-up for his deeply troubled conscience (80).

Flory feels contempt for his colleagues and the "stink" of their company (81), but at the same time realises that his own attitude is even more reprehensible, for he is a cowardly liar, "half-dead and rotting" (82). His position is that of an outsider, and symptomatically the haven of the

Anglo-India, the Club, is "unhomelike" to him (83). Flory's talks with Veraswami are the only "safety valve" he has found in 15 years of dishonest existence (84). Even the beauty of nature reinforces his isolation. When he bathes in the jungle pool, he sees a beautiful pigeon in the trees above him, which sends "a pang" through him, "Alone, alone, the bitterness of being alone!" and he realises that "Beauty is meaningless until it is shared." (85).

It is "corrupting" to live "one's real life in secret" (86), but as well as the loneliness, there is the fear of what he is turning into, what the future holds. He will become one of the "poor old prosing wrecks", "littered about the "tomb-like boarding-houses" of Bath and Cheltenham, in "all stages of decomposition" (87). However, it is Elizabeth who provokes the fullest expressions of his fears. All he wants is "to talk, simply to talk!" to her, which is "the greatest of all needs" (88). He tells her that Burma is a "solitary hell" to most Europeans, and that it could be "paradise", if only there were someone to share it with (89). Elizabeth doesn't respond, and her flirtation with Verrall provokes psychopathic obscenity from Flory (90). He is shattered (91) at losing her, and becomes obsessive (92). He makes a final attempt to win her, telling her of the "horrible death in life", the "decay... loneliness...self-pity" of his existence. Like a drowning man, he experiences

a hallucination of how their life together could have been (93), with the "mythical piano" (which neither of them could play) at the heart of it (94).

Elizabeth is Flory's most crucial touchstone of loneliness. His inability to communicate with her is an echo of the wider problem that he has with his colleagues. He, even more than Ellis, is unsuited to the colonial lifestyle. Ellis is a fish out of water (95), but he is able to create his own mean existence. The sensitive Flory, gradually awaking to the unsuitability of his role, feels trapped, and the novel's protest is purely personal (96).

Flory's work in a timber firm was less oppressive than Orwell's real profession in Burma - the police. Orwell believed such work to be "demonstrably useful", whereas the police were part of the "machinery of despotism", where you saw "the dirty work of Empire at close quarters" (97). Flory's relatively innocuous profession, therefore, allowed Orwell to concentrate on problems of personality rather than politics.

Flory's loneliness even extends to the apparent intimacy he enjoys with his servants. Ko S'la is "devoted" to Flory, performs every arduous, distasteful duty with jealous zeal (98), even "undressing his master without waking him" (99). The real nature of this relationship was clarified by Orwell in the essay on Dickens, where he describes that between Sam Weller and

Pickwick as "feudal". Weller is "doggedly faithful" and "completely familiar" (100). Ko S'la stands to Flory as Weller stands to Pickwick; servant to master, and the relationship is implicitly non-equal. Because of this inegalitarianism, they are able to be on terms of intimacy without the "master" feeling threatened. As Orwell explained in The Road to Wigan Pier, one "looked down on them as 'natives'", but was quite ready "to be physically intimate with them". This even applied to Europeans with "the most vicious colour prejudice", and Orwell was "habitually" dressed and undressed by his "undisgusting" Burmese boy (101).

Flory's relationship with Veraswami is similarly blighted, because it is "unpleasant" when one's friend is not "one's social equal" (102). In the book, Orwell, as narrator, claims that there can be "affection, even love" between Englishman and Indian, but "no loyalty, no real friendship" (103). This echoes Forster's conclusion in A Passage to India, where Aziz and Fielding find their friendship frustrated. Aziz rides his horse into Fielding's shouting that they will "drive every blasted Englishman into the sea, and then...you and I shall be friends." Fielding wants friendship now, but "the horses...the earth...the temples...the tank, the jail, the palace, the birds, the carrion didn't want it, they said in their hundred voices 'No, not yet...'" (104). Orwell's view was not just a literary pose; Mulk Raj Anand told me that, at

the end of the war, Orwell supported his contention,

...in an address before the All India Society, that 'there could be no friendship between Indians and Englishmen, until India was free.' This society included ex-governors, generals, colonels and ICS retired people. Some of them were furious at the end of my address and boasted that they were loved by their babus and bearers. Ranjit Shahani supported them and I remember the sweat running down my body. Orwell got up and said in a soft but firm voice, that he agreed with me completely: 'there could be between Indian and Englishman until they're free.' I shall never forget that incident. He was shy and I could not even thank him for what he had done. But in his speech, he said he had resigned from the Imperial Police Service because he felt, during those years, that as a policeman he could never enjoy a free relationship with the Burmese and he asked the sahibs to read his book Burmese Days in confirmation of his testimony. (105)

So Flory's inhibitions were Orwell's too, and the only occasion when the former enjoyed free relationships were when they took place in natural surroundings.

This leads us to another point, Orwell's profound childhood love of nature and the countryside. With Orwell, evocative power is often a yardstick of involvement, and one can gauge his feeling for nature by the strength of his writing. Even he modestly acknowledged that in Burmese Days, "The descriptions of the scenery aren't bad." (106). In fact they are memorably good, and heightened by their occurrence between unhappy social relationships. For example the villainy of U Po Kyin, the tongue of Ellis and the appearance of Ma Hla

May prelude Flory's walk to the jungle pool. As the human surroundings fade, the natural ones take over. Flowers have a sharp scent, and a huge peepul tree overhangs the pool, its roots forming "a natural cavern" under which "clear greenish water bubbled." The place is a "green grotto walled with leaves". Even the fish gently "came nosing and nibbling at his body" as he bathed (107). Flory relaxes and notices a beautiful pigeon with "jade green back as smooth as velvet", "irridiscent breast" and "coralline beak" (108). The emotions created in this passage are in strong contrast to those engendered by the descriptions of his social life.

Similarly Orwell, the narrator, reviews Flory's dismal career from school to Burma, and follows it with the most glorious descriptions of the seasons in that country. The summer sun glares in the sky "like an angry god", later the monsoon squalls become ceaseless downpours, when everything stays damp and mildewed. The land floods and stagnates with a "stale, mousy smell"; the paddy is planted in "knee-deep water";

Then one night, high overhead, one heard a squawking of invisible birds. The snipe were flying southward from Central Asia.

The rain ceased, the paddy dried and ripened and the Burmese children played,

...hopsotch with gonyin seeds and flew kites in the cool

winds. It was the beginning of the short winter, when Upper Burma seemed haunted by the ghost of England. Wild flowers sprang into bloom everywhere...honeysuckle in thick bushes, field roses...violets in dark places in the forest.

The nights and mornings were "bitterly cold"; mist lay in the valleys, and "myriads" of snipe and duck abounded on the jeel. Burmans went to work "muffled and "pinched" with the cold;

In the morning one marched through misty, incongruous wildernesses, clearings of drenched, almost English grass and naked trees where monkeys squatted in the upper branches, waiting for the sun. (109)

There is quiet, controlled joy in this description, and no mistaking Orwell's pleasure in handling the material. There is an optimism, richness and confident authenticity not always present in his writing. He is moved by atavistic joy of nature and the "surface of the earth".

Finally, his moving account of nature in the shooting expedition follows U Po Kyin's plot, Veraswami's problems and M Hla May's frightening abasement, in a similar pattern to the first description.

It is significant that Orwell portrayed nature so fully and confidently. It showed a renaissance of interest in the world around him. If, as I contend, Orwell's first love of nature and companionship were severely altered by the needs of a "lower-upper-middle class" training; his

natural warmth and undifferentiated interests were moulded to suit a particular world view; and, for a long time, areas of his life lay dormant, it is these descriptions of nature and native life in Burma that are symbolic of his resurrection. What he discovered in Burma was his ineptitude for the role of policeman, and an extreme loneliness, which had been with him from childhood. Not only did he become conscious of loneliness, but also of the difficulties of the individual in relating to society. This is one of the crucial, unsolved questions of the novel, which throws light on the kind of relationships permitted by Imperialism; none of which are satisfactory to the Orwellian protagonist, nor to the author himself. It should be stressed, however, that at this stage Orwell has made no systematic indictment of Imperialism, but rather voiced the personal frustration of a sensitive individual, intolerably placed.

His love of nature catalysed his appreciation of life over a wider spectrum. In the novel it is the sole refuge for sensitivity, but as such it is inadequate. Having had his interest rekindled, it was impossible for him to continue in his previous manner. He could not enjoy natural surroundings while ignoring social ones. It was no longer enough to remain aloof, to consider the human situation 'in vacuo', while indulging in aesthetic

raptures; to be stimulated in one sphere and ignore another. As a result, his attention was forced onto the problem of human relationships, in particular the individual's to society. He was later to have experiences (in Spain and elsewhere) in which the question changed from 'how can the individual relate to society?' to 'how can an individual withstand the pressures of society and maintain his integrity?' We will deal with this in due course.

Another evidence of regeneration, is his descriptions of Burmese life. These are symbolic rejections of the 'pukka-sahib' world, and Orwell uses them to highlight this conflict. Flory wishes to take Elizabeth to a Burmese dance-drama (pwe), he knows she would love it, for "no-one with eyes in his head could resist a pwe dance." (110). His enthusiasm blinds him to her obvious reservations. Orwell relishes the exoticism of the occasion; the fact that it is staged on a road; the "appalling din" of the orchestra; the heat which stimulates the "feral reek" of the crowd; the unfamiliar drink they are given; the beautiful, breastless female dancer who smokes cigars and is bizarrely dressed. On all these points Flory and Elizabeth, symptomatically, are out of sympathy, Maurice Collis, incidentally, gives a very similar account of a 'pwe' in his autobiography (111). Orwell's description of the dance is

masterly, making comprehensible comparisons, while losing none of the enigma. She commences with a rhythmic "nodding" and "posturing", like a "jointed wooden figure on an old-fashioned roundabout". Her hands twisted like "snakeheads" and could lie back along her forearms. The pace quickened and she,

...danced in a grotesque posture as though sitting down, knees bent, body leaned forward, with her arms extended and writhing, her head also moving to the beat of the drums".

In a climax, she whirls "as swiftly as a top", with the layers of longyi flying out like "petals of a snowdrop", and finally sinks into a curtsy (112).

What a pity Orwell didn't record more such events. Elizabeth is revolted by the 'Burmese-ness' of the whole affair, while Flory eagerly related the spectacle to Burmese history, with its "centuries of culture", handed down through "innumerable generations" in an unbroken flow,

In some way that I can't define to you, the whole life and spirit of Burma is summed up in the way that girl twists her arms. When you see her you can see the rice fields, the villages under the teak trees, the pagodas, the priests in their yellow robes, the buffaloes swimming the rivers in the early morning, Thibaw's palace. (113)

Elizabeth is alarmed by Flory's interest in all this, more than she is offended by the implied obscenity of the dance (114).

She understands that this is not how a white man should conduct himself (115). She is "disquieted" by his continual praise of "Burmese customs", especially when he "favourably" contrasts them with English ones; after all, the Burmese are only an "inferior", "subject" people "with black faces" (116). Their visit to the bazaar is "rather fun" to Flory (117), but Elizabeth feels she is always being "dragged" to watch "filthy disgusting" native habits, which was "all wrong somehow" (118). The sensual detail of Orwell's description of the bazaar is proof of his involuntary interest in the world about him (119), he cannot resist its vibrant, vital variety.

...there was a reek of garlic, dried fish, sweat, dust, anise, cloves and turmeric.

Cigar-brown people "surged" around them, jostling and bargaining;

There were...red bananas, baskets of heliotrope-coloured prawns the size of lobsters, brittle dried fish tied in bundles, crimson chillis, ducks split open and cured like hams, green coco-nuts, the larvae of the rhinoceros beetle... aphrodisiacs in the form of large soap-like pills, glazed earthenware jars four feet high, Chinese sweetmeats made of garlic and sugar, green and white cigars...strips of alligator-hide with magical properties...(119)

Again Maurice Collis described the bazaar of a small town very similarly to Orwell (120).

It is worth emphasising Orwell's gradual identification of race and class issues through his Burmese experiences. The taboo on "native" life is a defence against the erosion of white hierarchic dominance, buttressed by myth and prejudice. Orwell was too intelligent to be fooled by myths, too curious to be contained by taboos, and too sensitive to work happily within such a system. His keen interest in the scenery and life of Burma is proof of these qualities, and of his rebellion against the system which tried to suppress such qualities.

Orwell's empirical outlook, which is a feature of his writing, meant that the personal aspect of his involvement in oppression was vitally important. He reviewed Graham Greene's The Heart of the Matter in 1948, criticising the unreality of the hero;

...if he were the kind of man we are told he is - that is, a man whose chief characteristic is a horror of causing pain - he would not be an officer in a colonial police force.

(121)

The memory of his old job still pricked him. In The Road to Wigan Pier, Orwell told how the monstrousness of his job was brought home to him. He was in a police station with an American missionary,

One of my sub-inspectors was bullying a suspect (I described this scene in Burmese Days) The American...said thoughtfully, "I wouldn't care to have your job". It made me horribly

ashamed. So that was the kind of job I had! Even an ass...
a teetotal cock-virgin from the Middle West, had the right
to look down and pity me!

Orwell commented that the system of justice needed very insensitive people
to run it (122). The autobiographical police inquisition in Burmese Days is
overlooked by Westfield, whose dismay is masked by brusqueness. The suspect
is a "timorous wretch" who was found in possession of a valuable ring, and
being only a "poor coolie", the police believe "He have stole it." The sub-
inspector turns "ferociously", pushes his face "tomcat fashion" into the
other's and "roars" the accusations of theft and previous offences at the
man, who denies them. The man is bent over and his buttocks exposed to show
bamboo scars. He looks "in agony" at Westfield, who turns away. Because the
scars 'proved' he is an old offender, Westfield "moodily" has him imprisoned,
although he "loathes" doing this "from the bottom of his heart" (123).

Later in the novel, Ellis rejoices in corporal punishment, saying
it is the "only thing" that impresses the Burman;

Have you seen them after they've been flogged? I have.
Brought out of the jail on bullock carts, yelling, with
their women plastering mashed bananas on their backsides.

(124)

This fictional delight contrasts with Orwell's factual memory, where the

"Wretched prisoners" with their "grey, cowed faces", the "scarred buttocks"

and the "howling families" are "beyond bearing when you are in any way responsible for them." (125). Orwell couldn't ignore "the expression of the human face" (126), and when that face told him that he was cruel and unjust, the last defences of this sensitive man crumbled, and the 'lie' of altruism became apparent (127). The animus of the Burmese against the British was made worse for Orwell by the unpalatable nature of his work (128).

In 'Shooting an Elephant', Orwell told how he came to understand the true position of the white man in the Empire. He had gone to deal with a rampaging elephant which, although it had killed, was now harmless. However, a huge crowd of Burmese had gathered and he realised that he would have to shoot the animal after all, because the people "expected" it of him, and he "had got to do it" (129). Retreat would mean ridicule, and "every white man's life in the East, was one long struggle not to be laughed at" (130). The pressures for conformity, from Europeans and natives alike, gave the lie to any freedom; one merely became a "hollow, posing dummy" (131).

Finally, arduous physical conditions played their part in undermining the white man in the tropics. In Burmese Days, the climate is an important theme, helping to establish a 'unity'. In the opening chapter it is

"close" at eight thirty (132), "fierce and throbbing" at nine (133); "hot beyond bearing" at ten (134) and "oppressive", "horrible" and "evil" after that (136). Such conditions bring on Ellis's violent temper, as his prickly heat irritates intolerably (137). The food which Europeans eat is also uncomfortable. Just the thought of a "stodgy" breakfast saps enthusiasm (138); Orwell commented that "all European food" in Burma is "disgusting", and backed it up with a dispiriting list (139). The evening meal is "pretentious and filthy" (140), and Flory reminisces that the "filthy, monotonous food" is "the worst thing in Burma" (141). The gourmet zenith appears to be imported food which has travelled "eight thousand miles on ice" (142). In The Road to Wigan Pier, Orwell described colonial Burgundy as tasting of "iron and water" (143), and in Down and Out in Paris and London, he called colonial claret "muck" (144). The social life of youths is no better, consisting of squalor and distastefulness (145), but it doesn't improve much later, and Flory's bachelor quarters resemble a Robinson Crusoe hideout (146), while Burmese accommodation is "dark and sluttish" (147). Anglo-Indians work in "comfortless camps...sweltering offices...gloomy dak-bungalows" (148). Small wonder that physical deterioration (another theme of the novel) sets in early. Flory is prematurely aged (149), and deeply conscious of this in Elizabeth's company

(150). Verral considers Anglo-Indians to be "yellow-faced loafers", who make him "physically sick" (151).

Partly owing to the circumstances, Flory is a moral coward (but not a physical one). His nervousness is stressed, and he has the half-smile "of a man who is never sure of his popularity" (152). He calls himself "a spineless cur" for failing to support his friend (153), and knows it is because he lacks the "small spark of courage" to do so. But to stand up would mean a row, and "Oh! how he loathed a row!" All his nervous symptoms increase at such a prospect (154). However, he does show the necessary courage, when Elizabeth offers him the prospect of redemption from the "dirty, miserable years" and release from having to "dance the dance du pukka sahib for the edification of the lower races" ⁽¹⁵⁵⁾. He overcomes ennui and nerves to declare himself. The effort of Flory's speech is sympathetically drawn by an author who (his friends noted) found shyness a barrier to public utterance (156). The suicidal "ennui" of colonial existence is stressed (157), and the destructive effect it has on life is comprehensive (158). It spills over into homesickness, which in turn gives way to a divided, even rootless, feeling when one realises that "one's heart" is in an "alien and hated" country (159). In later reviews,

Orwell revealed a genuine nostalgia for Burma (160), despite his obviously painful memories of life there, yet Burmese Days is full of yearnings for England (161).

The significance and critical nature of his time in Burma was referred to by Orwell in several later extracts. He described his job in the Imperial Police as one for "which I was totally unsuited" (162). Later he wrote that he gave it up,

...partly because the climate had ruined my health, partly because I already had vague ideas of writing books, but mainly because I could not go on any longer serving an imperialism which I had come to regard as very largely a racket. (163)

Also, he wrote angrily to George Woodcock of his Burmese experiences,

I gave up that job partly because it didn't suit me, but mainly because I would not any longer be a servant of imperialism. I am against imperialism because I know something about it from the inside. The whole history of this is to be found in my writings, including a novel Burmese Days. (164)

The lessons of Burma did not bear fruit immediately, but in the following years, his ideas on oppression, class, Socialism and other key issues slowly evolved in their wake. He saw in Burma that society was hierarchical and had to be so to sustain itself; he was repelled by his own part in that oppression,

particularly in view of his childhood identification with the underdog and hatred of bullying. The personal protest of Burmese Days gradually expands into a realisation that oppression anywhere diminishes one's own freedom. The question of how the individual relates to society, posed expressively in the novel, is developed in his next two novels, but sharply reappraised in Homage to Catalonia. In Spain he discovered that some societies could be so terrible that to join them was a fate worse than loneliness. This obsessed him in an age of totalitarianism, and his energies were spent exposing its dangers. His other causes (and ending racism was certainly one) did not disappear, indeed they emerge time and time again throughout his later work. They are the necessary foundations of decency upon which he built his protest against the new dictatorships. If he had never been exercised about the poor and the oppressed; if he had never hated hierarchies and exploitation, he would never have written the stinging indictments that he did against totalitarianism. His awareness of racial attitudes in Burma and their significance, are necessary stages in the growth and development of his whole outlook.

CHAPTER 5: THE EMPIRE

When Orwell came back from Burma in August 1927, he made up his mind to leave the Imperial Police. Later in that same year he began collecting material which resulted in his first book, Down and Out in Paris and London, published in 1933. This is a masterpiece of skilful reportage and observation, but there are few hints of what he had learned in Burma, and would come out with later. The social and political implications are muted and little more than pleas for sympathy and amelioration of the downtrodden's lot. Like 'A Hanging', it is primarily a literary exercise. He was recording rather than interpreting what he saw and experienced, as his empiricism required a wide factual basis before he could draw radical conclusions in print.

One of the themes that developed from his Burmese experiences was his understanding of the economic exploitation of imperialism. Because he was not an economist, what he had to say came in small, but powerful, bursts, and although his opinions were by no means original, they represented a revolutionary change for someone of his social background. It is the consistency of his emotional development which is striking, however. He wrote an article for a French journal (1), in which he described the British annexation of

the "earthly paradise" of Burma. He analysed their policy of using native administrators only up to a certain level, as helpful in containing ambition, and establishing good grass-roots communication. He dismissed dyarchy as a "fiction of democracy", but noted that Burma's backwardness (encouraged by the British) prevented any effective challenge. He was as *contemptuous of* the Nationalists as he was to be in Burmese Days, and it is hard to believe that for two years out of the five in between the two publications, the Saya San rebellion tied down large numbers Indian and British soldiers, with the Burmese only possessing primitive weapons. His ignorance must have been contrived, and is out of keeping with the rest of the article.

He worked himself into a positive fury over the British possession of mines, oil-wells, forestry and their profiteering in rice, claiming that they "steal" and "pillage" the country shamelessly. They had deliberately arrested Burmese development, and flooded the captive market with English manufactures, so that the Burmese were "dragged" into "the web of industrial capitalism" with no hope of becoming "industrial capitalists themselves." Even the apparently beneficial railways facilitated British economic penetration. As

one historian colourfully put it;

...the steam engine could not but be seen as a monstrous device that sucked in raw materials and belched out manufactured goods. (2)

As late as 1946, Orwell wrote a letter to Miss Tennyson Jesse, protesting that her book (The Story of Burma) had contained,

Nothing about the economic milching of the country via such concerns as the Burma Oil Company (3).

The clinching British argument of protecting Burma meant that the Burmese were selling their resources at cost in order to have them guarded. Orwell believed this would eventually become clear to the Burmese, as would their "slave to master" relationship within the Empire.

The tone of the article is hyperbolic and there is no attempt to relate imperialism with domestic politics, nor to suggest how the situation could be improved. It does contain some of Orwell's consistent anti-imperial themes, however, and reads like a first exercise in their expression.

In a review of Trials in Burma in 1938, Orwell stated that the author had grasped "the essential situation" well, that Burma had not profited from the "huge wealth" taken from her, and the "hopeless rebellion" of 1931 had "genuine grievances" behind it (4). In 'Not Counting Niggers', the following

year, Orwell challenged the hypocritical oversight of colonial populations ("the overwhelming bulk of the British proletariat"), and the disgustingly low standard of life that we "are at great pains to keep" them at. The average British income was over ten times that of an Indian, and,

It is quite common for an Indian coolie's leg to be thinner than the average Englishman's arm. And there is nothing racial in this...it is due to simple starvation. This is the system we all live on and which we denounce when there seems to be no danger of its being altered (5)

This is what Orwell had in mind when he claimed five years later that there was "quite a strong case for saying that British Imperialism is actually worse than Nazism" (6).

In The Lion and the Unicorn, Orwell stated that the wealth of England was largely derived from Africa and Asia, and in the present technological age undeveloped countries could be no more independent than "a cat or dog" (7). This was why Britain had inhibited Indian development, partly for fear of competition, but,

...partly because backward people are more easily governed than civilised ones.

It was true that Indians ruthlessly exploited fellow Indians, but this was only possible under the British aegis. Once Britain ceased to be an exploiter

"the balance of forces would be altered";

Once check that stream of dividends that flows from the bodies of Indian coolies to the banking accounts of old ladies in Cheltenham, and the whole sahib-native nexus, with its haughty ignorance on one side and envy and servility on the other, can come to an end.

India can be developed sympathetically with English help, and indeed she can only advance in an equal partnership, which ensured her integrity and protection, and gave technological aid.

In the 1942 essay on Kipling, Orwell commented favourably on that writer's inability to understand that "an empire is primarily a money-making concern." (8). A significant difference between imperialism and totalitarianism was that the former acted in ignorance, whereas the latter didn't. Everyone lived "by robbing Asiatic coolies" and imperialism enabled this to happen. The adoption of the English language by Indians was economically induced (9), and, in a poem attacking Pacifism, he ended a verse by accusing the pacifists of wanting the,

...dear old game of scratch my neighbour
In sleek reviews financed by coolie labour. (10)

The sentiment was probably more appropriate than the scansion.

In a review of Beggars my Neighbour in 1943, Orwell attacked the

author's call for a compromise peace as the "imperialist solution" to the war, in that it would leave India enslaved in a world of "three or four great imperial powers." This foretaste of Nineteen Eighty Four came in a book which Orwell believed to be deeply conservative and against the interests of India, despite its opposite claims. He received some support from London based Indians in this (11). He reserved a fine attack of spleen for Fielden's proposed de-industrialisation of India and perceived this sheltered hypocrisy as a spiritual swindle of the bourgeoisie, directed against working class and 'natives' alike:

"Now, one of the finest weapons that the rich have ever evolved for use against the poor is 'spirituality'. If you can induce the working man to believe that his desire for a decent standard of living is 'materialism', you have got him where you want him. Also, if you can induce the Indian to remain 'spiritual' instead of taking up with vulgar things like Trades-unions, you can ensure that he will always remain a coolie.

Such sentiments didn't "come well" from someone in a "comfortable and privileged position" (12). This is an echo of his condemnation the year before, where, in 'Looking Back on the Spanish War', he had thundered against the "damned impertinence" of the bourgeoisie when they "lecture" the working class for their "materialism". All that people wanted was a decent, secure life for

themselves and their children: "Not one of those who preach against 'materialism' would consider life liveable without these things." (13).

Tied in with this meaning of spirit in Beggars my Neighbour was that element of transferred nationalism, a product of wealth without responsibility, which so irritated Orwell. India (instead of Russia) was the target here, and pious Oriental mysticism allowed the "life of an English gentleman and the moral attitude of a saint" to be enjoyed simultaneously.

In the name of pacifism you can compromise with Hitler,
and in the name of 'spirituality' you can keep your money.

The "mythos" of a "religious and patriarchal East", set against a "greedy and materialistic West" permitted the rejection of industrialism and Socialism, and ended in a "strange no-man's land where the Fascist and the pacifist join forces." (14). This was one of the minority perversions that Orwell detected in Britain's imperial exploitation, and it was all the harder for him to express because of his own self-confessed attachment to the past. However, he was sensitive enough to acknowledge the inequalities of the age he loved (15), and came down hard on reactionary nostalgia.

Orwell always kept in mind the positive achievements of the British in India, which gave him a perspective lacking in others. At times his

attitude seems perverse, and he often played devil's advocate to different audiences. There was a genuine doubt in his mind as to where the line between exploitation and benefit should be drawn, but he never failed to call for an end to imperialism. Orwell reviewed Brailsford's book on India in November 1943, praising its incisiveness and two main conclusions, that Britain should leave India, but the latter's poverty would remain. In an analysis of the exploitive influence of the British, he updated some statistics in 'Not Counting Niggers'. The peasant lived in the landlord's "grip", farming with "Bronze-Age" technology; his physique was wretched and per capita income was five per cent of Britain's. Industrial workers slaved twelve hours a day for 365 days a year and earned a pittance, while they lived in slums (16). The Government of India was an "old-fashioned despotism", "letting things slide" and not bothering about its subjects, provided they were "outwardly obedient"; as a result (to take one fact out of the "thousands" available) India could not manufacture a car engine. This example obviously impressed itself on Orwell, for he repeated it in another review six months later (17). On the positive side, the British had built railways and, if one studied a railway map of Asia, India looked like "a piece of fishing-net" on a "white table-cloth" (18). This, along with a unity of law and trade gave India a real

homogeneity. Professor Ayer confirmed Orwell's admiration for the practical achievements of Anglo-India (19). Orwell had considerable hopes for the future of countries such as India and China which, with their impressive populations and resources, stood a genuine chance of achieving equality with the old imperial powers.

There is some question as to how Orwell stood on the issue of giving independence to a united India. For most Indian administrators it was a matter of pride that India was unified, and they hoped this would be their legacy

at independence. A war-time colleague, ^{Professor} W. Eapson, at the BBC, told me that:

His number 2 in the Indian Section was a Moslem, and Orwell was struck down with horror shortly before the liberation of India to find that he had all along been a Pakistan supporter, in favour of separation. You understand Orwell was passionate about the freeing of India, saying sometimes that if achieved it would be the most important result of the war. Only a man very wrapped up in his own theories could combine that with not realising what the Moslems were thinking while meeting them all the time. (20)

Mr. Eapson's tone suggests that Orwell possessed an earnest naivety combined with tunnel vision, but I think he has underestimated Orwell here. Orwell reviewed Beverly Nichols's book, Verdict on India, in 1944, and claimed that the policy of "Divide and Quit" (ie establish Pakistan before freeing India) was "a thinkable solution", which might "avert civil war" (21). So he was

familiar, if not in agreement, with what the Muslims were thinking.

Orwell continued the theme of Britain's oppressive economic exploitation of India in reviews(22), but also found an "exceptionally happy example of colonial development" when he reviewed Margaret Mead's Coming of Age in Samoa. Samoa's "traditional life" had been minimally interfered with, because the country was "too poor to be worth exploiting" and hence the Samoans had been "very lucky" (23). The situation was different in Africa, where "the basic fact" was "racial exploitation". The African had been "robbed" of his land, lived in "atrocious poverty" and was systematically oppressed. The Boers were "patriarchal" and had no intention of treating an African "as a human being" (24). Their policy of overtaxing Africans had driven them from the land and forced them to become a bare labour force in the white economy.

Later in the year he reviewed Louis Fischer's book Empire and India, and agreed with the author that only the common people of both nations (who benefitted least from the arrangement) would try and end it. He was wary of the argument that if India developed, it would automatically improve world (ie Western) trade. After all, there was a good chance that India would want

to manufacture her own products and, given the differential wages structure, was more likely to undercut Western markets than vice-versa. The smaller Far-Eastern countries have certainly fulfilled this expectation. He also doubted, for the first time in print, the size of the direct, assessable money profit that Britain drew from India. He claimed that it only benefitted "a few thousand persons", who controlled "government policy" and "the newspapers", and who wished to hide "the truth about India" (25). This modified, but didn't alter, his basic contention that Britain, as a whole, had benefited from exploiting India.

The question of how far Britain depended on her colonial exploitation nagged at Orwell. In Partisan Review, he condemned the Left for habitually ignoring the issue (26), and a little later, in Tribune, he expressed his doubts openly. He was genuinely puzzled that there could be an emphatic disagreement within the Left, in how far Britain benefitted economically, and he acknowledged the difference between 'benefiting' and 'depending'. In fact the confusion was widespread, and both Tories and Indian Nationalists disagreed amongst themselves about its scale. One can sympathise with Orwell when he pleads that this was not "an insoluble question", and the figures

to settle it "must exist" if one knew where to look for them. He then stated his own personal belief that Britain had "robbed" her colonies, and that we couldn't make restitution to them "without lowering our standard of living for several years". However painful the consequences might be, Orwell felt that the issue should not be avoided, even if it were decided on the level of freeing India or having extra sugar (27), it should be done in full knowledge of the facts. Orwell received a positive response in the following week's Tribune from an indignant colonial subject who listed Britain's economic gains, and expressed disillusionment in Britain's Socialists for their dilatory attitude (23).

In his introduction to the first volume of British Pamphleteers, in 1948, Orwell linked the rise of capitalism with the "horrors" of industrialisation: cultural destruction; degradation of European workers, and, above all, "the enslavement of the coloured races" (29). Ironically, the introduction to the second volume, in 1951, was written by A.J.P. Taylor and contained the nearest thing to an apology for Imperialism, predicting that India would "sink back" into "the anarchy and violence from which it was preserved by a century and a half of British rule" (30). An effective technique that Orwell employed was to slip in a reference to the different living standards between India

and England, in a non-political context. Thus in 'Books vs. Cigarettes', he pointed out that the average Englishman spent more on cigarettes "than an Indian peasant has for his whole livelihood" (31). However, in two later essays 'Towards European Unity' and 'Writers and Leviathan', he positively identified Britain's prosperity with her colonial plundering (32).

So his development of thought about Britain's economic exploitation moved from an initial overstatement, through periods of doubt about its scale and effect, and ended as a confident plank in his Socialist platform. He believed that people were constantly deluded about their motives, and this explained the divergence of interpretation about such matters - the belief came first, and was eagerly bolstered by the facts.

This leads us to the consideration of another point, the damage to the integrity of British Socialism caused by Imperialism. Orwell has been called 'The Conscience of the Left', and he certainly never withheld criticism because it offended some orthodoxy or solidarity. He was always a "guerrilla fighter" on the flanks of the regular Socialist army; he realised that Socialism's only hope of success lay in honest self-appraisal. Hence his astringent and sometimes bitter attacks against anything which betrayed this essential 'decency'. He wrote Nineteen Eighty Four to show up the "perversions"

to which centralised economies "are liable", but more importantly to satirise the "totalitarian ideas" which intellectuals (including those of the Left) had espoused. Incidentally, he located it in England to "emphasise" that the English are not "innately better than anyone else" (33). Similarly he wrote Animal Farm to destroy the "negative influence of the Soviet myth upon Western Socialist movements" (34). Russian historical development had been unlike Britain's, but everything known about that country was translated into British terms, with consequent misunderstandings. Orwell held that the belief in Russian 'Socialism', and imitation of its tactics had corrupted British Socialism terribly - hence the "destruction of the Soviet myth was essential" for its revival. Kostler believed that the Soviet Socialist myth held a religious significance for many people (35). Orwell realised that the Empire proved a similar stumbling block for Socialists, in that they couldn't approach it rationally and objectively, and hence had to resort to various forms of psychological dishonesty.

In The Road to Wigan Pier, he detected a "soggy, half-baked insincerity" among the intellectual Left's attitude to the Empire. They claimed to be anti-imperialist and were witty about "the white man's burden... 'Rule Britannia'... Kipling's novels and Anglo-Indian bores", but refused to face up to the question

of whether they wanted the Empire to disintegrate or hold together. Their "high standard of life" depended on keeping "a hundred million Indians...on the verge of starvation", yet they felt no moral responsibility for Imperialism. They accepted "the products of Empire", and saved their souls by "sneering" at the people who held it together (36). Orwell's anger is coloured here by having been on the receiving end of such sneers, but his real concern is that this hypocrisy vitiated the moral stance of Socialists, stagnating and alienating people from the cause.

He believed they had the same double standards over abolishing class distinctions, and this led them to fall back on squabbling and irrelevancies.

Fenner Brockway remembered Orwell's antipathy to this:

I wouldn't say that Orwell was a practical man in applying his socialist convictions and (he) would be absolutely fed up with business meetings which would be dealing with all kinds of details of organisation and administration. I was chairman of the I.L.P. that year, and God - the silly little amendments we had from Trotskyists and Communists, and I can't tell you how Orwell was fed up to the teeth with all th

(37)

Orwell mercilessly caricatured the stereotypical socialist as "the intellectual tract-writing type...with his pullover, his fuzzy hair and his Marxian quotation" (38). He included a parody of another socialist 'hanger-on' in

Coming up for Air (39). Rayner Heppenstall provided unintentional corroboration of Orwell's points when he described a Socialist weekend retreat in terms little different from Orwell's satire (40).

Working class Socialists tended not to suppress unpalatable truths, because they remained largely ignorant of them. Another distraction from the fundamentals of Socialism, that Orwell detected, was the concentration on an unappetising, materialist future. Because "political speech and writing" was "largely the defence of the indefensible" (41), the true cause of Socialism was obscured "like a diamond hidden under a mountain of dung". "Doctrinaire priggishness, party squabbles and half-baked progressivism" had become the refuge of insincerity and unless that "smell" were removed, all would be lost (42). So strongly did Orwell feel about this, that he left the Independent Labour Party early in the war, and Fenner Brockway explained Orwell's disillusionment to me:

...in a sense the I.L.P. was a different organisation then (when Orwell joined), it much reflected George Orwell's own personality. Its Socialism was idealistic and ethical. The I.L.P. which George Orwell left was an I.L.P. which had lost a good deal of its idealism and its ethical attitude, had become materialistic, had become broken in the conflict between Trotskyist and Communist, neither of whom had the spirit of the I.L.P. when Orwell joined. And, therefore, in a sense,

It was the I.L.P. which changed more than Orwell. (43)

The evasive, hypocritical attitude that everyone, but particularly Socialists, had to the Empire was responsible for moral deterioration, and all its consequences. He reviewed Union Now, in which the author had suggested a bloc of 'the democracies' to face the Axis, but completely ignored the dependencies (colonies) of the 'democracies'. The colonies were to be unrepresented in the union, which provoked Orwell to write that the "unspoken clause is always 'Not Counting Niggers'" (44). He was not optimistic that the Labour Party would improve things, because their leaders "when it comes to the pinch, are merely His Majesty's opposition", and incapable of releasing the untapped decency of the English people (45), which might change things. Orwell's populist faith led him to aim much of his subsequent writing about India etc. at a mass, rather than an intellectual, audience.

The integrity of Socialism was important in 1936, but Orwell felt it was vital in 1940, and in The Lion and the Unicorn he equated the creation of a Socialist Britain with winning the war. Hence he turned on the Socialists' dilemma over Empire even more fiercely. He accused the English of hypocrisy in Imperialism, the working class variant being ignorance, and the ruling class response being a decay into stupidity and inability to rule. The latter

were less beneficial to society than "fleas to a dog" and their contrived incompetence was designed to cover this (46). The intellectuals were frustrated by the bureaucratisation of the Empire and the domestic class stranglehold, and went over to a cosmetic Left-wing stance, a product of security without responsibility. They carped unpatriotically and worked their way into key positions within the Socialist movement. This was suicidal with "Hitler at the gate", for Socialism could not be established without defeating Hitler; Hitler could not be defeated while Britain remained capitalist, and yet the Socialist leadership were hopelessly compromised by capitalism.

Orwell realised it was important to understand why Socialism had failed in Britain. The Labour Party was the only serious representative of British Socialism, but being a party of the trades-unions, committed to the material improvement of its membership, "it was directly interested in the prosperity of British capitalism", particularly "the British Empire". The living standard of its members "depended indirectly on the sweating of Indian coolies", yet its policy was anti-imperialist and it was pledged "to make restitution to the coloured races" (47). It had failed to implement a positive imperial policy ("transforming the Empire into a federation of Socialist States

because there were serious doubts whether it "could make itself obeyed"; it had no sympathisers in the colonial or civil services or the armed forces, and hence risked revolt. Accordingly it degenerated into a permanent opposition, with policies "a variant of conservatism", and a "game of make-believe". In 1940, however, "being a Socialist no longer means kicking against a system which in practice you are fairly well satisfied with", it meant seriously examining the cost, and implementing Socialism, in order to defeat Hitler.

He felt there should be an initiative on the Empire, restructuring it on Socialist lines, to show the colonies, and Socialists themselves, that they meant business. India should be offered ~~cession~~, to mend her injured pride, but hopefully she would join with Britain in an equal alliance, and be offered technical and economic help; this should be extended to all of Britain's imperial possessions. Even if the suggestions were not fully implemented, "something like it should" be official policy; "It is always the direction that counts" (48). This would not disintegrate the Empire, but free it from "the money lender, the dividend drawer and the wooden-headed British official".

He was continually exercised by the fact that "we all live by robbing Asiatic coolies", while maintaining that those coolies "ought to be set free", in short, a humanitarian was "always a hypocrite" (49). In 'Looking Back on the

Spanish War', he called Britain "equivocal", with her "democratic phrases and coolie empire" (50). The differential living standard of East and West was one of the great unmentionable facts of life for Socialists. Orwell talked about the international and domestic ramifications of this in Tribune (51). In order to turn people from capitalism, Socialists had stressed the oppression of the working class, ignoring the fact that compared with Indians, they were "next door" to "millionaires"; hence nothing was said and total lack of solidarity between white and coloured workers ensued; the coloured role being a "bottomless reserve of "scab labour". To Asian eyes, the European class struggle was "a sham", and Socialism was everywhere "sidetracked by Nationalism and race hatred"; it is interesting to see Orwell using the Marxist analysis of race-hatred for once, in this context.

However, when he wrote about colonialism in Morocco, he noted that race-hatred and servility did not accompany French exploitation. He believed Morocco could be freed at the expense of "a few wealthy men" and the example would rock Franco's colony "next door", but, when "one looks at the faces of the people who rule us, one remembers rather sadly that the age of miracles is over" (52). Two and a half years later, in The Observer, he noted that

France's pride, injured by the events of 1940, had given rise to a crude nationalism which enabled the French Left to ignore their empire.

He returned to the theme of British Socialists' imperial blindspot with a kind of urgent weariness in the Autumn number of Partisan Review in 1945. He claimed that "the weakness" of the Left was their "inability to tell the truth about the immediate future". To continue colonial exploitation was "incompatible with the spirit of Socialism", yet ending it would entail "a difficult reconstruction period" when Britain's living standards would fall "catastrophically". Only a minority, who had travelled, would even face the issue; the stock attitude being that "we should lose nothing by liberating... the colonies". This elision of fact didn't satisfy the "coloured peoples", who were inclined to overstate Britain's dependence on exploitation. Hence the "soft-peddalling" of the Beveridge Report, which would have caused resentment in India (53). One can sense a growing disgust in Orwell that political survival had to rely on the expedients of lying and suppression. This was one of the major ingredients of totalitarianism which he developed in his last two books. Orwell often tested Labour reaction to Indian independence by asking questions at Party meetings. He always got a "perfunctory" clichée of sympathy, but "then the subject dropped", and he never heard it raised "spontaneously" by anyone else (54).

