

Generously Angry: George Orwell Reconsidered

by
G. Patrick Armstrong

If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.¹

It is probably true that George Orwell has never been better known than in the present day. In Canada *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *Animal Farm* have been set texts in schools for many years and even the date "1984" has a sinister weight to the ears of many people.² *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in fact must be one of the most widely read books in recent history. The word "Orwellian" is a favourite of writers of letters to the editor and many of Orwell's expressions have become part of ordinary vocabulary. The fact that we have reached that dread date has spawned a number of articles on the significance of Orwell and much speculation about what he would be doing if he were alive today. It is certainly clear that George Orwell still has something to say to us thirty-four years after his death. But the question of just what that would be remains. Two essayists, Norman Podhoretz and E.L. Doctorow, examined this question in early 1983 and came up with two very different answers. On the one hand, Podhoretz thinks Orwell would be a "neo conservative" if he were alive today, while E.L. Doctorow thinks that he would be a liberal.³ Both of these writers derive support for their positions principally from their reading of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*; Podhoretz concentrates on the fact that the book's brutal society is named "Ingsoc" (English Socialism) and reads Orwell as a 1980s American anti-communist; Doctorow concentrates on the fact that "Ingsoc" is a tyranny and reads Orwell as being a 1980s American civil libertarian. Podhoretz says that "Ingsoc" is 'over there'; Doctorow argues that it is 'right here.' It seems rather hard to believe that Orwell could have been in opposing camps at the same time. I believe that neither is correct in his appreciation of Orwell and that they have been led to their incompatible views because of their emphasis on Orwell's two famous novels. The concentration on his two last novels has blinded people to the fact that these were not the only things that Orwell wrote. This essay attempts a view of Orwell stressing what I believe to be his principal message as a political writer. Podhoretz and Doctorow, among others, have misunderstood Orwell's central point that neither left nor right has a monopoly on truth and that an uncritical adherence to either point of view will, sooner or later, lead a country or an individual to tyranny and the worship of power. This essay, then, has two aims: to support this assertion and to awaken in others, the desire to read more of this unique man's writings. Orwell has a great deal to offer the thinking man.

To better understand Orwell one should read an essay, written in 1946, called "Why I Write"⁴ in which, after two decades of practicing his craft, Orwell laid out in clear and simple style his reasons for being an author. He was, he said, "somewhat lonely" as a child and this isolation led him to invent a more interesting world through writing.⁵ After leaving Eton College, he spent five years in the Indian Imperial Police in Burma (an "unsuitable profession"), finally quitting and returning to England to undergo "poverty and a sense of failure" which, in turn, increased his "natural hatred of authority." It also gave him an intimate and lasting personal awareness of the conditions of the working class, the unemployed and the destitute as he saw for himself how they lived and died. These experiences, when combined with his knowledge of the "nature of imperialism," were not, he felt, enough to give him an "accurate political orientation." That was supplied by the rise of Hitler and by Orwell's own participation in the Republican cause during the Spanish Civil War. These events "turned the scale" and, reflecting on them a decade later, he stated that "every line of serious work that I have written since 1936 has been written, directly or indirectly, *against* totalitarianism and *for* democratic socialism, as I understand it." From that point on, he wrote because there was some lie that he wanted to expose or some fact to which he wished to draw attention. From this we see that we are faced with a very political writer who, from an early age, had been accustomed to being alone and was therefore willing to take unpopular positions. Orwell's stated purpose in writing was, negatively, to attack totalitarianism and, positively, to defend democratic socialism. At present, there are many writers who purport to uphold the latter but who do not much emphasize the former. It is significant that Orwell put his opposition to totalitarianism first, suggesting, perhaps, that he saw that fight as logically preceding the struggle for democratic socialism.

