Loneliness is the subject of the next group which includes “Soledad” and “Carta y telegrama.” Closely related to these is “Cuando les digo que quizá esté muerta . . .” which focuses on the trauma brought about by the death of a close friend.

The unpredictability and impetuosity of human behavior are brought out in the stories “Carta a un negro extranjero,” in which a black revolutionary kills some of his fellow-activists to protect a white reporter he had intended to violate, and “Charlie Pass, 812, 8400” in which two strangers meet on the highway and make an appointment neither will keep.

“All places los angeles se caen,” which gave its name to the collection, represents another group. Here, by making use of a group of visiting students from Brazil, the erosion of the old values of the Church both spiritually and physically is revealed. The remaining story “El cuento” shows the plight of a young writer.

Underlying all of these stories, some of which do contain autobiographical elements, is the expression of the human need for stability and security.

The narrative attitude of the majority of these stories is first person narration. This is employed in twelve, four of which are in epistolary form, and in one, “La dulce Europa,” it is combined with third person narration. In “Hombre pequeno” for example, first person narration creates an atmosphere of intimacy and strengthens the impression of the hurt that has transformed the protagonist into a destructive force “. . . lo romperé todo!”

The effectiveness of second person narration is seen in “El cuento.” Here the reader hears only one side of the conversation between the writer and the publisher; this serves to emphasize the power and lack of consideration on the part of the publisher whose voice is the one heard.

In “Hetaira,” third person narration is skilfully used to merge the author's point of view with that of the protagonist. By skilful alternation and mingling, the two points of view become one. Another type of merging is employed in “Soledad” where the dog bearing the same name becomes the personification of the protagonist's loneliness.

Throughout the stories the author avails herself of a colloquial language which is deceptive in that it is used to subtly veil serious comments: in “Hetaira” it is the effect of a domineering mother; in “Peligro . . .” the growing commercialism of the Church, to cite two examples.

All in all, Teresinha Alves Pereira in Peligro: los angeles se caen has revealed great potential for short story writing, although her choice of subject matter and treatment of theme are at times a trifle too obvious.

Dexter J. Noël

ALEX ZWERDLING
Orwell and the Left

More than one critic has pointed out that Orwell was in some sense more successful as a human being than as an artist. The reader of his novels remembers less particular scenes or images or characters, less any specifically literary quality, than he does the narrator's tone of voice. It is curious that so self-effacing a writer as Orwell always survives in our minds as the principal character in all his own works. The persona, the gentle, decent, slightly cranky socialist gadfly with what he himself described as “a capacity to face unpleasant facts,” is what lives for us. This is the Orwell who has become in the years since his death a kind of twentieth century literary and political saint.

What was admirable about Orwell was his power of discrimination, his refusal to see the world around him in moral blacks and whites, and what Professor Zwerdling attempts to make us understand is the precise character of Orwell’s response to an historical period that expected of the political writer unqualified ideological commitments.

In strict adherence to the principle that movements tend to seek self-definition through conflict with the rivals that most resemble them, the Left of Orwell’s time was fragmented into a series of competing orthodoxies, each expecting its adherents to accept its own teachings as final truth, to be blind to its errors and inconsistencies, and to regard its competitors with suspicion and...
contempt. In such an atmosphere Orwell, who distrusted any orthodoxy, saw himself as a kind of in-house critic of the Left as a whole, as "the Left's Loyal Opposition."

Although Zwerdling's book is nominally about Orwell's aims and perceptions, its real value lies in its discussion of his tactics. In a world of theoreticians, Orwell was an empiricist. He regarded ignorance as the major obstacle to socialism, not so much ignorance of socialism as of the conditions that socialism, as Orwell understood it, offered to correct. As a mechanism of self-protection, capitalism and imperialism had erected a series of blinds behind which their beneficiaries could live their lives without having to face or understand what was being done in their names. Orwell made it his task in life to tear down those blinds and to make people face what the British rule in India and the operations of modern industrialism at home are like, what it is like to be a policeman in Burma, or a tramp, or a Parisian dishwasher, or a frowsy bookshop assistant, or an unemployed coalminer. Orwell's work is always rooted in the psychological fact of life as people are actually compelled to live it. He forces us to see the human meaning of the political and economic evils for which socialism is to provide the cure. As Orwell said more than once, the primary disadvantage of being oppressed is that it makes you invisible and voiceless.

But such a program implies considerable optimism on Orwell's part about the essential decency of his audience. It assumes no less than that people will move to change a social evil once it is made manifest to them. It involves both an appeal to reason and a belief that political problems can be approached rationally. Throughout the late thirties and on into the forties, however, as Orwell witnessed the rise of the totalitarian states and the apparent blindness of his fellow leftists to the horrors of the communist regime in Russia, his belief in the decency and reasonableness of his fellow men began to fail him. He saw, as so few of his contemporaries were willing to, that a collective society is not necessarily either democratic or egalitarian, that utopia does not come into being simply because capitalism perishes.

The method by which he communicated this insight, according to Zwerdling, was once again empirical. He will make us perceive directly, or as directly as the medium of fiction will allow, how it is that a revolution is betrayed, what it is like to live under the complete control of the state. The realism of the early novels and documentaries is inadequate. The mythologies of state collectivism and power worship will yield only to new counter-mythologies, and these are what Orwell hoped to provide in his last two works, Animal Farm and 1984.

Zwerdling's prose is a delight, and his knowledge of the ins and outs of leftist political writing is really very impressive. The book is particularly useful for the light it sheds on 1984. One might disagree with some of his readings of the early novels, and with his rather low valuation of their literary merit, but they do not really bear directly on his subject.

Nicholas Guild
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