In Tribune, in 1946, he put forward some of the problems he felt Socialists ought to be facing "in the short run" after colonial liberation. He instanced hostility, chaos, the "frightful poverty" which would compel Britain to give them help, and the choice between "liberating India and having extra sugar". These questions had to be dealt with, for uncertainty tended to "perpetuate imperialism" (55). He believed the choice would ultimately have to be made by the man in the street and "the woman in the fish queue", reinforcing his view that public opinion counted and could sway events in a real way (56).

In 'Towards European Unity', he stressed the principles of Socialism (liberty, equality and internationalism), and believed that the "only worthwhile political objective today" was to establish a Socialist United States of Europe, without "colonial dependencies". In order to "build true Socialism at home", the Europeans "must stop being exploiters abroad"; but to be self-sufficient, they needed Africa and the Middle East. This meant that the position of the indigenous people "must be changed out of recognition" to a "complete equality" with Europeans. This would entail a "vast change of outlook and would probably be resisted by the British working class (57), if they thought only in terms of materialism. Orwell was becoming more and more concerned

with the moral effect of this continued self-deception, and the key word in his analysis here, as in so many other places, is "true" Socialism. An inconsistency of this magnitude merely led to moral and intellectual decay in the practitioners,

In 'Writers and Leviathan', Orwell talked about the impossibility of ignoring political issues in literature, and of the consequent trap of "yielding oneself over to orthodoxies and 'party lines'", with the "timidity and dishonesty that that implies". For fear of offending the fashion, people dishonestly gave themselves over to catch-phrases; hence everyone was "anti-Fascist, anti-imperialist, contemptuous of class distinctions, impervious to colour prejudice" etc (58). Like the obnoxious Hermione in Keep the Aspidochelone Flying, who declared that "we're all Socialists nowadays. But I don't see why you have to give all your money away and make friends with the lower classes (59)

The trap of such sloppy thinking was that inadmissible "falsities" "make it impossible for certain questions to be seriously discussed"; because Left orthodoxy had been framed by people with no hope of attaining power, it omitted large areas of life: "kings, governments, laws...armies, flags, patriotism, religion...the whole existing scheme of things". Philosophically, it inherited certain questionable beliefs, such as "the truth will prevail", "man is naturally good" etc, which led to unadmitted contradictions in the real world.

The attitude to Russia demonstrated this schizophrenia; words like democracy held two "irreconcilable meanings", and concentration camps "right and wrong simultaneously"; Fascism had triumphed against all Socialist predictions.

Now that the Left was in power, it was "obliged to take responsibility and make genuine decisions", which involved fighting against its own "past propaganda", in particular the avoidance of the economic consequences of ending imperialism. Workers were won over to Socialism "by being told that they were exploited", but in world terms, "they were exploiters" (60). What really worried Orwell now was not so much the fact of exploitation, but "that this question, among people...faithful to Left ideology, cannot be genuinely discussed. The question was then pushed, "unanswered" into a "corner of one's mind", while one repeated "contradictory catch-words" (61). The spectre of doublethink is raised. Orwell referred to this schizophrenia in his last writings, extracts from a manuscript notebook, where he talked of British highmindedness "about American treatment of Negroes", but ignoring our own oppression in territories "separated from us by water"; "on this last fact the essential hypocrisy of the British Labour movement is based" (62).

It was impossible to discuss the differences in living standards between white and coloured workers, and Orwell believed that white workers "have absolutely no feeling of solidarity" with coloured ones (63). This could

turn the latter into "Fascists". He repeated that lack of international solidarity was caused by racism/imperialism in 'Looking Back on the Spanish War'. Everywhere working class movements had been crushed by "open, illegal violence" while their overseas comrades had looked on and done "nothing"; underneath this, "secret cause of many betrayals", was the fact that there was not even "lip-service to solidarity" "between white and coloured workers" (64). In other words, the European workers had paid the price for ignoring their coloured comrades, by becoming too compromised even to help each other, Orwell was ignoring the nationalistic ingredient, which he later acknowledged to be a vital factor (65). He saw alarming manifestations of this cynical self-interest elsewhere, such as when the Germans flooded the Italians with faked Socialist leaflets before their attack on Caporetto. They claimed that the men were ready to shoot their officers, and invited the Italians to fraternise. Many Italians were fooled, taken prisoner and "jeered at for their simple-mindedness". Orwell thought this one of the "most shocking deeds of the war", and a "trick" that damaged "the very roots of human solidarity" in a way that no violence could (66). As with imperialism, self-interest and expediency had shaped morality.

Orwell's worries about the psychological effects of imperialism

gradually crystallised into the phenomenon of doublethink. The universal, tacit agreement not to mention unpalatable facts led eventually to the mass solipsism (insanity?) of Oceania. From his childhood, Orwell had been aware of unresolvable contradictions. At school he was supposed to love his benefactors, but subjectively he hated them, consequently the "consciousness of sin" was never far from him (67), and he knew he lived among "absolute" laws, which were impossible to keep. Similarly, the ideals of the school cancelled each other out, and seemed "unattainable" (68). Later, he noted that the intelligentsia who called for war in 1939, had no thought that it would affect them personally; "softness and security" had undermined their grip on the reality of life (69). Another way of withholding reality was to misuse words and concepts deliberately, as Orwell had encountered in Spain with the word 'Trotskyist'. The word had three meanings: someone who wished for world revolution; a member of Trotsky's actual movement; a disguised Fascist whose purpose was to split Left-wing forces. The word's "peculiar power" derived from the interchangeability of the three referents, whereby a believer in world revolution could be called a Fascist, and, in Spain, given an indefinite jail sentence (70).

Even Pacifists indulged in a similar subterfuge when, by a process

of selection and exaggeration, they pretended that "Nazism and Capitalist democracy" were identical. Orwell believed that this was traceable to an unwillingness to "learn where their incomes come from", and to admit that violence was "integral to modern society", and was "simply a highbrow variant of British hypocrisy" (71). People's attitude to atrocities were also conditioned by their "political predilection"; the Right and the Left never believed in the same atrocity stories simultaneously, and "stranger yet" things could "suddenly reverse...merely because the political landscape has changed". Sadly, "The truth...becomes untruth when your enemy utters it" (72), and totalitarianism in particular, "attacks the concept of objective truth" (73). Antisemitism was associated with doublethink, with facts "so unbearable" that they are "habitually pushed aside and not allowed to enter into logical processes", or they may "enter into every calculation and yet never be admitted as fact, even in one's own mind" (74). The rewriting of history was not always "plain forgery"; people believed "with part of their minds that they are actually thrusting facts into the past". Instead of "merely lying", they feel their version was "what happened in the sight of God", and hence are justified in rearranging the facts" (75).

He summarised the various symptoms of doublethink as "schizophrenia"

in 'In Front of your Nose', in March 1946. It was "especially in political thinking" that incompatible beliefs and the ignoring of facts flourished. It was possible to carry this on "intellectually" indefinitely until reality intervened, and it was less restrained in totalitarian countries than elsewhere. With characteristic honesty, Orwell included himself as a sufferer of such delusions. One only held right opinions "when either wish or fear coincides with reality", but this knowledge permitted one to insulate judgement from emotion. In domestic matters "two and two invariably make four" (Winston Smith's touchstone of reality), whereas politics is a "subatomic or non-Euclidean world" where illogicality reigns - "all finally traceable to a secret belief that political opinions, unlike the weekly budget, will not have to be tested against solid reality". (76)

In Nineteen Eighty Four, doublethink lies at the "very heart" of Oceanic philosophy. The "power of holding two contradictory beliefs... simultaneously" has to be conscious to afford "sufficient precision", yet unconscious to avoid a feeling of "falsity and...guilt":

...To tell deliberate lies while genuinely believing in them, to forget any fact that has become inconvenient, and then, when it becomes necessary again, to draw it back from oblivion for just so long as it is needed, to deny the existence of objective reality and all the while to

take account of the reality which one denies - all this is indispensably necessary.

Even the use of the word doublethink involves the concept, with "the lie always one leap ahead of the truth". It is this technique which gives the Party control and infinite potential "to arrest the course of history" (77). Orwell's training is apparent in his outline of doublethink; guilt does accompany deception, yet deception can be justified if it is felt to be working in the interests of a higher cause. He couldn't resist a jibe at the intellectuals in his summary of doublethink: "in general, the greater the understanding, the greater the delusion: the more intelligent, the less sane", and their enthusiastic attitude to war was a function of their distance from it. The leaders were the least responsible members of society, and they maintained their control because the "prevailing mental condition" was "controlled insanity", manipulated in their own interests.

Doublethink underpinned hierarchic exploitation, and Orwell's satirisation developed from his initial concern over systematic hypocrisy, such as that practised by the Labour Party over the Empire. If a party of social progress and supposed integrity succumbed, what hope did the world at large have of avoiding the catastrophe which such a habit entailed? He

believed that the intelligentsia was infected with doublethink; in particular the doctrinaire and orthodox. But, in any event, where self-interest led to a blunting of truth, similar factors were involved. At the moment, he believed, the ordinary person was relatively free of this sophistry, but with the example from society's leaders, he feared it would not be long before they followed, and society headed into the spiral of degeneracy that he so feared.

So his experience of colonialism enabled him to form definite conclusions about the economic nature of its exploitation, and the resultant gulf in living standards between East and West; exploiters and exploited. The hypocritical attitude of British socialists struck him initially as perverse, but eventually as an alarming symptom of the human capacity for self-deception and 'unconscious' exploitation. The Empire, in other words, provided him with much of the fundamental material out of which he was to evolve his indictments of socio-political oppression, particularly that manifested in the totalitarian states.

CHAPTER 6: THE IMPACT ON ORWELL: THE LINKING OF RACE AND CLASS.

Orwell's linking of race and class attitudes is a vital stage in his political and social awareness, it marks a cohering vision of the world, and a determined progress towards a comprehensive appraisal of how man oppresses man, and opposition to this oppression. We will look briefly at the social attitudes he was taught in childhood, reminding ourselves of the racial ones, before seeing how Burma provided the key which unlocked these various experiences and gave him an understanding of the racial/class stratifications of society, which in turn had significance for his progress in Socialism.

Orwell belonged to a class struggling economically to distance itself from inferior encroachment; this class illustrated irrational 'group' behaviour in that the closer it moved to the inferior group, the harder it tried to distinguish itself by social symbols. Orwell reviewed Ernest Branah's The Secret of the League in 1940, and was intrigued by that gentle author's delight in recounting the crushing of the proletariat. He perceived it as "the reaction of a struggling class", menaced not so much economically, but "in its code of conduct and way of life" (1). In Down and Out in Paris and London, Orwell had analysed the pointless subjugation and waste of a plongeur's life, and concluded that it was owing to "superstitious fear" of

"the mob", based on the "idea that there was some fundamental, mysterious difference between rich and poor, as though they were two different races, like Negroes and white men" (2); an interesting comparison, which he left undeveloped. The fear was based on ignorance and, as there was no innate distinction between rich and poor, the mob was already loose "in the shape of rich men", suppressing the poor. Ignorance allowed the rich to view the poor as "sub-men" - as it allowed some colonials to see the 'natives' as "Damn black swine who've been slaves since the beginning of history". This was the same psychological device that Fascism used when it described Negroes as "semi-apes" (3); it dehumanised the subject and permitted a degree of contempt and exploitation that would otherwise have been unthinkable.

Orwell believed that his own class, "the shock absorbers of the bourgeoisie", were the real source of myth and stereotyping of the working class, and that the "sniggering superiority" of the upper-class derived from them. He said they were,

...in much the same position as a family of 'poor whites' living in a street where everyone else is a Negro. In such circumstances you have got to cling to your gentility because it is the only thing you have; and meanwhile you are hated for your stuck-upness and for the accent and manners which stamp you as one of the boss class. (4)

As we saw in the chapter on Burma, the Europeans had distanced themselves;

in the same way from the 'natives', by clinging to the symbols of superiority. In other words, racial and social distancing were similar in their expression and purpose. In The Psychology of Race Prejudice, W.I. Thomas wrote that inter-group antipathy is "reinforced" by "the contempt of the higher caste for the lower", and thus it is "psychologically important to the higher caste to maintain the feeling and show of superiority". Such signs (including racial characteristics) being "aids to the manipulation of one class by another" (5).

Orwell's belief that the threatened "lower-upper-middle" class were the most sensitive and prejudiced section of society has received support from many sources. It has been diagnosed as a reason for that class's role in the rise of Fascism; a study by Bettelheim and Janowitz in America showed that the lowest section of the middle class were more intolerant towards inferiors than the classes above or below them (6); and Arthur Koestler wrote that they were the "only truly class-conscious social stratum" with a "half-caste's obsessional yearning for respectability (7).

One symbol of social superiority that Orwell soon learned about was accent; and it is worth looking at his comments on the significance of accent in some detail. At an early age he was trained to be revolted by working class

accents (8), and the snobbishness of his prep-school included being "swift to detect small differences" in accent, manners etc (9). Orwell's family were anxious that he acquired the right accent for, as Orwell said in The Lion and the Unicorn, "in 1910 every human being in these islands could be 'placed' in an instant by his clothes, manners and accent" (10). Four years later, in 'The English People', he made the same observation, but stressed that "the most striking difference of all is in language and accent, as Mr. Wyndham Lewis has put it, the English working class are 'branded on the tongue'" (11). He repeated the contention, previously stated in The Road to Wigan Pier, that economically allied classes established their differences by "accent, manners and to some extent, outlook". This was because snobbishness is "never quite separable from idealism", and reverence for the upperclasses is reflected in an "almost general uneasiness about the cockney accent" (12). The associative chain is growing sophisticated: accents symbolise class, and class symbolises a different philosophy of life.

Orwell was conscientious and consistent in observing how social position determined (or was associated with) accent. In the diary for The Road to Wigan Pier, he instanced a man who had climbed from manual to clerical work and had been "bourgeoisified" in clothes and accent; however, in the

atmosphere of a working man's club, his accent became "much broader" (13). He was obsessed with any discrepancy between accent and actual status (14) throughout the diary. In Burmese Days, Mrs. Lackersteen prepared herself to meet a young aristocrat, and began "putting on an accent like a temporarily promoted chorus-girl playing the part of a duchess in a musical comedy"; her accent grew "more aristocratic with every word she uttered" (15). One of Orwell's most sympathetic characters, George Bowling, "cured" himself of dropped aitches and "a cockney accent" (16). When he returned to Lower Binfield, he recognised an old girl-friend, but was shocked at "how bad her accent had got!" She never "used to drop her aitches", but had obviously gone to pieces with marriage (17).

Orwell remarked that Dickens, although genuinely on the side of the "poor against the rich", could not help but regard "a working class exterior as a stigma". Class differences were so pronounced that the 'gentleman' and the 'common man' "must have seemed like a different species of animal" (18). The affinities of this with racism are obvious and, indeed, Orwell used the phrase to point out the dangers of stereotyping in antisemitism (19). Dickens used accent to give a hierarchic aspect to his novels, in that his heroes never had a 'common' or 'regional' accent. This led to the absurdity of Little

Pip, for instance, who spoke "upper-class English" despite being raised by people speaking "broad Essex" (20). In Orwell's childhood, he claimed that people mixed up social position with moral virtue (21), and some of the epithets he used to describe accents seem to be influenced by this: some are "base" (22), "bad" (23) and "good" (24).

Orwell was very conscious of his own accent, and this gave him some anxious moments in his early tramping days. He couldn't disguise his accent and, with "frightful class-consciousness", assumed he would be "spotted as a gentleman" the moment he opened his mouth (25). He did try and cover his accent though, but dropped the pose in the face of a friendly picnicker, who "looked closely" at him in sympathy and said "how painful" it must be for a man of his stamp etc (26). He also discovered that fellow down-and-outs were especially sympathetic to someone fallen from the higher classes, as they knew him to be from his accent (27). This illustrates the totemic significance of accents, and how identification can break social barriers, when the symbolism is no longer relevant.

Sometimes accents didn't matter, for example in the North, or in the tramp world, where BBC English was regarded as just another dialect (28). In a cheap lodging-house Orwell was addressed by an Indian with "tun", "a thing

to make one shudder" in India, but here, they had "got below the range of colour prejudice" (29). In other words, when there is no social 'system' to prop up there is no use for the props. Unfortunately there was a hierarchy in Britain, partially at any rate supported by such symbols. One of the themes of The Road to Wigan Pier is the impasse of class differences, and accent as a symbol of this. More immediately he noted that news bulletins and political speeches were ignored because they were delivered in an "upper class accent" (30), and this was "deadly" to anyone aiming at a large audience, for it aroused an "immediate class antagonism" (31). Churchill's "twang", although upper class, sounded cockney and ensured his success, whereas Sir Richard Acland's "typical upper-class accent" ensured his failure (32).

Sometimes accent signalled a 'racial', as well as a class, distinction. Scottish nationalism, for instance, conducted a "tirade" of "class hatred" against the BBC accent (33), and the Scots felt "pushed into an inferior position" by an "Anglicised upper class" who spoke with a different accent, or even language. Orwell believed this was the most "dangerous kind of class division" in Britain (34), because race and class were combined. Orwell had half-anticipated the similarity of racial/social totems in The Road to Wigan Pier, when he called "class stigmata" "comparable to a race difference" (35),

and advised against giving undue weight to either as this distracted attention from the more serious matters of exploitation. This was particularly true of his own "shabby-genteel" class, where talk of class war scared them, so "they forget their incomes and remember their accents", and defend "the class that is exploiting them" (36). Here accent, as a symbol of social status, actively works against a class's material interests.

Orwell disliked the upper-class's accent, and noted that their lifeless conversation was "instinctively" parodied "from novelist to novelist", and that every "duke or baronet" was shown as an "ineffectual ass" (37). His own portrayal of Sir Thomas Hare in A Clergyman's Daughter is an object lesson in such parody (38). In his manuscript notebook, he referred to the "over-fedness, fatuous self-confidence...constant bah-bahing...about nothing...a sort of heaviness and richness combined with a fundamental ill-will" that upper-class accents conveyed to him (39). Finally, in 'The English People', he talked about how accent could be neutralised of "class labels" by teaching a "national accent" which should be given to "all children alike", so that it would be "impossible...to determine anyone's status from his accent" (40).

The British class system resembled a racial hierarchy, such as the Empire, where the different levels wore their distinguishing characteristics

as badges. The position of the "shabby-gentle" class was analogous to the Eurasians, who clung fiercely to the fetishes of superiority to disguise their precariousness. Symptomatically, around the turn of the century, the term 'race' was used loosely to describe classes or other groups. According to E.J. B. Rose, some physical anthropologists "actually thought that the working class were a separate race" (41). Orwell reflected this when he confessed that, at an early age, "the working class" ceased to be a ~~race~~ race of friendly and wonderful beings and became a race of enemies". They hated Orwell's class out of "pure, vicious malignity", and seemed "sub-human", with "coarse faces, hideous accents and gross manners" (42).

There is a close parallel in the way Orwell portrays both Burmese and working class antagonism to himself, as a middle class Englishman. The working class would "insult you in brutal ways", just for "looking like a member of the upper classes"; it was impossible for a well-dressed person to walk in a slum "without being hooted at". Whole areas were unsafe because of "hooligans" (43). In Burma Orwell was fouled on the sports' field, sneered at and had "insults hooted" after him. Thousands of aggressive youngsters stood on street corners and "jeered" at him (44). The bourgeois victim is visibly distinctive, by dress or race, and part of his myth about both groups is that they are surly and ungrateful. It was Orwell's perception of this contrived

ignorance in one field that accelerated his disenchantment with middle class opinion and outlook generally. M. Edwardes noted that the ordinary people of India and Britain were "engaged in a struggle against the same privileged class, the British who ruled in Britain...and in India" (45). He also noted that capitalists refused to invest in Britain as this would have entailed social, perhaps political, reform, "and the working class were just another native race to be exploited and denied a voice in their own destiny". This confirms Orwell's belief that capitalism and imperialism only benefitted a small elite.

It is interesting to note the hint of paranoia in Orwell's description of 'natives' and working class, a necessary buffer to intimacy, as were other stereotypes about them. Working class physical characteristics were felt to be as permanent as racial ones. In 'Boys' Weeklies', Orwell commented that foreigners and the working class were only ever stereotypically portrayed in children's literature (46), and he felt the same thing about Punch. It was symptomatic of the similar social role both groups played.

The most damning myth Orwell learnt about the working class was their "snell". In childhood, he was taught that there was something "subtly repulsive about a working class body"; not only navvies and tramps, but "even 'lower-class people' whom you knew to be quite clean...were faintly unappetising.

The smell of their sweat, the very texture of their skins were mysteriously different from yours" (47)..Eight years later in Tribune, Orwell explained that the theory was that "the working classes are...smelly by nature". Their smell was "nasty" and different from "ourselves". "We were taught just the same about Jews, Negroes and various other categories of human beings" (48). This is racism, but it is clearly the same as social training, and reflects the pattern that Pöliakov noted with regard to Aryanism. The "true Aryan" is a bourgeois, male Westerner, "who could be defined equally by reference to coloured men, proletarians or women" (49).

Orwell's proverbially keen sense of smell would have reverberated this doctrine, and Park, in his book, Race and Culture, claimed that many "racial antipathies" are acquired "through the nose". Some writers believed that "the sense of smell is in some subtle way, a guide to moral differences", and Park thought that it was the "sensuous basis for racial antipathy" (50). Such antipathies seem to inhibit intimate and ultimately sexual contacts, "They are a bar to miscegenation" (51). This would have appealed to Orwell's Swiftian side as much as it would have offended his liberal one.

In order to emphasise the class gulf in Britain, Orwell underplayed such divisions in Asia, saying that "among all Asiatics for all I know, there is

a sort of natural equality, an easy intimacy between man and man" (52). This from someone who knew Indians and their caste system! He stressed the "inherent" (racial) characteristic of working class smell (53), and the "idealistic" (emotional) reaction of the bourgeoisie to it (54). All of Orwell's class training was designed to repel him from the working class and to picture them as a repulsive threat. Supposed physical characteristics were vested with moral overtones. Orwell eventually saw through this, noting that stature, longevity, gait and even physical proportions were a result of diet, work and environment (55). Psychological considerations were important too, as premature aging, or staying young, were "largely a matter of wanting to do so" (56).

Orwell's class training, then, reflects the categorical mood of late Victorian thought. The stability of his childhood era undoubtedly owed much to hierarchic stratifications and pigeonholing. The cement which kept the structure intact was the myths and beliefs about the various groups which ensured their self-containment, yet guaranteed a 'place' within it. His race training was basically the acceptance of the Edwardian anthropological world-view: bourgeois Briton, followed by white foreigner, brown Asian and black African. We have discussed the myths of Empire, and he was imbued with them from an early age. His time in Burma, I believe, gave him the empirical key which allowed him to

unlock the doors of myth and exploitation, initially of the 'natives' of Empire, but also, by direct inference, of the 'common' people of Britain. His training about the two groups had been so similar, that when one of them was truly seen through, then the other could not be far behind.

Orwell had always been a lonely figure (at least in his own estimation) and his peculiar background of victim and "bourgeois buffer" gave him an unusual insight into the lot of the underdog and the oppressed. The isolation and unacceptability of his colonial role, as we have seen, precipitated a crisis which determined him to leave the job. This very 'marginal' quality of Orwell's life, however, meant that he was, in practice, less attached to the 'group' and its demands, than normal. Of course his desire for attachment was strong, but the compromises involved usually ensured his abstinence. He was like a suspicious passenger on a bus, clinging to the rail and always ready to jump off should the vehicle make a wrong turn. It was such an outlook, an ability to face unpleasant facts (too strong for the true believer) which enabled him to see through the myths of the "lower-upper-middle class" and Anglo-India.

The conditions of brutality of Orwell's job in Burma awakened compassion and discontent in him (57). He saw that he was part of a system

which horribly oppressed, in contrast to the myth he had been taught, whereby everybody was supposed to be threatening the middle classes/British. In Burma, this was compounded by the hypocrisy of pretending to help those one was exploiting. This realisation shattered the moral justification for his work and undermined the whole of his social/racial training. The high-minded phrases of colonial apologists must have disgusted Orwell as he supervised the bullinga, floggings etc and grew aware of the universal, inchoate resentment that swelled around him. It was ironic that the over-sensitive Orwell was situated where unintelligence and unresponsiveness were called for (58), but it woke him from his youthful cocoon into an awareness of reality. It is interesting that nowhere does he comment on two important labour disputes (one of dock-workers/coolies and the other of Irrawaddy Flotilla Company crews, in May 1924), that happened while he was in Burma, and which resulted in terrible hardships for the participants.

Orwell believed that oppression in a foreign country was less acceptable than at home (59), and he gave a lengthy statement about his psychological state soon after returning from Burma. He had evolved the simple theory that "the oppressed are always right and the oppressors are always wrong". Because of his bad conscience, he not only wanted to escape imperialism

but, "every form of man's dominion over man". He wanted to submerge himself and avoid any "suspicion of self-advancement". His thoughts turned to the English working-class, because:

...they supplied an analogy. They were the symbolic victims of injustice, playing the same part in England as the Burmese played in Burma. In Burma the issue had been quite simple. The whites were up and the blacks were down, and therefore as a matter of course one's sympathy was with the blacks. I now realised that there was no need to go as far as Burma to find tyranny and exploitation. (60)

In other words,, he approached social (domestic) oppression through racial (colonial) subjugation. It is interesting that he saw "failure" as a means of identifying with the "victims", for it also allowed him to sublimate the fear of his schooldays and 'touch bottom' in a double catharsis. He was indulging a delayed plunge he had long promised himself (61), and also revealing a sado-masochistic complex, which a friend believed "characterised" his "emotional life" (62). Certainly much of his early tramping/dishwashing experiences only make sense with this in mind; for example, the horrors of school food and baths (63) were almost exactly repeated in the 'spikes' (64). Orwell claimed that at school he had only rebelled "emotionally" and not "intellectually" (65) and his experience here echoes this priority. He had to be thoroughly dissatisfied emotionally with imperialism, before he began to look around

intellectually for something to put in its place (ie Socialism).

Orwell was not the only middle-class person to return from the colonies and experience the revelation of social inequality, transferring his overseas experience to home. Laurence Brander explained to me that:

...he knew pretty well nothing about his own country when he left it for five years. When at last he did see it, it must have been a bit of a shock. It was to me, for I left at 23 and when at last I came home permanently in '39 I was shocked to find that all the faults I had seen in Indian society were very present in my own. None of us should have been sent to India before we were 30. (66)

The puncturing of the Anglo-Indian credo, put Orwell into an empirical frame of mind where he determined to find out the 'facts' for himself. Down and Out in Paris and London is relatively objective social journalism, in which the 'facts' are intended to speak without too much help from the author. Burmese Days is, as we discussed, the emotional autobiography of the disillusionment, loneliness and unsuitability of Orwell's time in Burma (and one which he referred to with some enthusiasm). A Clergyman's Daughter explores loss of faith, and fits in well with Orwell's personal development on this score. However, he had an understandably low opinion of it, calling it "bollox" in a letter to Henry Miller (67), and saying that he had only written it for because he was "desperate for money" (68). He was similarly dismissive of

Keep the Aspidistra Flying, and indeed both books are *principally*

compendia of individually interesting experiences that he had had, held together by a tenuous story line, *although useful developmental landmarks.*

The Orwellian protagonists, Dorothy and Gordon, are authentic rebels, but their efforts and the resolutions of their rebelliousness are clearly unsatisfactory - to readers and author alike. They are reinstated by the 'change of heart technique', something which Orwell criticised Dickens for using, and their lifestyles alter hardly at all. Their 'unreality' can be gauged against Orwell, whose life changed structurally as new realisations influenced him: Burma, Paris, Wigan and Spain.

The work he did for his next book, The Road to Wigan Pier, opened his eyes in detail to the terrible condition of the working class, and the book's fiery anger seemed to refine his outlook on socio-political matters, and gave him the cue to set out his own road to Socialism. Fenner Brockway agreed that it was Orwell's Burmese experiences that triggered off his quest for 'realities at home, and led him to look for social justice in an emotionally and intellectually satisfying form (69). Indeed some of his observations in the book are directly related to Burma. When he inspected caravan sites in Wigan, which housed the poorest of the poor, he claimed never to have "seen comparable

squalor except in the Far East". He was "reminded of the filthy kennels" in which "Indian coolies" lived in Burma (70). He rejected economising the Public Assistance handouts given to the unemployed, because they might eventually find themselves at the level of "an Indian or Japanese coolie", living on "rice and onions" (71).

As his understanding of and sympathy for Socialism increased, he correlated the patterns of race and class oppression. Sometimes he did this explicitly, for example when he talked of the British in Burma all being "officially" regarded as "of the same class" (which in domestic British terms they were not), "in contradistinction to the other and inferior class, the 'natives'" (72). In 'Democracy in the British Army', he talked of the role of racism in maintaining the Empire. The British soldier developed a swaggering arrogance, directed towards the 'natives', and such an attitude was "absolutely necessary", because it was impossible to "hold down a subject Empire with troops infected by notions of class solidarity" (73). In a letter to Partisan Review he listed the two things which caused him most anguish about British society, as "class distinctions and imperialist exploitation" (74).

More often he related the two less directly, with insights into the similar structure and psychology of capitalism and imperialism. We saw how

the British treated the colonial 'natives' as inferior clay, avoiding all intimacy and recognition of their humanity. One symptom of this attitude was the tendency to overlook the 'natives' altogether, and behave as if they were invisible. In Burmese Days, Orwell described some sweepers with "stick-like limbs", "draped in earth-coloured rags" as "a procession of skeletons walking" (75). They are camouflaged and dehumanised, as are other "earth-coloured" Indians throughout the book (76). In the essay 'Marrakech', written in 1939, he found Moroccan life so primitive, that it was "always difficult to believe that you are walking among human beings", and "all colonial empires" were "founded upon this fact":

The people have brown faces - besides, there are so many of them! Are they really the same flesh as yourself? Do they even have names? Or are they merely a kind of undifferentiated brown stuff, about as individual as bees or coral insects? They rise out of the earth, they sweat and starve for a few years, and then they sink back into the nameless mounds of the graveyard and nobody notices that they are gone. (77)

This was the emotional safeguard which permitted exploitation to thrive. Orwell developed the idea by saying that all manual workers are "partly invisible", and the more important the work, the less visible. White skins were still "fairly conspicuous" compared with the tropical peasant "the same colour as the earth", whom the eye always misses. Because people went to

exotic places to satisfy their urge for travel and romantic illusions, the 'natives' would have spoiled the illusion. Orwell believed this was a superficial difference between the exploited colonial and capitalist victim; poverty is not noticed where there are brown skins, but no-one "would think of running cheap trips to the Distressed Areas" (78). However, one of the worst victims of capitalism was virtually invisible, the "grimy caryatid upon whose shoulders nearly everything that is not grimy is supported" - the miner.

Orwell described the conditions down the mine as "hell" (77), and said that the work would have killed him within weeks. He was impressed with the "different universes different people inhabit"; people would probably "prefer not to hear" about how the coal miner worked (80), and one could "drive a car right across the North of England and never once remember that hundreds of feet below the road you are on miners are hacking away at the coal" (81). It was a positive effort to link "coal" with this "far-off labour". To Orwell, the miner stood as "the type of the manual worker", because his work was both awful and necessary, and "remote from our experience", "invisible and as forgettable as "the blood in our veins" (82). The invisibility of the colonial 'natives' had opened Orwell's eyes to the existence of the miner, and this in turn led him to observe the reality of Morocco, in particular

some wretched old women carrying firewood. The "strange" thing about the women was their "invisibility"; they had passed him regularly for several weeks, and although "registered" "on his eyeballs", he had not "truly...seen them":

Firewood was passing - that was how I saw it. It was only that one day I happened to be walking along behind them, and the curious up and down motion of a load of wood drew my attention to the human being underneath it. Then for the first time I noticed the poor old earth-coloured bodies, bodies reduced to bones and leathery skin, bent double under the weight. (83)

It is a pity his proposed appointment to the Lucknow Pioneer never materialised (84), for he would have had some interesting observations to make in India at this stage!

Another similarity of colonial and capitalist victims was their passivity in the face of oppression. The Burmese convict regarded himself as the "victim of a foreign conquerer" (85); the firewood women were simply "beasts of burden" (86), and the majority were too ignorant and ground down by poverty even to be conscious of their subjugation. Only the livelier minds, the U Po Kyins or Dr. Veraswamis, attempted to lift themselves up the imposed ladder of success, by toadying in their various ways to white supremacy. We have seen Orwell's views on the oppression and exploitation of the colonial peoples, and

there is no need to repeat it. It is interesting, however, to bear them in mind when looking at his own experiences as a 'victim' in the capitalist world.

He was taken to a 'poor ward' in a Paris hospital, and experienced, for the first time, the invisible or sub-human role that the poor and the 'natives' played all their lives. His "feeble protests" against cupping were ignored as if he were "an animal" (87). The medical staff were not interested in 'people', only in studying diseases. Doctors walked past patients "followed by imploring cries", but would only stop if the condition furthered their learning. Orwell felt it "queer" that they combined such "intense interest" with "a lack of perception that the patients were human beings"; they did not look at your face nor say a word in conversation: "as a non-paying patient, you were primarily a specimen" (88). Patients wore a uniform nightshirt, which gave the same cue as a brown skin - indicative of a non-person. Patients were known just by their numbers (reminiscent of Zamyatin's We), and Numéro 57 ("a regular exhibit at lectures") was handled literally like "a rolling pin", with a "gentle roll to and fro", or was shown off "like a piece of antique china" (89).

The patients, like colonial subjects, were trapped by their own low self-esteem in a system which they couldn't comprehend, let alone challenge.

Tramps in the English 'spikes' were treated in a similar fashion. Admission to the spike was as bureaucratic and needlessly long, as to the hospital; the tramps were herded around and given the same uninterested medical going-over as the Parisian patients (90), and Orwell used animal imagery unselfconsciously for this treatment (as he had for the Moroccan wood-carriers). The tramps also wear the potently dehumanising uniform nightshirt (cf. its use in concentration camps); have their movements severely limited, and are forced to accept an illogical and uncomfortable regimen, which includes having their food wasted.

Orwell noted the same passive acceptance among the ordinary working class in the North. He knew a miner who had had a colliery accident and was forced to collect his compensation "once a week at a time named by the colliery, and when he got there he was kept waiting about for hours in the cold wind". Orwell felt this was humiliating, wasteful and "very different" from how the bourgeoisie were treated, with their expectations of bank accounts and decent treatment. "Petty inconvenience" and "indignity", doing "everything at other people's convenience", was "inherent" in working class life:

A thousand influences constantly press a working man down into a passive role. He does not act, he is acted upon. He feels himself the slave of mysterious authority and has a firm conviction that 'they' will never allow him to do this,

that, and the other. (91)

This was Orwell's emotional experience from schooldays, and the condition he knew the colonial subjects suffered. It was the thought pattern of the underdog, the victim. In the Kentish hopfields he had suggested forming a union of sweated workers, but was told that "'they' would never allow it. Who were 'they'? I asked. Nobody seemed to know, but evidently 'they' were omnipotent" (92). This recalls Orwell's paranoia at prep-school, where he believed that every adult was a spy in the headmaster's pay, intent on watching his every move (93), and it is a precursor of the attitude that flourished in the totalitarian state. On another occasion he wanted to collect information from Sheffield Town Hall, accompanied by two working class acquaintances. Although these two were more forcible characters than Orwell, they refused to go in, on the grounds that they would be refused the information, whereas he wouldn't. The information was withheld, "But the point was that I assumed my questions would be answered, and the other two assumed the contrary" (94). Orwell related this to other class hierarchies, and observed that the training and expectations of the bourgeoisie would always ensure that they emerged on top, whereas the working class would subside into passivity. During the air-raids of 1940, Orwell confided to his diary that foreigners and the working class were more

frightened than the middle class because it was not "their war" and they had "nothing to sustain them" (95).

Orwell also noted that race and class were related in the matter of social aspirations and models. We have talked about the 'native' and British attitude to each other's cultural items and behaviour (chapter 3), and Orwell believed that the working and middle classes followed a similar pattern. He claimed that cheap, readily available items, had "averted revolution" (96). He felt magazines, particularly girls' magazines, deliberately fostered "wealth fantasy", identification with the aims and outlook of the rich, and hence bred a docile, passive reaction to social injustices (97). In 'The English People', he believed that it was "unquestionable that most working class people want to resemble the upper classes in manners and habits" (98). We have seen, in his own class training, just how contemptuous the bourgeoisie were of working class culture and life. There is, then, a similar pattern of identification/striving and rejection/distancing between middle/working class, and European/native, and Orwell understood the psychology on both sides. The containment of the 'inferior' by palliatives, diversions and brute force, clearly gave scope for the developments which found expression in the fully established iron hierarchy of totalitarianism, and which Orwell satirised so effectively

in his last two books.

Orwell became interested in "the colour problem" in America, mainly through meeting numbers of American servicemen in London during the war, and seeing American Negro soldiers. He wrote a number of reviews on this between 1940-46, which clearly demonstrated his understanding of the race/class relationship. In a review of Richard Wright's Native Son, he stated that "colour feeling" prevented the white man from seeing the Negro as "a human being", but rather as a "slave or pet animal". Meanwhile the black person grows up feeling that whites stand "between him and the sun, blocking the way to any life with any meaning whatever" (99). He reviewed another of Wright's books in some detail, and paraphrased the Negro's dawning perception of how life is organised:

By degrees he comes to realise that 'they', directly or indirectly, control every detail of his behaviour, and that all rebellion is futile, since 'they' can do anything they choose. The law is no protection. If a negro breaks the unwritten code...or is merely suspected of holding undesirable opinions - he can be simply killed. There is no redress since the police and the judges are all white.

This is virtually a totalitarian concept of society, and one which would be familiar to Winston Smith. Interestingly, he also indicates that it has strong affinities with British imperialism, because "well-educated" blacks

are kept out of the best jobs; they "swallow insults"; conceal their "true feelings to flatter the vanity of the white race"; accept their inferior status simply to "stay alive"; "inform on one another"; "take sides with white against black" and "appear stupid" to win "a sort of tolerance". Orwell believed (in a phrase almost straight out of Burmese Days) that, "Any kind of decent relationship with a white man is impossible". It even led to an even more interesting reaction - black antisemitism. Youngsters were "taught to shout insults at Jews" as the "one opportunity" of getting revenge on "the white race" (100). The pecking order of the social hierarchy is racially reinforced.

Later, he reviewed a book by William Russell called Robert Cain, in which the hero has a close biographical resemblance to Orwell himself; Cain grows up with a complex about his father, and, in a rebellious mood, develops "a secret sympathy with the niggers". He doesn't stop calling them 'niggers', but feels "a kind of incoherent rage at the way they are treated". He wishes to befriend a mulatto boy, but lacks the "moral courage" to do so. Having grown up in "a fairly comfortable...family", he leaves home and "freezes on a park bench". His predicament is that "of the sensitive person isolated among ignorant bores". The story is of the struggle of "enlightenment against reaction, of labour against capital, or coloured against white". Sadly, Cain

reverts to reaction on inheriting the family business, and treats the blacks like "a kind of animal", giving them just enough to stay alive, as one would "with a horse or a mule". Orwell pointedly comments that the book's moral is "it is better to be a lonely and persecuted individual...then to be too well integrated with your environment" (101). He reviewed Russell's play Cellar, in which a wounded black man is not helped, because it would put whites at risk. The black is "pathetically conscious" that he is not regarded as "a full human being", and Orwell concluded that "though we may escape physical prisons we all continue to be prisoners of our temperaments and upbringing (102).

Orwell's relating of race and class issues is crucial to an understanding of his development in Socialism. It is the point where his incoherent ferment finds a positive channel along which to express itself. Orwell's childhood training dealt similarly with race and class outlooks. He was born into a family where both outlooks formed a necessary part of its world view. It invented myths and was attached to social totems that distinguished it from the encroachment of inferiors at home - at the same time identifying with its superiors. Because of a tradition of colonial service, a similar distancing identification pattern was employed abroad.

The importance of myths and totems was profound. Myths allowed the dehumanisation of the group in question, while totems provided readily identifiable cues, which in turn allowed pent-up mythical referents to come flooding in. Both obscured the true socio-economic relationships which existed and allowed the arrangement to continue undisturbed by conscience.

It was Burma which gave Orwell the empirical proof of the real nature of imperialism; not the mythical descriptions of it from safe, Southern England, but the harsh facts of responsibility in the glaring tropical sun. It also needed the peculiar qualities that Orwell brought to bear on the Burmese situation. Without his blend of rebelliousness, sympathy for underdogs, the need to prove all things, and a masochistic tendency to face up to unpleasant facts, he might have been just another colonial administrator. With these qualities he was obliged to examine himself, his job, his environment and the ideals that had been fed to him in his youth (and were still being given to him). Although his revolt in Burma was essentially personal, he could not ignore the facts of oppression and exploitation that he saw and participated in. Nor could he reconcile them with the mythical world view of Anglo-India. The disintegration of his descriptive framework of the world left a vacuum which was only gradually filled by his post-

colonial social experiences cohering. The disillusion^{ment} was part of the slow germinating process of the inchoate rebelliousness he had felt at school. His East-End and Wigan experience demonstrated to him the essential similarity of the working classes in Britain and the 'natives' in Burma. Both were exploited, by the same group of people, treated as invisible and alien; stereotyped unfavourably by their small, ungrateful and surly personalities, degenerate physiques and so on. This was all done systematically yet unconsciously in order to maintain the hierarchical status quo.