There are three clear stages in Orwell's political development. The first stage, in Burma with the police, gave him a first hand view of the grubby realities of empire which forever inoculated him against imperialistic appeals.⁶ From 1927 to about 1936 he held a series of depressing jobs on the edge of society and went on expeditions to live with tramps. These gave him a first hand view of the lives of the poor and oppressed which was to fuel his socialism.⁷ (It was during this period that he began to become a socialist although he did not join the Independent Labour Party until 1938.⁸)

The third stage in his development seems to have begun in 1936 when Victor Gollancz, the famous left-wing publisher, commissioned him to tour the depressed areas of northern Britain and report on them for the readers of the Left Book Club. The resulting work, *The Road to Wigan Pier*, caused quite a stir among the left-wingers who were expecting a hard-hitting exposé of the evils of capitalism but got, as well, an assault on the middle class socialist theoreticians who scarcely knew more about real working class people than the most blinkered tory. Later that year, Orwell decided to fight in Spain but,

probably because of the expressed criticism of the communists in *Wigan Pier*, was steered away from the International Brigades and found himself instead in the militia forces of a small Spanish Marxist party, (POUM).⁹ It proved a dangerous choice for POUM was condemned and purged by the increasingly Stalinist Republican government. Thus it was that Orwell learned about the mendacity of communism at first hand — “in Spain, . . . *anyone* professing revolutionary Socialism (i.e. professing the things the CP professed until a few years ago) is under suspicion of being a Trotskyist and in the pay of Franco and Hitler.”¹⁰ He escaped back to England in 1937 and began to write *Homage to Catalonia* an account of the suppression of POUM and his part in the Civil War. He was not afraid to describe the role of the communists in crushing the original workers’ movement,¹¹ and this book, following on the uneasy reception of *Wigan Pier*, established his position within the left-wing camp as one of its severest critics. The awkwardness of his position is clear; in the struggle against fascism, no one wanted to hear Orwell saying that communism, and the Soviet Union, was no better.¹⁰

A fourth stage, or perhaps only the maturation of the third, developed over the next few years. Back in England, Orwell’s finances limped along as he earned small sums here and there from his writing. (None of his books sold very well and Gollancz wouldn’t touch *Catalonia*.) His views upon return from Spain were rather extreme — “Fascism after all is only a development of capitalism, and the mildest democracy, so-called, is liable to turn into Fascism when the pinch comes.”¹³ By 1941 he had moderated these views somewhat. British, “so-called” democracy had not turned into fascism with the pinch of the war and Orwell now felt it was, after all, something real — “In England such concepts as justice, liberty and objective truth are still believed in.”¹⁴ That his country was at war, and his worst prophesies unfulfilled, seem to have rubbed away the rough and intolerant sectarian feeling that *Catalonia* sometimes displays. In 1941 he got a rather pointless job at the BBC broadcasting about literary subjects to India. In 1943 he was able to leave this job (which had, at least, given him one of his few periods of steady, predictable income) to take the position of literary editor of the *Tribune* where he wrote a regular column called “As I Please.” Orwell produced some of his most interesting and variegated writing in these columns. In keeping with his strong and clear views he believed, and wrote, that the purpose of the *Tribune* was to combine socialist policy with freedom of speech and a civilized attitude.¹⁵ Giving up his position as literary editor in 1945 to go to Europe as a war correspondent, he continued the column for another couple of years.

In 1944 Orwell completed the first of the two books which were to make him so famous, namely, *Animal Farm*. As was by then customary, he had some difficulty in getting the book published. When published, eighteen months later, it sold very well (500,000 copies in the USA¹⁶) and at last began to free him of the financial worries which

had plagued him for so long. However, his health, never good and long neglected, was failing fast. He managed to complete *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and see it published in June 1949. Just as the success of his last two novels was bringing him the wide readership he deserved, he died in January 1950 at the age of forty-six. With the passage of time, his early death seems more and more of a tragedy.