The realisation of this focused Orwell's feelings against oppressive systems and led him to seek for an egalitarian basis of society. Similarly his disillusionment with, and peripheral status in, bourgeois society determined him to seek a group worth identifying with. The equation of racial and social hierarchic dominance precipitated him along the road to Socialism. The idea of a racial/social hierarchy, in which the inferior group accepted their place, and the ruling group exercised its control by economic, psychological and technological means, was to swell later in Orwell's work into the vision of a totalitarian society. A vision partly realised in practice by Stalinist Russia, Nazi Germany and Civil-war Spain.

CHAPTER 7:

THE IMPACT ON ORWELL: RACE AND CLASS IN ANIMAL FARM AND NINETEEN EIGHTY FOUR.

We have examined the development of Orwell's racial attitudes and their relationship to his social ones, roughly up to a point where his obsession with totalitarianism begins to assert itself. We will now look at the significance of these attitudes in Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty Four. I hope to avoid the impression that there are illogical or asequential changes in Orwell's outlook. Rather there is a responsive organic growth of existing material to new situations. For example, Orwell may appear to have abandoned his quest for democratic socialism in his last two books, but the obsession with power, technology and totalitarianism only make sense in the light of his championing of the underdog, hatred of bullying, belief in the freedom of the individual and so on, which underlay his support of democratic socialism.

It was "the Spanish War and other events of 1936-7" that convinced Orwell to become a consciously political writer "against totalitarianism and for democratic socialism" (1), but the roots of this decision went far back. His reminiscence of prep-school days, 'Such, Such Were the Joys', has a distinct flavour of totalitarianism, and the Empire (in Burma) bore a structural resemblance to the Oceanic hierarchy. At the bottom were the Burmese corresponding to the proles in their animal-like existence and lack

of intellectual/political significance. Above them, were the racially distinct lower British officials; 'Outer Party' elements, whose social and economic privileges were gained at the expense of their intellectual and moral freedom. Like Winston, Flory and Orwell were confined to a death-like lonely silence which could not be broken within the system. Their obedience was demanded; heterodoxy forbidden; and they were expected to swallow and repeat absurdities in the name of British Imperialism/The Party. Above them, the 'Inner Party' of aloof central administrators handed down directives and invisibly controlled their lives. Even the wretched Nationalists were faint foreshadows of the Brotherhood. One must not pursue the analogy ruthlessly, for the Empire was a relatively loose affair run by unimaginative minds, with only a low technological level of enforcement. However, it no doubt seemed evil enough at the time, and only the subsequent development of totalitarianism gave it an innocuous retrospective.

Orwell had considered the hierarchic feature of totalitarian societies for many years before he wrote Animal Farm. In a review of Assignment in Utopia, by E. Lyons, he talked about the similarity of Stalin's Russia with Fascism; the same denials of freedom, terror, liquidations, confessions, leader-worship, but above all the same structure of Leader/Party/Proletariat (2). In another

review, two years later, he claimed that the two regimes, "having started from opposite ends" have both evolved towards "oligarchical collectivism" (3).

In The Lion and the Unicorn, he stated that totalitarianism was opposed to the concept of "a society of free and equal human beings", that Hitler "came into the world to destroy...the idea of human equality:

The thought of a world in which black men would be as good as white men and Jews treated as human beings brings him the same horror as the thought of endless slavery brings us.

Racial inequality is a convenient symbol of social inequality.

In 'The Prevention of Literature' he compared the mystique of the totalitarian state to a theocracy, in which the ruling class's infallibility was a key to their held on power (5). Later, in 1946, he picked up Burnham's idea of the adoptive principle in oligarchy, whereby disruption from below is neutralised by promoting the disruptor (6). He noted the rigid "racial" character of Swift's Houyhnhnms' "caste system", where the menial horses are a different colour from their masters and do not interbreed with them.

Similarly the educational system of the Lilliputians took "hereditary class distinctions for granted" (7). He wrote 'Such, Such Were the Joys' between Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty Four, and the atmosphere of totalitarian oppression hangs heavily over it. He described the pattern of school life as:

...a continuous triumph of the strong over the weak. Virtue consisted in winning...being bigger, stronger, handsomer, richer, more popular, more elegant, more unscrupulous than other people - in dominating them, bullying them, making them suffer pain, making them look foolish, getting the better of them in every way, Life was hierarchical and whatever happened was right. There were the strong, who deserved to win, and there were the weak, who deserved to lose and always did lose, everlastingly. (8)

Inequality lay at the heart of a totalitarian society, and the ultimate inequality was slavery. Orwell appears to have been periodically haunted by the notion of slavery. In The Road to Wigan Pier he talked of the Fascist objective as the "slave state", in which "the slaves would be wellfed and contented"; it was "a world of rabbits ruled by stoats" (9). In a review of Russell's Power: A New Social Analysis, he claimed that the dictators were aiming at a "slave society" based on organised lying (10) In Homage to Catalonia he believed that only Socialism could save the world from "centuries of semi-slavery" (11), and in a review of Liddell Hart's The British Way in Warfare, he claimed that "slavery, which seemed as remote as cannibalism in 1932, is visibly returning in 1942" (12). He developed this in 'Looking Back on the Spanish War', saying that the slavery which had been "restored under our very noses" was likely to endure, contrary to popular sentiment, and exemplified the "slave empires of antiquity" which had lasted for thousands of years. Virtually all

of the slaves had "gone down into utter silence" (13). He repeated this last point two years later in Tribune (14), and expressed concern about people's complacency. All was not pessimism, however, and he challenged the "nothing new under the sun" reaction by claiming that "the idea that an advanced civilisation need not rest on slavery" was relatively new (15). With the collapse of Nazi Germany, he felt able to write, in 1946, (perhaps with more relief than conviction) "the huge everlasting slave empire...will not endure, because slavery is no longer a stable basis for society" (16). By contrast, he wrote in 1945 and 1947 that nuclear weapons presaged a world political stalemate which would be "horribly stable" (17), and encourage hierarchic states "with a semi-divine caste at the top and outright slavery at the bottom" (18).

It only needs slight modification of our conception of racial exploitation to accommodate the totalitarian vision into the pattern. Although power hungry individuals could climb in an adaptive structure, the intrinsic inequalities of opportunity between top and bottom would tend to freeze it into a hereditary caste structure.

Power hunger is another important factor of hierarchic oppression. He had mentioned the acceptance of power tactics by the intelligentsia in his

review of Russell's book (19). In the Dickens essay he had discussed the chicken and egg of progress; does social change start in the system or the individual? Six years later he pondered the same problem, prompted by Koestler's essay, 'The Yogi and the Commissar', but considered that "the central problem - how to prevent power from being abused remains unsolved" (20). Even comics tended towards a crude leader-worship, rather than the gentler heroes of his own childhood (21). In real life, however, it was the Nazis whose "aim was simply power" and who tried anything "provided it left them on top" (22). This thesis has been confirmed by Alan Bullock, who claimed that "from the first Hitler and the other Nazi leaders thought in terms solely of power" (23).

Orwell's admiration for the working class was largely owing to their non-acceptance of power as a weapon (24), and his disillusionment with the intelligentsia was made worse by their unabashed acceptance of it (25). He accused an eminent professor of having "power and virtue inextricably mixed up" (26), and James Burnham of seeing it "larger than life" (27). Literature was infected too, and he described James Hadley Chase's No Orchids for Miss Blandish as "a daydream appropriate to a totalitarian age", with its tortures, executions, floggings, falsification, treachery etc (28). He believed that the most crucial difference between people was "between having and not having the

appetite for power" (29), but that no serious attempt had been made to eliminate the "power instinct" (30). He warned that it might not yield easily to social change, however (31).

O'Brien explained to Winston, in the Ministry of Love, the nature of the power appetite:

The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of others...wealth or luxury or long life or happiness: only power, pure power...Power is not a means, it is an end. One does not establish a dictatorship in order to safeguard a revolution; one makes the revolution in order to establish the dictatorship. The object of persecution is persecution, the object of torture is torture. The object of power is power. (32)

Power also consisted of "inflicting pain and humiliation", for suffering proved true obedience (33); it was "an intoxication" that was "constantly growing subtler": "the thrill of victory" over the "helpless" enemy, symbolised by "a boot stamping on a human face - forever":

The face will always be there to be stamped upon. The heretic, the enemy of society, will always be there, so that he can be defeated and humiliated over again...Always we shall have the heretic here at our mercy, screaming with pain, broken up, contemptible - and in the end utterly penitent, saved from himself, crawling to our feet of his own accord. That is the world that we are preparing, Winston. A world of victory after victory, triumph after triumph; an endless pressing, pressing, pressing upon the nerve of power. (34)

Orwell has been criticised for supplying the Party with inadequate motivation, in this analysis of power; but the verdict of the historian, this time Joachim Fest, supports him again:

To say that Hitler was ambitious scarcely describes the intensity of the lust for power and the craving to dominate which consumed him. It was the will to power in its crudest and purest form...for the only principle of Nazism was power and domination for its own sake...Germany, like everything else in the world, was only a means, a vehicle for his own power...By its nature this was an insatiable appetite, securing only a temporary gratification by the exercise of power, then relentlessly demanding an even further extension of it. (35)

Many of the features of totalitarian societies, as well as those of power, slavery and hierarchy are to be found as themes in Orwell's writings from 1936 onwards: the perversion of history and language; the arbitrariness of law; lying, propaganda, censorship; the dual code of public and private morals; autarchic states and so on, all have lengthy rehearsals in Orwell's journalism and essays, before being skilfully incorporated into his last two satires.

There are direct implications for his racial attitudes in these two books, however, and we will look at these now. Old Major's valedictory address to the assembled animals warns against the direction (and supplies the cause) that animal society might go in. He admonishes them that:

no animal must ever tyrannise over his own kind. Weak or strong, clever or simple, we are all brothers. No animal must ever kill any other animal. All animals are equal. (36)

Innate inequality of strength and intelligence contrast with the moral injunction not to take advantage of it. As we have seen, racism is frequently a rationalisation of socio-economic reality, and if that reality is a result of innate differentials, then the racism will be firmly established. Furthermore, if the ingredient of power hunger is added, then the hierarchy will be rapidly and permanently established. This is an interpretation of Animal Farm.

The "clever" animals (the pigs and dogs) learn the song 'Beasts of England' by heart, and even "the stupidest of them" pick up a few words (37). The cleverer animals are deeply influenced by Old Major and begin work on realising his vision. The work of teaching and organising "fell naturally on the pigs...the cleverest of the animals", in particular Snowball and Napoleon (38). Here is straightforward Darwinism based on 'natural' ability, and because of Orwell's chosen medium - animals - the categorisation is rigid in a way that nineteenth century racists fervently hoped human races were. There is no interbreeding, and no way in which a sheep can become a pig; they have unalterably different levels of comprehending and organising their worlds. I believe the symbolism of Orwell's animals is far more complex than this simple

delineation, however, and has affinities with the Chaucerian technique in which in individuals or species represent different human characteristics.

The pigs, led by Snowball, Napoleon and Squealer, formulate Old Major's rambling Utopianism into easily digestible animal facts. They meet with apathy and stupidity (the antithesis of their own qualities), but Boxer and Clover, who cannot think for themselves, accept the pigs as teachers and pass things on to the other animals "by simple arguments" (39). The horses' earnest gullibility is demonstrated over the matter of Boxer's hat (40). Snowball has decreed that all clothing is associated with human beings and hence anathema to animals; Boxer throws away a very useful hat because of this. There is a fetishistic element in this argument which is common to racism; the clothes are only 'cues' to humanity, and not intrinsically evil. Snowball tells Mollie that "these ribbons you are so devoted to are the badge of slavery (41), they are "the mark of a human being. All animals should go naked". This encourages a superficial, but politically 'correct', view.

When the rebellion comes, it is motivated by hunger, despite the politicisation of the pigs (42). Snowball and Napoleon immediately assert their dominance. They throw the whips on a fire, issue food, force the farm house door, summon a meeting and allocate work. They have secretly taught

themselves to read, and have reduced Animalism to Seven Commandments (without consultation), and soon after they make their first expropriation - the cows' milk. The pigs solve problems and improvise, but do no actual 'work', they "directed and supervised the others. With their superior knowledge it was natural that they should assume the leadership" (43). In fact, other animals have similar cognitive capacity (e.g. Benjamin), but lack the will to exploit it. The pigs are the managerial class of their society in Burnham's terms, unavoidably trapped in a racial categorisation.

Orwell accumulates the evidence for the pigs' superiority, they are the only ones with ideas (resolutions) and despite a concerted effort to educate all the animals, a definite ladder of capacity is evident. The pigs "read and write perfectly"; the dogs are only interested in the Seven Commandments; Muriel reads well, and unselfishly for others; Benjamin is cynical of his ability; Clover knows letters but not words, and Boxer can only manage four letters; Mollie learns her own name. No-one else gets beyond A, or learns the Seven Commandments, and so the "essential principle of Animalism" is distilled to "Four legs good, two legs bad", which would keep whoever had grasped it "safe from human influences" (44). Intelligence ranges from the highly sophisticated to the moronic, and is unalterable. The reduction of Animalism

to a tautenic irrelevance is the kind of dramatic oversimplification worthy of Goebbels or Big Brother. When the hierarchy is gradually established, it is this kind of background which leads us to realise that it was inevitable. Orwell was uncertain about the innateness of the power 'instinct', but here he has made it a matter of the pigs' racial endowment.

The pigs "order" apples to be mixed with their milk, despite hungry looks from the other animals. Squealer cynically, mendaciously and cleverly justifies this, claiming that it is not done "in a spirit of selfishness" (he "actually dislikes them"), but to preserve the pigs' health. The whole farm depends on their brains, and they mustn't fail, or "Jones would come back" (45). The speech is a demonstration of "brain", and also the other unsavoury characteristics which will eventually lead the pigs to dominate Animal Farm. The pigs are, therefore, a privileged caste, and because they are "manifestly cleverer" than the others, it is accepted that they "decide all questions of farm policy" (46), which the rest ratify with a nominal vote. When the struggle between Snowball and Napoleon is decided in the latter's favour, the balance of power is destroyed and the dictatorship established.

The animals no longer vote on issues, but merely receive orders from a "committee of pigs". They are uneasy at this, and "would have protested if

they could have found the right arguments" (47). Now Napoleon is surrounded by his dogs and pigs on a raised platform, facing the rest of the animals. The animals work like "slaves" (48) and the pigs supervise; the pigs move into the farmhouse and sleep in the beds, and announce they will get up one hour later in the morning. Napoleon has undermined animal unity by trading with humans. Because they are isolated, they can make no comparison with the outside world, except via Squealer. They are always cold and hungry and nearly starve (49); Squealer explains that "a too rigid equality of rations...would have been contrary to the spirit of Animalism" (50). Napoleon becomes even more remote, and his duping by Frederick is a signal for a reign of terror to begin. The terror allows attention to focus on Snowball as a scapegoat, and keeps the animals constantly cowed in a state of fear from which they never again emerge to challenge the pigs' supremacy.

Boxer finds it hard to marshal his thoughts on these new developments, but Squealer crushes doubt by claiming that he could "show" proof, "if you were able to read it" (51). Confessions and executions follow apace, and the animals "creep away in a body", dismayed and frightened. The inadequacy of the animals' capacity is illustrated by Clover:

If she could have spoken her thoughts, it would have been to say that this was not what they had aimed at when they

had set themselves years ago to work for the overthrow of the human race...such were her thoughts, though she lacked the words to express them. (52)

This was the ~~Sartre~~ theme that Orwell introduced into Oceania via 'Newspeak', when the elimination of words limited the cognitive capacity and expression of all. Here, it is used to denote the inferior innate capacity of certain species.

Napoleon no longer appears in person, but has 'representatives'; the campaign against Snowball is whipped up into war-hysteria and another battle fought with the humans. The animals celebrate the bloody victory with an apple; the pigs with whisky. A further example of the animals' inability to grasp the significance of events is when they find Squealer at the bottom of a ladder with paint and brush, yet fail to connect this with the fact that the Commandments alter under their noses (53).

Animal Farm is a racial, not an adaptive, hierarchy. When thirty young piglets are born, a new school is built for them; they are "discouraged from playing with the other young animals"; a rule is made that when a pig and any other animal met on the path, the other animal must stand aside; and all pigs "have the privilege of wearing green ribbons on their tails on Sundays" (54).

All these are drawn from Orwell's own experience in race and class training;

(55), and are indications of his intention here.

Despite their own austerity, the animals notice that the pigs seem well enough off. All the barley is to be reserved to provide them with beer (56). The discriminatory allocation of scarce resources fulfills the same function as in Oceania, where a whiff of real coffee or chocolate is redolent of privilege, and emphasises in a sensual way the gap that power creates between rulers and the ruled. The increasing ceremony of the farm reflects the hierarchy. On parades, Napoleon's cockerel leads the pigs, then the horses, cows, sheep and poultry, the whole flanked by the dogs (57).

The true relation of the pigs to the other animals is contained in two telling phrases that precede the removal of Boxer. The animals worked "under the supervision of a pig", but were alarmed and raced off "without waiting for orders from the pig" (58). Boxer was betrayed and the pigs got drunk in celebration. Some new horses arrived, but they were no different, "willing workers, good comrades, but very stupid". They cannot get beyond the letter B, and don't understand Animalism (59). The pattern of dominance and subservience, privilege and want, is now thoroughly established. The pigs and dogs proliferate, do no productive work, yet get fatter; the rest of the animals labour in the fields, go hungry, sleep on straw and get hot and cold

in season. The 'natural' results of intelligence and stupidity have been translated into socio-economic reality.

When the pigs assume fully human dress and habits, the wheel has come full circle, and a party of visiting farmers congratulate them on the tight running of Animal Farm. One visitor quipped: "If you have your lower animals to contend with...we have our lower classes!" (60). Pigs and humans even appear to metamorphose into each other. Orwell has portrayed the social manoeuvring which formed the thesis of Goldstein's supposed book The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism, in which the basic pattern of society, the Low, Middle and High, remains unchanged. The ambition of the Low (which is rarely articulated) is to establish a fair society, but the Middle merely wish to change places with the High, enlisting the help of the Low with promises, while the High want to stay where they are (61). The pigs overthrow Jones with the help of the other animals, but then proceeded to operate like Jones in their turn. The emotional salves which used to accompany oppression have largely been abandoned. Deliberate deception and ruthless exploitation are now the order of the day. Total selfishness might describe the behaviour of the pigs, with minimal window-dressing to disguise it.

In Nineteen Eighty Four there is a similar pattern of innate, caste-

like characteristics associated with certain categories of people, and this is a reflection of Orwell's stereotypical childhood training, which led him to perceive the world thus. We will consider some general views he held about the working class in order to understand his portrayal of the proles, which is in turn important in understanding the nature of the Oceanic hierarchy. We have dealt with his early class outlook, but his later attitude to the working class was far from simple. He believed they "licked the boots" of rich people (62), but this was because the "frightful weapon of unemployment has cowed them" (63). He admired the spirit that sang lusty songs in the face of horrible conditions (64) but, in both A Clergyman's Daughter and Keep the Aspidochelone Flying, the London working class are really just a dim backdrop for his characters to perform against. They are little more than caricatures. Gordon sees some "red-armed women", "squat as the beer-mugs in their hands" in a pub door; inside sat "four monstrous women with breasts the size of melons" talking bitterly (65). They are transported virtually unchanged into Oceania, where "two monstrous women with brick-red forearms folded across their aprons were talking outside a doorway". These women stiffen "as at the passing of some strange animal" when Winston approaches (66). His Party uniform constituting a cue to suspicion and 'difference' of an almost racial kind.

Later he sees "a monstrous woman, solid as a Norman pillar, with brawny red forearms...stumping to and fro" with washing (67), singing a song that Orwell might have heard in his hop-picking days. He practically apotheosises her "thick arms", "mare-like buttocks", "monstrous dimensions", "rasping red skin", comparing her beauty with a girl's, as that of a fruit to a flower (68). His admiration for fertile working class womanhood was an unfeigned emotion (69).

It was the instinctive, unconscious quality to working class life that attracted Orwell, but at the same time gave him serious doubts. They were "not in favour of persecuting the heretic", nor would they "exert themselves to defend him". He believed that they were "too sane and too stupid to acquire the totalitarian outlook" (70). Similarly, they couldn't care less about the written word, but neither could they conceive of restricted freedom of speech (71). What this meant was that they could never be influenced in their behaviour beyond a certain point; they were partially isolated. As Orwell said, they had to live "to some extent against the existing order" (72); their pleasures were private and informal, and their outlook anachronistically gentle compared with the public media's. The working class kept their heads down, and this led to the incomprehension and passivity in the face of bureaucracy that we noted earlier, when the unemployed gazed "at their destiny with the same sort

of dumb amazement as an animal in a trap" (73). It also led to xenophobia, "a folly which has to be paid for very heavily from time to time" (74), a lack of solidarity with coloured workers, and a loss of righteousness.

Working class inability to grasp the significance of any European event exasperated Orwell. He had the "sensation of kicking against an impenetrable wall of stupidity", which had, nevertheless, "stood them in good stead" (75). He saw Mosely "bamboozle" a working class audience in Barnsley (76), and Home Guard officers take similar advantage of gullibility in London, which Orwell illustrated with animal imagery (77). Two years later he compared the working class struggle to a "blind and stupid plant" which only knows how to "push towards the light" (78).

The other side of the "stupidity" coin was an unaffected joy of life, which Orwell often noted. He only heard singing in the BBC when "the charwomen are at work", when they made "as much noise as a parrot house", singing "wonderful choruses" (79), giving the place "a quite different atmosphere". Orwell believed the working class were free from the petty worries that obsessed the "shabby-genteel". George Bowling declared that a prole never worried about the sack, and although life was hard, he was a "free man" when not working (80); he, himself, "had the prole's attitude to money", free from

worry" (81). Bowling's unselfconscious use of 'prole' is reminiscent of Veraswami's masochistic Anglo-mania, and indicates that Orwell chose his pleasanter characters to utter the less acceptable comments. The common man was less likely to make spectacularly ridiculous errors, such as the theory that American troops had been brought to Britain to crush a rebellion; "one has to belong to the intelligentsia to believe things like that, no ordinary man could be such a fool" (82). The oxymoronic "Too stupid and too sane", sum up Orwell's view of the working class, and with this in mind, we can turn to the proles of Oceania.

There is the same dichotomy in Winston Smith's view of the proles: admiration and despair. In his bleak world, he believes that "hope lies in the proles", and that they only need "to rise up and shake themselves like a horse shaking off flies" (83). This is directly derived from Orwell's admitted inspiration for Animal Farm, where a cart-horse stood for exploited animals, which in turn symbolised the proletariat (84). However, the Party taught that the proles were "natural inferiors", "animals" and that if neglected would revert to a "natural...ancestral pattern" of behaviour, "like cattle turned loose upon the plains of Argentina" (85). The Party slogan was "proles and animals are free" (86). Clearly they are locked into their inferiority

by heredity, and O'Brien dashes Winston's faith in their potential by claiming that "they are helpless, like the animals. Humanity is the Party. The others are outside - irrelevant" (87). The definition of humanity excludes the proles, in a grand racial statement; as Syme said: "The proles are not human beings". Ironically, Orwell portrays the Party's version of 'humanity' on the same page, and it is of a dummy with "blank discs" for eyes, uttering unconscious noises from the larynx "like the quacking of a duck" (88). Orwell has established the topsy-turvey values of Oceania in a single example.

The proles retain human decency and wrath in the face of the Party's efforts to end it. A woman protests at obscene cinema violence, in "a typical prole reaction", and we learn that prole seats are segregated from Party members'. Winston believes that proles have a "gift", or animal-like instinct, for telling when a rocket is about to fall, and are emotionally in touch with their environment, while being unable to comprehend it *intellectually*. Prole women stiffen at his approach, as if he were "some unfamiliar animal" (89), and his Party overalls are a species of race/class badge. Proles enjoy their activities in a kind of celebration of life; Winston thought the "Norman-pillar" of a woman would have been "perfectly content" to do her work for a "thousand years", pegging nappies and singing rubbish (90). He recalls that

Party members do not sing spontaneously; one is reminded of the charwomen in the BBC corridors.

Winston's memories of his mother awaken his conscience to ordinary human emotions. He perceived that she had obeyed "private" standards, "her feelings were her own", not dictated by the Party. He now values the "helpless gesture" of sympathy and solidarity which the proles practise; he realises they "had stayed human...not become hardened inside" because they owed no loyalty to any party, country or idea, "they were loyal to one another". They had hung on to the "primitive emotions" which he had re-learned by conscious effort"; "The proles are human beings...we are not human" he declared aloud (91). In other words the proles had maintained individual, not group or 'nationalistic' morality. He now sees his indifference to a severed hand as symptomatic of the gulf between the two outlooks, when he had kicked it into the gutter during an air-raid. There is an echo of Orwell's own experience too, during the Spanish war, when he knew that the Italian militiaman was "born knowing what I had learned out of books and slowly" (92).

There is little doubt that Orwell intends the proles to be seen as a race apart, at least by the Party. Winston's way is blocked "by an enormous prole...who seemed to form an impenetrable wall of flesh" (93). Winston finds

himself on a train "full of proles in holiday mood" (94), and bands of rowdy proles roam the streets singing a Hate Song in preparation for Hate Week (94). The proles are constantly described in different terms from Party members; the women are earth-mother figures, while the men are fierce but pathetic ineffectuals. Orwell also points out the gap between the Party ideal and reality; the "tall muscular youths and deep-bosomed maidens" of propaganda turn into the "small dark...ill-favoured...beetle-like type...with short legs, swift scuttling movements" that proliferate in the ministries (95). This is an amusing parody of the Nazi Aryan myth, where the Nordic gods are celebrated by the rabbit-like Goebbels and the pig-like Goering. In Oceania, the Party preaches an unprecedented "contempt for the working class" (96), and Party members speak with a different accent from the proles (97), Winston and Julia even toy with the idea of going 'down and out' in Oceania by speaking "with proletarian accents" and working in a factory (98).

All prole activities are circumscribed by the Party machine, particularly the Ministry of Truth, which mechanically doles out their "rubbishy newspapers", cheap novelettes, films and pornography (99). As Orwell explained in an appendix, the word "prolefeed" displayed "a frank and contemptuous understanding of the real nature of Oceanic society", indicating

"rubbishy entertainment and spurious news" (100). The Party comprehensively manipulates prole 'input'.

Party members have their emotions even more rigidly controlled, particularly the sex drive and family life, but this is because they are more highly educated and more is expected of them. All that is required of the proles is a "primitive patriotism" that can be directed and exploited, and they can be left to wallow in petty, specific grievances, with no hope of forming an overall picture (101). The paroxysms of hate which the proles are periodically "lashed" into, is precluded by a Hate Song. Orwell may well have picked up some of the inspiration for this from Dickens, for he quotes A Tale of Two Cities, in his essay on that author. People dance to the "popular Revolution Song" like "demans", keeping "a ferocious time... like a gnashing of teeth in unison". Suddenly they "swooped screaming off" "with their heads low down and their hands high up"; this was "devilry", and more "terrible" than violence (102). Orwell described it as an evil vision, and it clearly impressed him, although he had claimed elsewhere that "no Hymn of Hate has ever made any appeal" to the English (103).

The stunting of prole intellect has left them harmless. They will continue indefinitely "from century to century" without any rebellious

impulse or ability to conceive change. Because society doesn't require their education, they are uneducated. "They can be granted intellectual liberty because they have no intellect", unlike Party members (104). They are an inert mass, only reacting to stimuli, as O'Brien claimed, they will never revolt "in a million years"; "they cannot" (105).

Orwell uses animal imagery to symbolise heterodoxy. Julia's sexual rebellion is "like the sneeze of a horse that smells bad hay" (106), and Winston knows that the "animal instinct" of "undifferentiated desire" was the force to destroy the Party (107). Animals, like the proles, are in touch with instincts too deep for orthodoxy to control, and the "too stupid, too sane" judgement of the working class is reinforced by this comparison.

There is a strain of conventional racism in Nineteen Eighty Four, apart from the hierarchical element. The 'Two Minutes Hate' openly plays on the "Asiatic faces" of the Eurasian army (108); Big Brother stands "like a rock against the hordes of Asia" (109), and Goldstein (whose antisemitic role will be dealt with in the next chapter) is intimately identified with them (110). Trucks of prisoners with "sad, Mongolian faces" roll past (111); "Foreigners" are a "strange kind of animal" in Oceania (112). Posters for Hate Week feature an "expressionless Mongolian Face", which is ripped down and burnt with effigies of Goldstein, and an "old couple...suspected of being

events in Iran demonstrate the acuity of Orwell's description, from the effigies of Carter to the posters of Big Brother Khomeini.

The narrowing of proletarian intellectual conceptualisation is demonstrated when Orwell tries to find out about pre-Revolutionary life in Oceania. He asks an old proletarian if previously they could be shipped around "like cattle" (114), but unfortunately the old man's memory was "nothing but a rubbish heap of details". In exasperation, he realises that they can remember "a million useless things", but relevancy lies outside their ken; "They were like the ant, which can see small objects but not larger ones" (115). This worm's eye view allowed them only to focus on "petty grievances", while the "larger evils invariably escape their notice" (116). This is reminiscent of Orwell's dismissive attitude to the Burmese Nationalists, who he only saw as nuisances operating on a trivial scale.

It is worth a small diversion to consider the symbolic significance of top-hats in Nineteen Eighty Four, for they are a tool of stereotypical indoctrination, and Orwell handles the theme well. Top-hats were not a neutral item to Orwell. He would have experienced their snobbish associations at Eton, and during the Second World War, he noted their disappearance as a symptom of the egalitarianism of wartime conditions. He feared that after

the war, things would revert to 'normal', and "the worst sign of all...will be the reappearance in the London streets of top-hats" (117). In Tribune, he was depressed that the "bombs have achieved nothing" and recounted his horror of pre-war inequality brought on by the sight of someone "with great care and evident pleasure...polishing a top-hat"(118). A year later he wrote to Partisan Review that the sight of top-hats meant that "the snob note is definitely returning" (119).

Winston read the official Party history of pre-Revolutionary life, which described "fat, ugly men with wicked faces" (rich capitalists) and illustrated them with a picture. The man was dressed in a frock coat, and "a queer shiny hat shaped like a stovepipe...a top-hat". This was the capitalists' uniform, which "no-one else was allowed to wear" (120). Orwell has drawn on the lesson of the Illustrated Alphabet (121), which identified people by their sartorial badges. Winston wonders whether there ever was such a creature "as a capitalist, or any such garment as a top-hat" (122). He remembers the Party cartoons of street battles, sluns and "capitalists in top-hats - even on the barricades the capitalists still seemed to cling to their top-hats" (123). He reminds the old prole that capitalists "drank champagne" and "wore top-hats" (124), but is sidetracked by trivial

remniscences. The Party used the hats as a conscious stereotyping device, as potent as a racial characteristic, and Orwell has merely satirised a weakness of ordinary Socialists': to reduce complexity to a cartoon simplicity. In The Road to Wigan Pier, he claimed that they had symbolised the "class war" by creating two mythical figures: a 'proletarian', "a muscular down-trodden man in greasy overalls in contradistinction to a 'capitalist', a fat, wicked man in a top-hat and a fur coat" (125). Orwell used this fetish as an example of the technique of narrowing and directing consciousness, at the expense of understanding principles and widening horizons. It is the equivalent of the "two legs bad, four legs good" chant of Animalism, and an indispensable aspect of the Party's domination and control of Oceanic society.

The low status of the proles is reflected in their relative freedom; they use scent (126) and double beds (127), and mix pleasure with unconscious heterodoxy. Again animal imagery is used to describe their instinctual, non-intellectual legacy. They will stay alive "like birds" passing on the vitality which the Party could not kill, "the birds sang, the proles sang, the Party did not sing" (128). He used the same image to describe their freedom from Party contamination; they swallowed everything, but it left no residue and was harmless, "just as a grain of corn will pass undigested through the body

of a bird" (129). The proletarian attitude to prison exemplifies their blissful ignorance of oppression. While the Party prisoners sit terrified, they yell obscenities, fight the guards, smuggle food, and check the telescreen. The old proletarian woman who ends up on Winston's lap contrasts dramatically with the latter's timorousness.

These differences in attitude stem from the relative places of the proles and Party members in the hierarchy. The proles are the 'Low' of society, with no hope of achieving their aims, even if they were able to formulate any. The technology which enforces Oceanic collectivism enables the groups to be permanently separated, and to display 'racial' characteristics which buttress the segregation. The 'Middle' established their tyranny at a moment when class hierarchy had ceased to be an economic necessity; when the machine had potentially eliminated drudgery. Just when the old ideals of human brotherhood could have been implemented, the new 'High' chose to freeze society into a rigid stratification, investing themselves permanently with power. They did not own power (or wealth) individually, but collectively, because they controlled everything and disposed of the products as they saw fit. Consequently "economic inequality has been made permanent" (130).

Challenges to this state were removed by world military stalemate and

de-intellectualisation of any potential dissidents. The proles had no means of comparison with the outside world, and were not even conscious of being oppressed. The Party had to mould the consciousness of its own members, and only influence the masses "in a negative way".

Oceanic hierarchy has Big Brother as a focus of love and reverence, with Goldstein attracting hate and fear. Emotions are best directed at symbolic individuals, and consequently more easily controlled. The Inner Party constitutes 2% of the population, and the Outer Party 12%; below that come the "dumb masses", the proles, and then the equatorial slave populations, who are not even counted, because they "are not a permanent or necessary part of the structure" (131). This is traditional racism, for they are referred to as "coloured slaves" (132) and "ill-paid and hard-working coolies" who "pass continually from conquerer to conquerer like so much coal or oil". They are a "bottomless reserve of cheap labour" within the tropical regions (133). The pattern is the same as in Animal Farm, where the leader is Napoleon, followed by an Inner Party of pigs, and the mass of animals. In the totalitarian states of Germany and Russia, Hitler and Stalin were the figureheads, supported by the Nazi and Communist parties, under whom were the German and Russian peoples, in their turn above all other races. The historian, Fest, described the

Nazi hierarchy (which was racially homogeneous) as divided into three strata
(under Hitler):

...the National Socialist 'high nobility', veterans of the struggle, the party members, who would form a kind of new 'middle class', and the great anonymous masses...the collective of those who serve, those who never come of age, as Hitler explained it. But these would still be called to rule over the 'class of subject alien nationals...let us not flinch from calling them the modern slave class. (134)

British Imperialism echoed the same structure, with the monarch presiding over the bourgeoisie, who lorded it over the working class and foreigners, who in their turn sat on the colonial subjects. In other words, the hierarchical patterns are similar, while varying tremendously in details.

Orwell was at pains to show that Oceania had transcended unsophisticated racism. There was no bar to success because of traditional "racial discrimination", in fact Jews and Negroes were to be found "in the highest ranks of the Party". Despite this, the hierarchy was more rigid and permanent than anything that had preceded it. One of the disadvantages of conventional racism was that individuals could go beyond the stereotype and undermine the image, which in turn weakened the whole structure. Also the technology for enforcing stratification had been relatively weak hitherto. It was difficult to hold a population in complete ignorance and degradation until the middle

years of the twentieth century, and the world of Oceania (with its autarchic states, telescreens and secret police) was the first totalitarian anti-Utopia about the twentieth century. Orwell explained the nature of the rigid, hereditary stratification that characterised Oceania:

There is far less to and from movement between the different groups than happened under capitalism or even in the pre-industrial age...Proletarians, in practice, are not allowed to graduate into the Party. The most gifted among them who might possibly become nuclei of discontent, are simply marked down by the Thought Police and eliminated.

So the proles are 'a race apart'; the adoptive principle does not apply to them. Traditional racism is no longer the 'racism' in question. The role of blacks, Jews and so on has been shifted on to the proles (and the tropical slave populations). Again Orwell explained how this shift of emphasis helped ensured its perpetuation. The Party was not "a class in the old sense of the word", because it did not pass on "class privilege" physically, but rather as "the persistence of a certain world-view and...way of life". It was permanently the ruling class because it could "nominate its successors"; it did not perpetuate "blood", but "itself"; it was not important who wielded power "provided that the hierarchical structure remains always the same" (135). In other words, the structure not the content of the hierarchy was important, and the collective oligarchy of the Inner Party was best able to maintain that

structure. It was a pyramidal affair, held in check by total surveillance and control, and dedicated to its own perpetuation.

The racism of Nineteen Eighty Four is, in effect, a satire on the existing forms of racism, based on Orwell's understanding of the real issues that underlay these forms. The transposition served the same kind of illustrative purpose as the book's setting in England, "to emphasise that the English-speaking races are not innately better than anyone else and that totalitarianism, if not fought against, could triumph anywhere" (136). Put differently, totalitarianism had not taken that particular form, and the book was intended as a prophylactic against its doing so. Similarly, the 'racial' theme did not deal with conventional racism, recognisable to Orwell's audience of 1948, but rather with the underlying structure and motivation that could manifest itself in more permanent ways. He was pointing to the basic, not the superficial, realities of race/class oppression; man's categorical tendency and power instinct. He subtilised many themes in the book, and to appreciate his skill in presenting the message, it is usually necessary to go below the surface; only in this way can we see the continuity between our world and Oceania, and the relevance of his warnings.

The society which Orwell portrayed in Nineteen Eighty Four owes much

to the traditional and contemporary societies that he had experienced and read about, but it also incorporates novel features which removed much of their old structural weaknesses. The essence of class, caste and race is very much present in his hierarchy, but it does not exactly parallel any of these classifications. Rather it draws something from all of these, adding unique elements of its own. It is this achievement in updating and projecting the possibilities of hierarchic oppression that gives Orwell's work its frisson of reality. We are introduced to a society that is almost insane, yet retains emotional, structural integrity. He credited Poe with being "fantastic" but "never arbitrary", because his most outrageous stories are "psychologically correct" (137). They kept "the rules of their own peculiar world", and were convincing because, in order to write successfully about such a world "you have got to believe in it" (138). Such was the case with Orwell.

The proles are not strictly equatable with any race or class that has existed, but there is a large correspondence in function with the slaves of classical antiquity, the working classes of industrial capitalism, the masses of Nazi Germany, Soviet Russia and the colonial subjects of British Imperialism. What Orwell has succeeded in doing is abstracting the spirit of discrimination and oppression from all of these societies and fusing them into a credible whole within his own framework.

The hierarchic structure of racism in his last two books has been considered, and the irrationality of racism over a wider spectrum will now be dealt with. We saw that Orwell's race and class training involved irrationality in the creation of myths about various groups; here we will be more concerned with the phenomena of patriotism, nationalism and the need for scapegoats.

Orwell's attitude to irrationality as such was ambivalent; on the one hand he was a positive empiricist, but on the other he acknowledged and exhibited much irrationality in attitude and behaviour. His writing reflects his need to be firmly fixed in time and space, with both feet on the ground. In all of his fiction, with the exception of Animal Farm, we are told the time on the opening page. Sight, sound, touch, taste and particularly smell, are the keys to his world. Phrases like "the surface of the earth" and "the process of life", conjure the typical wideranging yet fundamental nature of his interests. He admired writers such as Shakespeare and Dickens who were unsystematic, yet fearlessly curious about the whole range of human activity. He believed Shakespeare "could not restrain himself from commenting on almost

everything" (1), and that "the unmistakeable Dickens' touch" was his unstoppable imaginative fecundity and love of detail (2).

In a thousand ways Orwell demonstrated his faith in the testable, factual, sensual and rational. However, he recognised that much human behaviour wasn't explicable in these terms. Several chapters in The Road to Wigan Pier are devoted to exposing the inadequacy of a materialist approach to Socialism at the expense of emotions "which lay deeper than the economic motive" (3). In an adaptation of Wells, he stated that laudable human qualities only existed because the environment demanded them, and mechanical efficiency implied "softness", which is "repulsive" (4). Vulgar hedonism eventually led to "something resembling a brain in a bottle" (5), and the failure of Socialism was its "assumption that man has no soul", allowing Fascism to "play upon every instinct that revolts against hedonism and a cheap conception of 'progress' (6).

Ironically he attacked Wells as the champion of shortsighted materialism in Horizon in 1941. Wells had ludicrously underestimated the appeal and strength of Hitler, and Orwell rounded on this with some bitterness. Hitler was "a criminal lunatic" with huge, successful armed forces, but no one was willing "to shed a pint of blood" for the "common-sense", "hedonistic world-

view" of Wells et alia. In order to defeat Hitler, it was necessary to create "a dynamic not necessarily the same as the Nazis, but...as unacceptable to 'enlightened' and hedonistic people". The "atavistic emotion of patriotism" and the "ingrained feeling" of superiority "to foreigners" were the forces which had sustained Britain in the early days of the war; similarly the Russians were "fighting like tigers" "in defence of Holy Russia...the 'sacred soil of the Fatherland'", not for the ideals of Utopian Socialism. Orwell believed that:

The energy that actually shapes the world springs from emotion - racial pride, leader-worship, religious belief, love of war which liberal intellectuals mechanically write off as anachronisms. (7)

Wellsian, rational thought had completely misunderstood the nature of the Bolshevik and Nazi regimes, which, according to Orwell, were "a Rule of the Saints...enlivened by witchcraft trials" and the creation of "all the war-lords and witch-doctors in history rolled into one", respectively (8). In Germany, science was "fighting on the side of superstition". He concluded his attack on Wells by claiming that the latter was "incapable of understanding that nationalism, religious bigotry and feudal loyalty are far more powerful forces than...sanity" (9).