The stages in the above short sketch of Orwell's life seem clear. The Burma Police turned him against imperialism and gave him a realization that even the prosperity of the British working class depended on Indian exploitation half a world away.¹⁷ It turned him, if not towards socialism, at least away from those things which an Old Etonian ought to cherish. His moves toward what might be termed a conventional socialism continued until about 1936 as a result of his experience living in the rough. The third stage, the one of most interest to us, was brought about by his participation in the Spanish Civil War. This so thoroughly showed him what communism actually practiced that he was never inclined to believe what it preached. The change from the second to the third stage and away from ordinary, rather complacent, socialism was foreshadowed in *Wigan Pier*, described in *Catalonia* and fully developed in *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

It should be noted that the common element underlying these turns of thought was Orwell's personal experience. Burma showed him the sordid and stuffed shirt underside of the glories of empire and set him questioning. He turned to socialism not because he read a theory and liked it (he seems to have been quite unread in the classics of socialism) nor because he had a bad case of middle class guilt but simply because he had lived down and out. He picked hops with tramps; he slept in doss houses; he lived poor in quasi-genteel surroundings; he washed dishes in a smart hotel; he rented rooms from unemployed working people.¹⁸ He had first-hand experience of the horrors of being poor. "How dreadful a destiny it was to be kneeling there in the bitter cold, on the slimy stones of a slum backyard, poking a stick up a foul drainpipe."¹⁹ Such horrors drew him to the one political grouping which was aware, however dimly, of the sights that could be seen in Merrie England. Nonetheless, he never joined the socialists heart and soul and, especially, he never took on their opinions as his own. The contrast between what Orwell had actually experienced and that about which other socialists acted so knowing led him to write passages like these:

The middle class ILP'er and the bearded fruit juice drinker are all for a classless society so long as they see the proletariat through the wrong end of a telescope.²⁰

Sometimes I look at a Socialist — the intellectual, tract-writing type of Socialist, with his pullover, his fuzzy hair, and his Marxian quotation — and wonder what the devil his motive really is. It is often difficult to believe that it is a love of anybody, especially

of the working class, from which he is of all people the furthest removed. The underlying motive of many Socialists, I believe, is simply a hypertrophied sense of order. The present state of affairs offends them not because it causes misery, still less because it makes freedom impossible, but because it is untidy; what they desire, basically, is to reduce the world to something resembling a chessboard.²¹

Spain brought him face to face with Stalin's development of Marxism. He found, when he returned to England one step ahead of the OGPU, that his socialist friends, while greedy for news of fascist atrocities, were not interested in Stalinist atrocities. In any case, the latter were easily explained away by socialist theory.²² Orwell, however, had been present and he knew what he had seen. No amount of theory, no amount of "objective reality," could shake his view.

Never a typical socialist, Orwell was, in fact, never a typical anything. He was not a typical Old Etonian and he must have cut a very peculiar figure in Burmese colonial society. He was a most atypical socialist, coming to it from personal observation and not from books, and being, first, sceptical of dogmatic socialist theory and, later, actively hostile to it. If he were alive today and a "neo conservative" as Norman Podhoretz evidently believes, Orwell would not be typical of that designation. He would probably be raising uncomfortable questions about the condition of Central America and publicizing some of the less emphasized effects of "Reaganomics." The "neo conservatives" might be better off with Orwell as a socialist; he always made a very uncomfortable intellectual ally.

In some respects, Orwell was not really an intellectual. That is, despite his considerable interest in intellectual matters, he had not come to his beliefs through intellectual pursuits but from personal observation. In Sir Karl Popper's terms he was a "methodological nominalist" and not a "methodological essentialist."²³ He did not move towards socialism as a result of asking questions such as "what is the essence of the Ideal Society?" or "what is Justice?" but as a result of observing the world and believing that something must be done to improve it. He was not a "social engineer" prepared to tear up everything to start anew with fresh blueprints, but a "social tinkerer." This is the force of his remark that many socialists were not (and are not) animated by a desire for freedom or an absence of misery but by a desire to reduce the world to a chessboard, putting in place the Perfect System. Probably when he considered the matter in 1937 he could not see where the Perfect System led but, in 1944 with *Animal Farm*, he could. The revolution on the farm leads to as much suffering as pre-revolution days. The sole difference is the change in masters. Despite his apparent lack of interest in reading the writings of the major socialists,²⁴ Orwell knew intuitively where "the doctrine of the Vanguard" led.

So the first message from George Orwell to us thirty years later is simply this: distrust the theories (and be suspicious of the motives

of the theoreticians). People, the people you know, have actually to live in Utopia and mould to its realities. Intelligent, sensitive and reflective experience is the only guide. The message is, unfortunately, as important now as it was then. The 'Theory,' whether from Plato, Hegel, Hitler, Marx or Lenin, has a very powerful attraction on certain minds. Those who have accepted the 'Theory' so completely that they cannot even imagine thought or sensation outside of its epistemological constructs cannot be reached by Orwell or by anyone else. Orwell was, first and foremost, a champion of free thought unfettered by the blinkers of unquestioning belief in any 'Theory.'

Orwell was in no one's camp. He was a genuinely independent thinker of left-leaning flavour, always uncomfortable in the presence of received wisdom. The claims of writers today that he would be on 'their' side and buy all 'their' theories betray an incomprehension of Orwell. He was able to look a situation in the face and fearlessly write about it. A comparison of Podhoretz' and Doctorow's articles illustrates this incomprehension as each has claimed Orwell entirely for his own theory, the former for the "neo conservatives," the latter for the civil libertarian/ecology/anti-nuclear brigade (perilously close to Orwell's "bearded fruit juice drinkers").

His independent position was the source of Orwell's most famous novel. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is not a book about the evils of socialism at all; it is a book about tyranny. Orwell, as a socialist himself, had the intellectual courage to write about a tyranny which called itself English Socialism or Ingsoc. If one remembers that he said that he wrote to make a point or to expose a lie, and that his audience for all previous writing had been from the left, one can understand why he chose to write about Ingsoc. Had he named the state English Fascism or Ingfash, he could not have made the point and exposed the lie that totalitarianism comes only from the right. Left-wingers, reading about Ingfash, would have remained complacent believing such a system would never happen in socialist England. Orwell's point was, rather, that totalitarianism is, and remains, simply totalitarianism. Whether the Thought Police wear red shirts or black shirts makes no difference at all: Winston Smith will be treated exactly the same way. This is very far from being a trivial point. There is, in fact, none more important. Freedom and dignity are the fundamental issues of politics and the 'Theory' will always demand their sacrifice to save itself. The seductive power of the 'Theory' will inevitably lead the believer to the destruction of everything which it cannot encompass. The 'Theory' moves ever closer to the concentration camp. Orwell was then, the rebel within the socialist ranks, trying to show the partisans where their ideology could direct them.

Orwell tried to bridge the chasms of political ideology but he failed in his lifetime. With the very wide audience that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* received in the United States as a result of being selected by the Book of the Month Club, he found that it was being taken as a straightforward attack on socialism (even then he was being conscripted as a

“neo conservative”!). He found he had to emphasize the book was not an attack on socialism but “a show-up of the perversions to which a centralized economy is liable and which have already been partly realized in Communism and Fascism.” He expounded further “that totalitarian ideas have taken root in the minds of intellectuals everywhere, and I have tried to draw these ideas out of their logical consequences.” The book was set in Britain to emphasize that “totalitarianism, *if not fought against*, could triumph anywhere.”²⁵ He would be very sorry to see it used as a club to beat only one variety of totalitarianism.

The view of Orwell as an anti-socialist is still to be found today. Podhoretz makes great play of the fact that Orwell was a critic of socialism, that *Animal Farm* is clearly about the Bolshevik seizure of power and Stalin’s reign,²⁶ and that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is about Ingsoc and not about Ingfash. He also claims that Orwell did not seem to be greatly interested in Hitler and Nazism. In fact there are 119 index references in the *Collected Essays . . . (CEJL)* to Hitler (as against 57 for Stalin) and Orwell reviewed *Mein Kampf* in 1940 and showed that he understook very well what it was about.²⁷ Yet, these are Podhoretz’ principal arguments that Orwell, if he were alive, would be a “neo conservative.” Orwell was a socialist because he believed that the thrust of socialism, despite all its false turns, has been concerned with an improvement in the life of most people.²⁸ The “neo conservatives” are, apparently, former members of the “new left” who now have mortgages and vote for Ronald Reagan. Orwell would never have been a member of such an uncritical and complacent group as the “new left” in the first place. He wrote about the terrors of the left-wing ‘Perfect Society’ because he wanted to impress firmly upon people that totalitarianism is no better, and no different, when it flies a red flag.