Orwell celebrated the end of Britain's cultural isolation from Europe in 'The Rediscovery of Europe', in 1942. The effects of the Great War

had drawn Britain, psychologically and commercially, from her ivory-tower, and
in Literature:

Themes like revenge, patriotism, exile, persecution, race hatred, religious faith, loyalty, leader-worship, suddenly seemed real again. Tamerlane and Genghis Khan seem credible figures now, and Machiavelli seems a serious thinker, as they didn't in 1910. We have got out of a backwater and into history
(10)

He returned to the theme 6 months later, in a review of Eliot, when he commented on the absence of such sustaining emotional qualities in Eliot's poetry (11). The second World War gave Orwell insights into his own patriotic motivation (as we shall see), and considerable understanding of other people's. He called the slogan "cheese, not Churchill", silly, because it demonstrated "psychological ignorance"; people would die for Churchill, but not for cheese (12). This illustrates the strength of man's 'self-transcending tendency' over his basic hedonism, leading to the 'irrational' choice of hardship over pleasure, when it is deemed necessary.

Irrationality was fostered in other ways too. In 'Such, Such Were the Joys', Orwell talked of the irrational terrors and lunatic misunderstandings (13) which were introduced in him by the contradictory and incomprehensible environment of his prep-school. In 'New Words', he wrote that the reluctance to innovate words to cover currently unnameable referents, was grounded in the

"superstitious" "unreasoned instinct" that it was "definitely unsafe" to take a "direct, rational approach to one's difficulties". He believed this originated in childhood, and the belief by "avenging demons" waiting to sabotage presumptuous rationality (e.g. claiming to have caught a fish before it is landed etc.) and that it survived in adults "as a fear of rational thinking".

He concluded that adults were only less superstitious than children:

...in proportion as they have more or less power over their environment. In predicaments where everyone is powerless (e.g. war, gambling) everyone is superstitious. (14)

Most anthropologists would agree that some such animistic attitude characterised the outlook of primitive societies, past and present. Orwell argued that its continuation into twentieth century adults needed to be taken into account.

When human beings felt that they belonged to different groups which had their own belief-systems and highly-charged emotional attachments, irrationality often expressed itself in reliance on a sustaining 'mystique'. Orwell claimed that both Socialism and Fascism relied on a "mystique", namely, "the idea of equality" (15), and "strict morality, a quasi-religious belief in itself" (16). The problem, as Orwell saw it, was not that man had such strong irrational tendencies, but rather how to harness them for decent, constructive purposes. The phenomenon which he termed "Nationalism", came more and more to

dominate his thoughts in this respect. He advocated an honest enquiry, and that no progress could be made:

...unless we start by recognising that political behaviour is largely non-rational, that the world is suffering from some kind of mental disease which must be diagnosed before it can be cured.

He did institute his own enquiry and, very broadly, proposed two channels within which the 'self-transcending tendency' flowed: nationalism and patriotism. We will deal with his thoughts on these in some detail. In a Time and Tide article, Orwell originally used the word nationalism to describe the positive desire for national self-identity and determination, "desirable up to a point", and contrasted it with "racialism...the invention...of conquering nations" which pushed exploitation beyond "the point that is normally possible, by pretending that the exploited are not human beings". Orwell saw the "racialism of Nazi Europe as a development of past imperial attitudes; Hitler was "the ghost of our own past...the extension...of our own methods, just at the moment when we are beginning to be ashamed of them" (18). In other words, imperialism and Nazism employed the same psychological device of categorisation and exploitation.

It is worth glancing at Orwell's attitude to national self-determination, which is not straightforward, and relates to the area under consideration. He

passionately longed for the freeing of India, but was not afraid to point out "the element of mere nationalism, even colour hatred" that attached to the independence movements (19). He later included "self-pity" and "short-sighted vengeance" as a characteristic of coloured peoples' 'nationalism' (20), and believed that colonial oppression may have exacerbated the trend towards "romantic", "emotional" chauvinism (21). He feared that all nationalist movements of coloured people were tied up with "racial mysticism" (22), and that our history of exploitation was largely to blame (23). Despite worries of this sort, he never wavered in his desire to see India independent and equal; when it came to smaller countries, however, his attitude was different.

He called Burma "a small, backward country", and talk of it becoming independent, "nonsense". He referred to the creation of "comic-opera states" (which brought him justifiable rebukes), but also asked serious questions about the reality of independence for such small countries: who would arm/defend them? What was the attitude of more powerful neighbours etc? (24). Responses appeared in the following week's Tribune, and Orwell replied to them. He deplored the encouragement of "petty nationalism", and wondered if it would stop until the Welsh and Cornish had their 'independence'. He summed up his argument: "The plain fact is that small nationalities cannot be independent,

because they cannot defend themselves" in the modern world (25). He suggested splitting S.E. Asia into 'spheres of influence', between India, China and the responsible imperial powers. Robert Duval wrote, as a footnote to Orwell's reply, that "Nationalism" was the "most universal and deep-rooted" emotion that governed "communal conduct" and that a "subject people" always hated its "governors" (26). Orwell also received a good-humouredly serious letter from a Welsh Nationalist, and he wrote a final, weary summary of his stand. He welcomed decentralisation of administration, and increased autonomy, including for Wales, but "in a world of power politics and intolerant nationalism" he saw it as futile for a small country to "set up tariff barriers", "stage 'frontier incidents'" and "generally" annoy its neighbours (27). He reiterated the 'spheres of influence' solution; a pattern that was ironically close to Burnham's pessimistic 'superstate' theory.

The problems did not end there, however, for in most countries there was the question of racial minorities. In Burma, these accounted for up to 20% of the population: Karens, Kachins and Shans all had their own "customs and appearance". Orwell remembered that a Karen had confided in him that he wanted the British to stay, "Because we do not wish to be ruled by the Burmese". Orwell believed the problem of minorities to be "literally insoluble while

nationalism remains a real force". He cited the Sudan, Ulster and "a hundred other places" as examples. "The question is always how large must a minority be before it deserves autonomy", and nobody was consistent in their judgments on this; "sympathy with one group almost invariably entails callousness towards another" (28). In the following week's Tribune, he acknowledged the Scottish case against England, but felt their problems had to be settled in some kind of unison. There were things which could be done to ease the strain, and teaching and broadcasting of Gaelic was one of them. He admitted that at one time he would have called it "absurd" to keep alive an "archaic", minority language, but now he was "not so sure". If people felt they had a "special culture" (and language), then they should be free to pass it on to their children. More attention should be paid to "the small but violent separatist movements" in the British Isles, before they grew into anything more dangerous. This, prophetically, takes us to the next country: Ireland.

Ireland was case of nationalism, on England's doorstep, which did not meet with Orwell's approval. Indeed his whole attitude to Ireland and the Irish seems to have been unduly negative. His encounters with Irish people in Down and Out in Paris and London are, on the whole, distasteful. He met an Irish tramp who smelt and suffered from innumerable diseases (29). His colleague,

Paddy, kept up a monologue in "a whimpering, self-pitying Irish voice" (30); had a "low, worm-like envy" of his betters (31); and the "abject, envious... jackal's character" of a tramp. Orwell did record his generosity, however, and believed it was "malnutrition and not any native vice that had destroyed" him (32). In 'Hop-Picking', he noted that Irishmen "never think of paying their passage" home, but always stowed away; and that the lodgers in a London 'doss-house' were "a pretty low lot - mostly Irish unskilled labourers" (33). In The Road to Wigan Pier, he even appears to have acquired a visual stereotype, with the astonishing claim that an acquaintance was "a dark, small-boned, sour, Irish-looking man...astonishingly dirty" (34). He pointed out in Tribune, that Joyce's "extremely disgusting" description of the Dublin stout-vats, had done nothing to put the Irish off "their favourite drink". (35). On a more serious note, he believed that the Irish voters in England acted as "a sort of drag on Labour Party policy" (36), and that "imported labourers with low standards of living, such as the Irish, are greatly looked down on" (37).

The politics of Ireland annoyed him more than the aesthetic revulsion. He felt that English public opinion had prevented the Government from putting down the rebels in the "Irish Civil War" "in the only way possible" (38).

Julian Symons remembers:

...arguing with him about Ireland post 1916, and saying that of course one would have supported the Irish against the British occupying forces, but he didn't agree...He was very much opposed (more so than, from my recollection, is apparent in the letters) to the idea that Socialists ought to be sympathetic to a nationalist movement (like Zionism) which might, because of its revolutionary character, be regarded as 'progressive'. He thought such movements were wrong-headed or evil". (39)

We will discuss Zionism in the next chapter, but Symons's view is confirmed by a review Orwell wrote of Sean O'Casey's Drums under the Window in 1945. In an angry opening paragraph, he compared the support of Irish nationalist writers by the English to a dog praising its fleas, and went on to say that a potentially interesting book had been ruined stylistically by pretentious, narcissistic, bombastic chauvinism. All references to England were "hostile" or "contemptuous". He wondered why "the worst extremes of jingoism and racialism have to be tolerated when they come from an Irishman?" He blamed the intelligentsia for swallowing the most blatant nationalism "so long as it is not British nationalism". In the case of Ireland, it was probably England's "bad conscience" which led to "political sympathy" perverting "literary judgement", and allowed "Mr. O'Casey and others like him to remain...immune from criticism". Orwell claimed it was "time to revise our attitude" and that Cromwell's massacres should not cause us to mistake "a bad...book for a good one" (40).

Orwell's anger is as much directed at English 'transferred nationalism' here, as it is at O'Casey's chauvinism. He was bitterly opposed to transferred loyalties, whether Ireland, India or Russia was the object, and his patriotism was offended by gratuitous abuse of the kind O'Casey employed. He felt that broader tolerance, as exemplified in the English culture, was worthier than the kind of narrow nationalism that appeared to characterise the Irish or Scots.

His attitude to the independence of small countries was influenced, therefore, by pragmatic considerations of 'power politics', and in some cases by his emotional reaction to the tenor of their cries for independence - particularly if these maligned England. What, however, were his views on the role of nationalism in the wider context of politics and human behaviour? He believed that one could only understand the modern world if one recognised "the overwhelming strength of patriotism, national loyalty", and that "as a positive force" there was "nothing to set beside it"; Hitler and Mussolini "rose to power" because they understood this, while their opponents hadn't (41)

Nationalism, unfortunately, often prevented people from acting in their own best interests. Nearly everyone recognised the benefits of a universally-accepted second language, yet the world was growing more, not less,

nationalistic in language (42). Cartography too, showed the same trend, and Orwell thought it "an interesting minor manifestation of nationalism that every nation colours itself red on the map" and exaggerates its size by distorted projection (43). In History, books had been "rewritten in far more nationalistic terms" over the last few years, giving children "as false a picture as possible of the world outside" (44). He tied "the horrors of emotional nationalism" into a syndrome of centralised, hierarchic economies, "infallible fuhrers", the disbelief in objective truth, the cessation of history and the theory "that the end justifies the means" (45). In other words, it was integral to the totalitarian state. Even names played an important part in "nationalist thought" (46); countries that had "gone through a nationalistic revolution" nearly always changed their names, because people "feel that a thing becomes different if you call it by a different name" (47).

Political judgement was "vitiating" because people, particularly the intelligentsia, only saw things in nationalistic terms ("power politics and competitive prestige"). Instead of asking "what are the facts... (or) probabilities they wanted to make it appear that their faction was "getting the better of some rival faction". Again, he saw "contempt...for objective truth", the "holding of schizophrenic beliefs", disregard for facts, and gullibility, as

"mental vices" which "spring ultimately from the nationalistic habit of mind" - itself a product of fear and insecurity (48). Orwell felt this problem was important enough to merit serious study and called nationalism a "disease" which was "almost universal". He believed there was some "psychological vitamin" lacking in modern society which encouraged the "lunacy" of "believing that whole races or nations are mysteriously good or mysteriously evil" (49). This was a sad deterioration from the standard of Dickens, who was "remarkably free from the idiocy of regarding nations as individuals" (50). Racism was, therefore, closely related to nationalism; both were manifestations of the 'in-group'/'out-group' split, which underlay so many patterns of human behaviour.

The essay 'Notes on Nationalism' was Orwell's personal investigation into the subject, and it highlighted much that was directly relatable to racial attitudes, and provides another bridge between them and the world of Nineteen Eighty Four. Orwell defined 'Nationalism' as an emotion that attaches itself to any group, "church or class" (as well as race or area) and is sometimes merely an antipathy "without the need for any positive object of loyalty". It involved identifying with "the unit" and "placing it beyond good or evil and recognising no other duty than that of advancing its interests."

It further involved the assumption "that human beings can be classified like insects" and that large "blocks of humanity" can be "confidentially labelled 'good' or 'bad' (51). The emotion was genuinely self-transcendent, for the nationalist sought advancement "not for himself but for the...unit in which he has chosen to sink his own individuality". This is fundamental to racism, and is one of the emotions that the Party manipulates so skilfully in Oceania. Orwell has recognised that many people can adjust to a higher plane of emotional 'reality' which involves strenuous identification in a positive (but occasionally negative) way. The irrational nature of this attachment was underlined for Orwell by the vagueness and questionable existence of some of the objects of devotion, such as Jewry, Christendom and the White Race, and the fact that it could be negative, for example when a Trotskyist could be sustained merely by anti-Stalinist activities.

Orwell offered a final lengthy definition of a nationalist: one whose mental energy was spent in "boosting or denigrating"; who was obsessed with "victories, defeats, triumphs and humiliations"; who sees history as the rise and fall of "great power units". Nationalism was not worship of success, for the nationalist picked his side first, then persuaded himself that it was the "strongest", "even when the facts were overwhelmingly against him".

Nationalism was, therefore, "power-hunger tempered by self-deception", and although a nationalist was flagrantly dishonest, since he was "conscious of serving something bigger than himself", he was "unshakeably certain of being in the right" (52). One can clearly see the implications for totalitarianism in this summary; history as a tool of infallibility; the emotional switchback of victory and defeat, and the constant readjustment of 'facts' to suit one's emotional commitment. Orwell's intuitions have been confirmed by social psychologists; for example, Tajfel's research at Bristol has shown that a person's behaviour can be altered predictably by telling him that he belongs to a group - even one he has never heard of:

Almost automatically the participant in these experiments favours anonymous members of his own group and...he is likely to go out of his way to put the members of another group at a disadvantage...People will stick up for a group to which they happen to be assigned, without any indoctrination about who else is in the group or what its qualities are supposed to be". (53)

The urge to subordinate one's individuality to a group, including privately-held beliefs and ethics, seems to be an innate human characteristic, and one which Orwell recognised as posing a great problem.

He became more conscious of the ubiquity of 'nationalistic' thought, and was amazed at the continued survival of inept political commentators, until

he realised that their audience was not looking for accuracy, but merely the "stimulation of nationalistic loyalties". The habit affected the criteria of literary criticism too, where the "temptation to claim that any book whose tendency one disagrees with must be a bad book from a literary point of view" was yielded to by people of "strongly nationalistic outlook", without conscious dishonesty (54). Orwell himself was not free of this habit, and was probably speaking from personal experience.

He cited political Catholicism and Communism as two potent objects of loyalty. Chesterton was a writer who had sacrificed sensitivity and honesty in the cause of Catholic "propaganda", and ignorantly idealised "the Latin countries". Spiritual superiority was expressed as crude chauvinism; double standards were applied to the democracy and jingoism of England, France and Italy:

His hold on reality, his literary taste, and even to some extent his moral sense, were dislocated as soon as his nationalistic loyalties were involved" (55)

He listed the characteristics of such an attitude, whatever their object of devotion: "obsession", involved the fetishistic attachment to every facet of the "unit" (a country would be praised for its power, culture, beauty, climate etc.). In Oceania the obsession is circumscribed and no competition

permitted. Then there was "instability"; not of the quality of emotion, but the object of that emotion. In Nineteen Eighty Four feelings are switched around like "a blowlamp", from Big Brother to Goldstein, from Eurasia to Eastasia. Orwell was particularly concerned with "transferred nationalism", and realised that devotion to an unknown entity allowed genuine ignorance to shelter the holder from uncomfortable truths. The "slavish rubbish" written about Stalin by intelligent people, was proof to him that "some kind of dislocation" had occurred. Because conventional patriotism was unacceptable, an ersatz version was sought abroad which allowed people to "wallow unrestrainedly in exactly those emotions" from which they imagined themselves to be emancipated. "Transferred nationalism, like the use of scapegoats, is a way of attaining salvation without altering one's conduct" (56). Orwell's cold appraisal of this gives him a more reliable and permanent status as a political commentator than virtually all of his contemporaries; he believed that "no nationalist of the more bigoted kind can write a book which still seems worth reading after a lapse of years". (57).

A third characteristic was "indifference to reality", in particular the hypocrisy where "there is...no...outrage...which does not change its moral colour when it is committed by 'our side'", and becomes "meritorious" when it

is done "in the 'right' cause" (58). He cited the disagreement over atrocities by political enemies, and claimed that in nationalist thought "there are facts which are both true and untrue, known and unknown". The other symptoms of nationalism follow like the prognosis of a disease: falsification of history; deliberate shielding of the truth, and "the general uncertainty as to what is really happening makes it easier to cling to lunatic beliefs", and deny "unmistakeable" facts. This unreality suited most nationalists, who preferred a dream world "not far from schizophrenia", where their unit was "getting the better of some other unit" and which had "no connection with the physical world (59)

Orwell classified the forms of nationalism as he had experienced them.

"Positive nationalism", including Neo Toryism, Zionism and Celtic Nationalism, was characterised by exaggerated self-importance and a feeling of innate racial superiority. We have talked about "Transferred Nationalism", with its allegiances to Russia, Rome, India etc, and Orwell included Pacifism under this heading, as sometimes being "inspired by an admiration for power and successful cruelty" (60). Finally, there was "Negative Nationalism", which included Anglophobia, antisemitism and Tretskyism, and tended to be a mirror-image of one of the other nationalisms (vide Toryism, Zionism and Stalinism).

This classification introduces the 'scapegoat' concept where, instead of

loyalty and love, anger, hatred and fear are focused onto the objects.

Having 'classified' the nationalisms (as Orwell's categorical training encouraged him to do), he sounded a warning about their universality. Perhaps "the Eltons, Pritts and Coughlins" were extreme, but "we deceive ourselves if we do not realise that we can all resemble them in unguarded moments". Let "the most fair-minded and sweet-tempered person" be provoked and he may be transformed into "a vicious partisan, anxious only to score over his adversary" indifferent to the lies and illogicalities he may commit (61). As Orwell realised, feelings deeper than rationality had been tapped, and were extremely difficult to control. Various theories have been advanced to explain this dislocation between intellect and emotion, and a very brief survey has been included in the notes (62). Orwell understood the effects of this 'split', although he was writing before much work had been done on it. As soon as strong emotions are involved "the sense of reality becomes unhinged", as does the "sense of right and wrong":

There is no crime, absolutely none,, that cannot be condoned when 'our' side commits it. Even if one doesn't deny that the crime has happened, even if one knows that it is exactly the same crime as one has condemned in some other cases, even if one admits in an intellectual sense that it is unjustified - still one cannot feel that it is wrong. Loyalty is involved, and so pity ceases to function" (63)

Winston and Julia's willingness to commit horrifying crimes in the name of The Brotherhood, to undermine The Party, are scarcely satiric examples of this (64). Orwell recognised the relationship between these modern expressions of irrational behaviour and traditional ones. Extremes of nationalism were made possible "by the breakdown of patriotism and religious belief"; the traditional forms had been "an inculcation" against unlicensed excesses, circumscribed by custom and usage.

Orwell believed it was necessary to fight, on the moral plane, against nationalistic tendencies in oneself and, as they were unavoidable to some degree, side with the objectively better cause. His advice boiled down to an updating of the Dickensian "think and behave decently". One needed to know one's real feelings and make allowance for the "inevitable bias". Even though it was impossible to eliminate such feelings "simply by taking thought", one could recognise them "and prevent them from contaminating" one's "mental processes":

The emotional urges which are inescapable, and perhaps even necessary to political action, should be able to exist side by side with an acceptance of reality. But this, I repeat, needs a moral effort...few of us are prepared to make..."(65)

'The Sporting Spirit' was a light postscript to his consideration of

nationalism, dealing with the non-sporting implications of competitive sport, inspired by the visit of a Russian football team. One controversy "typical of our nationalistic age", was the composition of the teams they played - were they Club or international sides? He believed that international sporting contests led to "orgies of hatred" ("mimic warfare" - such as the 1936 Olympics), because prestige and the sense of belonging to "some larger unit" aroused "the most savage combative instincts". Spectators were more prone to believe that these "absurd contests" were tests of "national virtue" than the players. Sometimes conventional racism exacerbated this trend, and "one of the most horrible sights in the world" was a "fight between white and coloured boxers before a mixed audience". In countries where competitive games and nationalism were "recent developments", "even fiercer passions are aroused", which literally ran riot. When "strong feelings of rivalry" are aroused, "the notion of playing the game according to the rules always vanishes. People want to see one side on top and the other humiliated". Such sport is "war minus the shooting", precipitated by identifying "with large power units and seeing everything in terms of competitive prestige". He believed people in the countryside had more opportunity for physical and sadistic outlets, but city dwellers were forced to sublimate theirs in groups; similarly the Middle

Ages were less frenetic than the ancient or modern worlds. In both the countryside and Middle Ages, life was less fragmented and threatening (but not necessarily easier) and therefore people had less need to band themselves into nationalistic groups (66).

Orwell had admitted that the urge to identify with a group and be subordinate to its demands was universal and unavoidable. How, then, did he look to see man cope with this? We saw earlier that power hunger was one of the most sinister drives that Orwell believed man to have, and it was this which he felt was responsible for the reckless, deleterious character of nationalism. Patriotism was his answer to the aggression of nationalism.

Orwell admitted that he had been brought up in the "military tradition" as a patriot, and sympathised with it even "under strange disguises" (67). One of his earliest publications was an extremely patriotic poem in The Henley and South Oxfordshire Standard, at the age of 11 (68). In 'My Country Right or Left' he gave a detailed account of his childhood and public school 'moral' military training, which started "from the cradle onwards" (69). Because he was just too young to fight in the Great War, he developed a "one-eyed pacifism" and superficial rejection of this training which became bitter at times (70). Even the affable Bowling, created in 1938, claimed that the men in the trenches

"weren't patriotic" (71). It was the Second World War, however, and the threat to England which brought home to Orwell the strength of his dormant feelings. He had a dream, the night before the Russo-German Pact was announced, which revealed to him that he was "patriotic at heart"; would fight if possible, and even the Chamberlain Government was "assured" of his loyalty. There were many rational motives which Orwell could have advanced to justify his patriotism, such as opposition to Fascism, but he didn't pretend that they were "the emotional basis" of his actions; it was the "long drilling in patriotism which the middle classes go through". It had taken England being "in a serious jar" to awaken him, and incidentally to rouse his concern for the 'underdog'. He was honest enough to admit that one of his most idealistic actions, fighting in the Spanish War, was partly prompted by the fascination that it might be like the Great War, for which his "senses had been waiting for twenty years".

Orwell's declaration of patriotism to the Government and ruling class of 1939 Britain, apparently contradicted his other strongly held emotional beliefs, like egalitarianism and social progress. He felt bound to explain this paradox. Patriotism was "nothing to do with conservatism", but was "devotion to something that is changing, but is felt to be mystically the same",

and as such an "everyday phenomenon". He compared two poems, one by a Communist, John Cornford, the other by Sir Henry Newbolt, a jingoist. He reckoned "the emotional content" of the two poems was "exactly the same", and proved "the possibility of building a Socialist on the bones of a Blimp, the power of one kind of loyalty to transform itself into another, the spiritual need for patriotism and the military virtues" (72). Orwell says, in effect, that since such feelings are always stirred in an emergency, without benefit of rational reflection, it is better to have decently-directed 'instincts' to arouse. It was better to have a patriotic rather than a nationalistic allegiance.

Orwell considered patriotism "a connecting thread" which ran through all classes in England; the working class variant being "profound" but "unconscious", while only the Europeanised intelligentsia were "immune" to it (73). It had united the country at critical moments, such as Dunkirk (74), and appeared to be one of the "aiding features of the English character, traceable in English Literature from Shakespeare onwards" (75). Its popular manifestations were usually low-key and low-brow, as expressed on the postcards of Donald McGill. It, along with its ugly sister nationalism, was "stronger than class hatred, and always stronger than any kind of internationalism" (76).

He repeated this assertion in Partisan Review (77), and had, in fact, given an early example of this from his down and out days in Paris: at the bistro where he drank, a man who started out the evening "with good Communist principles", but who changed into "a rampant chauvinist, denouncing spies, challenging all foreigners to fight" etc. after a few litres (78). Orwell called this "a queer thing" in 1933, but ten years later he understood it well enough.

In a review of Mein Kampf, he claimed that Hitler understood the need for "patriotism and the military virtues" (79), and in The Lion and the Unicorn wrote that it was impossible to understand "the modern world" unless one recognised the strength of patriotism and national loyalties, and one couldn't survive on hedonism amid peoples "who work like slaves...breed like rabbits and whose chief national industry is war" (80). He was, in effect, encouraging the development of a patriotic dynamic to combat Fascism.

History repeated the lesson of the role of the self-transcending emotions, for "if whole armies had to be coerced, no war would ever be fought". Men died in battle, voluntarily, because of "abstractions called 'honour', 'duty', 'patriotism' and so forth" (81). One of Britain's handicaps (prior to the war) had been the "divorce between patriotism and intelligence", between Highbrow and Blimp. This would have to end, if Britain's chances of

surviving the war were to be real (82). So would discrepancies of wealth which led to inequality of sacrifice. Orwell believed that if this inequality were ended, England's morale would "probably be unbreakable", but until such time there was only "traditional patriotism" to appeal to - "deeper...than elsewhere, but...not...bottomless" (83). Similarly the gulf between the landowning class and the managerial, but propertyless intellectuals, would have to be bridged by Socialists making intelligent use of "their patriotism" instead of merely insulting it" (84). In other words, he saw Britain's survival resulting from the combination of intellectually satisfying social principles with emotionally satisfying patriotism. He gave his personal testament of patriotism in The Lion and the Unicorn and asked if people really wanted "England conquered" or not; if not, they "must add to (their) heritage or lose it...go forward or backward. I believe in England, and I believe we shall go forward" (85). He defended his patriotism from scorn in a heartfelt, satiric poem (86), but confided his deepest feelings to his private war-time diary. He had been urged to emigrate by friends, but refused and thought it "better to die if necessary...not that I want to die; I have so much to live for..." (87).

His patriotism was not without honour, however, and he admitted he

"would dodge paying tax" if he could; "Yet I would live my life for England readily enough, if I thought it necessary. No-one is patriotic about taxes"

(88). He had fictionalised this attitude in Coming Up for Air, where the Lower Binfieldians "were all true-blue Englishmen...but at the same time nobody ever thought of paying a tax...if there was any way of dodging it" (89).

Orwell believed that patriotism was one of the few decent expressions of the urge that underlay nationalism (the self-transcending urge). If harnessed to compassionate intelligence (sympathy for the underdog), it was probably the best choice, for he believed a choice had to be made, and that the feeling would come out in one form or another. For him, patriotism was attachment to a living, developing organism. The 'character' of England, "the gentleness, the hypocrisy...the reverence for law and the hatred of uniforms... the suet puddings and the misty skies" would remain, even though social revolution may (and he hoped would) come:

England will still be England, an everlasting animal stretching into the future and the past, and, like all living things, having the power to change out of recognition and yet remain the same" (90)

Patriotism was "the bridge between the future and the past"; it had "a flavour of its own", with something in it that "persists, as in a living creature".

What had the England of 1940 in common with that of 1840?

But then, what have you in common with the child of five whose photograph your mother keeps on the mantelpiece? Nothing, except that you happen to be the same person." (91)

Patriotism was not to be confused with nationalism, "since two different and even opposing ideas are involved". Patriotism, for Orwell, was "devotion to a particular place and a particular way of life, which one believes to be the best in the world but has no wish to force on other people". Patriotism was "of its nature defensive, both militarily and culturally", while nationalism was "inseparable from the desire for power" (92). Patriotism could be described as "an inoculation against nationalism"; an interesting metaphor, for the principle of inoculation is to give a quiescent strain of an active virus to stimulate the body's defences against the latter. In this case the antibodies produced would consist of moral decency and intelligence.

Although Orwell's patriotism really surfaced in wartime, it is detectable throughout his life as a constant love affair with things characteristically English: cricket; tea; pubs; cookery; furniture, even the English Sunday and the weather were as subtly attractive as otherwise. As he explained with passion in The Lion and the Unicorn:

And above all, it is your civilisation, it is you. However much you hate it or laugh at it, you will never be happy away from it for any length of time. The suet puddings and the red pillar boxes have entered into your soul. Good or evil, it is

yours, you belong to it, and this side the grave you will never get away from the marks it has given you"

The Lion and the Unicorn is Orwell's most explicit patriotic statement, as

Coming Up For Air is his most lyrical, and in both of them he makes clear

how the emotion differs from nationalism. Whereas the latter turns on victories,

prestige and the humiliation of rivals, Orwell admits shame at some of England's

jingoist achievements; nationalism extols beauty and strength, but Orwell

celebrated the mildness, ugliness and apathy of the British; nationalism

revelled in great public displays of military might, but Orwell was grateful

for the privacy, quietness and anti-militarist tradition of English life.

Perhaps most important of all, the characteristic myths and beliefs of the

English turned on a vaguely Christian support for the underdog; a feeling for

fair play, and for the validity and objectivity of the law; and despite our

hypocrisy, a genuine belief in incorrupt, democratic methods. He believed,

from conviction and experience, that the repository of most of these virtues

was in the ordinary working class.

This, then, was part of Orwell's answer to the problem of nationalism.

If one has to be irrationally attached to something, then at least let it be

something decent, worthwhile, which would add to human culture - not destroy it.

Over and above that, one should seek to establish an intellectual and moral

balance to one's irrationality, and so both guide and give perspective to one's feelings and actions.

CHAPTER 9:

ANTISEMITISM: AN EXAMPLE OF SOCIAL IRRATIONALITY

Orwell absorbed much of the atmosphere of the era that he grew up in.

His attitude to race and class issues demonstrated this, although in many ways

his outlook changed in the light of later experiences. This was the case with

Jews and antisemitism. Tosco Fyvel wrote that,

...ideologically, historically, he had been brought up in a milieu that was profoundly antisemitic in its time and... a little of that spirit clung. (1)

Another friend believed that Orwell's family was of the type likely to hold

irrational fears about Jews (2). Orwell himself had no illusions about how

people in his childhood viewed the Jews. In a review of Trilby, he looked

at du Maurier's portrayal of Svengali's 'genius', in contrast to other people's

'character'; "character is what counts". He believed that the normal attitude

towards the Jews was that "They were natural inferiors " (3), and he added

his own experience to du Maurier's, in an assessment of Jewish status in

Edwardian England;

...it was accepted more or less as a law of nature that a Jew was a figure of fun and - though superior in intelligence - slightly deficient in 'character'.

He believed that they had a rough time at public schools, and that their

'Jewishness' was a handicap comparable to a physical stigmata. He took it for

granted that rich Jews disguised their identity under aristocratic names (like a "criminal" changing "identity"), and recalled an incident in Rangoon where a ragged white boy spoke to him, in an accent "difficult to place"; Orwell asked his nationality,

He answered eagerly in his chi-chi accent: 'I an a Joo, sir!' And I remember turning to my companion and saying, only partly in joke, 'He admits it openly.' All the Jews I had known till then were people who were ashamed of being Jews. (4)

Orwell's opinion about the treatment of Jews in public school has been corroborated (5), and one can imagine the outcast of 'Such, Such Were the Joys' being grateful that there were other more 'inferior' creatures than himself in the world. Perhaps the name-changing elicited his understanding - he did *the same thing himself*, and at the age of 10 he may well have seen Punch's cartoon of "Moses and Aaron" trading as "Crewe and Lansdowne" (6). His comparison of the 'disadvantage' of Jewishness to a physical disability, is evidence of identification (via his fictional protagonists) with such sufferers (7).

Another interesting point is his need to 'place' people by their accent. *This reflects* the categorical tendency, prevalent in his childhood. In a letter to Tribune, he explained why he had talked about the smell of the working class:

in The Road to Wigan Pier. It was not only the working classes who were believe to smell thus, and in a revealing sentence he claimed,

...We were taught just the same about Jews, Negroes and various other categories of human beings. (8)

It seems the young Orwell was taught quite a lot about Jews, and we must direct ourselves to this for a moment.

The antisemitism of Orwell's childhood acknowledged 'good Jews' and 'bad Jews'. In his review of Trilby, he noted that there was a racial difference between them. One of the characters, Glorioli, is of Spanish descent, one of the 'Seph'ardim', and possesses admirable qualities; Svengali, who comes from East Europe, is "an oriental Israelite Hebrew Jew." du Maurier was writing in the late nineteenth century when the persecutions of Jews in Russia and Eastern Europe were resulting in large numbers of refugees leaving their ghetto homes and escaping to England and America. A growing campaign was conducted to stop this flow of immigrants, climaxing in the Aliens' Bill of 1905. The campaign took the form of presenting a repulsive picture of the Jewish immigrant and forecasting disaster when he arrived. A typical report was sent from the Emigration Halls of Hamburg, by R.H. Sherard in 1905, who saw

...filthy, rickety jetsam of humanity, bearing on their evil faces the stigmata of every physical and moral degradation

men and women who have no intention of working, otherwise than in trafficking. (9)

The year before, the Tory M.P. for Sheffield had announced in Parliament that 82,000 of the "scum of Europe", had arrived. His fellow M.P. from Northampton warned that if we exported our "best" and received the "worst", the racial stock of Britain would be "seriously impaired and deteriorated." (10). It is ironic to see that while the Burmese were complaining that the British policy of importing Indians into their country was undermining the racial stock, a similar complaint was going up in this country with regard to the Jews from East Europe.

While many attacks, by writers such as Joseph Banister, Foster Fraser and Sherard, were hyperbolic and designed to create hatred, there was evidence for the subversion of British culture in the East End, where the majority of Jewish immigrants settled. In 1893 Sir William Marriot declared in Parliament,

There are some streets you may go through and hardly know you are in England.

Twelve years later, another M.P. painted an exotic picture of the area, instancing railway timetables, advertisements and public entertainments, all given "in Yiddish" (11). The idea was deliberately fostered that Jewish immigrants were diseased, immoral and fecund; that they would swamp local

people, put them out of work, and lower standards. Much of this propaganda was aimed at the working class, and it was helped by the visible presence of the competitive alien.

Bitter were the costers' complaints that the Jewish competitors grabbed the pitches which they had occupied for many years, did business for unfairly long hours, undersold and generally disrupted the accepted usages of the trade. (12)

Even the dockers' leader, Ben Tillett, expressed resentment,

Yes you are our brothers and we will do our duty by you. But we wish you had not come. (13)

Most trade unionists were in the uncomfortable position of seeing exploited workers, who thoroughly deserved their theoretical help, while at the same time attempting to exclude the immigrant in order to safeguard the jobs of their membership. Orwell's comments on the ingrained xenophobia of the working class were true, and the fear had largely come about because of resentment at such competition, real and imagined. Working class antisemitism was a complicating factor in Orwell's attitude towards the phenomenon. In a letter to me, T.R. Fyvel wrote that Orwell liked to "identify culturally" with

the British working class and he knew that a scornful antisemitism was part of the British working man's folklore - and he felt, I think, that like other parts of that folklore this had to be accepted as fact. (14)

Orwell certainly believed that it was as much a working class as a bourgeois

sentiment (15), and its economic origins dated from this period. Even more virulent were small shopkeepers who had seen their business decline, owing to demographic changes and allegedly unfair competition.

Along with the repulsive stereotype, there also came into being the image of the Jew as 'economic man'. The poor immigrant, with no home to return to, was forced to earn his living as best he could. Late nineteenth century London was not the easiest place to do this, therefore the immigrant was forced to drive himself more mercilessly than his indigenous neighbour. J.A. Hobson wrote in The Problem of Poverty in 1891,

Admirable in domestic morality and an orderly citizen, he is almost devoid of social morality. No compunction or consideration for his fellow worker will keep him from underselling and over-reaching them; he acquires a thorough mastery of all the dishonourable tricks of trade which are difficult to restrain by law; the superior calculating intellect which is a national heritage, is used unsparingly to enable him to take advantage of every weakness, folly and vice of the society in which he lives. (16)

These different stereotypes presented conflicting images; here the Jew is a responsible family man - a far cry from the "diseased traffickers" of Sherard.

As Orwell pointed out fifty years later, accusations which cancelled each other out were no problem for the person who really disliked Jews. It is also interesting that the "superior calculating intellect" is presented as a

racial trait. The antisemitism which led to the Aliens' Bill (when Orwell was two years old), was largely based on economic considerations, although it may have reached the level of racial theory among a minority. People such as Arnold White believed in the world 'conspiracy' theory, and saw events such as the Marconi and Indian Silver scandals and the Rothschilds empire, as evidence of this (17). Even Hobson argued that the Boer War was fought for Jewish "interests". However, Orwell noted that Mosley, for instance, hadn't started off his Fascist career by disliking Jews, but only did so when he saw its usefulness in Europe.

One of the complaints about the Aliens' Bill had been its class nature. The criterion for allowing in refugees was frankly financial. The Jewish Chronicle of November 1909, raged against the Bill, pointing out that,

...a half-witted or criminal alien with a ten pound note in his pocket is a worthy resident of these islands, while a sane, honest and industrious foreigner with less than five pounds in his possession is a menace to the national peace.(18)

The poor alien was held to be a drain on the state, the more affluent was greedy and 'amoral', exciting the jealousy of the bourgeoisie. However, those with the necessary Anglicised graces could live down their racial 'disability'. The captain commanding Orwell's position in Spain was a Jew, and there was no derogatory feeling towards him from anyone (19). It is possible that the

intensely patriotic young Orwell would have known about the East End 'aliens' who didn't 'volunteer' for service in the Great War (20). In any event he was a long way from the attitude he admired in Dickens, who held no prejudice against Jews (despite his Fagin portraits) and abjured 'Jew jokes'. Dickens wrote before the large waves of immigration that we have been talking about, and so wouldn't have had that xenophobic stimulus. Dickens's outlook on the Jews was part of his naturally tolerant, decent world-view.

The figure of the repulsive Jew crops up in Orwell's essay 'Hop-Picking' he had many squalid encounters, but reserved a special venom for a young, louse-laden, unwashed Jew from Liverpool,

...a thorough guttersnipe. I do not know when I have seen anyone who disgusted me so much as this boy. He was as greedy as a pig about food, perpetually scrounging around dustbins, and he had a face that recalled some low-down carrion-eating beast. His manner of talking about women, and the expression of his face when he did so, were so loathesomely obscene as to make me feel almost sick. (21)

This wretched creature was immortalised in literature because he ate some chips that had been trodden on (22). He also seems to have been fictionalised in the surreal night scene in A Clergyman's Daughter, under the insulting name of Kike (23). Of all the pathetic cast, the Kike is the least constructive, most self-pitying, dirtiest, most despised member. He has fleas, is refused an overcoat, and had no conversation except humourless complaint. He personifies

the human flotsam that left the Hamburg Emigration Halls for England.

He was not the only Jew to go from 'Hop-Picking' to A Clergyman's Daughter. Orwell mentioned a thief in the essay, who sold his stolen goods to "a Jew in Lambeth Cut" (24). When Dorothy returns from the hopfields, she stayed in a disreputable house in Lambeth Cut, and one person who took her for a potential prostitute and intimidated her "worst of all" was the Jewish owner of a cheap clothing shop. He obstructed passers-by, forcing them into the shop; once there he cajoled them into buying trousers or threatened to fight. He was a rude bully, but still kept an eye out for the "birds". Dorothy "makes his mouth water", and he enquires if she's "ready to begin" with a lecherous eye and a "discreet pinch on the backside" (25). He is a burlesque of the worst (alleged) Jewish characteristics, the "visible alien" par excellence.

Another Jew who went from fact to fiction was one Orwell met in prison. In the essay 'Clink', Orwell recorded his case. He had taken £28 from his employer and spent it on tarts in Edinburgh; some of the money was repaid, and the rest was going to be. Orwell was particularly interested to hear that the employer had offended the synagogue by prosecuting before going to the Jewish arbitration courts (26). In Keep the Aspidistra Flying, the money was reduced to £27 and the man had bolted to Aberdeen, but otherwise he was as before.

This anecdote illustrates a criticism traditionally levelled against Jews - their exclusiveness. This apparently self-imposed characteristic was much resented by non-Jews. When a community is exclusive in disputes, marriage, socialising, religion, business etc. it is ⁱⁿ a poor position to argue against discrimination by the host society. Arthur Koestler, in his essay 'Judah at the Crossroads', talked frankly about the self-segregating tendency of the Jewish faith, and believed all Jews,

...are bound to regard themselves, by the articles of their faith, as members of a separate race, with a separate national past and future. The fact that they are unaware...of the secular implications of their creed, and that the majority indignantly reject 'racial' discrimination if it comes from the other camp, makes the Jewish tradition only more paradoxical and self-contradictory. (27)

Recent studies of antisemitism have certainly not ignored this aspect (28).

Orwell was antagonistic to this self-segregating characteristic, and in a review of The Spirit of Catholicism, he talked about,

...the Hebrew-like pride and exclusiveness of the genuine Catholic mind. (29)

Even with Hitler in power, Orwell didn't mince words; in a review of The Calf of Paper, he wrote that a scene in the book,

...is a reminder that if you want antisemitism explained the best book to read is the Old Testament. (30)

In a review of The Martyrdom of Man, Orwell recounted a pleasure usually only afforded by a few great authors. When he read Reade's description of the ,

...typical Hebrew prophet, and saw the words 'As soon as he received his mission he ceased to wash', I felt profoundly 'This man is on my side'...Here was somebody who...accepted Jesus as...one of a long line of very similar Jewish fanatics.