One of the clearest statements of Orwell’s political beliefs (at least as they were in 1941) is set down in his long essay “The Lion and the Unicorn.”²⁹ It is typical Orwellian invective, containing sentences like “England is the most class-ridden country under the sun. It is a land of snobbery and privilege, ruled largely by the old and the silly.” “Right on!” cries the left-wing intellectual, “That’s telling them!” Then he reads further to find “[The English intelligentsia] take their cookery from Paris and their opinions from Moscow” and “it is unquestionably true that almost any English intellectual would feel more ashamed of standing to attention during ‘God save the King’ than of stealing from a poor box.” It is not every political writer who would incorporate these two variant opinions into the same essay. Simultaneous broadsides to right and left are not the least of the pleasures of reading Orwell. In “Lion” he defined what he considered socialism to be: “Socialism aims ultimately at a world-state of free and equal human beings. It takes the equality of human rights for granted.” One of the main thrusts of the essay is that World War II cannot be won unless Britain becomes socialist which Orwell felt it must. His program in-

volved nationalization of key industries, limitation of incomes, educational reform and the replacement of the empire with a free and equal commonwealth. Taken only thus far, this is a program with which many people calling themselves socialists could agree. The interesting thing about this program is that Orwell did not intend a reconstruction of society at a stroke by a vanguard possessing the road map to Utopia, but as an evolution which he expected would "not be doctrinaire, nor even logical." Again we see the pragmatic, humane and careful thrust of his political position. Later he attacked the belief that "half a loaf is the same as no loaf." This belief, not unheard of today, would argue that since the Soviet Union and Canada have police and people in jail, there is no difference between the two countries or the two systems. Canadians do not have perfect freedom, so, really — "objectively" — there is no difference between Canada and the USSR. As Orwell pointed out, "The intellectuals who are so fond of balancing democracy against totalitarianism and 'proving' that one is as bad as the other are simply frivolous people who have never been shoved up against realities." He had finally brought himself to agree that British democracy was worth preserving though he added the *caveat* "to preserve is always to extend."

There is precious little political writing which is as balanced as Orwell's. Yet, it is not a spineless balance; there is no doubt of Orwell's stand. He was very aware of the inadequacies and injustices of British society in 1941 but he was not seduced into the appealing intellectualized line that anything which falls short of perfection must be condemned root and branch. There have been very few political writers who see reality whole and undistorted by some theoretical epistemology.

Orwell saw very clearly indeed. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is a detailed description of a mature, stable tyranny. That is what is so terrible about it — it is "a boot stamping on a human face — for ever."³⁰ O'Brien's long speech, "The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake . . . Unless he is suffering, how can you be sure that he is obeying your will and not his own? . . . The face will always be there to be stamped on,"³¹ is the speech of the Master. Ingsoc is stable, it could last forever. Winston's revolt is negligible, Goldstein's opposition Brotherhood is illusory. Big Brother is immortal. A recent writer confidently states that "tyrannies are invariably opposed by those who are subjected to them" and gives Hitler's twelve year, Thousand Year Reich in illustration.³² But Hitler barely got started and he was not overthrown by internal opposition in any case; the USSR passed that birthday over half a century ago. What Orwell described, in such detail, was a new political entity: *developed totalitarianism*.³³

I have concentrated on George Orwell as a political writer, a reasonable enough choice because that is essentially what he was. There is, however, much more to Orwell. His interest in people produced several fascinating essays on British popular culture — the form and content of boy's weeklies, the significance of smutty postcards,

the sad state of the English murder and even, how to make a perfect cup of tea.³⁴ He wrote some very good critical essays on literary matters.³⁵ There is his incomparable masterpiece "Politics and the English Language,"³⁶ and "Reflections on Gandhi" is topical on the heels of the recent Attenborough film.³⁷ These are only some of his major essays. There are others and his small efforts are equally worthwhile. The reader would do well to consider one of his collections of essays or, better, his four volumes of *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters*. His novels are also well-worth reading as is evidenced by the fact that they have been almost continually in print since his death. Altogether he was an illuminating writer who had a "knack of hitting nails crisply on the head."³⁸ Always his fearless and clear-eyed view whines through with a distinctive and provoking vision.

As the apocalyptic battle between political positions continues with each side convinced that it has all the truth and that the other side has only fools and swindlers, thinkers like Orwell stand out. Marked by courage and independence, Orwell never gave away his freedom and allowed others to think for him. As more and more intellectuals, for whatever reasons, allow their minds to be filled with prefabricated opinions, the true 1984 approaches in which all will have the same opinion. The issue of left or right is pretty insignificant in Treblinka or Kolyma.

Footnotes

Unless otherwise indicated all footnotes refer to Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (ed.), *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell* (Penguin, 1970 and reprints), cited as *CEJL* followed by the form 4.38 (volume 4, item 38).

1. Attributed to Orwell, Peter Lewis, *George Orwell: The Road to 1984* (London: Heinemann, 1981), p. 97. I have not been able to find the original although a sentence rather like it appears in "The Prevention of Literature," *CEJL* 4.16. If it was not said by Orwell, it ought to have been.
2. The date is not a prophecy; it was picked because it was in the future but sufficiently close. It was also the reverse of '48, the year it was written.
3. Norman Podhoretz, "If Orwell were Alive Today," *Harper's* (January 1983); E. L. Doctorow, "On the Brink of 1984," *Playboy* (February 1983). Irving Howe, "Enigmas of Power," *The New Republic* (Year End Issue 1982) is an altogether better article and delineates Orwell's skill in describing totalitarianism. Howe's article is mercifully free from the sound of grinding axes.
4. *CEJL* 1.1. Quotations in the rest of the paragraph are from this reference.

5. There is some evidence that Orwell made his early days seem rather worse than they were. See Bernard Crick, *George Orwell: A Life* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1980), p. 15 and *passim* and Jacintha Buddicom, *Eric and Us* (London: Leslie Frewin, 1974) who records (p. 155):

The Eric we had known had been a philosophical and admirably balanced boy: a boy of sympathetic understanding and withal a sense of humor. But the novels are all frustration. Occasionally a person one might like to meet flitters across a page, but the main characters are so unmercifully fated to failure. Their creator writes as though simple, enduring happiness is not only impossible but also in some way wrong: the dial only counts the shadowed hours.

Unfortunately, after this lapse of time, it is too late to say which picture is the more accurate. In any case, it is next to impossible to know what was actually going through little Eric Blair's mind from observing him as an outsider, especially (as in the case of Buddicom) when one is remembering years later. George Orwell was a pseudonym he adopted rather casually in 1932 (*CEJL* 1.33); his real name was Eric Blair and he was buried as Blair.