(31)

He demonstrated a familiarity with the Old Testament in much of his writing, and in 'New Words' he used it to exemplify irrational, unadventurous thought,

...the most dangerous pride is the false pride of the intellect. David was punished because he numbered the people. (32)

This can be interpreted as resentment against the arrogance of the Jewish outlook, a feeling he also held for Catholics and Communists. It is also a reaction to the Anglican/Old Testament tradition that he had been brought up in.

Down and Out in Paris and London received mainly good reviews, but a late one by Edmund Fuller charged it with possessing, "...a vein of the grossest most flagrant antisemitism that I have seen in years." (33). This comment came twenty years after the book was written, during which time the Nazis had been and gone - something which Orwell was aware of in distinguishing antisemitism before and after the rise of Hitler. However, does the book contain antisemitism? Or is this a case of an imaginary scenting of some? Not many people emerge from Orwell's dishwashing and tramping scrutiny unscathed, and Jews are none

exception. He described the red-haired Jewish owner of a second-hand shop in Paris, whom he was obliged to patronise, as an "extraordinary disagreeable man" who swore furiously at customers and paid "incredibly low prices". He preferred exchanging to buying,

...and he had a trick of thrusting some useless article into one's hand and then pretending that one had accepted it...It would have been a pleasure to flatten the Jew's nose, if only one could have afforded it. (34)

Orwell was obviously on the wrong side of the counter to appreciate the man's possible finer points, and he enjoyed this delayed dig, including the oblique reference to the man's physiognomy in the last line. Assuming he has given a true account, one cannot blame Orwell for feeling as he did; however, the writing is designed to create emotional revulsion.

Another Jew shared a room with Orwell's friend, Boris. The Jew owed Boris money and was sleeping in Boris's bed (the latter on the floor), as he repaid Boris a meagre daily sum - enough for a coffee and three rolls. Boris hoped that the Jew would steal machinery from work and employ him to clean it. This didn't happen, and now the Jew had become patronising about repaying Boris. This upset Boris, who said that Orwell, as an Englishman, could not conceive,

...what torture it was to a Russian of family to be at the mercy of a Jew. 'A Jew...a veritable Jew! And he hasn't even

the decency to be ashamed of it. To think that I, a captain in the Russian army...am eating the bread of a Jew. A Jew... I will tell you what Jews are like.'

Boris told of a "horrible" old Jew "with a red beard like Judas Iscariot", who had offered him a beautiful seventeen year-old girl for "only fifty francs". Boris, afraid of "diseases", declined. The Jew indignantly denied such a risk - the girl was his own daughter!

'That is the Jewish national character for you. Have I ever told you...that in the old Russian army it was considered bad form to spit on a Jew? Yes, we thought a Russian officer's spittle was too precious to be wasted on Jews etc.' (35)

Orwell obviously enjoyed relating this antisemitic, sexually-spiced anecdote, which is in keeping with continental tradition. He saw nothing wrong with this, provided it told a good story.

Boris's Jew has meanwhile become a "dirty thief". Apparently the Jew had only paid up the daily two francs under threat, and then patronisingly. In the morning, he stole it back; Boris thought his behaviour "intolerable";

'Will you believe it, the other night he had the indecency to bring a woman in here, while I was on the floor. The low animal!

Also the Jew intended to leave, owing rent and ruining Boris (36). It is hard to imagine a more ungentlemanly series of manoeuvres; Orwell has portrayed him as a true 'cad', with 'brains' but no 'character'. The "woman" is the

the final damning indictment in this Svengali-like behaviour. Orwell and Boris appear as overgrown public-school boys, naively enthusiastic and loyal, whom the Jew exploits and robs. Dashed unsporting.

Just before Orwell left Paris, he heard about an old miser who lived in that quarter, and who had been approached by a "business-like" Jew, with a plan for smuggling cocaine. The Jew swore there was no risk; he already had half the necessary money from a student, and asked the miser for the rest. He and the student spent weeks "bullying, coaxing and arguing, going down on their knees and imploring him to produce the money" (37). The money was handed over, the Jew delivered the cocaine and promptly vanished. Early next morning police raided the quarter and the student and the miser were desperate to avoid being caught in possession of the drug. The miser would not dream of getting rid of it and, with an imaginative touch, it was placed in an emptied face-powder tin. The police arrested them, took away the tin and analysed the substance - which turned out to be face powder. The Jew had "double-crossed" them, as he had done others previously (38).

All three stories of Parisian Jews conform to the antisocial, scheming, 'economic man' stereotype, while Boris's virulent attitude was typical of the emigré 'white' Russian's, who saw the Jew as saboteur and pest. There is no

doubt that Orwell enjoyed such stories, unselfconsciously and without apology, as he would have related any snippet about human nature. It is antisemitism of the most 'natural' kind, ingrained in the culture of Europe, and with nothing 'remarkable' about it (39).

When he returned to England, Orwell was in the land of tea-drinkers and unimaginative cheap cafes. He described the interior of one such cafe, including in the scenario,

In a corner by himself a Jew, muzzle down in the plate...
guiltily wolfing bacon. (40)

The derogatory animal imagery expresses his fundamental disapproval. Later he met a pavement artist called Bozo, who looked Jewish, but denied this "vigorously" and called his hook nose "Roman" (41). Orwell thoroughly approved him, as the book shows, and it cannot be coincidental that Bozo emphasised his non-Jewishness. His reaction was what Orwell had expected from the little boy in Rangoon.

There are no neutral references to Jews in the book; any Jew described in detail is an unpleasant character. However, the tone is of resigned disgust rather than hatred. Jews are seen as stereotypically second rate. The same comment could be made of Orwell, as he himself made of Eliot. He claimed it "nonsense" to call Eliot antisemitic, because "of course" there were "anti-

semitic remarks" in his early work,

'...but who didn't say such things at the time? One has to draw a distinction between what was said before and what after 1934.' (42)

Orwell is confusing issues here; after all, if a remark is anti something or other, then it is anti, whether or not some scarcely sane philosophy has been developed elsewhere which magnifies the consequences out of all recognition. One might as well claim that bullets aren't dangerous in view of the Hydrogen Bomb. What Orwell meant was that such ideas were part of the cultural 'scenery' with implications at face value. But he must have realised that people don't disguise their identity (as Jews did) unless they were under considerable pressure. The problem for Orwell's later enquiries into antisemitism was that the Gas-Chambers had overshadowed the earlier attitudes.

Undoubtedly many of Orwell's early comments about Jews are uncomplimentary. In Burmese Days there are two scathing asides; one remarking that the Empire was "a device for giving trade monopolies to...gangs of Jews" (43). There are frequent references to Blackwoods magazine throughout the novel (and Orwell certainly read it), and that publication had taken a definitely antisemitic stance, objecting to the appointment of Lord Reading as Viceroy, and Montagu as Secretary of State for India, saying that Jews had too much "influence" in

the Empire. There was also the 'Indian Silver Scandal' just before the First War, when Orwell was at the impressionable age of ten, in which Jews were unfavourably implicated (44).

In a letter to Jack Common from Morocco, he was sarcastic about Jewish gluttony following the Yom Kippur fast (45). However, one can see his irritation with Jews most clearly, at this stage, in a review he wrote of Professor MacMurray's book, The Clue to History. He summarised the book's main thesis as an inverted 'Conspiracy Theory', proclaiming the inevitability of Communism and the special Jewish role in this. Even Hitler was only a scourge, preparing

...the Jewish Kingdom of Heaven in the form of a society of free and equal human beings.

He dismissed the author's claim that the Hebrew culture was the only religious culture, as dishonest, and was further annoyed by the assertion that 'Jewish consciousness' was freer from dualism than any other group's. He believed that they were "slaves to the most incorrigible dualism of all", seeing everything in "Jew-Gentile" terms. They had no sense of "human brotherhood"; the Old Testament was full of "hatred and self-righteousness",

No duties towards foreigners are recognised, extermination of enemies is enjoined as a religious duty, Jehovah is a tribal deity of the worst type. (46)

Finally, the Jews rejected Jesus "more decisively" than pagan nations. Here is

the familiar accusation of exclusiveness, and as its role in Jewish life seems particularly remarkable, a short diversion around that point may be appropriate.

All early human groups were exclusive. In order to survive, man organised himself into viable bands; this entailed the development of amity within one's own group, and enmity to those outside it. For a group to survive, it had to feel itself uniquely important, the only 'real' humanity. These emotions evolved as part of early man's survival package, along with increased brain capacity, upright gait and so on. The Old Testament is one of the earliest and most comprehensive tribal histories in existence; it is hardly surprising, therefore that it is full of the sentiments that Orwell has outlined. What is peculiar to the Jewish culture, is its continuity; the tribal exclusiveness which has adapted to modern times. Part of that exclusiveness is a compensation for having no homeland since the Diaspora. It is a measure of Orwell's incomprehension that he scarcely registered this intellectually and certainly not emotionally.

Orwell was never tolerant of claims for such things as "national consciousness" (despite The Lion and the Unicorn), and he described MacMurray's thesis of the continuity of Jewish consciousness as "racial mysticism", and queried its known worth;

Moreover, he seems to be suggesting that the 'Jewish consciousness' - developing, no doubt, but recognisably the same thing

has persisted from Biblical times until the present...(but) how much has a typical modern Jew, a New York solicitor say, in common with some bloodthirsty nomad of the Bronze Age? Is there really such a thing as the 'Jewish consciousness?' (47)

The answer to the penultimate question is more affirmative than Orwell cared to believe, in view of the way he has phrased it. But it is not the implied simple relationship either, and to understand 'Jewish consciousness' one would need greater insight into Jewish culture than I (or I suspect Orwell) possessed.

But a cultural mystique is undoubtedly a feature of Jewishness, and, according to Koestler, it is semi-consciously racial. Ironically it was this concept of cultural continuity that Orwell appears to have borrowed in The Lion and the Unicorn, to give his patriotism an evolutionary aspect.

Another claim by MacMurray, was Jewish responsibility for all social progress, either directly or via Christianity. Orwell angrily discounted this, and was incensed by the arrogance of such "inevitable" prognoses. In the light of contemporary Europe, Orwell believed this to be a foolish attitude, because it vindicated Hitler;

The 'Jewish consciousness' is 'poison' to the Aryan races and Hitler's perception of this is 'the proof of his genius'. The only difference is that whereas Hitler disapproves of what is happening...MacMurray approves.

Orwell claimed that if such an issue were even believed to exist, everyone

would "side" with Hitler; if Western civilisation felt threatened by an alien race it "throw itself at Hitler's feet". This was the worst time for theorising about the Jews as a "sinister", "mysterious" group; what was needed was to regard the Jews as "human beings before they are Jews." Orwell disliked apocalyptic racial statements about the future of civilisation and, in a cruelly ironic thesis, painted Hitler as the underdog and the Jews as unattractive victors. However, some of the arguments rubbed off on Orwell, and he later wrote about the need to resist Hitler, and the fact that,

From the English-speaking culture...a society of free and equal human beings will ultimately arise. But it is precisely the idea of human equality - the 'Jewish' or 'Judaeo-Christian' idea of equality - that Hitler came into the world to destroy...(48)

The appeal at that stage of the war was to the English-speaking peoples, but the 'Jewish' idea of equality had entered Orwell's writing, as had the concept of cultural 'consciousness'. It seems as though the claims of Jewish civilisation (initially rejected because of their immodesty and his ingrained prejudice) were later admitted to be partially valid.

Apropos of MacMurray's thesis relating Jews to Communism, Orwell included a Jewish left-winger in Coming Up For Air. At the political meeting attended by George Bowling was,

...what they call a Trotskyist...very thin, very dark, nervous-looking boy. Clever face. Jew, of course. (49)

This was the stereotype of the Jewish political activist; undernourished, neurotic and intelligent. It is a wonder that Orwell did not add that he was tubercular and living in a garret.

Orwell rounded off his review of MacMurray's book with a well-turned paraphrase of the scapegoat theory of antisemitism (50), which revolved around Jewish exclusiveness and the ghetto life.

As Orwell's social and political sensitivity grew, the derogatory stereotypes of childhood no longer satisfied him and we can see a determination to find the truth of complex realities, no matter what the cost. Despite events in Europe, he wasn't constrained by emotional prejudice. He neither pretended that persecuted Jews were perfect, nor did he ignore their plight because they were distasteful to him. We shall see how his curiosity became aroused; how his calls for an investigation into antisemitism were met by an honest personal enquiry of his own; and finally his mature consideration of the matter.

Although the Second World War forced the question of antisemitism into the forefront of Orwell's consciousness, he had already written perceptively about Moroccan Jews in the essay 'Marrakech'. He described the squalid condition of the Jewish quarter; the narrow streets, with urine running down; the

windowless houses and sore-eyed children; the black robes of Jews who worked in "fly-infested" booths. When he lit a cigarette, a "frenzied rush" of Jews, many blind and disabled, clamoured for one, and he emptied his packet in seconds.

None of these people...works less than twelve hours a day, and every one of them looks on a cigarette as a more or less impossible luxury.

The Jews were horribly overcrowded and poor, yet Orwell still heard the "usual dark rumours" about them; peoples' jobs were given to Jews; Jews were the "real rulers of the country"; they had "all the money" and controlled "everything";

'But,' I said, 'isn't it a fact that the average Jew is a labourer working for about a penny an hour?'

'Ah, that's only for show! They're all moneylenders really. They're cunning, the Jews.'

In just the same way, a couple of hundred years ago, poor old women used to be burnt for witchcraft when they could not even work enough magic to get themselves a square meal.

(51)

The passage illustrates the awesome conditions of the ghetto and its cultural introversion, which doesn't disappear when the walls do. Orwell's sympathy is apparent throughout the passage, and there are two small pointers to his feelings. First, he makes no mention of the smell which must have pervaded the quarter - a rare omission; and secondly, he uses a symbolic yardstick of deprivation - the attitude to cigarettes (52).

The war precipitated a crisis in Orwell's attitude to antisemitism.

He knew that Jews fled Fascist persecutions (53); that in England, Mosley had used them as scapegoats since 1934 (54), and that the Blackshirts described the war as "Jewish" (55). In a letter to Partisan Review, he talked of the history of British xenophobia which underlay the current anti-Jewish resentment. Trade-Union opposition, for example, had prevented large scale immigration before 1939. He believed things had improved with personal contact and more job availability (56). However, there were "disquieting pockets" of antisemitism about; Jews were believed to "dodge military service", be the worst offenders "on the Black Market" etc. even by people who had never seen a Jew. The idea (57) of a "Jewish war" had not caught on, though. As the war continued, he became more thoughtful and puzzled; his attitude fluctuated too. He sympathetically reviewed a play in Time and Tide which dealt with Jews in Germany (58), but less than a week later in Tribune he wrote rather testily that he had "heard enough" about "concentration camps" and Jewish "persecutions" and would welcome something that told what it was like to be a Nazi (59).

In a letter to Partisan Review, 1943, he recounted the extent and content of antisemitism, as he saw it. He believed that antisemitism was "primarily a working class thing", and cited his Home Guard experience as proof that only they held the "cunning and sinister" racial theory of Jews. This

allowed the working class simply to ignore Jewish persecutions. Despite this, he believed that xenophobia rather than anti-Jewishness was the motive (English Jews were accepted, European ones weren't). However, antisemitism had spread to the middle class,

The usual formula is 'Of course I don't want you to think that I'm antisemitic, but...and here follows a catalogue of Jewish misdeeds.

These included evasion of military service, breaking the food laws, queue jumping and so on. Orwell cited the "incredible tactlessness" of some refugees, such as the remarks of a German Jewess, "These English police are not nearly so smart as our S.S. men". Orwell felt that bourgeois arguments were only rationalisations of prejudice, and that people hated Jews so much, they forgot about the horrors. Even the intelligentsia pretended that the refugees were all "petty bourgeois", so their "abuse" could continue under a "respectable disguise" (60). In fact the intelligentsia were the least honest in their antisemitism, because, recognising its irrationality, they couldn't admit that they suffered from it. This is like the schizophrenia that Orwell said the Left had over the Empire, where at least the economic advantages of hypocrisy were obvious. Exactly what benefit derived from antisemitism was not clear.

In a review of Douglas Reed's Lest We Forget, Orwell described Reed's

home-spun Fascism, and his unbelievable objection to "sympathy" for Jews;

For the Jews, it appears, have never been persecuted in Germany...Everybody else has been persecuted, but not the Jews; all the stories about Pogroms and so forth are just 'propaganda'. (61)

This puzzled and alarmed Orwell; here was one influential writer whose antisemitism had caused the facts to "bounce" off his consciousness "like peas off a steel helmet" (62). Orwell then reviewed two books on Jews by Jews. He urged the need for research into antisemitism, and distinguished its irrational and economic components. One of the books, Why I am a Jew, claimed that the Jews were persecuted simply because they had retained their Jewish faith against all the odds. Orwell didn't believe that this carried much weight in modern times. The other book, The Devil and the Jews, claimed that antisemitism was on the same level as medieval witch-hunting, but had survived into the modern world. Orwell agreed that contemporary ideas about Jews were irrational, instancing the simultaneous Fascist charge of "Communist" and "Capitalist", and the belief that poor Jews were secret millionaires. There were still two questions to be answered: why were Jews initially persecuted? Why had this survived, when other persecutions hadn't? Orwell ended his review in a characteristically frank and challenging manner, asking why people were still

ready to believe that Jews "smell", that they were planning to dominate the world, and that they were immoral. The subject needed investigation,

And the fact that we should probably find that antisemitism of various kinds is alarmingly common, and that educated people are not in the least immune from it, ought not to deter us. (63)

The last sentence is perhaps the beginning of an acknowledgement that Orwell recognised some of the symptoms in himself. His "ability to face unpleasant facts" made him realise that suppression was no answer. The frequency and diversity of antisemitism made him consider its complexity; clearly it does not involve one simple psychological process, yet it seems universal.

A few days later, he wrote about the reaction to his two previous reviews, which brought him the usual "wad of antisemitic letters", and left him thinking "for the thousandth time" that the problem was evaded even by the people "it concerns most directly" (64). He distinguished the fanatic believer in The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, from the moderate, widespread antipathy of small business and professional men who believed that the Jews brought problems on themselves. The latter believed in the 'economic man' figure of asocial underhandedness, wrote well-balanced letters, disclaimed racism, and supported their complaints factually. They also acknowledged 'good' Jews, and claimed to have been influenced only by the behaviour of Jews themselves. Orwell

warned the Left that their method of dealing with antisemitism only in rational terms, was inadequate, and psychologically ignorant (as he had chastised them in The Road to Wigan Pier for failing to meet Fascism on its own emotional ground). Orwell's strength was his insight into the power of emotions over the sterility of hedonistic materialism. He didn't want arguments to remain at that level, however; he wanted them examined dispassionately, so that rationality could eventually predominate. What he did know to be self-defeating, was to suppress or disclaim such feelings. This psychological acuity influenced the satirical form of his two final books - where his 'emotional' foot in the door allowed reflective discussion to follow.

Orwell continued his argument in Tribune, by acknowledging the truth, but impotence, of the arguments that Jews were scapegoats;

One does not dispose of a belief by showing that it is irrational. Nor is it any use, in my experience, to talk about the persecution of the Jews in Germany. If a man has the slightest disposition towards antisemitism, such things bounce off his consciousness like peas off a steel helmet.

(65)

His experience with Douglas Reed and the antisemitic correspondents confirmed the conclusion that he wrote in 'Notes on Nationalism', "...their antisemitism has caused this vast crime to bounce off their consciousness." (66). He warned that an enquiry ought not to assume the causes to be economic, and illustrated

this with the antisemitic strain in European Literature;

Without even getting up from this table to consult a book I can think of passages in Villon, Shakespeare, Smollett, Thackeray, H.G.Wells, Aldous Huxley, T.S.Eliot and many another which would be called antisemitic if they had been written since Hitler came to power. Both Belloc and Chesterton...~~more~~ than flirted with antisemitism, and other writers... have swallowed it...in its Nazi form. Clearly the neurosis lies very deep, and just what it is that people hate when they say that they hate a non-existent entity called 'the Jews' is still uncertain. (67)

He believed that people were afraid to investigate, for "fear of finding out how widespread"it is. He is beginning to examine his own childhood cultural climate, and to see that even here it was not the liberal humanitarianism he had assumed (as he had already discovered with imperialism and class). His enquiry is shifting its balance from the simplistic and patent to the complex and latent. Other experiences, such as the Socialist attitude to Empire, demonstrated that people often disclaimed influence by the factors which really affected them. This was owing to embarrassment and ignorance of their own psychological processes. The importance and diversity of the Jews' scapegoat role, made access to it and definition extremely difficult.

One symptom of antisemitism that Orwell diligently kept track of was the 'Jew joke', Here the Jew was always stereotyped as crook, charlatan, money-

lender or cunning miser. In 'The Art of Donald McGill', Orwell noted that the 'Jew-joke' had disappeared after the rise of Hitler (68). However, in his war-time diary of 1940, Orwell was so disturbed by anti-Jewish rumours, particularly that Jews predominated among those sheltering in the Tubes, that he determined to "try and verify this". A week later he wrote,

With reference to the advertisements in the Tube stations, 'Be a man' etc. (asking able-bodied men not to shelter there but to leave the space for women and children), D says the joke going round London is that it was a mistake to print these notices in English. (69)

In the summer of 1942, he recorded a story from David Astor, which summed up the lunatic suspiciousness of wartime, and also included a dig at Jewish 'cleverness';

First Jew: 'Where are you going to?'

Second Jew: 'Berlin.'

First Jew: 'Liar! You just say that to deceive me. You know that if you say that you are going to Berlin I shall think you are going to Leipzig, and all the time, you dirty crook, you really are going to Berlin!' (70)

Obviously the privately circulating Jew joke was not finished; when Orwell heard a public one, he recorded it (71).

Towards the end of 1944, he included a leaflet in Tribune, which had been handed out in a pub,

LONG LIVE THE IRISH!

The first American soldier to kill a Jap was Mike Murphy.
The first American pilot to sink a Jap battleship was Colin Kelly.

The first American family to lose five sons in one action and have a naval vessel named after them were the Sullivans.

There followed a list of Irish-American heroes, until...

The first American son-of-a-bitch to get four new tyres from the ration board was Abie Goldstein.

Orwell appealed for any similar manifestations to be sent to him (72). Orwell was not the first to comment on this offering. In a pamphlet (which Orwell had collected), the Communist Scottish M.P. William Gallacher also quoted it, but followed it up more forthrightly. Gallacher had read the poem in The Enfield Gazette, and accused the editor of foolishly helping Nazi "antisemitic poison" into the American press. He then documented the true facts behind the Colin Kelly battleship sinking. The bombardier was "the Jew Meyer Levin", who was "praised by his comrades for his self-sacrificing action in aiding their escape". Gallacher concluded,

The young Jewish hero is dead. The purveyor of antisemitic filth is still alive. Is it strange that mankind often wonders at the perversity of fate? (73)

In Orwell's large pamphlet collection, a significant number were pro-Jew and pro-Palestine (74); proof that he was aware of their views.

It was difficult to tread the line between condemning antisemitism and neurotically detecting it everywhere. Orwell wrote to Roy Fuller in 1944, apologising for a reviewer's insinuation that Fuller's work was antisemitic. He personally had not found it so, and imagined that the reviewer had associated the central character's Jewishness and inadequacy, "and perhaps that counts as antisemitism nowadays." (75). Orwell ended the letter with a sigh of despair, claiming that it was impossible to write about Jews "favourably or unfavourably" without "getting into trouble". Roy Fuller assured me that the charge of antisemitism was groundless, and that he had hoped for a public apology from Tribune (76). On the other hand, when Orwell saw venomous antisemitism, he felt bound to comment on it;

TO THE JEW-PAID EDITOR, TRIBUNE, LONDON.

...WE KNOW YOU ARE IN THE PAY OF THE YIDS AND SOVIETS. YOU ARE A FRIEND OF THE ENEMIES OF BRITAIN! THE DAY OF RECKONING IS AT HAND. BEWARE. ALL JEW PIGS WILL BE EXTERMINATED THE HITLER WAY -- THE ONLY WAY TO GET RID OF THE YIDS. PERISH JUDAH.

He pondered the loss of reality in such an attitude, impervious to proof, and listed similarly unfounded beliefs, including "the machinations of the Jews", and

Catholic nuns who believed that at Masonic gatherings the Devil appeared in person, wearing full evening dress with a hole in the trousers for his tail to come through. In one form or another this kind of thing seems to attack nearly everybody, apparently answering to some obscure psychological

need of our time. (77)

The "need" required examination, but Orwell's disgust with this level of antisemitism is apparent. He defended Tribune's liberal editorial policy, but excluded "antisemitic propaganda" as permissible (78). A characteristic of such antisemitism was its obsessiveness, and Orwell saw its relationship to the cohesive nationalism of totalitarianism. It did not matter that such feelings were based on nonsense, the dynamic of group subscription ensured their success.

Orwell felt that this complex problem needed immediate investigation, perhaps prompted by the recognition of symptoms in himself. He, therefore, attempted to neutralise the phenomenon by understanding it. Paul Potts remembered that,

Orwell used to say that everyone had some antisemitism in them and the thing to do is to take it out and let the air of reason reduce it considerably (79)

He did not always maintain such an optimistic attitude, but he did document the 'pecking-order' role of antisemitism, with its relevance to 'good' Jew/ 'bad' Jew (80); American Negroes (81); Irish labourers (82); and Moroccan Arabs (83). Their antisemitism was a buffer shielding them from the uncomfortable socio-economic facts of life.

There was the added complication in wartime, of people being ashamed

of their antisemitic feelings, because of the fate of the European Jews. As Orwell observed in 'Notes on Nationalism', antisemitism was rarely evident because "any thinking person" sided with the Jews against the Nazis, carefully disclaiming and avoiding it. However, he believed it to be "widespread" and exacerbated by "the general conspiracy of silence" (84). Even after the war, Orwell believed that no-one "literate enough to have heard the word ever admits to being guilty of antisemitism" (85). In fact the liberal tradition of this country had always limited the acceptable "expression" and "influence of antisemitism" (86).

However, despite the difficulties, Orwell resolved to think the thing out in print, and the result was 'Antisemitism in Britain', published in 1945 in The Contemporary Jewish Record. He began with statistics reflecting the relative insignificance of Jews in the business and political life of the country. He cited examples of antisemitism which demonstrated that intelligent people were ashamed of and careful to distinguish it from "disliking Jews"; also that it was irrational, and accusations "merely rationalise some deep-rooted prejudice". Because of this, people had such feelings, "while being fully aware that their outlook is indefensible", and attempts to change them could be counter-productive (87)

He thought the latent growth of war-time antisemitism was assisted by the war's

'Jewish' tag (Jews would benefit most from an Allied victory); the largely undisputed charge that Jews dodged military service; the nature of Jewish occupations (e.g. retail), where shortages, corruption etc. ensured unpopularity; poor Jewish behaviour during air-raids.

Orwell was particularly interested in the last point, and his war-time refers to it several times. One entry is relevant here; Orwell conducted a personal survey of three central Tube stations, and detected a "higher proportion of Jews" than normal, noting that they went "out of their way" to make themselves "conspicuous",

A fearful Jewish woman, a regular comic-paper cartoon of a Jewess, fought her way off the train at Oxford Circus, landing blows on anyone who stood in her way. (88)

Because the predominantly Jewish Whitechapel area had been blitzed early on, the higher proportion of Jews was to be expected, but the "regular comic-paper cartoon of a Jewess" stereotype was one that Orwell sympathised with. However, he was aware of this, and his commitment to fairness and the underdog ensured his objectivity. When I suggested to Arthur Koestler that Orwell wrote against the evil of antisemitism from his moral, conscious self - but underneath he was suffering from the same condition, Koestler replied,

I think your assessment of Orwell's attitude is correct, or, to paraphrase it in Weitzman's words 'nobody should be more

antisemitic than he can help'...the emotional bias was unmistakably present. (89)

There was a masochistic element in some Jews which offended Orwell.

The tendency to "admire anyone who kicks them" was something he believed they shared with Indians (90). Orwell even recorded the "fantastic" view that some Jews were turning pro-Hitler. Apart from the persecutions, he thought Hitler's system preferable to them, but owing to their "central European" rather than "Jewish" mentality. However, he was offended that they made use of England "as a sanctuary", while "feeling the profoundest contempt" for it,

...you can see this in their eyes, even when they don't say it outright. (91)

And though he didn't say it outright, this rankled Orwell's patriotic feelings.

Orwell was disturbed by the conflict between people's real and declared feelings on antisemitism. He instanced a service of intercession for Polish Jews in St. John's Wood, attended by people he knew to be antisemitic. He believed this to be a conscious (intellectual) attempt to behave "decently" by people whose subjective (emotional) sentiments must have been very different. This was a mixed blessing, ensuring that antisemitism never became respectable, but suppressing feelings which would have been better dealt with in the open. This led to compensatory distortions in literature, the press etc. and on

Palestine, where it was "de rigueur" among "enlightened" people to accept the "Jewish case as proved and avoid examining the claims of the Arabs". (92). It was the same sort of unreality that Orwell had noted with the unmentionability of Empire by the Left. Thanks to Hitler, a psychological gap was opening up, where the press was "censored in favour of the Jews", but privately antisemitism was increasing. Orwell's honesty and fear of the moral, social consequences of 'doublethink' were aroused, and he warned that guilt undermined objectivity. He believed people were afraid of "probing too deeply",

...of discovering ~~not~~ only that antisemitism is spreading, but that they themselves are infected by it. (93)

Orwell's attitude here is the same as he adopted to the Left's blind spot over bourgeois culture; one should not ignore or disclaim what is there, for this only erected inhibitions. One should investigate fearlessly, and deal as decently as possible with whatever existed.

He recapitulated the antisemitic strain in British culture (94), and emphasised the war's polarisation of the conscious suppression of antisemitism in some, and its neurotic increase in others (95). Working class prejudice was rationalised by calling the Jew an exploiter, the intelligentsia's by believing him unpatriotic. This latter argument was a reaction to the shallow 'Leftism'

of the thirties, in which Jews were believed to predominate (96).

Orwell admitted ignorance of the origins of antisemitism, but concluded that it was part of "the larger problem of nationalism", itself uninvestigated,

...and that the Jew is evidently a scapegoat, though for what he is a scapegoat we do not yet know. (97)

In 'Politics vs Literature', Orwell summarised the emotional vacuum of the Houyhnhnms, where the only feeling is directed against the Yahoos, who occupy "rather the same place as the Jews in Nazi Germany" (98).

His final paragraph emphasised the psychological nature of antisemitism and the difficulty of objectivity where one's own emotions were involved,

What vitiates nearly all that is written about antisemitism is the assumption in the writer's mind that he himself is immune to it...He thus fails to start his investigations in the one place where he could get hold of some reliable evidence, in his own mind.

This challenging honesty makes Orwell's work individual and deeply attractive.

He believed that an intelligent person could see his emotions dispassionately,

and therefore suggested that the starting point for antisemitic investigation

was "why does antisemitism appeal to me? What is there about it that I feel

to be true?" At least then one discovered one's rationalisations. The problem

should be looked at by people "who know that they are not immune to that kind

of emotion", But it could only be cured within the larger context of nationalism

Orwell had come as near as he could to acknowledging publicly his own antisemitic tendency; the ability to face up to unpleasant facts had proved itself once more.

There was little further development in Orwell's attitudes after this, if only because his obsession with totalitarianism took up so much of the rest of his life. There are things worth commenting on, however, such as Zionism. He had known of the refugee problem in Europe during the thirties, without much comment. He reviewed a book, In the Margin of History, weeks before the outbreak of war, in which the author, Professor Namier, talked about the Jews' impossible position "as a racially distinct people", without their own country. Orwell was unclear whether this meant that "unrestricted immigration into Palestine" was desirable (100). Some years later, in a review of Mulk Raj Anand, he challenged the Left's pro-Jewish Palestine/pro-Congress axis, by asking how many realised that the majority of Congress were "violently anti-Jew?" (101) This was elucidated for me by T.R.Fyvel,

To Orwell the Palestine Arabs were Asians and so victims, the Jews were white, technically advanced and so imperialists and oppressors. (102)

In 'Notes on Nationalism', Orwell expressed disapproval of Zionism, by claiming that it was inverted antisemitism with the usual nationalistic

trappings; and by doubting the "incongruous reasons" for the intelligentsia's support of Palestine (103). One intellectual Zionist was Victor Gollancz. A close friend of Orwell told me that Orwell had fallen "in hate" with Gollancz, after the refusal to publish Orwell's deeply-felt Homage to Catalonia, for ideological reasons. Thus "anything he (Gollancz) was for, George Orwell was against", including Zionism with its "racialist and imperialist" features. Also, apparently, much of the anti-Communism of Orwell's last two books, "had some roots in the hatred of Golly" (104). The figure of Goldstein with its "sheep-like head", had a similar inspiration.

Others noted his lack of "Jew-consciousness"; Fyvel declared that,

...in personal relationships there was not a trace of anti-Jewish feeling in him. (105)

This was despite Orwell's disapproval of Fyvel's Zionism; Julian Symons recalled that Orwell "particularly disliked Zionism",

...saying that it had nothing to do with Socialism, and deprecating the support for it in Tribune that came at that time from Jon Kinche and T.R.Fyvel. (106)

Arthur Koestler discussed the "Palestine issue" only once with Orwell, and

...he declared himself to be entirely on the side of the Arabs; then we decided to drop the issue as it might endanger our friendship. (107)

Fyvel was evidently with Koestler and Orwell on that occasion, for he recalled that,

...concerning the Holocaust, Auschwitz, the desire of the survivors of the death-camps to get to Israel - on all this he had something of a blindspot. He rather agreed with Ernest Bevin that there was no reason why the Jewish survivors should not after 1945 live peacefully in Europe - weren't they getting on peacefully in Britain? I remember that Koestler and I on one occasion argued with him at length about this, to little avail. (108)

Orwell sincerely believed in the Jews' ability to live peacefully in post-Hitler Europe. In a bitter attack on Britain's xenophobia and the mean exclusion of refugees (from Hitler and Stalin), Orwell suggested inviting 100,000 refugees to settle here rather than Palestine (109). Two months later in Tribune, he broadened his attack on xenophobia and immigration policy. He related the conversation of two conservative Scottish businessmen about the Poles, a few of whom had been allowed to work in Scotland, under tight restrictions. Apparently the Poles were buying up all the property, "invading the medical profession and taking Scottish jobs. The solution was to "let the Poles go back to their own country". Britain was too crowded and needed emigration. One man put forward such resolutions publicly, whenever he could. The other believed the Poles were "very degraded in their morals",

Their ways are not our ways, he concluded piously. It was

not mentioned that Poles pushed their way to the head of queues, wore bright-coloured clothes and displayed cowardice during air-raids, but if I ~~had~~ put forward a suggestion to this effect I am sure that it would have been accepted.

Orwell believed that this was the "contemporary equivalent of antisemitism", with Poles instead of Jews as scapegoats. Orwell believed that the effects of "race hatreds and mass delusions" would be mitigated "if they were not reinforced by ignorance". The subjective feelings would remain, but their known consequences would ensure more humanitarian results, particularly in the case of refugees (110).

Ignorance plays the same part in racism and nationalism as it did in imperialism; it allows prejudice and exploitation to be unhampered by truth or conscience. If you don't trouble to find out that Indians are starving in order to supply you with tea; that Jews are killed for being Jews; that Poles have no country to return to - then you can hold your views with an easy conscience, while the oppressed continue to suffer. Education may not change your subjective emotions, but it will bring the enormity of your outlook home to you, and may change your behaviour. These are laudable suggestions from Orwell, but it is strange that they should have been accompanied by the Palestine "blind-spot". Perhaps this reality bounced off Orwell's consciousness "like peas off a steel helmet" (111).

Possibly the harder Orwell was pressed by his Zionist friends, the more he dug his heels in. He quoted a passage from Samuel Butler's Note Books approvingly in this context. Butler was asked "gravely" to persuade the rich Jews to return to Palestine, by writing a book, but,

I am afraid I was rude enough to decline to go into the scheme on the ground that I did not care twopence whether the Rothschilds and Oppenheims went back to Palestine or not. This was felt to be an obstacle; but then he began to try and make me care, whereupon, of course, I had to get rid of him.

(112)

Orwell remarked the ironic change in sixty years, where now the Jews were forcibly excluded from Palestine. Orwell's irritation is apparent again in a letter to Richard Rees, where he praised Israel Zangwill as a novelist, but added "he has a strong tinge of Jewish nationalism of a rather tiresome kind" (113). Zangwill actually wanted Zionism established in an uninhabited quarter of Uganda.

Part of the explanation of Orwell's dislike of Zionism may be in his attitude to all small nationalist movements, particularly those that attacked Britain. We have mentioned Irish nationalism on this score, and Julian Symons believed that Zionism fell into a similar category; he told me that,

We didn't agree at all about Zionism in particular and revolutionary nationalism in general. He was very much

opposed...to the idea that Socialists ought to be sympathetic to a nationalist movement like Zionism...He thought such movements wrong-headed or evil (and Zionists) were mostly a reactionary force trying to achieve their ends simply in terms of violence. (114)

Julian Symons emphasised that Orwell was never faintly disturbed by his (Symons's) Jewishness. British policy on Palestine was bound to antagonise Zionists, and much of their propaganda was vituperative, scarcely distinguishin Nazis from British. This would have angered Orwell, possible to the point of irrationally forfeiting his sympathy for their cause.

Orwell wrote in Commentary that antisemitism had not been a factor in the post-war Election, and repeated that the Jews and Palestine Arab problem was primarily about colour. In 'Revenge is Sour', he described a Jew venting his hatred on German prisoners. Orwell wondered if he was enjoying his new found "power", and concluded that he was "behaving as he had planned to behave in the days when he was helpless" (115). Although the article is conciliatory, he was disturbed to see a Jew taking it out on helpless Germans. This seems to be another case of Orwell supporting the underdog, even a Nazi one. T.R.Fyvel gave me some background to the above story, which modifies this view;

In 1945 in Germany he saw an American Jewish officer (one!) lording it over Germans and came back convinced that Jews as puffed-up camp followers of the Allies would now as victors

maltreat the Germans who were defeated - another score against the Jews. (116).

His last comments on antisemitism only continue existing opinions. He was disgusted by Pound's antisemitism, but felt that it should not be confused with his merits (if any) as a poet (117). In a letter to Julian Symons he tried to place antisemitism into a historical, cultural perspective; He felt that disliking Jews wasn't "intrinsically worse" than disliking any other group of people, and that one must distinguish pre from post 1934 comments. Eliot's antisemitic remarks were "about on a par with the automatic sneers...at Anglo-Indian colonels in boarding houses". They would have had a different significance after Hitler. He instanced American Anglophobia as harmless, because Britons weren't being persecuted; if they were, sensitivity would be increased. He finished strongly as usual,

Some people go around smelling after antisemitism all the time. I have no doubt Fyvel thinks I am antisemitic. More rubbish is written about this subject than any other I can think of. (118)

Orwell believed that actual behaviour was more important than emotional outlook. He did not subscribe to the theory that the man who has committed murder in his heart is as guilty as the man who has committed it in practice, after all, where is the body in the first case? Such arguments were moral

reductionism that, he believed, clouded so many issues in his day;

...democracy is 'just the same as' totalitarianism...To be on the dole is a horrible experience; therefore it is no worse to be in the torture-chambers of the Gestapo. In general, two blacks make a white, half a loaf is the same as no bread. (119)

Orwell hated such preciousness. It reflected ignorance, and shifted the argument from central issues, squandering attention and effort.

In his review of Sartre's Portrait of the Antisemite, he accused the author of making no attempt to relate antisemitism to such "obviously allied phenomena" as "colour prejudice". He wanted to defuse antisemitism, and whereas he had previously admitted its uniqueness (in origins and motivation), he now accommodated it in a broader pattern of feelings. In the Sartre review, he stressed that calling antisemitism a "disgraceful aberration" only drove it underground. He faulted Sartre on several facts, but more seriously on his "atomised vision of society", in which the antisemite, the bourgeois and the Jew are "all classifiable in much the same way as insects". This itself was "dangerously close" to antisemitism, and, as race prejudice is a "neurosis", and resistant to argument, the first step was to stop regarding it "as a crime".

Meanwhile the less talk there is about 'the' Jew or 'the' antisemite as a species of animal different from ourselves, the better. (120)

This echoed his fear that totalitarianism, with its "German science", "Jewish science" etc. destroyed humanity's

...common basis of agreement, with its implication that human beings are all one species of animal (121)

Finally, there is the antisemitism of Nineteen Eighty Four, which showed Orwell's understanding of the emotional value of the Jews' scapegoat role. Emmanuel Goldstein (a blatantly Jewish name) is the Enemy of the People, introduced during the Two Minutes Hate;

He was the primal traitor, the earliest defiler of the Party's purity. All subsequent crimes against the Party, all treacheries, acts of sabotage, heresies, deviations, sprang directly out of his teaching.

He is eternally plotting, in some foreign country, or perhaps even Oceania.

Goldstein is a composite scapegoat. He derives from the Devil in Christianity, and Trotsky in Stalinism. He is ubiquitous and one must always be wary of his subversions; he is as old as the Creator/Good Father figure of Big Brother, and his crimes have been plotted with Calvinistic predetermination. He plays the same role as Snowball in Animal Farm, harassing the state, always aiming at its overthrow, but never succeeding.

Like Big Brother, he is the Party's necessary psychological device for maintaining control. His appearance too, is archetypically Jewish;

It was a lean Jewish face, with a great fuzzy aureole of white hair and a small goatee beard - a clever face, and yet somehow inherently despicable, with a kind of senile silliness in the long thin nose, near the end of which a pair of spectacles was perched. It resembled the face of a sheep, and the voice too, had a sheep-like quality. (122)

The face is "clever"; it is also "inherently" (racially, unavoidably) despicable. The definition of a despicable face is, therefore, a Jewish one. The senility is integral too. Indeed one theory, developed to explain the Nazi Holocaust, is founded on this feature (123). Its thesis, very briefly, is as follows.

There is a psychological process of fantasising which splits the father figure into good and bad. The good father-figure is an idealised, divine entity, containing all the characteristics which the child needs. The bad father-figure is a monster of fear and hatred compounded of all that the child abhors. Neither figure is related to reality; they are caricature devices which the child uses to comprehend the world. Such fantasies decline with the usual security and maturity of adulthood. The Jews are ideal candidates for the bad father-figure. Firstly, the relationship of Christianity to Judaism is analagous to that of son to father; also the Christian is taught a Trinity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, while his popular conception of Judaism involves a tyrannical father-figure, who is, in Orwell's words, "a tribal deity of the worst sort" (124). On top of this, Jews had a civilisation long before monotheism

or a literate culture had reached Europe beyond the Mediterranean.

This explanation, taken with other factors, can help us to understand why antisemitism varies from mild distaste to homicidal paranoia, depending on the need of the holder. In any event, the bad father-figure, with its Freudian associations, seems to be one of man's most readily comprehensible symbols. Goldstein, with his goatee beard, senile silliness, long nose with perching spectacles and "primal" treachery, is a perfect representation of such a figure. He is also in direct contrast with the good father-figure of Big Brother, who is everything a perfect father should be, calm, omnipresent, omnipotent and reassuring.

Goldstein's sinister potential is reinforced by his televised appearance against a background of marching Eurasian soldiers; his "bleating voice" and self-satisfied "sheep-like face" is backed by the "terrifying power of the Eurasian army" (125). The performance is arranged to concentrate the audience's emotions (fear, hatred, love) and direct them "from one object to another like the flame of a blowlamp" (126). The climax of fear and rage is reached when Goldstein's voice becomes "an actual sheep's bleat" and his face momentarily changes into a sheep's, before melting into a "terrible" Eurasian hier (127). The whole theme of Goldstein, the Two Minutes Hate, Big Brother,

crowd control etc, is proof that Orwell understood the techniques of psychological manipulation.

Orwell's picture of the Jewish role in arousing emotion which can be directed at will, owed much to the Nazis. It was the Oceanic version of The Protocols of the Elders of Zion. Incidentally, there is a remarkable correspondence between a summary of the "world conspiracy" in The Protocols, and Oceanic society. Part of that summary was that the masses would be kept away from politics by education and censorship; free speech and association would be curtailed. History would be used as propaganda for the present government. "Everyone will be spied upon"; "A vast secret police" force will monitor all critics of the regime,

Liberalism will be utterly extirpated and unquestioning obedience demanded from all.

Education will only be for a predestined "station in life"; the Jewish leaders will appear "efficient and benevolent", especially the "exemplary" ruler, who will have "no property" and be "above reproach".

The people of the earth will rejoice in being so well governed: and so the kingdom of Zion will endure. (128)

Orwell's totalitarian anti-Utopia is in the same tradition as the society of The Protocols. It is highly probable that Orwell read them; he certainly

referred to them (129).

The Jewish scapegoat concept in Nineteen Eighty Four illustrates its role in perpetuating the Party, but does not really explain the underlying psychological needs. The Party requires a permanent scapegoat as much as a permanent Leader, for only in this way can the whole range of human emotions be manipulated. Orwell explains the 'how', not the 'why' of the issue, except where the intrinsic conclusions of the narrative elucidate it. We can see what kind of emotions people are sublimating, their physical and psychological insecurities and their subsequent hatred, all of which emphasises the Saviour-like qualities of Big Brother.

In conclusion we can say that Orwell's attitude towards antisemitism underwent some profound changes during his life. It progressed from a simple cultural sympathy, accepted as a "law of nature", through a realisation that antisemitism was covering a wider, deeper problem than Jews could possibly represent. Presumably his own antisemitism, being non-violent, was unable to provide him with the deeper insights which he felt ought and could be attained. As so often with Orwell, his decency, support for the underdog and appetite for truth, led him along a painful path. Even today, after scores of researchers have produced studies of antisemitism, the picture that emerges

is enormously complicated - as complicated as the mind of man itself. The very scope of antisemitism should warn us that it fulfills different things for different people. Whatever common factors can be found between the antipathy of Catholics, Nazis, East-Enders, Middle-Eastern Arabs, American Negroes, Irish labourers etc, etc to the Jews must be very general indeed. Orwell believed that antisemitism was related to other psychological/behavioural patterns, which he termed 'Nationalism', and that these were connected with man's self-transcending urge. He also believed that an emotion, such as antisemitism, which had been acquired through a cultural milieu, was ineradicable. But that this didn't matter - what did matter was that the effects of such an emotion were understood and checked. This, like all conscious decency, could only be achieved at a price, and this price was unceasing moral effort. He believed that whatever the inherent or acquired complexion of a person's beliefs, emotions and prejudices were, they needn't influence his conduct unduly, if only he exercised the rational, moral muscle to keep them in check.

So far in this thesis Orwell's directly discernable racial and social attitudes have been examined.

The background of Victorian/Edwardian racial attitudes, and in particular those that influenced imperialism, have been discussed, and (along with Orwell's own biographical details) have been taken as his relevant psychological provenance. His own childhood attitudes - and their importance have been considered; in particular his attitudes to the Chinese and Scots were traced all the way through, as examples of how he came to terms with early conditioning and modified his outlook in the light of experience.

The significance of Burma was covered under two broad headings: the general background (including the role of Indians there) and conventional racism as fictionalised in Burmese Days; and the critical aspect of the experience, as it related to growing Burmese nationalism, waning British confidence, and Orwell's own personal crisis. Orwell's attitude to the

•

Empire was then considered more generally: the scale of economic exploitation involved; the deleterious effects of imperialism on British socialism (which really provided a seminal analysis of 'doublethink').

It was argued that Burma provided Orwell with the empirical key to unlock the myths of his racial and social conditioning. The similarities in his attitudes towards the working class and colonial 'natives' were then discussed. This correlation was not merely transitory, it was argued, but fundamental to his whole developing outlook on exploitation, oppression, hierarchy and so on. His two great final satires were examined in this light, and the principles underlying the structure of their societies (social, psychological and economic) were delineated in order to demonstrate this.

The significance of irrationality was seen as vital by Orwell, and his attitude to nationalism and patriotism was perceived as relating to the psychological core of racism. Patriotism, it was claimed, was Orwell's decent channelling of the self-transcending urge away from the power-seeking canker of nationalism. Antisemitism was taken as an

example of social irrationality, and his own development (and ambivalence) noted.

This, in a sense, covers all the relevant ground. I felt, however, that it was somehow rather limiting to confine 'racial and social attitudes' so concisely, and I really wanted to show that they were related to, indeed permeated like a dye, the whole of his outlook. Clearly this could be an open-ended commitment, but I believed that some attempt to place them in a wider world-view was important.

This is the justification for the final chapter. Although it is an attempt at a 'synthesis' and a 'conclusion', the contents do face both ways and could equally be thought of as new departures. The chapter is divided into four broad, non-exclusive parts: the self-transcending urge; the nature of man (innate vs. learned); the connection between immutability, pessimism and reaction; the relationship of the individual to society.

First, it is important to have a brief sketch of the development of man. Although man's path through the climatic upheavals of the Pleistocene is a mystery, he emerged with a significantly increased brain. The brain is a social instrument, largely connected with communication. Man's brain grew in harmony with his habit of living in co-operative social

groups, with these groups in turn competing for the most favoured territories.

The argument that factors solely external to man accounted for his growing cerebellum cannot be sustained. If he had had to stay one, or even two, steps ahead of his nearest non-human competitor, then this thesis would not now be written.

Man evidences two apparently conflicting types of behaviour: co-operative and warfare. As far as we know this has always been the case, and indeed may be an essentially human characteristic. The co-operative aspect of man, it is argued, came about via the survival value of small, tightly-knit social groups, while the aggressive aspect resulted from the competition between these groups. Survival depended, therefore, on the 'dual code' of cohesion within one's own group and aggression without. In evolutionary terms, the bigger brains survived because they were the ones who organised themselves most effectively. Co-operation within groups also encouraged the development of learning; pointing man away from instinct (internally stimulated behavioural circuitry) and in the direction of variable learnt behaviour - whence man's adaptability (and malleability).

If we look for a moment at the Old Testament, we can gain an idea of how this process may have worked throughout pre-history. The Old Testament

is one of the best surviving tribal records of the second millenium B.C. and amongst other things describes the struggles of the tribes of Israel to establish themselves in the 'land of milk and honey'- Canaan. In order to win this favoured territory, they had to undergo a lengthy, painful training period ('forty years in the wilderness'), during which they were enjoined to think of themselves as exclusive, "chosen" people, serving the one true God, and other peoples as inferior, competitive enemies. When their in-group, out-group rivalry was sufficiently stimulated, their internal social cohesion sufficiently strengthened by ingrained habit, they were able to overcome the less organised tribes of Canaan. This was the foundation for that Jewish 'exclusiveness', the unpopular legacy which Orwell drew attention to; and also relates to the attraction of cliques, which we discussed earlier in connection with 'Boys' Weeklies' (1).

Of course this is a grossly oversimplified picture, but repeated thousands upon thousands of times, it does provide a feasible explanatory framework within which the dramatic expansion of the neocortex, and the mutually compatible growth of co-operation and aggression, can be accommodated. One of the most crucial arguments about man centres on the degree to which environment or genetic factors shape his behaviour. The old 'nature vs. nurture'

conflict is still very much alive (and unresolvable at present), with both sides basing themselves on emotional predilection and using 'facts' selectively to bolster up respectability. The 'innate behaviourists' currently borrow many of their arguments from ethology (examples, Morris, Ardrey, Lorenz, Tinbergen), with claims ranging from: hanging works of art in a home is an extension of the instinct which makes animals mark out their territory with urine, to the assertion that man is genetically programmed to produce atomic weapons. The school of learning (examples, Montagu, Popper, Koestler), places far more emphasis on the social environment as a factor in human behaviour. While acknowledging 'drives' and 'urges', it stresses that the role of instinct is relatively minor, and cites the enormous range of behaviour in different societies as proof of this. The truth probably lies somewhere between these two extremes. For example, the urge to identify with a group, that Orwell examined in 'Notes on Nationalism', seems "all but universal", and probably genetic; whereas the actual group identified with is a matter of learning, and indeed may be non-existent, except in the mind of the identifier. The ability to learn is one of man's most important features, and in evolutionary terms this is to be expected, for the current representatives of the human race will be those, by and large, who have made the wisest choices and 'learnt' by them.

The mechanism of discrimination is a feature of all life forms, serving to choose between "the beneficial and the prejudicial". Emotion becomes associated with such discrimination and may be called in by suggestion or association. "Distinctive characteristics are fostered for solidarity within the group, in contrast to others" (2). The 'usual' is accepted as safe and comfortable, while the 'unusual' is regarded with suspicion. The uniqueness of man's development in this respect is his use of symbols to indicate 'in-group' or 'out-group' status; hence the 'nationalisms', which Orwell noted, in language, dress, religious belief, race and so on.

A further important development in man's self-assessment is the concept of the autonomous, responsible individual. This was first popularised by the Protestant Reformation in Europe during the sixteenth century, and has subsequently become intrinsic to Western man's self-image. Orwell acknowledged its profound cultural influence; both fictionally when his rebel-heroes strive to establish their identities outside that of the 'group', and in his later essays, where he dwells on the theme at some length.

How, then, do Orwell's racial and social attitudes fit into this picture? We will deal first with the self-transcending urge; the drive which makes individuals subordinate and merge their identities with that of the group.

Orwell witnessed an era of its most unvarnished expression in Nazi Germany, where Hitler's fears for the survival of the Aryan German race were couched in the crudest Darwinian language. Much of his support was based on a sense of victimisation, paranoia and the need for scapegoats. Hitler claimed that war was a criterion of survival, a fact which Orwell reluctantly acknowledged, although for different purposes (3). Books such as P.F. Drucker's The End of Economic Man and James Burnham's The Machiavellians reflected the philosophy of 'the corporate state' and expressed the growing acceptability of 'group morality'. The colonial ethos which had been current in Orwell's childhood assumed that a superior race was entitled to rule over an inferior one, and when that assumption was shaken the result was a heightening of group solidarity. Similarly Orwell's class training encouraged a defensive outlook which was translated into aggressive behaviour. Sometimes the colonies served as an outlet for the aggressive and frustrated, so that race hatred flourished without check at 'the outposts'. From prep-school onwards Orwell had seen that the better organised flourished at the expense of others. Flip and Sambo, although not omnipotent as Orwell had supposed (4) had more contacts than the boys. Similarly, the Inner Party had more cohesion than the Outer Party and the Proles, and were consequently more successful. It is a long way from the Cro-Magnon

hunting group to the National Socialist state of 1939, but the one grew from the other only because their members were intelligent and capable of combining socially to survive.

A crucial step was involved, however, with increased group size. Symbols almost certainly played a part in assisting the widening of man's concept of his group, once the limits of individual contacts had been passed. The use of language, customs, dress, religion, physical features etc in signalling one's own 'group', must have been as revolutionary a factor in the growth of societies as industrialism was later to be. Orwell's attitude to accent as a categorical tool showed the teleological significance of this, and also indicated the limitations it imposed. The more one was at home in a wide 'accent-group', the harder it was to cross over comfortably into another. Racial features also carried in-group significance. The slave societies of the ancient world were often structured on a racial basis, for example Greece, Rome and the Aryan civilisation in India. European imperialism certainly was too, and where real differences were insignificant, mythical ones were created.

All such signals of difference/similarity became totems to which men freely gave their allegiance (or enmity), and in the twentieth century items such as flags, badges, slogans, salutes excited as much loyalty as flesh and

blood human beings. Figureheads were held to incorporate all the virtues and qualities of the group which they represented. In Animal Farm the animals' loyalty is directed to the farm flag, 'Beasts of England' and Napoleon; in Oceania, all loyalty is subsumed in the apotheosis of Big Brother. Within both societies, the ruling groups are given their own symbols of superiority; the pigs have green tail ribbons and Party members wear distinctive uniforms. Orwell's earlier fiction does not ignore this symbolism either: the narrator in Down and Out in Paris and London and Dorothy in A Clergyman's Daughter are accepted as down and out because of their dress; Flory is separated by race; Gordon's alienation is caused by ignoring society's 'money god'; and in Homage to Catalonia, Orwell is threatened because he belongs to a group with the wrong initials.

The "habit of identifying" with a "unit", "placing it beyond good or evil and recognising no other duty than that of advancing its interests", appears to be "all but universal" (5). Those who rejected traditional loyalties and transferred their allegiances could "wallow unrestrainedly in exactly those emotions" from which they believed themselves emancipated; "all the overthrown idols can reappear under different names, and because they are not recognised for what they are they can be worshipped with a good conscience"

(6). We have examined Orwell's answer to the problem of aggressive 'nationalism' but the question of the inevitability or innateness of such emotions leads us on to the next area for consideration.

Perhaps one of the most crucial aspects of man's behaviour, and one which is hotly debated, is aggression. Ashley Montagu summed up the significance of attitudes in this respect:

(the) two opposing views of human aggression - that aggressive behaviour is innate, and that making every allowance for genetic influences it is largely learned - define not only two ways of looking at human beings - important enough in itself - but also two ways of being human. (7)

The thesis of the innate aggressionists (and innate behaviourists generally) is that man is genetically programmed to behave in certain ways, and that it is unreasonable to expect otherwise. Because man has 'no choice', his social systems (law, punishments, recreation, relationships etc) should be structured to accommodate these traits. If man is innately violent, there is no point in improving his environment in the hope of eradicating such violence; that is a "romantic fallacy". It is better to face up to the violence and channel it 'harmlessly' into something else. The "variability and plasticity" which characterise human responses (8), are largely ignored, as is the fact that there is "no physiological evidence of any spontaneous stimulation for fighting

arising within the body" (9). It is an emotional modernisation of the doctrine of Original Sin, in that the condition is inescapable and universal.

How did Orwell address himself to the spirit of this problem in his own day? He wrote an article for The Manchester Evening News in 1946 (between his two supposedly pessimistic satires), in which he traced the genealogy of socialist ideas from ancient to modern times:

Underneath it lies the belief that human nature is fairly decent to start with, and is capable of infinite development. This belief has been the main driving force of the Socialist movement...and it could be claimed that the Utopians at present a scattered minority are the true upholders of the Socialist tradition. (10).

He frankly admired Dickens for his views as well as his writing skills, and observed that Dickens always pointed to "a change of spirit rather than a change of structure". He approached human problems "along the moral plane", and believed it was useless "to change institutions without a change of heart" (11). Orwell added that although progress was slow and "invariably disappointing", it was nevertheless real. He stated the classic dilemma of which should be improved first - human nature or the system, and believed the priorities appealed to "different individuals" and eras of history.

Dickens was a populist and Orwell too believed in the people. After his nightmare adventures in Civil War Spain, he wrote that the experience had left

him "not with less but more belief in the decency of human beings" (12). The balance had been altered by the innumerable acts of generosity, humanity and heroism that he had been shown, so that he was able to write to Connolly about his new, wholehearted commitment to Socialism (13). He had been privileged to see a society where a change of heart and a change of structure had occurred, albeit temporarily, and the vision had left a permanent mark on him. He saw heroism at home, and declared it "admirable...even hopeful" that working class people didn't disintegrate on the dole; "they realise that losing your job does not mean that you cease to be a human being" (14). This was a genuine feeling, and David Astor remembered being told that Orwell admired "the working class mother of ten" more than anyone (15).

In 'The Rediscovery of Europe' Orwell acknowledged that cultural evolution often occurred after economic or technological breakthroughs, when "the whole spirit and tempo of life changes" and was reflected in all aspects of life (16). There was not an automatic improvement, however, and in a letter to Humphrey House he talked about the fallacy of expecting it "without the recognition that common decency is necessary" (17). Similarly in 'Catastrophic Gradualism', he warned that although centralised control was a necessary precondition of Socialism, "it no more produces Socialism than my typewriter

would of itself produce this article that I am writing" (18). The role of human moral choice was crucial.

The issue of collectivism led him to raise the question, "how are freedom and organisation to be reconciled? Unless there is some unpredictable change in human nature, liberty and efficiency must pull in opposite directions" (19). Leaving aside the relationship of individual to society, which we will deal with later, this poses the problem of the evolution of social ethics. The concept of 'in-group' and 'out-group' has always shaped man's practical morality. As symbolism enabled a wider concept of in-group to emerge, so responsibility and love were expanded and became the wider present day 'nationalisms', with only Utopians embracing the whole of humanity.

Orwell experienced the ability of human nature to shape itself constructively in the Spanish militia training, where 'Revolutionary' discipline replaced the drilling of men into "automatons" by giving an "understanding of why orders must be obeyed" through creating "political consciousness" (20). Towards the end of the Second War he devoted a whole Tribune article to the question of the mutability of human nature. The atmosphere of the times had made people forget that they "could ever behave sanely" and live without war, so he reminded readers that "things do change".

The sensitive morality of Diary of a Nobody compared with the brutality of Don Quixote was an example of the "enormous difference between the age of Cervantes and our own"; similarly the recent practice of throwing pennies to 'mudlarks' from London bridges was now seen as degrading to all participants (21). He used another Tribune article to proclaim his belief in man's mutability

An argument that Socialists ought to be prepared to meet, since it is brought up constantly by...neo-pessimists... is the alleged immutability of human nature...Man is of his nature sinful and cannot be made virtuous by Act of Parliament. Therefore, though economic exploitation can be controlled to some extent, the classless society is forever impossible. The proper answer, it seems to me, is that this argument belongs to the Stone Age.

He believed that human acquisitiveness could be "bred out in a couple of generations" if wealth were redistributed and plentiful; after all "we not only don't practise cannibalism any longer, but don't even want to" (22).

Sometimes he was pessimistic and found it difficult "to believe in the survival of civilisation". This was because most of man's problems appeared to be of his own making and related to "desire for power" which "seems to be taken for granted as a natural instinct...like the desire for food". It was no more "biologically necessary" than drunkenness or gambling, and he believed that the conditions of the modern world made bullying "a major human motive" (23). The crucial role of the "power instinct" in Nineteen Eighty Four indicates the

importance he attached to this problem. He commented on the "bottomless selfishness of the human being" which manifested itself during bombing raids ("hoping that it will fall on somebody else"), and his fictional accounts of bombs falling - in Coming up for Air and Nineteen Eighty Four - do not show much optimism about human nature. In 'Writers and Leviathan', he referred to "distinctly questionable beliefs" inherited by Socialism, such as that "man is naturally good and is only corrupted by his environment". This "perfectionist ideology" was widespread (24).

In 'James Burnham and the Managerial Revolution', Orwell noted that Burnham accepted power hunger as "a natural instinct...like the desire for food" and dismissed Socialism because it involved "a general moral attitude of co-operation and self-abnegation such as no social groups have ever...been observed to display". Orwell criticised Burnham's "iron laws" and "apocalyptic visions" about the future of humanity as a "mental disease" brought on by "power worship", which is "not...separable from cowardice". Burnham's thesis, however, lay uncomfortably close to Orwell's fears for the future of society and found its way, in a modified form, into Nineteen Eighty Four. Orwell was at times as liable to the same pessimism for which he criticised Burnham.

Orwell recalled the Don Quixote/Sancho Panza relationship as a useful

simplification of the duality of human nature. Sancho, "the voice of the belly protesting against the soul", was the moral underdog, yet he got Orwell's support against the lofty idealism of the Don. However, as in all good morality stories, "the high sentiments always win in the end", and the offer of "blood, toil, tears and sweat" triumphs over the offer of "safety and a good time" (25). In a Tribune article in 1936, he lampooned the artificiality of modern environments, and wondered why no one had asked "what is man? What are his needs?" He believed that "man only stays human by preserving large patches of simplicity in his life" and that the tendency of modern life was to "weaken his consciousness, dull his curiosity and, in general, drive him nearer to the animals". (26).

He saw the suggestion that human nature couldn't be altered as a trend of the "new pessimism", which linked up Catholicism, Conservatism, Fascism, Pacifism and Anarchism. The common factor in all these was a "refusal to believe that human society can be fundamentally improved"; man was "non-perfectible"; progress was "an illusion". He saw an obvious connection between "this belief and political reaction", as he had already pointed out in his review of Fielden's Beggar My Neighbour. The trick of the neo-pessimists was to set up a man of straw called "Human Perfectibility", and demolishing this

Utopian vision was "money for jam". The answer, according to Orwell, was that "Socialism is not perfectionist, perhaps not even hedonistic", but it was moving towards making the world a better place. It did not answer man's spiritual needs, but these needs could not even be considered "while the average human being's preoccupations are necessarily economic" (27). Ashley Montagu quoted the belief in 'biological egalitarianism' as a current example of a 'man of straw', this time set up by Konrad Lorenz, and conveniently misrepresenting the views of egalitarians in opportunity, personal and political freedom (28).

This leads us to the next stage of our consideration, the link between human nature, pessimism and political reaction. The present-day believers in the immutability of human nature are, on the whole, the innate behaviourists. They draw on a long religious emotional tradition. The notion of Original Sin was incorporated by Herbert Spencer in his view of man as unalterably fixed in his patterns of behaviour, particularly the 'ethics of enmity and the ethics of amity'. Sir Arthur Keith specifically claimed in his New Theory of Evolution that "human nature has a dual constitution; to hate as well as to love are part of it; and conscience may enforce hate as a duty just as it enforces the duty of love". (29). The ineradicability of this behaviour is stressed, and some of its consequences are openly applauded as reactionary: Ashley Montagu quotes a

review of Ardrey's Territorial Imperative to establish this point:

If Ardrey is right, the assimilation of immigrants, particularly those of a noticeably different culture and physical appearance is a more fundamental problem than we have previously believed. Racial prejudice may not simply be a matter of ignorance, which a more progressive policy will eliminate in time. Distrust of the foreigner may be an inevitable accompaniment of the group cohesion which holds our own society together. Perhaps we should stop aiming at the impossible task of trying to love and understand our neighbours. It might well be better if we kept ourselves to ourselves, barking across our fences now and then, baring our fangs in ritualised aggression, but never going so far as to engage in open conflict. (30)

The message of this is clear: racism is unavoidable, must be recognised as such and ritualised.

War is seen as inevitable, not a result of complex issues, such as class or economics (31); weapons have the genetic inevitability of birdsong (32), and war is, in fact, "the all-purpose answer to our innate needs" (33). Hierarchy, too, is programmed into our behaviour, as "an instinct 3 or 4 hundred million years old" and a "mystery of the fundamental life force" (34). A book such as Antony Jay's Corporation Man can be seen as the interpretation and prophecy of man's behaviour, in these terms. 'Territoriality' is a key claim of the innate behaviourists, with obvious implications for private over communal property. Education, in such a world view, can be no

than the supplying of facts or information, for any radical changes in outlook or behaviour must be discounted. Sexual stereotypes are as rigid as racial ones, and only misery results from trying to escape them.

The implications of innate behaviourism can be summarised as conservative and reactionary; man is still the naked ape, genetically and emotionally tied to the African savannah, even when he is in a spaceship or a commune. Man is unchangeable except in trivialities and technological gimmickry. How did Orwell react to the expression of this type of pessimism in his own day? How did he view the links between inevitability, pessimism and reaction? First of all it must be admitted that he has a streak of almost pathological pessimism running through his writing from first to last.

In Down and Out in Paris and London he talks of poverty and personal failure as "the thing you knew would happen to you sooner or later" (34), and in A Clergyman's Daughter and Keep the Aspidistra Flying, inevitable capitulation is worked out with a remorselessness worthy of Greek tragedy. In Keep the Aspidistra Flying and Coming up for Air, personal compromise is linked with a deterioration in society generally, and some of his personal correspondence just before the war talks of the "concentration camp" looming ahead as a certainty (36). He flirted with Miller's apathetic pessimism in 'Inside the

Whale' and was jerked into resilience in such articles as 'The Limit to Pessimism' and 'My Country Right or Left'. He was continually worried about the course of the war in his private diary, describing his "helplessness" over the infallible mismanagement of events (37); all of which contrasted with his deliberate, published optimism in The Lion and the Unicorn and Tribune. Many of the themes of Nineteen Eighty Four crystallised for him during the war: the formation of the world into autarchic superstates; the use of propaganda; ignoring of 'plain facts' and many others, in his journalism and essays. It should be born in mind that Orwell's pessimism was never of the type where he actually wished the existence or continuation of the things that he feared. It is true that there is an almost masochistic fascination with many of the things which he spoke loudest against. From the way he wrote in Nineteen Eighty Four, it is a reasonable assumption to say that deliberate cruelty and unrestrained power fascinated, even attracted, him. But as with his analysis of the Don Quixote side of our nature having the last word over the Sancho Panza, he always came down on the ethical side and rejected the enthralling but poisonous alternative. Perhaps it would be true to say that temperamentally Orwell was a pessimist, but morally and intellectually he was an optimist. Rather he was a realist. He knew where cruelty, dictatorship, greed, power-

hunger etc led, and it was to a far worse place than the world he was living in, therefore he rejected them.

He pointed out the negative or sinister implications of literature, citing Eliot as an example of the former and Yeats of the latter. Although he admired both men's poetry, he regarded Eliot's views as elitist, austro-fascist, reactionary and pessimistic (39); and Yeats' "tortured style" of poetry reflected his "sinister vision of life" (40). In the case of Yeats there was an ingredient of occult mysticism allied to esoteric knowledge which inclined him to an authoritarian, elitist ("hierarchical, masculine, harsh, surgical") view of the world. He believed in a "cyclical universe", where, by definition, progress could not be permanent, because things always came round to their beginnings again; "an inequality made law". He saw that "Fascism means injustice and acclaims it for that very reason". Orwell expanded on the connection between astrology and reaction, in which a return to an "age of tyranny" could be predicted almost mathematically. Even Burnham, in The Managerial Revolution, reckoned the oligarchy which he described had its roots in the hieratic organisation of Dynastic Egypt.

Yeats' implicit claim that 'there is nothing new under the sun' was celebrated ostentatiously by G.K.Chesterton. Orwell described it as "one of

the stock arguments of intelligent reactionaries" and saw that it was "rooted in the fear of progress", and in particular of "that hated, dreaded thing, a world of free and equal human beings" (41). He pointed out the same tendency in a review of C.S.Lewis, whose claims of infallibility ("with the implication that every heresy has...been refuted before") and esoteric knowledge ("with the implication that you should leave your thinking to the priests") displayed political affiliations which were "invariably reactionary". He drew attention to C.S.Lewis as an example of "the big counter-attack against the Left" being undertaken by its opponents at that time (42). This reflected Orwell's contention that there was no such thing as non-political writing, and that a writer's 'world-view' would be implicit in everything that he wrote. In 'Inside the Whale', he commented that the mental connection between pessimism and a reactionary outlook was "no doubt obvious enough", and that it flourished when people were relatively well-off (43).

Orwell realised that this "mental connection" was not a new development, for he saw the same "inter-connection between Swift's political loyalties and his ultimate despair "as one of the most interesting features" of Gulliver's Travels. Swift's pessimism, Orwell felt, derived from his jealousy and unfulfilment (44) and, like Tolstoy, he was a disbeliever in human happiness. Orwell saw both writers as having an incurious horror of the 'processes of life'

mixed up with sexual inhibition and misanthropic tendencies, and being unlikely "to admit that earthly life is capable of much improvement". Swift's "implied position" was close to Orwell's contemporaries who derided "whatever is 'modern' and 'progressive'". In general Swift "assumes that we know all that we need to know already": how different from Orwell's own unstoppable and wideranging interests. Perhaps Orwell was closer to the benign image of the observant eighteenth century cleric than Swift ever was. Orwell concluded that the sum of Swift's "pessimism", "reverence for the past", "incuriosity" and "horror of the human body" was the attitude of the religious reactionary who defends an unjust order by claiming that this world cannot be substantially improved.

There is undoubtedly a thread, which Orwell perceived, between a pessimistic view of man's immutability and a reactionary socio-political outlook. How did Orwell react to some of the implications or conclusions of such neo-pessimists? He utterly rejected the artificial divisions erected between people; the 'nationalisms' of race, class, religion and so on. He believed that such divisions damaged "the roots of human solidarity" more than violence, and were consequently more dangerous. According to Fenner Brockway, "Orwell instinctively treated all human beings as equals", and had

in his being "a sense of human equality". His Socialism was:

...based in his belief in the importance of the human personality. It might be an illiterate, it might be a prostitute, might be a director. But it was the human personality within the physical form and within what the environment had done to that personality that he saw as the rich thing, and sought conditions for its fulfilment. (45)

David Astor echoed this, claiming that Orwell treated people neither as better nor as worse than himself; his "instinct" was for human equality (46), and he had a perfect horror of hierarchy.

The view of war, or violence, as a 'natural' occupation for man was abhorrent to Orwell. Although he occasionally defended war as "necessary", he knew that it was "certainly not right or sane" (47), and he saw the use of a permanent war atmosphere in suppressing a population. While the ritualisation of aggression in competitive sport is seen by some as a way of containing it, Orwell knew that it only encouraged the very tendency it was "containing" ("war minus the shooting"). In matters of education, sex roles, race, social progress, indeed the whole spectrum of human activity, Orwell opposed the views of reactionary pessimists, despite sharing some of their ideas as his 'fears for the worse'.

Finally we will consider the relationship of the individual to society,

and individual morality to social morality. We have mentioned that the Reformation ushered in the concept of the responsible, autonomous individual, and this in turn produced the philosophic preconditions for industrial capitalism. Orwell related prose literature to rationalism, "the Protestant centuries" and the autonomous individual. He also attributed the refusal to "outrage" one's own conscience, "rebellion and the idea of intellectual integrity" to Protestantism (48). In other words, the idea of personal responsibility for one's own decisions and destiny is a relatively new development in human consciousness. We hypothesised earlier that man evolved as part of a group, and his 'nationalistic' loyalties developed from the 'dual code' of anxiety-enmity which this produced. Clearly there was scope for conflict as Orwell suggested, when the individual's conscience was not in harmony with that of the group.

Orwell was under no illusions about the power of group morality. In The Lion and the Unicorn he wrote about "highly civilised human beings" who were trying to kill him with bombs. They felt no enmity against him "as an individual"; they were "only doing their duty", serving their country, which had "the power to absolve (them) from evil". In private life, they were no doubt "kind-hearted, law abiding men who would never dream of committing murder"

The English too, were moved by "instinct" to think and act collectively (49).

Orwell related an incident from the Spanish war, with typical modest diffidence, which exemplified the essential difference between individual and group morality. He had crawled out into no-man's land to snipe at the Fascist lines, and as some Republican aircraft were spotted approaching, confusion broke out and a man leapt up and ran along a parapet in full view. The man was "half-dressed and...holding up his trousers with both hands as he ran". Orwell did not shoot at him, partly because he was a poor shot and wanted to return to his own lines, but also because of "that detail about the trousers":

I had come here to shoot at 'Fascists'; but a man who is holding up his trousers isn't a 'Fascist', he is visibly a fellow creature, similar to yourself, and you don't feel like shooting at him. (50)

This illustrates Orwell's deep compassion for his fellow men and the psychological/behavioural distinction between the ethics of the group and the individual. Orwell was fighting on the Republican, democratic, anti-Fascist side, and his self-transcending urge had caused him to identify with their interests and to view their opponents as stereotypical figures of enmity: Orwell reflected this when he claimed that he had "come here to shoot at 'Fascists'". The man holding up his trousers had shattered the stereotypical image of a 'Fascist', by demonstrating his universal, vulnerable, unpretentious humanity:

"visibly a fellow creature, similar to yourself", and therefore impossible to kill. The incident is rather like the snapping of a hypnotist's fingers when he awakens a subject from a trance; in this case Orwell has switched from the mode of group morality to his own individuality, 'at a glance'.

Orwell experienced a similar change of outlook to the poet Stephen Spender, soon after he returned from Spain, badly wounded. He wrote to Spender:

I looked upon you as a sort of fashionable successful person, also a Communist...and because having met you I could regard you as a type and also an abstraction. Even if when I had met you I had not happened to like you, I should still have been bound to change my attitude, because when you meet anyone in the flesh you realise immediately that he is a human being and not a sort of caricature embodying certain ideas. (51)

The relationship of this stereotypical outlook with racism is no doubt obvious, and it illustrates the consistency of Orwell's attitudes in different fields. Orwell recorded another 'change of heart' incident, from group to individual code, at the end of the war. A hardened anti-Boche journalist happened to stumble across the pathetic body of a dead German with a bunch of lilac blossom on its breast and "his feelings" underwent "a change", transforming him into a sympathetic humanitarian so that "his attitude was quite different from what it had been earlier" (52).

Although we have covered Orwell's views on the strength of the self-

transcending urge in its nationalistic and patriotic forms, it is worth remembering how important he believed such tendencies to be. David Astor recalled that 'Notes on Nationalism' was the only piece of Orwell's writing that the author ever urged him to read (53). The distortions which resulted from attachment to a larger 'unit' were serious and very hard to rectify:

Every nationalist is capable of the most flagrant dishonesty, but he is also - since he is conscious of serving something bigger than himself - unshakeably certain of being in the right
(54)

He fictionalised, and scarcely exaggerated, such behaviour. Winston Smith heard himself "promising to lie, to steal, to forge, to murder, to encourage drug-taking and prostitution, to disseminate venereal disease, to throw vitriol in a child's face" (55), in order to help the Brotherhood overthrow the Party. As Orwell remarked in the essay on nationalism, "there is no crime, absolutely none, that cannot be condoned when 'our side' commits it...even if one admits in an intellectual sense that it is unjustified - still one cannot feel that it is wrong. Loyalty is involved, and so pity ceases to function". Even on a less sinister level, the habit of making generalisations about national, or group characteristics persisted, even when they were seen to be unfounded (56). This was significant because:

Myths which are believed in tend to become true, because they set up a type, or 'persona', which the average person

will do his best to resemble. (57)

Orwell understood the "tremendous urge to conformity in gregarious animals" (58); his fiction faithfully represents his gradual understanding of the nature of and his change in attitude towards the relationship of the individual to society. His early novels, and indeed his worked-up documentaries (Down and Out in Paris and London, The Road to Wigan Pier) have the need for individuals to integrate into society as one of their major themes. The watershed experiences in Spain and elsewhere from 1936 onwards altered his perspective completely and he realised that the price of an individual's integration into society could be the complete integrity and freedom of the individual. In our language, the individual would have to subordinate his own morality and personality to that of the group.

He explored the individual/society relationship in a series of important essays in the 1940's: 'Literature and Totalitarianism'; 'The Prevention of Literature'; 'Writers and Leviathan'; 'Politics vs. Literature'; 'Politics and the English Language'. These and other writings all enabled Orwell to 'think aloud' the dilemma of how an individual can remain morally intact, yet be part of his social environment. In 'Literature and Totalitarianism' he reckoned that the invasion of literature by politics had

brought "to the surface of our consciousness the struggle that always goes on between the individual and the community". He believed that his age was witnessing the demise of the autonomous individual, or rather "the individual is ceasing to have the illusion of being autonomous" (59). The strident pressures for nationalistic loyalties had cracked the concept of autonomy. In Tribune he pointed out the fallacy ("nonsense") that private freedoms could continue under totalitarianism. He thought it "the greatest mistake" to see individuals as genuinely "autonomous"; everyone needed "constant stimulation from other people". Robinson Crusoe was psychologically impossible; if Defoe had really been isolated on a desert island he would never have written the story, "It is almost impossible to think without talking", and if there is no freedom of speech, "the creative faculties dry up" (60). The problem is, therefore, how to reconcile man's twin needs of social stimulation and individual freedom.

In 'The Prevention of Literature' Orwell was concerned with the surrender of intellectuals to party ideologies and loyalties. He knew the argument was often reduced to the phrase "discipline versus individualism", which Orwell felt was a cover for the real issue of "truth versus untruth". The charges against individualism were wrapped in vague pejorative language such as

'escapist', 'romantic', 'egoist' and so on (61). Orwell believed that this was to cover the serious deficiencies of group loyalty. He referred to a 1915 pamphlet in his possession which, because of subsequent changes in Russian society and ideology, could not be acknowledged as truthful (or even in existence) by contemporary loyal Communists. This of course developed in Nineteen Eighty Four, when Winston is obliged to outrage his senses and intellect as well as his conscience, in order to 'eliminate' an incriminating newspaper article. O'Brien spelt out the totalitarian concept of how the individual relates to society. Reality existed in the mind, "not in the individual mind" which is fallible and mortal, but "only in the mind of the Party" (62). He continued: "the individual is only a cell", and asked "Do you die when you cut your finger nails?" The individual only has power when he renounces his individuality, for alone, he is "always defeated", but,

...if he can make complete, utter submission, if he can escape from his identity, if he can merge himself in the Party, then he is all-powerful and immortal. (63)

O'Brien pleaded for Winston to understand that "the death of an individual is not death...the Party is immortal" (64). Previously escape from individualism had been offered by religion, or the church, as in the case of T.S.Eliot (65), but the Party had now replaced that.

Orwell echoed the impossibility of individual freedoms under totalitarianism in 'The Prevention of Literature'; because one's loyalties either had to be individual or group. Winston realises that his mother's "nobility" and "purity" derived from her "private" standards which "could not be altered from outside" (66); and the Proles' humanity came from the fact that "they were not loyal to a party or a country or an idea, they were loyal to one another", and what mattered were "individual relationships" (67). They had retained "primitive emotions" which he had had to re-learn by conscious effort, autobiographically echoing Orwell's own admiration for the Italian militiaman in Spain (68). His contention in the essay that "it would not be beyond human ingenuity to write books by machinery" (69) is fulfilled in Oceania, and the argument advanced in the essay that "true identity is only attained through identification with the community" is the one which O'Brien constantly thrusts at Winston in the Ministry of Love.

In a Time and Tide article in 1940, Orwell had used the arguments of man being "only a cell in an everlasting body" to produce an optimistic prognosis. He felt the tremendous loyalties engendered, enough to cause self-sacrifice in battle, were because men were "aware of some organism greater than themselves, stretching into the future and the past, within which they

feel themselves to be immortal". People often only became "aware that they are not individuals in the very moment when they are facing bullets". Orwell believed that "a very slight increase in consciousness" could transfer their loyalty to "humanity itself which is not an abstraction" (70).

This was a brief respite in his tirade against the dangerous encroachments of group loyalty. In 'Politics and the English Language', he noted that political writing was bad writing, and where this was not true: "it will generally be found that the writer is some kind of rebel, expressing his private opinions and not a 'party line'"(71). In 'Writers and Leviathan', he claimed that literature was distorted by semi-conscious loyalties, and that ideological solidarity often called for plain lies: "political responsibility now means yielding oneself over to orthodoxies and 'party lines', with all the timidity and dishonesty that that implies" (72). A little later he commented that "Group loyalties are necessary, and yet they are poisonous to literature, so long as literature is the product of individuals". How then, could the writer resolve this paradox? Orwell believed that he should act in concert with his political allies, but not be bound by party ideology. If he wrote in the service of the party, it should be "as an individual, an outsider, at the most an unwelcome guerilla on the flank of a regular army". In other words,

the writer has to act as part of the community, but never sacrifice his own, individual moral code of behaviour. It is this individual moral code, and often the dynamic tensions which it creates with the social code around it that are the very substance of many writers' material. It is certainly true that a writer is only at his best when he is relating or discussing something which he really believes in, and this is usually matter directly accruing from his own experience. This is certainly true as far as Orwell is concerned. Thus a writer's main source, as well as his dynamo, is directly related to himself as an autonomous individual (or at least his belief in himself as an autonomous individual). The provenance of good prose literature, therefore, lay in the cultural atmosphere provided by the Protestant religion.