6. See, in particular, the novel *Burma Days* and the essay "Shooting an Elephant," *CEJL* 1.88.
7. "I became pro-Socialist more out of disgust with the way the poorer section of the industrial workers were oppressed and neglected than out of any theoretical admiration for a planned society." Preface to Ukranian edition of *Animal Farm*, March 1947. See, *CEJL* 3.110.
8. He wrote to Cyril Connolly on 8 June 1937 from Barcelona "at last [I] really believe in Socialism." See, *CEJL* 1.99. The principal works of this period were *Down and Out in Paris and London*, *A Clergyman's Daughter*, and *Keep the Aspidistra Flying*. There are also numerous essays, letters and notes which cover this period in *CEJL*. He left the ILP in 1939 because he could not accept its pacifism.
9. Partido Obrero de Unificacion Marxista-Workers' Party of Marxist Unification. He had been to see Harry Pollitt (General Secretary of the British Communist Party) who "evidently decided [he] was politically unreliable." See, *CEJL* 1.352. This reference explains how he came to join the P.O.U.M. militia.
10. "Spilling the Spanish Beans," *CEJL* 1.100.
11. "Indeed, in my opinion, nothing has contributed so much to the corruption of the original idea of Socialism as the belief that Russia is a Socialist country and that every act of its rulers must be excused, if not imitated." Preface to the Ukranian edition of *Animal Farm*, *CEJL* 3.110.
12. "... the Daily Worker has been following me personally with the most filthy libels, calling me pro-Fascist etc. . . ." Letter to Geoffrey Gorer, 15 September 1937, *CEJL* 1.105.
13. *Ibid.*
14. "The Lion and the Unicorn," *CEJL* 2.17.
15. *CEJL* 3.462.
16. *CEJL* 3.36 et al. Gollancz had first refusal of his books at this time but completely refused to publish a book which was clearly an attack on the Bolshevik Revolution. See, *CEJL* 3.103.
17. See "Not Counting Niggers," *CEJL* 1.155.
18. The fact that he was only visiting this life, escaping back to his parent's house in Southwold, does not change the fact that he had the courage to experience for himself the things about which others only read.
19. George Orwell, *The Road to Wigan Pier* (Penguin, 1962), p. 17.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 143.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 156.

22. "Gollancz is of course part of the Communist racket, and as soon as he heard that I had been associated with the P.O.U.M. and Anarchists . . . he said he did not think he would be able to publish my book, though not a word of it was written yet." Letter to Rayner Heppenstal, 31 July 1937, *CEJL* 1.102.
23. Despite the considerable agreement of Orwell and Popper on such questions, there is no reference to Popper in the *CEJL* index and Crick believes that he "was innocent" of reading him. See, Bernard Crick, *George Orwell: A Life* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1980), p. 351. This would seem further evidence that Orwell was not particularly interested in theoretical and philosophical matters.
24. There are, for example, in the *CEJL* index about as many references to Rudyard Kipling as to Marx and Lenin combined.
25. Letter to F. A. Henson, 16 June 1949, *CEJL* 4.158.
26. Left-wing sympathizers who think it is not are quite simply wrong. Orwell wished his publisher to make a change showing the courage of the pig Napoleon based on the example of Stalin who remained in Moscow during the German advance. Letter to Roger Stenhouse, 17 March 1945, *CEJL* 3.98.
27. *CEJL* 2.2.
28. "It is not possible for any thinking person to live in such a society as our own without wanting to change it." "Why I Joined the Independent Labour Party." *CEJL* 1.132.
29. *CEJL* 2.17. Quotations in the rest of the paragraph are from this source.
30. George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (Penguin, 1965, p. 215.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 211-215.
32. J. R. Hamilton, *A George Orwell Companion* (London: MacMillan, 1982), p. 177.
33. The argument that the USSR represents a new thing, "developed totalitarianism," is convincingly put forth in V.F. Turchin, *The Inertia of Fear and the Scientific World-view* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981).
34. Respectively: "Boy's Weeklies and Frank Richard's Reply," *CEJL* 1.163; "The Art of Donald McGill," *CEJL* 2.27; "The Decline of the English Murder," *CEJL* 4.25; "A Nice Cup of Tea," *CEJL* 3.3.
35. Respectively: "Charles Dickens," *CEJL* 1.62 (this essay contains a good deal about two basic responses to social injustice); "Tolstoy and Shakespeare," *CEJL* 2.21; "Lear, Tolstoy and the Fool," *CEJL* 4.76; "Benefit of Clergy: Some Notes on Salvador Dali," *CEJL* 3.42.
36. *CEJL* 4.38. This essay has become a classic.
37. *CEJL* 4.133.
38. Peter Lewis, *George Orwell: The Road to 1984* (London: Heinemann, 1981), p. 91.