James Burnham noted the difference between behaviour in public (group) and private life:

Burnham does not deny that 'good' motives may operate in private life, but he maintains that politics consists of the struggle for power and nothing else. (73)

In a later assessment, Orwell referred to the division between group and individual ethics:

And he is probably right in arguing from this that one cannot apply to politics the same moral code that one practises or tries to practise in private life (74)

Although many of Burnham's arguments repelled Orwell, as in the case of Professor MacMurray, they were accommodated into his outlook. He had to admit that "Man...is an animal that can act morally when he acts as an individual, but becomes unmoral when he acts collectively" (75). Nineteen Eighty Four is largely the story of the helplessness of the individual to live by his own code of behaviour, in the face of a sophisticated, technological, 'total' group code of behaviour, which is inescapable. Orwell's final position on this question might well be summed up by the conclusion which he wrote for a book review in The Manchester Evening News, 1944:

If the book has a moral it is that it is better to be a lonely and persecuted individual...than to be too well integrated with your environment" (76).

INTRODUCTION TO NOTES.

I have used simple abbreviations for most of Orwell's major works, published in book form, in these notes. The Key is as follows:

DOPL = Down and Out in Paris and London.

BD = Burmese Days.

ACD = A Clergyman's Daughter.

KAF = Keep the Aspidistra Flying.

RWP = The Road to Wigan Pier.

HC = Homage to Catalonia.

CUFA = Coming up for Air.

AF = Animal Farm.

1984 - Nineteen Eighty Four.

CEJL 1, 11, 111, 1V = Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters (4 vols)

Where a work appears in the CEJL volumes, I have indicated this, even though it may have been (and usually has been) published elsewhere earlier. Thus, although 'Such, Such Were the Joys' was published in book form in the U.S.A., I have indicated its reference in the CEJL, as this is the most readily accessible place for English readers. I have even done this with major works such as The Lion and the Unicorn and 'Charles Dickens', for although they both appeared in book form over here, the same criterion of accessibility applies.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 1

- 1) Encyclopaedia Britannica, 15th Edition, 1976. Book 15, p.360.
- 2) Levi-Strauss talks about the dilemma encountered by both sides when Spanish conquistadores met natives from the Greater Antilles: "...the Spaniards sent out commissions to ascertain whether or not the natives had a soul, the latter were engaged in drowning white prisoners in order to verify through prolonged watching, whether or not their corpses were subject to putrefaction."
Structural Anthropology 2, C.Levi-Strauss, Penguin, 1977.
- 3) Quoted in The Race Concept, Benton & Harwood, David & Charles, 1975, p.43.
- 4) There are many examples, for instance in Children and Race, D.Milner, Penguin, 1975.
- 5) Europeans and Asians were believed to have a "broad and innate difference - physical, intellectual and moral...such a difference has existed from the earliest authentic records, and is...coeval with the first creation of man." Ethnological Society of London, 1867, quoted in Victorian Attitudes to Race, C.Bolt, Routledge, 1971, p.19.
- 6) From 'Essai sur l'inegalité des races humaines', Quoted in E.Cassirer, The Myth of the State, Yale University Press, 1946 (New Haven, 1963).
- 7) Milner. Op.Cit, p.15.
- 8) Hitler, Joachim Fest, Penguin, 1974, p.84.
- 9) CEJL 1V, p.46.
- 10) 'Rudyard Kipling', CEJL 11, 217, 219, 220.
- 11) Quoted in Liberalism and Indian Politics, R.J.Moore, E.Arnold, 1966, p.76.
- 12) Ibid, p.77.
- 13) Quoted in Bolt, Op.Cit, p.178.
- 14) Ibid, p.183.
- 15) Pax Britannica, James Morris, Faber, 1968, p.136.
- 16) "Beneath them (The Aryans) was a fourth or servile class...the remnants of the vanquished aboriginal tribes whose lives had been spared. These were the slave bands of black descent...They were not allowed to be present at the great national sacrifices, nor at the feasts which followed them. They could never rise from their servile position..." Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1881, p.782.
- 17) "The Aryan off-shoots to the East and to the West alike asserted their superiority over the earlier peoples...civilisation merely means the civilisation of the western branches of the same race." Ibid, p 779.

18) Because it has relevance here and later, we will look at General Dyer's action at Amritsar in this note.

"On 15 April 1919, martial law was declared in the Punjab in consequence of a deed which became one of the great rallying cries of Indian Nationalism. Amritsar, a city of some 300,000 inhabitants and the chief religious centre of the Sikhs, stands about 250 miles north-west of Delhi. There, on 10 April, two nationalist leaders were arrested and deported. A large crowd attempted to enter the European cantonment and, on being turned away, began rioting in the city. Two banks were attacked, railway stations set on fire, four Europeans were murdered and others attacked, including a woman missionary who was left for dead. The military, under one General Dyer, restored order and all public meetings and assemblies were declared illegal. Nevertheless, on 13 April a meeting gathered in a large enclosed space known as the Jallianwall Bagh. When he heard of this, General Dyer went personally to the spot with ninety Gurkha and Baluchi soldiers and two armoured cars, with which he blocked the only exit. Then, without warning, he ordered his men to open fire on the densely packed crowd, and, on his own admission, fired 1,605 rounds before he withdrew, ordering the armoured cars to remain and prevent anyone from entering or leaving the Bagh. Official figures gave 379 dead and 1,200 wounded. Dyer's action was approved by the provincial government. The following day, a mob rioting and burning at another spot was bombed and machine-gunned from aircraft. On 15 April martial law was declared and not lifted until 9 June. During this period, Indians were forced to walk on all-fours past the spot where the woman missionary had been attacked, and according to the report of the Hunter Commission which enquired into the disturbances, public floggings were ordered for such minor offences as 'The contravention of the curfew order, failure to salaam to a commissioned officer, for disrespect to a European, for taking a commandeered car without leave, or refusal to sell milk and for similar contraventions.' Dyer testified that he had fired as many rounds as he did, because, 'I considered this the least amount of firing which would produce the necessary moral and widespread effect it was my duty to produce...from a military point of view not only on those present, but more sepecially throughout the Punjab!'"

The Last Years of British India. M. Edwardes, New English Library, 1963, pp.53,4

19) George Orwell: A Life, Professor Bernard Crick, Secker & Warburg, 1980,

20) RWP p.108

p-6.

21) Ibid, p.124

22) B.D., p.69

23) CUFA p.134

NOTES ON CHAPTER 2

- 1) CEJL 1V, 421.
- 2) CEJL 1, 528.
- 3) 'Such, Such Were the Joys', CEJL 1V, 394.
- 4) CEJL 11, 77.
- 5) CEJL 1V, 257.
- 6) 'Charles Dickens', CEJL 1, 492.
- 7) RWP, p.119. 141.
- 8) For an analysis of the symbolic value and meaning of the birthmark, see Orwell's Fiction, R.A.Lee, University of Notre Dame Press, 1972.
- 9) BD, p.61,2.
- 10) ACD, p.77.
- 11) See note 3.
- 12) See 'Charles Dickens', CEJL 1, p.473, for list of 'insult names'. Orwell himself used several of the names ('Kike', 'Dago', 'Nigger') in his novels, although, one should add, for authenticity. The hierarchy of races was as follows: The bourgeois, male Englishman; other white foreigners, the working class; the Aryan Indians, the dark-skinned Dravidians; the African Negro.
- 13) CEJL 1, 473,4.
- 14) Ibid.
- 15) Ibid.

- 16) BD, p.6.
- 17) 'Charles Dickens', Op.Cit. p.473.
- 18) RWP, p.100.
- 19) 'Such, Such Were the Joys', CEJL 1V, 407.
- 20) 'Boys' Weeklies', CEJL 1, 506.
- 21) Ibid, p.512.
- 22) Ibid, p.511.
- 23) The publisher, D.C.Thompson, only permitted its employees to vote on trade-union membership in 1978!
- 24) Ibid, p.516,7.
- 25) Ibid, p.517.
- 26) Social psychologists have used the equation Amity = Enmity + Hazard (external threat, common to all groups). In other words, the degree of amity experienced within a group is a factor of the enmity or external hazard experienced outside. The role of hazard can be illustrated in BD, when the earthquake brings together rival groups (whites and Club servants), in common 'friendship' against the common threat.
- Park, in his book, Race and Culture, talks of primitive tribes ranging over a territory "in a state of potential, if not actual, warfare". Inside each tribe one found "peace, order and security within...the 'in-group'. On the other hand, the permanence of this peace, security and solidarity is...determined by the degree or imminence of conflict without. The 'in-group' and the 'out-group' are to be conceived, therefore, as in a relation like that of compensating or countervailing forces." Collier- Macmillan, 1950, p.87.
- 27) 'Boys' Weeklies', Op.Cit, p.518.
- 28) See, for example, Orwell's excellent sketches of Parisian low-life in 'Inside the Whale', CEJL 1, 541; of the 1930's in the review of The Limit to Pessimism, CEJL 1, 585; of the colonial soldier's life in 'Rudyard Kipling', CEJL 11, 223; and many others.

29) Jenni Calder, in her book Chronicles of Conscience, wrote that Orwell enjoyed the picture of the Greyfriar's tea, and that to him "it represented an important facet of the English character". He was "directing his efforts towards establishing a situation in which everything was 'safe, solid and unquestionable'," this calm had a "profound attraction for him, even though it was built on inequalities"; the picture he drew was "not satiric", even though his tone is "regretful". The nostalgia is compatible with Orwell's Socialism, which has "peculiar warmth and humanity" and "solid contact with human situation unlike many "theorists". She believed he was "sad" that it was not possible to include all the features of the Greyfriar's tea "in a vision of Socialism". Secker & Warburg, 1968, p.168.

30) 'Boys' Weeklies', Op.Cit, p.512.

31) Ibid.

32) 'Such, Such Were the Joys', Op.Cit, p.385.

33) 'Boys' Weeklies', Op.Cit, p.507.

34) See note 26.

35) HC, p.110.

36) Ibid, p.112.

37) KAF, p.107.

38) RWP, p.127.

39) See beginning of chapter.

40) 'Rudyard Kipling', Op.Cit, 215.

41) Tribute to Kipling on his death, New English Weekly, 23/1/36.

42) RWP, p.121.

43) Ibid, p.126.

44) Ibid, p.129.

45) 'Rudyard Kipling', Op.Cit, p.215.

- 46) In order to emphasise U Po Kyin's wickedness, he described his brain as "barbaric", and his conceptualisation as pictorial rather than verbal; thus confusing atavism with wickedness.
- 47) Adelphi, May 1932.
- 48) 'Rudyard Kipling', Op.Cit, p.228.
- 49) 'In Defence of P.G.Wodehouse', CEJL 111, 388-403.
- 50) 'Rudyard Kipling', Op.Cit, p.217.
- 51) Ibid, p.215,6.
- 52) 'Wells, Hitler and the World State', CEJL 11 p.172.
- 53) 'Rudyard Kipling', Op.Cit, p.215.
- 54) Ibid, p.223.
- 55) Ibid, p.224.
- 56) Review of The Edge of the Abyss, CEJL 111, 124.
- 57) Tribute to Kipling, Op.Cit.
- 58) Letter to me, 26/9/77.
- 59) The World of George Orwell, Ed M.Gross, Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1971, p.171.
- 60) 'Rudyard Kipling', Op.Cit, p.217.
- 61) See, for example RWP, p.138-9; CEJL 11, 215-229; CEJL 1V, 241-261.
- 62) 'Rudyard Kipling', Op.Cit, p.228.
- 63). Orwell told Muggerridge that he thought this poem "the most beautiful in the language", Gross, Op.Cit, p.171.
- 64) 'Rudyard Kipling', Op.Cit, p.228.
- 65) Ibid, 225.
- 66) CEJL 11, 354.

- 67) 'As I Please', Tribune,
- 68) Footnote to 'As I Please', 29/11/46, CEJL 1V, 290.
- 69) Manchester Evening News, 9/8/45.
- 70) Letter to Henry Miller, CEJL 1, 258.
- 71) See review of Zest for Life, by Johann Weller, Time and Tide, 17/10/36.
- 72) CEJL 1V, 394,5.
- 73) 'The Limit to Pessimism', CEJL 1, 587.
- 74) 'Rudyard Kipling', Op.Cit, p.227.
- 75) Letter to Miss Tennyson Jesse, 14/3/46, CEJL 1V, 142.
- 76) " " " , 4/3/46, Ibid.
- 77) Tribune, 27/2/47.
- 78) See, for example, the work of E. Bogardus (Social Distancing and its Origins, Immigration and Race Attitudes).
- 79) BD, p.38.
- 80) CEJL 1, 252.
- 81) Four Absentees, Rayner Heppenstall, Barrie & Reckliff, 1960, p.158.
- 82) 'As I Please', 7/7/44, 'Tobias Smollett', CEJL 111, 283.
- 83) Letter to Eleanor Jaques, 6/2/33, CEJL 1, 141.
- 84) RWP, p.8,9,13.
- 85) Review of The Luck of the Maclean, New Statesman and Nation, 21/9/40.
- 86) 'Such, Such Were the Joys', Op.Cit, p.409.
- 87) Ibid.
- 88) Ibid, p.410.

89) David Aster told me that Orwell thought Eric "a terrible name", reminiscent of the children's story, and that "Blair implies you're Scottish and I'm not". David Aster believed "he thought it phoney, it gave an impression which he did not wish to give." Interview with me, 2/7/79.

Orwell wrote to Rayner Heppenstall, 16/4/40; "...don't afflict the poor little brat with a celtic sort of name that nobody knows how to spell. She'll grow up psychic or something. People always grow up like their names. It took me nearly 30 years to work off the effects of being called Eric." CEJL 11, 37.

90) 'Such, Such Were the Joys', Op.Cit, p.410.

Cyril Connolly thought Orwell's dislike of Scotland "...could be traced back to St.Cyprian's, where the pretty little Scottish boys of good family wore kilts on Sundays and were much in favour." Orwell: The Transformation. Stansky & Abrahams, Constable, 1979, p.85.

91) Interview with David Aster, 2/2/79.

92) Ibid.

93) 'As I Please', 14/2/47, CEJL 1V, 328.

94) Letter to Julian Symons, 29/10/48, CEJL 1V, 510.

95) " " " , 9/10/47, Ibid, p.435.

96) Letter to George Woodcock, 2/9/46, CEJL 1V, 239,240.

97) CEJL 1V, 327,8.

98) Tribune, 10/12/43,

99) DOPL, p.178.

100) CEJL 1, 516.

101) Ibid, p.524.

102) Review of Cycle of Cathars, by Hsiao Ch'ien, Observer, 11/11/45.

103) Review of The Good Earth, by Pearl Buck, The Adelphi, December 1937.

104) For example p.120, 178.

- 105) p.126.
- 106) BD, p.121.
- 107) Ibid, p.122.
- 108) Ibid, p.123.
- 109) Ibid, p.124.
- 110) Ibid, p.126.
- 111) Dante Called You Beatrice, Paul Potts, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1961, p.82.
- 112) CEJL 1, 407.
- 113) CEJL 11, 119.
- 114) Ibid, p.120.
- 115) 'Talking to India', November 1941.
- 116) CEJL 11, 263.
- 117) Ibid, p.471.
- 118) Ibid, p.478.
- 119) CEJL 11, 23.
- 120) 'As I Please', CEJL 111, 213.
- 121) Letter to John Middleton Murry, 14/7/44, Ibid, p.217.
- 122) The Manchester Evening News, 2/2/45.
- 123) CEJL 1V, 573.
- 124) He believed one could "do a little to mitigate the horrors of the colour war" by avoiding "insulting nicknames" and had gone through "the proofs of a reprinted book of mine, cutting out the word 'Chinaman'...and substituting 'Chinese'. The book was written less than a dozen years ago, but in the intervening time 'Chinaman' has become a deadly insult", As I Please, 10/12/43.

- 125) Banton & Harwood, Op.Cit, p.197.
- 126) For example, Shakespeare's The Tempest Act 1, scene 2; Act 2, scene 2; Othello, Act 5, scene 2.
- 127) CEJL 1V, 418.
- 128) Eric and Us, J.Buddicom, Leslie Frewin, 1974.
- 129) Time and Tide, 13/4/40.
- 130) p.122.
- 131) p.133.
- 132) Ibid, p.43.
- 133) Ibid, pp 35, 36, 38, 43, 45, 137, 141.
- 134) 1984, pp232, 3, 9.
- 135) CUFA, 44,5.
- 136) Letter to Roger Senhouse, 22/10/47, CEJL 1V, 436.
- 137) CUFA, p.43.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 3

- 1) See Stansky & Abrahams, Op.Cit, chapters 1 & 2.
- 2) See chapter 1, Burma: From Kingdom to Independence, F.N.Trager, Pall Mall Press, 1966.
- 3) For example, an English emissary had to remove his shoes, and the matter "became a matter of high politics" which "appeared to strike at the superiority of the white man". Contact between the British and the Burmese Court was broken off on account of this in 1875. The West in Asia, 1850-1914, M.Edwardes, Batsford, 1967, p.45.
- 4) Review of The Story of Burma, by F.Tennysen Jesse, CEJL IV, 139.
- 5) For example, Afghanistan, Nepal, Sikkin, Bhutan, Singapore.
- 6) RWP, p.54.
- 7) Trager, Op.Cit, p.42.
- 8) The 'Maistry' system allowed a man to recruit labour, feed and house them and deduct expenses from their wages. Owing to the exorbitant rates, many labourers were even unable to remit money home. The system was universally practised and condemned throughout Burma.
- 9) Quoted in The Indian Minority in Burma, N.R.Chakravarti, O.U.P. 1971, p.123.
- 10) The Census Commissioner of 1911 wrote: "...there is reason to believe that the present phase of Indian immigration is strengthening rather than weakening the hold of the Burmese..." Quoted in Ibid, chapter 2.
- 11) RWP, p.54.
- 12) Quoted in Chakravarti, Op.Cit, p.47,8.
- 13) Le Progrès Civique, 4/5/29, 'How a Nation is Exploited'.
- 14) As to South and East Africa, Mauritius, Guyana, Trinidad, Fiji, Ceylon etc.
- 15) There were 3 meanings: 'caste man'; 'black man'; 'overseas man'.

16) BD, p.138.

17) He wrote to a correspondent that "much of it is simply reporting what I have seen". CEJL 1V, 142, and Mulk Raj Anand told me that he asked a group "to read his book Burmese Days in confirmation of his testimony" that imperialism destroyed free relationships, Letter to me, 28/9/78.

18) BD, p.17,18.

19) Ibid, p.218.

20) Ibid, p.73.

21) Ibid, p.209.

22) Ibid, p.20.

23) Ibid, p.25.

24) Ibid, p.196,7.

25) Ibid, p.173.

26) Ibid, p.232.

27) Ibid, p.34.

28) Ibid, p.239.

29) Ibid, p.240,1.

30) Ibid, p.41.

31) Ibid, p.42.

32) Ibid, p.255.

33) Ibid, p.79.

34) Ibid, p.68.

35) See note 71, chapter 2.

36) BD, p.72.

37) In a review of Lionel Fielden's Beggar My Neighbour, he parodied the author's denunciations of the English, by satirising some Indian 'habits':

"Indians are an unmanly race who gesticulate like monkeys...as a people ...(they) are rotten with malaria and hookworm."

38) BD, p.82.

39) Ibid, p.109.

40) A correspondent claimed that he had never come across Orwell's story of a note saying "Please give the bearer 15 lashes", in over 50 years service, 13/4,

41) Flory tells Veraswami that the dear old havildar "who said that if the British left India there wouldn't be a virgin or a rupee left between..." should be "put on the retired list. BD, p.36.

42) Ibid, p.94,5.

43) Ibid, p.95.

44) Ibid, p.119.

45) Ibid, p.121.

46) Ibid, p.131.

47) Ibid, p.72.

48) Ibid, p.136.

49) Ibid, p.34.

50) Ibid, p.175-9.

51) Ibid, p.192.

52) The book-wallah thought the Bible must be "evil", because everybody wanted to sell rather than buy it. Ibid, p.209.

53) Ibid, p.220.

54) Ibid, p.253.

55) Ibid, p.24.

- 56) The Burmese are likened to "tom cats", p.113; Mrs. Lackersteen to "a snake", p.234; and MacGregor to "a saurian monster", p.105.
- 57) She contributed £80 million military stores; £137 million jute and sacks; £20 million wages; Government gift £100 million; £40 million wheat.
- 58) The British allowed Indians elected on a limited franchise to have control of certain areas of government: Health, Education and Local matters. The Viceroy could overrule them in the last resort, and the key areas of Finance, Foreign Policy, Law and Order were kept by the British.
- 59) See note 34, chapter 1.
- 60) Imperial Policing, C.Gwynn, Macmillan, 1936, p.63.
- 61) BD, p.30,1.
- 62) He believed they stood for a reactionary world-view, and that their methods were spiritually totalitarian, allowing no heterodoxy.
- 63) BD, p.106,7.
- 64) On Kipling's Death, Op.Cit, p.184.
- 65) Gwynn, Op.Cit, p.102.
- 66) Ibid, p.112.
- 67) BD, p.227,8.
- 68) CEJL 11, 93,4.
- 69) Moore, Op.Cit, p.119.
- 70) Trager, Op.Cit, p.45.
- 71) 'Shooting an Elephant', CEJL 1, 265,6.
- 72) BD, p.33.
- 73) Trager, Op.Cit, p.57.
- 74) Ibid, p.46.

- 75) BD, p.11.
- 76) Ibid, p.12.
- 77) Ibid, p.44,5.
- 78) Ibid.
- 79) Ibid, p.46.
- 80) Ibid, p.75.
- 81) Ibid, p.129.
- 82) HC, p.207.
- 83) CEJL 1V, 252.
- 84) Review of An Interlude in Spain, by C.D'Ydewall, The Observer, 24/3/44.
- 85) 1984, p.9.
- 86) BD, p.131.
- 87) Ibid, p.133.
- 88) Ibid, p.136.
- 89) Ibid, p.141.
- 90) Ibid.
- 91) Ibid, p.142.
- 92) Ibid, p.244.
- 93) Ibid, p. 46.
- 94) Ibid, p.248.
- 95) Ibid, p.268,9.
- 96) Ibid, p.49,50.
- 97) Ibid, p.52.

- 98) Ibid, p.50.
- 99) Ibid, p.53.
- 100) Ibid, p.77.
- 101) Letter to Rayner Heppenstall, 16/4/40, CEJL 11, 37.
- 102) BD, p.83.
- 103) Ibid, p.84.
- 104) Ibid, p.79.
- 105) Ibid, p.104,5.
- 106) Ibid, p.21.
- 107) Ibid, p.186.
- 108) Ibid, p.222.
- 109) Ibid, p.64.
- 110) Ibid, p.117.
- 111) Ibid, p.52.
- 112) Ibid, p.216.
- 113) Ibid, p.215.
- 114) CEJL 11, 251.
- 115) BD, p.108.
- 116) Ibid, p.51.
- 117) Ibid, p.147.
- 118) Ibid, p.148.
- 119) DOPL, p.189.
- 120) BD, p.183.

- 121) Ibid, p.186.
- 122) Ibid, p.187.
- 123) Ibid, p.188.
- 124) Ibid, p.204.
- 125) Ibid, p.214.
- 126) Ibid, p.256.
- 127) Ibid, p.258.
- 128) DOPL, p.13.
- 129) KAF, p.177,8.
- 130) 1984, p.54.
- 131) BD, p.145.
- 132) Ibid, p.187.
- 133) Ibid, p.259.
- 134) Ibid, p.80.
- 135) Ibid, p.83.
- 136) Ibid, p.118.
- 137) Ibid, p.195,6.
- 138) 'Charles Dickens', CEJL 1, 479.
- 139) BD, p.15.
- 140) Ibid, p.13,14.
- 141) Ibid, p.134.
- 142) Ibid, p.135.
- 143) DOPL, p.74.

144) BD, p.136.

145) Ibid, p.19.

146) Ibid, p.98.

147) Ibid, p.102.

148) Ibid, p.126.

149) Ibid, p.151.

150) Ibid,

152) BD, p.35.

153) Ibid, p.38.

154) Ibid, p.45.

155) Ibid, p.137.

156) Ibid, p.139.

157) Ibid, p.205.

158) Ibid, p.243.

159) Ibid, p.23.

160) Ibid.

161) Ibid, p.23,4.

162) ACD, p.12.

163) He wrote to Eleanor Jaques about "a moribund hag" he had seen in church, who stank of "mothballs & gin", and had to be carried "to and from the altar at Communion". CEJL 1, 126.

164) RWP, p.114,5.

165) BD, p.222.

- 166) Ibid, p.115.
- 167) Time and Tide, 30/3/40.
- 168) CEJL 111, 300,301.
- 169) BD, p.45.
- 170) CEJL 111, 424.
- 171) BD, p.117.
- 172) Ibid, p.116.
- 173) Ibid, p.114.
- 174) Ibid, p.112.
- 175) Time and Tide, 30/3/40.
- 176) Plain Tales From the Hills, Kipling, Macmillan, 1899, p.131.
- 177) Ibid, p.79.
- 178) Ibid, p.83.
- 179) RWP, p.109.
- 180) 'A Hanging', The Adelphi, August 1931, CEJL 1, 70.
- 181) CEJL 11, 122.
- 182) June 1940.
- 183) 9/8/45.
- 184) BD, p.112,3.
- 185) Ibid, p.71.
- 186) RWP, p.124,5.
- 187) Colour was just another vehicle for exploitation, Tribune, 10/12/43.

- 188) BD, p.20.
- 189) Ibid, p.25.
- 190) Ibid, p.29.
- 191) Tribune, 4/4/47.
- 192) 1984, p.45.
- 193) Gwynn, Op.Cit, p.46.
- 194) Ibid, p.59.
- 195) BD, p.236.
- 196) Ibid, p.238,9.
- 197) Ibid, p.240.
- 198) Ibid, p.232.
- 199) Ibid, p.235.
- 200) Ibid, p.174.
- 201) Ibid, p.175.
- 202) Ibid, p.176.
- 203) Ibid, p.193.
- 204) Ibid, p.202,3.
- 205) 'My Country Right or Left', CEJL 1, 590-2.
- 206) World Review, June 1950.
- 207) Letter to me, 18/5/77.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 4

- 1) Gross, Op.Cit, p.20.
- 2) RWP, chapter 9.
- 3) BD, p.9.
- 4) Ibid, p.37.
- 5) Ibid, p.74.
- 6) Ibid, p.106. See The Journey Outward, M.Collis, Faber & Faber, 1952, ch: 10.
- 7) BD, p.131.
- 8) Ibid, p.140.
- 9) Ibid, p.212,3.
- 10) Ibid, p.213,4.
- 11) Ibid, p.219.
- 12) Ibid, p.33.
- 13) 'Shooting an Elephant', CEJL 1, 265,6.
- 14) BD, p.100.
- 15) CEJL 1, 266.
- 16) BD, p.229.
- 17) Ibid.
- 18) Orwell quotes Swift's savage description of the Houyhnhnms "battering the warriors' faces into Mummy", with evident relish. CEJL 1V, 244.

Winston Smith has sadistic fantasies about Julia in 1984, and George Bowling has vivid insights into the violent mind of a party political speaker,

in CUFA.

- 19) BD, p.229.
- 20) Ibid, p.231.
- 21) Gross, Op.Cit.
- 22) RWP, p. 29.
- 23) BD, p.33.
- 24) Gross, Op.Cit, p.29.
- 25) A series of debates when common soldiers discussed with Cromwell and the army generals, matters of doctrine and government, on a basis of equality.
- 26) BD, p.25,6.
- 27) Ibid, p.26.
- 28) Ibid, p.27,8.
- 29) RWP, p.108, 124.
- 30) Banton & Harwood, Op.Cit, p.34.
- 31) BD, p.32.
- 32) Ibid, p.181.
- 33) Ibid, p.189.
- 34) Ibid, p.223.
- 35) Ibid, p.224.
- 36) Ibid, p.41.
- 37) Gross, Op.Cit.
- 38) BD, p.21.
- 39) Ibid, p.24.
- 40) Ibid, p.29.

- 41) 'Antisemitism in Britain', CEJL 111, 113.
- 42) BD, p.30.
- 43) Ibid, p.46.
- 44) Ibid, p.60.
- 45) Ibid, p.139.
- 46) 'Politics vs. Literature', CEJL 1V, 252.
- 47) Ibid, p.221.
- 48) Ibid, p.222.
- 49) Ibid, p.223.
- 50) RWP, p.126.
- 51) BD, p.38.
- 52) Ibid, p.39.
- 53) Ibid, p.40.
- 54) For example, his review of Beggar My Neighbour, CEJL 11, 349.
- 55) BD, p.57.
- 56) Edwardes, Op.Cit, p.174.
- 57) The Journey Outward, Collis, Op.Cit, pp. 120-2.
- 58) BD, p.65.
- 59) Ibid, p.66,7.
- 60) Ibid.
- 61) RWP, p.126,7.
- 62) Ibid.
- 63) RWP, p.115.

- 64) Ibid, p.108.
- 65) 'Why I Write', CEJL 1, 23.
- 66) RWP, p.123.
- 67) Ibid, p.139.
- 68) CEJL 1, p.23.
- 69) CEJL 1V, 142.
- 70) Stansky & Abrahams, Op.Cit, p.46.
- 71) BD, Title page.
- 72) CEJL 1, 25.
- 73) "Lead on Macduff", BD, p.19,34,219.
- 74) For example, Ibid, p.105.
- 75) Ibid, p.73,4.
- 76) See RWP, p.152.
- 77) Others include Flaxman in KAF; Warburton in ACD; Bowling in CUFA; Parsons in 1984 etc.
- 78) BD, p.31,2.
- 79) CEJL 11, 219.
- 80) A Study of George Orwell, C.Hollis, Bodley Head, 1956, pp.25-30.
- 81) BD, p.36.
- 82) Ibid, p.59.
- 83) Ibid, p.19.
- 84) Ibid, p.41.
- 85) Ibid, p.55.
- 86) Ibid, p.23.

- 87) Ibid, p.69.
- 88) Ibid, p.111.
- 89) Ibid, pp.169-171.
- 90) Ibid, p.210.
- 91) Ibid, p.211.
- 92) Ibid, p.214.
- 93) Ibid, p.263.
- 94) Ibid.
- 95) Ibid, p.23.
- 96) See note 60.
- 97) RWP, p.127.
- 98) BD, p.48
- 99) Ibid, p. 211
- 100) 'Charles Dickens', CEJL 1, 482,3.
- 101) RWP, p.124.
- 102) BD, p.45.
- 103) Ibid, p.75.
- 104) A Passage to India, E.M.Ferster, E.Arnold, 1924, Penguin 1969, p.317.
- 105) Letter to me from Mulk Raj Anand, October 1978.
- 106) Letter to Henry Miller, 26/8/36, CEJL 1, 258.
- 107) BD, p.54.
- 108) Ibid, p.55.
- 109) Ibid, p.63,4.

- 110) Ibid, p.96.
- 111) Collis, Op.Cit, pp.144-6
- 112) BD, p.99.
- 113) Ibid, p.100.
- 114) Ibid, p.101.
- 115) Ibid, p.102.
- 116) Ibid, p.112.
- 117) Ibid, p.119.
- 118) Ibid, p.120.
- 119) CEJL 1, 28.
- 120) Collis, Op.Cit, pp.147-9.
- 121) CEJL 1V, 500.
- 122) RWP, p.127,8.
- 123) BD, p.72.
- 124) Ibid, p.107.
- 125) RWP, p.128.
- 126) Ibid, p.129.
- 127) BD, p.37.
- 128) 'Shooting an Elephant', CEJL 1, 265,6.
- 129) Ibid, p.269.
- 130) Ibid, p.270.
- 131) Ibid, p.269.
- 132) BD, p.5.

- 133) Ibid, p.18.
- 134) Ibid, p.33.
- 135) Ibid, p.34.
- 137) Ibid, p.228.
- 138) Ibid, p.33.
- 139) Ibid, p.49.
- 140) Ibid, p.58.
- 141) Ibid, p.62.
- 142) Ibid, p.63.
- 143) RWP, p.161.
- 144) DOPL, p.127.
- 145) BD, p.62.
- 146) Ibid, p.47.
- 147) Ibid, p.13,14.
- 148) Ibid, p.33.
- 149) Ibid, p.16.
- 150) Ibid, p.78.
- 151) Ibid, p.193.
- 152) Ibid, p.32.
- 153) Ibid, p.59.
- 154) Ibid, p.61.
- 155) Ibid, p.144.
- 156) See The Crystal Spirit, George Woodcock, J.Cape, 1953, p.22. Also Mulk

Raj Anand's letter to me, October 1978.

157) BD, p.53.

158) Ibid, p.65.

159) Ibid, p.69.

160) See, CEJL 1, 264.

161) BD, p.19, 63, 64.

162) CEJL 1, 137. He echoed the same sentiments and "a hatred of imperialism" in the introduction to the Ukrainian edition of AF, CEJL 111, 456.

163) CEJL 11, 38.

164) Letter to George Woodcock, 12/7/42, CEJL 11, 264.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 5

- 1) 'How a Nation is exploited', Le Progrès Civique, 4/5/29.
- 2) Moore, Op.Cit, p.71.
- 3) CEJL 1V, 142.
- 4) The Listener, 9/3/38.
- 5) CEJL 1, 437.
- 6) 'As I Please', Tribune, 28/7/44.
- 7) CEJL 11, 113.
- 8) 'Rudyard Kipling', CEJL 11, 217.
- 9) Ibid, p.218.
- 10) 'Letter to an American Visitor', Tribune, 18/6/43.
- 11) A.N.Bose wrote to Fenner Brockway, 4/2/43, and sent a copy to Orwell: he claimed: "I might be prejudiced against the book which Mr. Fielden has written and for which the Freedom Defence Committee has given its imprint, but everyone who has genuine sympathy with the aims and objects of the Indian National Congress considers it to be an anti-Indian book, and more so as it is written by a person who is supposed to be for Indian freedom and published by a committee which is supposed to stand for India's liberation." Orwell's letter Manuscript Room, British Library.
- 12) CEJL 11, 358.
- 13) Ibid, p.359.
- 14) Ibid.
- 15) 'Such, Such Were the Joys', CEJL 1V 408,9.
- 16) Review of India, by H.Brailsford, The Nation, 20/11/43.
- 17) Review of Empire and India, by Louis Fischer, Nation, 18/5/44.

- 18) Op.Cit, Nation, 20/11/43.
- 19) Letter to me from Professor A.J.Ayer, 7/9/77.
- 20) Letter to me from ^{Professor} William Eapson, 2/11/77.
- 21) The Observer, 29/10/44.
- 22) The Manchester Evening News, 12/7/45.
- 23) Ibid, 6/4/44.
- 24) Ibid, 28/4/44.
- 25) Nation, 13/5/44.
- 26) CEJL 111, 226.
- 27) Tribune, 8/3/46.
- 28) Ibid, 15/3/46.
- 29) British Pamphleteers, Reynolds, (Orwell, Allan Wingate, 1948, Orwell's introduction.
- 30) British Pamphleteers 11, Reynolds, (Orwell, Allan Wingate, 1951, A.J.P. Taylor's introduction.
- 31) CEJL 1V, 121.
- 32) CEJL 1V, 427, 466,
- 33) Letter to F.A.Henson, CEJL 11, 564.
- 34) CEJL 111, 457.
- 35) See The Invisible Writing, Hutchinson, 1959, p.474,5.
- 36) RWP, p.139,140.
- 37) Transcript of Interview with Lord Fenner Brockway, 3/1/79.
- 38) RWP, p.156.
- 39) CUFA, pp.212-5.

- 40) Heppenstall, Op.Cit, 120,1.
- 41) CEJL 1V, 166.
- 42) RWP, p.189,190.
- 43) Lord Fenner Brockway, *interview, 3/1/79.*
- 44) 'Not Counting Niggers', CEJL 1, 437.
- 45) Ibid, p.438.
- 46) CEJL 11, 90.
- 47) Ibid, p.113.
- 48) Ibid, p.124.
- 49) 'Rudyard Kipling', CEJL 11, 218.
- 50) CEJL 11, 305.
- 51) Tribune, 10/12/43.
- 52) Ibid, 20/11/42.
- 53) CEJL 111, 448,9.
- 54) Ibid; p.449.
- 55) Tribune, 8/3/46.
- 56) See, for example, CEJL 111, 24; also CEJL 11, 109.
- 57) CEJL 1V, 427.
- 58) Ibid, p.465.
- 59) KAF, p.106.
- 60) 'Writers and Leviathan', CEJL 1V, 466,7.
- 61) Ibid,
- 62) Ibid, p.578.

- 63) CEJL 1, 407.
- 64) CEJL 11, 299.
- 65) 'Writers and Leviathan', CEJL 1V, 466.
- 66) Tribune, 4/8/44.
- 67) CEJL 1V, 393.
- 68) Ibid, p.407.
- 69) Adelphi, December 1938.
- 70) 'Spilling the Spanish Beans', CEJL 1, 306,7.
- 71) CEJL 11, 201.
- 72) Ibid, p.289,290.
- 73) CEJL 111, 110.
- 74) 'Notes on Nationalism', CEJL 111, 420.
- 75) Ibid, p.429.
- 76) CEJL 1V, 154.
- 77) 1984, p.171.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 6

- 1) CEJL 11, 48.
- 2) DOPL, p.107,8.
- 3) The Lion and the Unicorn, CEJL 11, 130. Talking to India, November 1941.
- 4) RWP, p.109.
- 5) Milner, Op.Cit, p.21.
- 6) Social Change and Prejudice, Bettelheim and ^MJanowitz, Collier-Macmillan,
New York, 1964, p.22.
- 7) The Invisible Writing, A.Koestler, Hutchinson, London, 1969, p.88.
- 8) RWP, p.122.
- 9) 'Such, Such Were the Joys', CEJL 1V, 408.
- 10) CEJL 11, 98.
- 11) CEJL 111, 19.
- 12) Ibid, p.35,7.
- 13) CEJL 1, 229.
- 14) See Ibid, p.203, 205 etc.
- 15) BD, p.182,3.
- 16) CUFA, p.98.
- 17) Ibid, p.205,6.
- 18) 'Charles Dickens', CEJL 1, 478.
- 19) CEJL 1V, 513.

- 20) CEJL 1, 478,9.
- 21) CEJL 1V, 409.
- 22) ACD, p.85, 94.
- 23) Ibid, p.176.
- 24) KAF, p.191.
- 25) RWP, p.132.
- 26) 'Hop-Picking', CEJL 1, 83.
- 27) Ibid, p.88.
- 28) RWP, p.102.
- 29) DOPL, p.150. 'Tun' corresponds to the use of 'Tu' in French.
- 30) CEJL 111, 163.
- 31) Ibid, p.167.
- 32) London Letter to Partisan Review, August 1943, CEJL 11, 332.
- 33) 'Notes on Nationalism', CEJL 111, 417.
- 34) CEJL 1V, 328.
- 35) RWP, p.201,2.
- 36) Ibid, p.199.
- 37) Ibid, p.138.
- 38) ACD, p.173.
- 39) CEJL 1V, 578.
- 40) CEJL 111, 51.
- 41) Colour and Citizenship, E.J.B.Rose, O.U.P. London, 1969, p-28.
- 42) RWP, p.110.

- 43) Ibid.
- 44) 'Shooting an Elephant', CEJL 1, 265.
- 45) The Last Years of British India, M.Edwardes, Op.Cit, p.22,45.
- 46) CEJL 1, 517.
- 47) RWP, p.112.
- 48) Tribune, 27/7/45.
- 49) The Aryan Myth, L.Poliakov, London, Chatto & Heinemann, 1974, p.272.
- 50) Race and Culture, Park^{R.} Collier-Macmillan, 1950, p.239.
- 51) Park, Op.Cit, p.240.
- 52) RWP, p.113.
- 53) Ibid, p.114.
- 54) Ibid, p.115.
- 55) RWP, p.86,7.
- 56) 'The Art of Donald McGill', CEJL 11, 189, 190.
- 57) RWP, pp.126-9.
- 58) Ibid, p.128.
- 59) Ibid, p.126.
- 60) Ibid, p.129, 130.
- 61) 'Such, Such Were the Joys', CEJL 1V, 415.
- 62) Heppenstall, Op.Cit, 198.
- 63) CEJL 1V, 398,9.
- 64) 'The Spike', CEJL 1, 59, 60.
- 65) CEJL 1V, 415.

- 66) Letter to me from Laurence Brander, 3/2/79.
- 67) CEJL 1, 258.
- 68) CEJL 1V, 241.
- 69) Transcript of interview with Lord Fenner Brockway, 31/1/79.
- 70) RWP, p.54.
- 71) Ibid, p.90.
- 72) Ibid, p.124.
- 73) CEJL 1, 443.
- 74) CEJL 111, 399.
- 75) BD, p.72.
- 76) Ibid, p.68, 209, 194.
- 77) CEJL 1, 427.
- 78) Ibid, p.429.
- 79) RWP, p.19.
- 80) Ibid, p.29.
- 81) Ibid, p.30.
- 82) Ibid, p.31.
- 83) 'Marrakech', CEJL1, 431.
- 84) The arrangement was cancelled because of Orwell's poor health, CEJL 1, 336,?
- 85) RWP, p.129.
- 86) 'Marrakech', CEJL 1, 430,1.
- 87) 'How the Poor Die', CEJL 1V, 262.
- 88) Ibid, p.264.

- 89) Ibid, p.266.
- 90) 'The Spike', CEJL 1, 59. DOPL, p.132.
- 91) RWP, p.43.
- 92) Ibid, p.44.
- 93) 'Such, Such Were the Joys', CEJL 1V, 392,3.
- 94) RWP diary, CEJL 1, 224.
- 95) CEJL 11, 429.
- 96) RWP, p.80,1.
- 97) CEJL 1, 526-8.
- 98) CEJL 111, 31.
- 99) Tribune, 26/4/40.
- 100) The Manchester Evening News, 28/2/46.
- 101) Ibid, 15/6/44.
- 102) Ibid, 20/12/45.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 7

- 1) CEJL 1, 28.
- 2) CEJL 1, 370.
- 3) Review of The Totalitarian Enemy, by F.Borkenau, CEJL 11, 40,1.
- 4) CEJL 11, 130.
- 5) 'The Prevention of Literature', CEJL 1V, 86.
- 6) 'James Burnham and the Managerial Revolution', CEJL 1V, 194.
- 7) 'Politics vs. Literature', CEJL 1V 251.
- 8) 'Such, Such Were the Joys', CEJL 1V, 411.
- 9) RWP, p.189.
- 10) CEJL 1, 414.
- 11) HC, p.171.
- 12) CEJL 11, 285.
- 13) Ibid, p.297,8.
- 14) CEJL 111, 231.
- 15) Ibid, p.121.
- 16) 'James Burnham and the Managerial Revolution', CEJL 1V, 214.
- 17) CEJL 1V, 26.
- 18) Ibid, p.424.
- 19) Power: A New Social Analysis, CEJL 1, 413,4.
- 20) 'Charles Dickens', CEJL 1, 469.

- 21) 'Boys' Weeklies', CEJL 1, 521,2.
- 22) Review of The Totalitarian Enemy, Op.Cit.
- 23) Hitler: A Study in Tyranny, Alan Bullock, Pelican 1962, p.356.
- 24) The Lion and the Unicorn, CEJL 11, 82. Also, CEJL 11, 148, 'The English People'
- 25) London Letter to Partisan Review, CEJL 111, 153, CEJL111, 22.
also 'James Burnham and the Managerial Revolution', CEJL 1V, 206.
- 26) Editorial to Polemic, 3/5/46.
- 27) 'Burnham's View of the Contemporary World Struggle', CEJL 1V, 373.
- 28) CEJL 111, 259.
- 29) 'Lear, Tolstoy and the Fool', CEJL 1V, 347.
- 30) 'Catastrophic Gradualism', CEJL 1V, 36.
- 31) Unlike some antisocial behaviour, such as greed: CEJL 111, 222.
- 32) 1984, p.211,2.
- 33) Ibid, p.214.
- 34) Ibid, p.215.
- 35) Bullock, Op.Cit, p.382.
- 36) AF, p.12,
- 37) Ibid, p.14.
- 38) Ibid, p.15.
- 39) Ibid, p.17.
- 40) Ibid, p.20.
- 41) Ibid, p.16,17.
- 42) Ibid, p.18,19.
- 43) Ibid, p.25.

- 44) Ibid, pp.29-31.
- 45) Ibid, p.32,3.
- 46) Ibid, p.42.
- 47) Ibid, p.49.
- 48) Ibid, p.51.
- 49) Ibid, p.64,5.
- 50) Ibid, p.95.
- 51) Ibid, p.70.
- 52) Ibid, p.75,6.
- 53) Ibid, p.93.
- 54) Ibid, p.96.
- 55) "But it was not long before I was forbidden to play with the plumber's children; they were 'common' and I was told to keep away from them". RWP, 1
"In no country inhabited by white men is it easier to shove people off the pavement". The Lion and the Unicorn, CEJL 11, 79.
- 56) AF, p.97.
- 57) Ibid, p.98.
- 58) Ibid, p.103.
- 59) Ibid, p.109.
- 60) Ibid, p.117,8.
- 61) 1984, p.162.
- 62) ACD, p.20.
- 63) RWP, p.111.
- 64) ACD, p.105,6.

- 65) KAF, p.93.
- 66) 1984, p.70.
- 67) Ibid, p.113.
- 68) 1984, p.174,5.
- 69) David Astor remembered that Avril Dunn (Orwell's sister) maintained that the type of person Orwell really admired was "the working class mother of ten." Interview with David Astor, 2/7/79.
- 70) 'The Prevention of Literature', CEJL 1V, 93.
- 71) London Letter to Partisan Review, CEJL 11, 144.
- 72) CEJL 11, 78.
- 73) RWP, p.76.
- 74) The Lion and the Unicorn, CEJL 11, 85.
- 75) Orwell's War-time diary, 15/4/41, CEJL 11, 448.
- 76) RWP diary, CEJL 1, 231.
- 77) Orwell's War-time diary, 23/8/40, CEJL 11, 418.
- 78) 'Looking Back on the Spanish War', CEJL 11, 299.
- 79) CEJL 11, 486.
- 80) CUFA, p.14.
- 81) Ibid, p.137.
- 82) CEJL 111, 429.
- 83) 1984, p.59.
- 84) CEJL 111, 459.
- 85) 1984, p.60.
- 86) Ibid, p.61.

- 87) Ibid, p.216.
- 88) Ibid, p.46,7.
- 89) Ibid, p.70.
- 90) Ibid, p.116.
- 91) Ibid, p.134,5.
- 92) 'Looking Back on the Spanish War', CEJL 11, 305.
- 93) 1984, p.94.
- 94) Ibid, p.97.
- 95) Ibid, p.51,2.
- 96) Ibid, p.72.
- 97) Ibid, p.78, 178, 124.
- 98) Ibid, p.124.
- 99) Ibid, p.38.
- 100) Ibid, p.107.
- 101) Ibid, p,61.
- 102) 'Charles Dickens', CEJL 1, 463.
- 103) CEJL 11, 79.
- 104) 1984, p.168.
- 105) Ibid, p.210.
- 106) Ibid, p.101.
- 107) Ibid, p.103.
- 108) Ibid, p.14.

- 109) Ibid, p.15.
- 110) Ibid, p.16.
- 111) Ibid, p.95.
- 112) Ibid, p.96.
- 113) Ibid, p.122.
- 114) Ibid, p.75.
- 115) Ibid, p.78.
- 116) Ibid, p.61.
- 117) 'As I Please', Tribune, 4/8/44.
- 118) CEJL 111, 289.
- 119) CEJL IV, 224.
- 120) 1984, p.61,2.
- 121) Chapter 2.
- 122) 1984, p.63.
- 123) Ibid, p.65.
- 124) Ibid, p.75.
- 125) RWP, p.99.
- 126) "...the smell of it was inextricably mixed up with fornication". Ibid, p.55
- 127) Ibid, p.117.
- 128) Ibid, p.175,6.
- 129) Ibid, p.128.
- 130) Ibid, p.165.
- 131) Ibid, p.167.

132) Ibid, p.158.

133) Ibid, p.152.

134) Hitler, Joachim Fest, Pelican 1977, p.1007,8.

135) 1984, 167,8.

136) Extract from a letter to Francis A.Henson, 16/6/49, CEJL 1V, 564.

137) Review of Midnight, by J.Green, CEJL 1, 280.

138) 'Inside the Whale', CEJL 1, 573.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 8

- 1) 'Lear, Tolstoy and the Fool', CEJL 1V, 345.
- 2) 'Charles Dickens', CEJL 1, 482-6.
- 3) RWP, p.164.
- 4) Ibid, p.170,2.
- 5) Ibid, p.173,6.
- 6) Ibid, p.188.
- 7) 'Wells, Hitler and the World State', CEJL 11, 168.
- 8) Ibid, p.170.
- 9) Ibid, p.172.
- 10) 'The Rediscovery of Europe', CEJL 11, 239.
- 11) Review of 'Burnt Norton', 'East Coker', 'The Dry Salvages', Poetry London, October 1942.
- 12) CEJL 11, 440.
- 13) CEJL 1V, 419.
- 14) 'New Words', CEJL 11, 23.
- 15) Review of The Freedom of the Streets, by Jack Common, 16/6/38, CEJL 1, 371.
- 16) 'Prophecies of Fascism', CEJL 11, 46.
- 17) 'As I Please', 29/11/46, CEJL 11, 46.
- 18) Time and Tide, 30/3/40.
- 19) Tribune, 19/3/43.
- 20) Review of The Sword and the Sickle, CEJL 11, 253.
- 21) CEJL 11, 354.
- 22) 'Towards European Unity', CEJL 1V, 425.
- 23) 'Writers and Leviathan', CEJL 1V, 466.
- 24) Tribune, 2/4/43.

- 25) Tribune 23/4/43.
- 26) Ibid, 30/4/43.
- 27) Ibid, 14/5/43.
- 28) CEJL 1V, 325.
- 29) DOPL, p.124.
- 30) Ibid, p.134.
- 31) Ibid, p.135.
- 32) Ibid, p.136.
- 33) CEJL 1, 94.
- 34) RWP, p.7.
- 35) CEJL 1V, 298.
- 36) CEJL 11, 176.
- 37) CEJL 111, 37.
- 38) Ibid, p.24.
- 39) Letter to me, 9/12/77.
- 40) CEJL 1V, 32.
- 41) CEJL 11, 75.
- 42) 'As I Please', Tribune, 28/1/44.
- 43) Ibid, 11/2/44.
- 44) Ibid, 12/5/44.
- 45) Letter to H.J. Willmet, 18/5/44, CEJL 1V, 177.
- 46) 'Notes on Nationalism', CEJL 111, 416.
- 47) 'As I Please', Tribune, 2/6/44.
- 48) CEJL 111, 339-340.
- 49) Ibid, p.386,7.
- 50) 'Charles Dickens', CEJL 1, 475.
- 51) CEJL 111, 410,411.
- 52) Ibid, p.412-4.

53) Nigel Calder, 1976, Quoted in Janus: A Summing Up, Koestler, Op.Cit, p.91,2.

54) 'Notes on Nationalism', CEJL 111, 413,4.

55) Ibid, p.415,6.

56) Ibid, p.418.

57) Ibid, p.428.

58) Ibid, p.419.

59) Ibid, p.420,1.

60) Ibid, p.425.

61) Ibid, p.428.

62) These can be condensed (over-simplified) into 5 main areas:

i) Neurophysiological. Man's brain comprises 3 distinct 'brains', all of which exercise overlapping, but hierarchically organised control of the 'whole brain'. The reptilian, mammalian and neocortical stages of brain development have been suggested as the gradations in question, with the latter 'rational' element experiencing an explosive and unconsolidated growth over the last million years of the Pleistocene. The older 'brains' are responsible for emotions, and the new for intellect. This split results in a kind of schizophysiology.

ii) Anthropological. Because the human infant spends so much time in a helpless state, he has become loyal, obedient and social. Imprinting, 'brain-washing' starts in the cradle.

iii) Psychological. Act of identification via symbols, slogans etc; gives added feed-back and group resonance to self-assertion of group.

iv) Linguistic. Language encourages group antagonism because of its emotive associations.

v) Immortality. The intellect and the emotions split completely on the question of personal immortality. This has profound ramifications.

63) 'Notes on Nationalism', CEJL 111, 430.

64) 1984, p.140.

65) 'Notes on Nationalism', CEJL 111, 430,1.

66) CEJL 1V, 63,4.

67) CEJL 1, 587.

68) "Awake Young Men of England".

"Oh! Give me the strength of the lion,
The wisdom of Reynard the Fox,
And then I'd hurl troops at the Germans,
And give them the hardest of knocks.

Oh! think of the War-lord's mailed fist,
That is striking at England today,
And think of the lives that our soldiers
Are fearlessly throwing away.

Awake! Oh you young men of England,
For if, when your country's in need,
You do not enlist in the thousand,
You truly are cowards indeed."

E.A.Blair, 20/10/14.

69)) 'My Country Right or Left', CEJL 1, 589, 590.

70) DOPL, p.113.

71) CUFA, p.112.

72) 'My Country Right or Left', CEJL 1, 590-2.

73) 'Rudyard Kipling', CEJL 11, 219.

74) The Lion and the Unicorn, CEJL 11, 84.

75) CEJL 111, 21.

76) The Lion and the Unicorn, CEJL 11, 84.

77) CEJL 11, 174.

78) DOPL, p.83,4.

79) CEJL 11, 29.

80) Ibid, p.127,8.

81) Time and Tide, 6/4/40.

82) The Lion and the Unicorn, CEJL 11, 96.

83) Ibid, p.109.

84) Ibid, p;118.

85) CEJL 11, 132-4.

- 86) CEJL 11, 343.
- 87) Ibid, p.403.
- 88) Ibid, p.414,5.
- 89) CUFA, p.43.
- 90) The Lion and the Unicorn, CEJL 11, 99.
- 91) Ibid, p.76.
- 92) 'Notes on Nationalism', CEJL 111, 411.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 9

- 1) Letter to me from T.R.Fyvel, 14/4/78.
- 2) Letter to me from Geoffrey Gorer, 2/6/78.
- 3) CEJL 1V, 293.
- 4) 'Antisemitism in Britain', CEJL 111, 383,4.
- 5) See, for example, Morris Collis, The Journey Outward, Op.Cit.
- 6) Punch, 9/7/13. Quoted in Antisemitism in British Society 1876-1939, Colin Holmes, Arnold, 1979, p.266.
- 7) Orwellian protagonists often have a physical stigmata (e.g. Flory's birthmark Winston Smith's varicose ulcer).
- 8) Tribune, 27/7/45.
- 9) Quoted in The English and Immigration, 1880-1910, J.A.Garrard, London, 1979, p.78.
- 10) Quoted in Ibid, p.18.
- 11) Quoted in Ibid, p.49.
- 12) The Jewish Immigrant in Britain, 1870-1914, Lloyd P.Gartner, Allen & Unwin, London, 1960, p.61,2.
- 13) Garrard, Op.Cit, p.135.
- 14) Letter to me, 14/4/78.
- 15) "...antisemitism is primarily a working class thing". CEJL 11, 332. Also, CEJL 111, 384; CEJL 1V, 512 etc.
- 16) Quoted in Immigrants and Minorities in British Society, Edited by Colin Holmes, Allen & Unwin, London, 1978, p.130.
- 17) See Holmes (1979) Op.Cit, chapter 5.
- 18) Garrard, Op.Cit, p.112.
- 19) HC, p.22,23.
- 20) Holmes (1979) Op.Cit, chapter 8.
- 21) CEJL 1, 79.
- 22) Ibid, p.80.

- 23) In the Dickens essay, Orwell listed "kike" as one of a number of "insulting nicknames" which the British gave foreigners, CEJL 1, 473.
- 24) CEJL 1, 94.
- 25) ACD, p.136.
- 26) CEJL 1, 114.
- 27) Judah at the Crossroads, published in The Trail of the Dinosaur, Hutchinson, London, 1970.
- 28) Holmes (1979), Op.Cit, chapter 1.
- 29) CEJL 1, 104.
- 30) Ibid, p.279.
- 31) CEJL 1V, 147.
- 32) CEJL11, 23.
- 33) Saturday Review of Literature, 18/2/50, Edmund Fuller.
- 34) DOPL, p.18.
- 35) Ibid, 32,3.
- 36) Ibid, p.35.
- 37) Ibid, p.109,110.
- 38) Ibid, p.112.
- 39) See, for example, The Good Soldier Svejk, by Jaroslav Hasek.
- 40) DOPL, p.118.
- 41) Ibid, p.143.
- 42) Letter to Julian Symons, 29/10/48, CEJL 1V, 509.
- 43) BD, p.38.
- 44) See Holmes (1979), Op.Cit, chapter 5, p.146.
- 45) CEJL 1, 394.
- 46) Review of The Clue to History, London, S.C.M.Press, 1939. Adelphi, Feb. 1939
- 47) Ibid.
- 48) CEJL 11, 130.

- 49) CUFA, p.147.
- 50) Adelphi, February 1939.
- 51) CEJL 1, 428,9.
- 52) He used it to illustrate the differential living standards of East and West, e.g. 'Books vs. Cigarettes'.
- 53) For example, CUFA, p.19; CEJL 11, 92, 111.
- 54) For example the RWP diary, CEJL 1, 231.
- 55) Letter to Partisan Review, April 1941, CEJL 11, 69.
- 56) CEJL 11, 208.
- 57) Ibid, p.209.
- 58) Time and Tide, 17/8/40.
- 59) Tribune, 23/8/40.
- 60) CEJL 11, 332,3.
- 61) The Observer, 7/11/43.
- 62) 'As I Please', Tribune, 11/2/44.
- 63) The Observer, 30/1/44.
- 64) CEJL 111, 112.
- 65) Ibid.
- 66) Ibid, p.420.
- 67) 'As I Please', Tribune, 11/2/44.
- 68) In a footnote to 'Antisemitism in Britain', Orwell explained why the Jew was placed even lower than Scots people, in the hierarchy of popular humour: "The Jew is credited merely with cunning and avarice while the Scotsman is credited with physical hardihood as well...It would seem vaguely wrong if it were the other way about". CEJL 111, 384. Disappearance of Jew joke since Hitler, CEJL 11, 187.
- 69) CEJL 11, 427.
- 70) Ibid, p.485.
- 71) Ibid, p.508.
- 72) CEJL 111, 331.

- 73) 'Antisemitism and what it means to you', Orwell's pamphlet collection, British Library.
- 74) Among more than 50 pro-Jewish pamphlets, there were titles such as: 'Palestine can take Millions'; 'Let My People Go'; 'The Problem of Statelessness'; 'The Disease of Antisemitism'; 'Jewish Palestine Fights Back'; 'Where can the Refugees go?'; 'Sham of Antisemitism'. British Library.
- 75) CEJL 111, 128.
- 76) Letter to me from Roy Fuller, 12/9/77.
- 77) Tribune, 19/5/44.
- 78) 'A New Year Message', Tribune, 5/1/45, CEJL 111n 357.
- 79) Paul Potts, Op.Cit, p.212.
- 80) 'As I Please', 6/12/46, CEJL 1V, 291-3.
- 81) The Manchester Evening News, 28/2/46.
- 82) CEJL 11, 332.
- 83) 'Marrakech', CEJL 1, 428,9.
- 84) CEJL 111, 426.
- 85) 'Writers and Leviathan', CEJL 1V, 465.
- 86) Holmes (1979), Op.Cit.
- 87) CEJL 111, 380.
- 88) CEJL 11, 427,8.
- 89) Letter to me, 6/6/77.
- 90) Orwell's war-time diary, CEJL 11, 428.
- 91) Ibid.
- 92) 'Antisemitism in Britain', CEJL 111, 381,2.
- 93) Ibid, p.383.
- 94) Orwell thought the Navy and 'smart' regiments would be closed to Jews, Ibid.
- 95) Ibid, p.385.
- 96) Orwell gave the Left Book Club as an example - another dig at Gollancz.
- 97) CEJL 111, 386.

- 98) CEJL 1V, 255.
- 99) CEJL 111, 387,8.
- 100) In the Margin of History, Namier, London, 1939. ^{L.B.} Time and Tide, 12/8/39.
- 101) Tribune, 19/3/43.
- 102) Letter to me, 14/4/78.
- 103) CEJL 111, 423.
- 104) Letter to me from Geoffrey Gorer, 10/5/78.
- 105) Letter to me, 14/4/78.
- 106) Letter to me, 9/12/77.
- 107) Letter to me, 6/7/77.
- 108) Letter to me, 14/4/78.
- 109) 'As I Please', 15/11/46, CEJL 1V, 277.
- 110) Ibid, 21/1/47, Ibid, 315,6.
- 111) Ibid, 11/2/44, CEJL 111, 112,3.
- 112) Ibid, 29/11/46, CEJL 1V, 291.
- 113) CEJL 1V, 544.
- 114) Letter to me, 9/12/77.
- 115) CEJL 1V, 20.
- 116) Letter to me, 14/4/78,
- 117) 'The Question of the Ezra Pound Award', CEJL 1V, 522.
- 118) Ibid, 509.
- 119) The Lion and the Unicorn, CEJL 11, 131.
- 120) CEJL 1V, 512,3.
- 121) 'Looking Back on the Spanish War', CEJL 11, 296,7.
- 122) 1984, p.13.
- 123) See Warrant for Genocide, by N.Cohn (Pelican).
- 124) Adelphi, 1939.
- 125) 1984, p.14.
- 126) Ibid, p.15.

127) Ibid, p.16.

128) Quoted in Cohn, Op.Cit, p.70,1.

129) CEJL 111, 110.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 10

- 1) See chapter 2, 'Boys' Weeklies' etc.
- 2) Quoted in Children and Race, Milner, Op.Cit, p.19.
- 3) CEJL 11, 100.
- 4) In 'Such, Such Were the Joys', Orwell recalled coming out of a forbidden sweet-shop and seeing a man staring hard at him: "...a horrible fear went through me. There could be no doubt as to who the man was. He was a spy placed there by Sambo!...obviously there would be other spies posted here and there about the town...It did not seem strange to me that the headmaster of a private school should dispose of an army of informers, and I did not even imagine that he would have to pay them...Sambo was all-powerful; it was natural that his agents should be everywhere." CEJL 1V, 392.
- 5) 'Antisemitism in Britain', CEJL 111, 387. 'Notes on Nationalism', Ibid, p.411
- 6) Ibid, p.418.
- 7) The Nature of Human Aggression, A.Montagu, O.U.P. London, 1976, p.11.
- 8) Ibid, p.67.
- 9) Quoting C.Constock, Ibid, p.96.
- 10) The Manchester Evening News, 31/1/46.
- 11) CEJL 1, 468,9.
- 12) HC, p.220.
- 13) "I have seen wonderful things and at last really believe in Socialism, which I never did before". Letter to Cyril Connolly, 8/6/37, CEJL 1, 301.
- 14) RWP, p.78.
- 15) Interview with David Astor, July 1979.
- 16) CEJL 11, 230.
- 17) CEJL 1, 583.
- 18) CEJL 1V, 36.
- 19) Poetry Quarterly, Winter 1945, CEJL 1V, 70.
- 20) HC, p.30.

- 21) CEJL 111, 322,3.
- 22) Ibid, p.222.
- 23) CEJL 1V, 288.
- 24) Ibid, p.465.
- 25) CEJL 11, 193.
- 26) CEJL 1V, 106.
- 27) CEJL 111, p.83.
- 28) Montagu, Op.Cit, p.12.
- 29) Quoted in The Territorial Imperative, R.Ardrey, Collins, London, 1967, p.6.
- 30) Montagu, Op.Cit, p.47.
- 31) African Genesis, R.Ardrey, Collins, London, 1961, p. 172.
- 32) Ibid, p.318.
- 33) The Territorial Imperative, Ardrey, Op.Cit, p.339.
- 34),Ibid, p.336.
- 35) DOPL, p.15.
- 36) Letter to Cyril Connolly, 14/3/38, CEJL 1, 244.
Letter to Jack Common, May 1938, Ibid, p.366.
Letter to John Sceats, 24/11/38, Ibid, p.398.
- 37) CEJL 11, 249, 454, 478.
- 38) 'As I Please', 12/5/44, CEJL 11, 173-5;Ibid, 2/2/45, CEJL 111, 375; Ibid, p.466; Review of 'Burnt Norton, 'East Coker', 'The Dry Salvages', CEJL 11, 275-9
- 39) Ibid (CEJL 11, 275-9).
- 40) Review of The Development of W.B.Yeats, by V.K.N.Krishna Menon, Horizon, January 1943, CEJL 11, 311.
- 41) CEJL 111, 121.
- 42) Ibid, p.304.
- 43) CEJL 1, 558.
- 44) 'Politics vs. Literature', CEJL 1V, 253.
- 45) Interview with Fenner Brockway, 3/1/79.

- 46) Interview with David Astor, July 1979.
- 47) 'Writers and Leviathan', CEJL 1V, 469.
- 48) 'The Prevention of Literature', CEJL 1V, 92.
- 49) CEJL 11, 77, 86, 87, 88.
- 50) 'Looking Back on the Spanish War', CEJL 11, 291,2.
- 51) Letter to Stephen Spender, 15/4/38, Quoted in B.Crick, George Orwell: A Life Secker & Warburg, London, 1980, p.244.
- 52) CEJL 1V, 22.
- 53) Interview with David Astor, July, 1979.
- 54) 'Notes on Nationalism', CEJL 111, 412.
- 55) 1984, p.217.
- 56) 'Notes on Nationalism', CEJL 111, 411.
- 57) 'The English People', CEJL 111, 21.
- 58) 'Politics vs, Literature', CEJL 1V, 252.
- 59) CEJL 11, 161.
- 60) Ibid, p.161.
- 61) 'The Prevention of Literature', CEJL 1V, 83.
- 62) 1984, p.200.
- 63) Ibid, p.212.
- 64) Ibid, p.216.
- 65) CEJL 11, 277.
- 66) 1984, p.134.
- 67) Ibid, p.135.
- 68) "For the flyblown words that make me spew
Still in his ears were holy,
And he was born knowing what I had learned
Out of books and slowly, CEJL 11, 305.
- 69) 'The Prevention of Literature', CEJL 1V, 92.
- 70) CEJL 11, 32.

- 71) CEJL 1V, 165.
- 72) Ibid, p.464.
- 73) 'James Burnham and the Managerial Revolution', CEJL 1V, 193.
- 74) 'Burnham's View of the Contemporary World Struggle', Ibid, p.372.
- 75) CEJL, 1V 210.
- 76) The Manchester Evening News, 15/6/44.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1) PRIMARY SOURCES

A Orwell, fiction:

Burmese Days, New York, 1934; London, 1935, Penguin, 1964.

A Clergyman's Daughter, London, 1935; Penguin, 1969.

Keep the Aspidistra Flying, London, 1936, Penguin, 1968.

Coming Up For Air, London, 1939; Penguin, 1967.

Animal Farm, London, 1945, Penguin, 1977.

Nineteen Eighty Four, London, 1949; Penguin, 1967.

B Orwell, non-fiction.

i) Works published in book form:

Down and Out in Paris and London, London, 1933; Penguin, 1968.

The Road to Wigan Pier, London, 1937; Penguin, 1969.

Homage to Catalonia, London, 1938; Penguin, 1966.

The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell, edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, 4 vols, London, 1968; Penguin, 1970.

ii) Articles, Reviews etc, not published in book form:

'Awake! Young Men of England'. (Poem) Henley and South Oxfordshire Standard,

'How a Nation is Exploited'. Le Progrès Civique, 4/5/29.

2/10/14.

Review of The Civilisation of France, by E.Curtius, The Adelphi, May 1932.

Review of Indian Mosaic, by M.Channing, The Listener, July 1936.
'Deserts and Islands'. Time and Tide, 21/11/36.
'More News from Tartary'. Time and Tide, 4/9/37.
Review of The Good Earth, by Pearl Buck, The Adelphi, December 1937.
'Political Reflections on the Crisis'. The Adelphi, December 1938.
Review of The Clue to History, by Professor MacMurray, The Adelphi, February 1939.
Review of In The Margin of History, by L.Namier, Time and Tide, 12/8/39.
'Notes on the Way', Time and Tide, 30/3/40.
'Black Man's Burden'. Tribune, 26/4/40.
Review of Journey Through the War Mind, by C.E.M.Joad, Time and Tide, 8/6/40.
Review of Indian Writing (various authors), The Listener, June 1940.
Review of Margin for Error, by C.Boothe, Time and Tide, 10/8/40.
Review of Till the Day I Die, by C.Odets, Time and Tide, 17/8/40.
Review of The English Revolution, by C.Hill, New Statesman and Nation, 24/8/40.
Review of The Luck of the Maclean, by C.Dodge, New Statesman and Nation, 21/9/40.
Review of The Armies of Freedom, by W.Shock, New Statesman and Nation, 14/12/40.
'Don't Let Colonel Blimp Ruin the Home Guard', Evening Standard, 8/1/41.
'Our Opportunity', The Left News, January 1941.
'Fascism and Democracy', The Left News, February 1941.
'Will Freedom Die with Capitalism?', The Left News April 1941.
'Talking to India', (Pamphlet), November 1941.
'Background to French Morocco', Tribune, 20/11/42.
'In the Darlan Country', The Observer, 29/11/42.
'Letter to an Indian', Tribune, 19/3/43.
Footnote to 'Whitehall's Road to Mandalay', by R.Duval, Tribune, 2/4/43.
Review of Lest We Forget, by D.Reed, The Observer, 7/11/43.
Review of Subject India, by H.Brailsford, The Nation, 20/11/43.
'As I Please', Tribune, 10/12/43.
'As I Please', Tribune, 24/12/43.
'As I Please', Tribune, 14/1/44.
'Chosen People', The Observer, 30/1/44.
Review of Coming of Age in Samoa, by M.Mead, Manchester Evening News, 6/4/44.
'As I Please', Tribune, 7/4/44.
Review of Empire, by Louis Fischer, The Nation, 13/5/44.
Review of Burma Surgeon, by G.Seagrave, The Observer, 11/6/44.
Review of Robert Cain, by W.Russell, The Manchester Evening News, 15/6/44.
Review of From One Generation to Another, by H.Martindale, The Manchester Evening News, 29/6/44.

Review of Letters From John Chinaman, by G.Dickson, The Observer, 7/4/46.
 Review of South of the Congo, by S.James, The Manchester Evening News, 24/8/44.
 Review of Verdict on India, by B.Nichols, The Observer, 29/10/44.
 Review of An Interlude in Spain, by C.d'Ydewalle, The Observer, 24/12/44.
 'World Affairs', Junior, January 1945.
 Review of Visions and Memories, by H.Nevinson, The Observer, 28/1/45.
 Review of Shanghai Harvest, by R.Farmer, The Manchester Evening News, 2/2/45.
 'Occupation's Effect on French Outlook', The Observer, 4/3/45.
 'De Gaulle Intends to Keep Indo-China', The Observer, 18/3/45.
 'Uncertain Fate of Displaced Persons', The Observer, 10/6/45.
 'Noisy, Dark Haired Foreigners', The Manchester Evening News, 12/7/45.
 'They Throw New Light on India', The Manchester Evening News, 9/8/45.
 'India', Commentary, November 1945.
 'Jews', Commentary, November 1945.
 'Cycle of Cathay', The Observer, 11/11/45.
 Review of Cellar, by W.Russell, The Manchester Evening News, 20/12/45,
 'Old George's Almanac', Tribune, 28/12/45.
 'Utopian Ideas', The Manchester Evening News, 31/1/46.
 Review of Black Boy, by R.Wright, The Manchester Evening News, 28/2/46.
 'Do Our Colonies Pay?' , Tribune, 8/3/46.
 Review of The Changing Face of War, by Liddell-Hart, The Manchester Evening News
 'Legacy From a House Painter', Manchester Evening News, 25/4/46. 4/4/46
 'As I Please', Tribune, 27/2/47.
 'As I Please', Tribune, 4/4/47.
 'Krishna Menon', The Observer, 30/11/47.
 Review of India Called Them, by Lord Beveridge, The Observer, 1/2/48.

iii) Letters not published in book form:

Times Literary Supplement, 23/5/42.
Tribune, 23/4/43.
Tribune, 14/5/43.
Tribune, 27/7/45.
The Manchester Guardian, 28/1/46.

C Other Primary Sources.

- ANAND, Mulk Raj. Coolie, London, 1938.
The Sword and the Sickle, London, 1942.
- BURGESS, Anthony. Time for a Tiger, London, 1956.
The Enemy in the Blanket, London, 1958.
Beds in the East, London, 1959.
- CHESTERTON, G.K. The Innocence of Father Brown, London, 1911.
'Lepanto', 1911.
The Incredulity of Father Brown, London, 1926.
- DICKENS, Charles. The Pickwick Papers, London, 1937.
Oliver Twist, London, 1938.
A Tale of Two Cities, London, 1859.
Great Expectations, London, 1860, 1.
Our Mutual Friend, London, 1864, 5.
- du MAURIER. Trilby, London, 1894.
- ELIOT, T.S. 'Burbank with a Baedaker', London, 1920.
'Gerontion', London, 1920.
'A Cooking Egg', London, 1920.
'Sweeney Among the Nightingales', London, 1920.
- FORSTER, E.M. A Passage to India, London, 1924.
- GREENE, Graham, The Heart of the Matter, London, 1948.
- KIPLING, Rudyard, Plain Tales From the Hills, London, 1888.
Stalky and Co., London, 1899.
Kim, London, 1901.
- LONDON, Jack. The Iron Heel, London, 1907.
Love of Life and Other Stories, New Edn. London, 1946.
- SWIFT, J. Gulliver's Travels, London, 1726.
- THACKERAY, W.M. Vanity Fair, London, 1848.
- WELLS, H.G. Kipps, London, 1905.
The History of Mr. Pelly, London, 1910.

2) SECONDARY SOURCES

A. Books about Orwell and his writing:

- ALLDRITT, Keith. The Making of George Orwell, London, Edward Arnold, 1969.
- ATKINS, John. George Orwell. London, Calder & Boyers, 1954.
- BUDDICOM, Jacintha. Eric and Us. London, Leslie Frewin, 1974.
- CALDER, Jenni. Chronicles of Conscience, London, Secker & Warburg, 1968.
- CONNOLLY, Cyril. Enemies of Promise. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1938.
- CRICK, Bernard. George Orwell: A Life. London, Secker & Warburg, 1980.
- GROSS, M. The World of George Orwell. London, Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1971.
- HEPPENSTALL, Rayner, Four Absentees. London. Barrie & Rockliff, 1960.
- HOLLIS, C. George Orwell: A Study. London, Hollis & Carter, 1956.
- KUBAL, S. Outside the Whale. New York, University of Notre Dame Press, 1973.
- LEE, R.A. Orwell's Fiction. New York, University of Notre Dame Press, 1972.
- MEYERS, J. A Readers' Guide to George Orwell. London, Thames & Hudson, 1975.
- George Orwell: The Critical Heritage. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.
- OXLEY, B.T. George Orwell. London, Evans Brothers, 1967.
- POTTS, Paul. Dante Called You Beatrice. London, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1961.
- REES, Sir Richard. George Orwell: Fugitive from the Camp of Victory. London, Secker & Warburg, 1961.
- STANSKY & ABRAHAMS. The Unknown Orwell. London, Constable, 1972.
- Orwell: The Transformation. London, Constable, 1979.
- THOMAS, E.M. Orwell. London, Oliver & Boyd, 1953.
- WOODCOCK, George. The Crystal Spirit, London, Cape, 1967.

B Other Books:

- ARDREY, R. African Genesis, London, 1961.
The Territorial Imperative, London, 1967.
The Social Contract, London, 1970.
The Hunting Hypothesis, London, 1976.
- BANTON, M. HARWOOD A, The Race Concept, London, 1975.
- BELLOC, Hilaire, The Jews, London, 1922.
- BENEDICT. Race and Racism, London, 1942.
- BENEWICK, R. The Fascist Movement in Britain, London, 1973.
- BETTELHEIM, B, JANOWITZ, M, Social Change and Prejudice, New York, 1974.
- BIDDIS, M.D. The Father of Racist Ideology - Gobineau, London, 1970.
- BIRKENAU, F. The Totalitarian Enemy, London, 1940.
- BOGARDUS, E. Social Distancing and its Origins, New York, 1928.
- BOLT, C. Victorian Attitudes to Race, London, 1971.
- BULLOCK, Alan, Hitler: A Study in Tyranny, London, 1962.
- BURNHAM, J. The Managerial Revolution, New York, 1941.
- CHAKRAVARTI, N. The Indian Minority in Burma, London, 1971.
- COHN, N. Warrant for Genocide, London, 1967.
- COLLIS, M. Trials in Burma, London, 1938.
The Journey Outward, London, 1952.
- EDWARDES, M. The Last Years of British India, London, 1963.
The West in Asia, 1850-1914, London, 1967.
- FEST, J. Hitler, London, 1974.
- FIELDEN, L. Beggar My Neighbour, London, 1943.
- GARRARD, J.A. The English and Immigration, 1880-1910, London, 1971.
- GARTNER, L.P. The Jewish Immigrant in Britain, 1870-1914, London, 1960.
- GWYNNE, C. Imperial Policing, London, 1936.
- HOLMES, C. Immigrants and Minorities in British Society, London, 1978.
Antisemitism in British Society, 1876-1939, London, 1979.

- JAY, Antony, Corporation Man, London, 1972.
- KOESTLER, Arthur, Arrow in the Blue, London, 1959.
Dialogue with Death, London, (Uniform Edition) 1966.
The Invisible Writing, London, 1959.
Janus: A Summing Up, London, 1978.
The Trail of the Dinosaur, London, 1970.
- LEVI-STRAUSS, C. Structural Anthropology, London, 1977.
- LORENZ, K. On Aggression, Vienna, 1966.
- MACMURRAY, J. The Clue to History, London, 1938.
- MACK, R. Race, Class and Power, New York, 1972.
- MARAIS, E. The Soul of the White Ant, London, 1939.
- MORRIS, D. The Naked Ape, London, 1967,
The Human Zoo, London, 1969.
- MOORE, R.J. Liberalism and Indian Politics, London, 1966.
- MONTAGU, Ashley, The Nature of Human Aggression, London, 1976.
- MORRIS, J. Pax Britannica, London, 1968.
Heaven's Command, London, 1973.
- MILNER, D. Children and Race, London, 1975.
- PARK, R. Race and Culture, New York, 1950.
- POLIAKOV, L. The Aryan Myth, London, 1974.
- REYNOLDS, R., ORWELL, G. British Pamphleteers (2 vols) London, 1948, 1951.
- ROSE, E.J.B. Colour and Citizenship, London, 1969.
- RUSSELL, B. Power: A New Social Analysis, London, 1938.
- STEWART, P. Immigrants, London, 1976.
- TENNYSON JESSE, F. The Story of Burma, London, 1946.
- TRAGER, F.N. Burma: From Kingdom to Independence, London, 1966.
- TREVOR-ROPER, H. The Last Days of Hitler, London, 1946.
- WELLS, H.G. Socialism and the Family, 1906.
The World Set Free, 1914.
The Commonsense of War and Peace, 1940.
The Outlook for Homo Sapiens, 1942.

• Colour in Britain (various contributors), London, 1960.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica 1857 & 1976

The New Internationalist.

The Sunday Times, 21/5/78.

DRUCKER, P.F. The end of Economic Man, London, Heinemann, 1939

BURNHAM, J. The Machiavellians, London, Putnam, 1943

MORRIS, J. Orwell's Picture of Collective Irrationality. PhD Thesis, Nottingham
University, 1970.

C Articles, Reviews etc:

Times Literary Supplement, 18/7/35, Anon.

Politics, December 1946, George Woodcock.

Saturday Review of Literature, 18/2/50, Edmund Fuller.

World Review, June 1950, (Orwell edition), Malcolm Muggeridge, Herbert Read,
Tribune, 3/11/50, T.R.Fyvel. T.R.Fyvel etc.

Twentieth Century, September 1956, T.R.Fyvel.

Encounter, July 1959, T.R.Fyvel.

Encounter, August 1959, Philip Toynbee.

Twentieth Century, March 1961, Avril Dunn.

New Statesman, 24/9/76, I.Hamilton.

D i) Letters to Orwell, not in CEJL:

From A.G.Baird-Smith, Time and Tide, 13/3/40.

From 'A Burmese Observer', Tribune, 16/4/43.

From E.A.Richards, Ibid.

From R.Duval, Tribune, 30/4/43.

From K.Rhys, Tribune, 7/5/43.

From L.Fielden, Horizon, November 1943.

From A.Perlmutt, Tribune, 3/3/44.

From A.Pollins, Ibid.

From P.Lambda, Tribune, 17/3/44.

From R.McLaughlin, Tribune, 17/12/44.

From H.Bers, Ibid.

From J.E.Miller, Tribune, 20/7/45.

From J.Healey, The Manchester Guardian, 31/1/46.

From B.Akpata, Tribune, 22/3/46.

From J.Jennings, Ibid.

D ii) Unpublished Letters to D.Walton:

Ahmed Ali, 9/8/78.
Mulk Raj Anand, 10/1/78.
Mulk Raj Anand, 16/5/78.
Mulk Raj Anand, 28/9/78.
David Astor, 12/6/79.
David Astor, 5/7/79.
David Astor, 4/1/80.
Professor Sir A.J.Ayer, 26/9/77.
Laurence Brander, 3/2/79.
Laurence Brander, 6/3/79.
Mrs. W.Briggs, 12/12/77.
Professor Bernard Crick, 12/7/77.
Professor William Empson, 2/11/77.
Roy Fuller, 12/9/77.
T.R.Fyvel, 13/4/78.
Geoffrey Gorer, 5/5/78.
Geoffrey Gorer, 10/5/78.
Geoffrey Gorer, 2/6/78.
Geoffrey Gorer, 8/6/78.
Arthur Koestler, 6/7/77.
Arthur Koestler, 31/1/78.
Lady Jennie Lee, 12/12/77.
Malcolm Muggeridge, 18/5/77.
Sonia Orwell, 25/9/77.
Captain M.Peters, 24/2/78.
Julian Symons, 9/12/77.
Julian Symons, 19/12/77.

D iii) Unpublished Letters to Orwell:

From A.N.Bose, 4/2/44 to Fenner Brockway, copy to Orwell. } Manuscript Room,
From Babraj Sahni, 20/11/45. } British Library.

E Taped Interviews on Orwell, with D. Walton:

Lord Fenner Brockway, 3/1/79.

Hon. David Astor, 2/7/79.