CHAPTER-III

GEORGE ORWELL THE SOCIALIST

According to Shorter Oxford Dictionary the word socialism means “a theory or policy of social organization which advocates the ownership and control of the means of production, capital, land, property etc. by the community as a whole and their administration or distribution in the interest of all”. What P. Yudin and Rosenthal say about it leads us to a better understanding of socialism:

Socialism is a social system based on public ownership of the means of production; it comes into being as a result of the abolition of the capitalist mode of production and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Socialism builds on two forms of ownership: State (public) ownership and cooperative and collective ownership. Public ownership pre-supposes absence of exploitation of man by man, and existence of relations of comradely co-operation and mutual aid among workers engaged in production. Under socialism there is no social oppression and inequality of nationalities and no anti-thesis between town and country, between mental and physical labour; although the essential distinction between town and country and between mental and physical labour continue to exist. Socialist society consists of two friendly classes - the working class and the collective farm peasantry - and a
social stratum, the intelligentsia. By virtue of public ownership, Socialism develops its entire economy on a planned, proportionate basis, a practice that is impossible under capitalism.

Socialism refers to both a set of doctrines and the political movements that aspire to put these doctrines into practice. Although doctrinal aspects loomed large in the early history of socialism, in its later history the movements have become predominant, so much so that there is no precise canon on which the various adherents of contemporary socialist movements agree. Socialism can be said to be a set of values or aspirations, which socialists wish to see embodied in the organisation of society.

"To each according to his need" has been a frequent battle-cry of socialists, but many of them would in fact settle for a society in which each would be paid in accordance with his contribution to the common wealth, provided that society would first assure all citizens minimum levels of housing, clothing, and nourishment as well as free access to essential services such as education, health, transportation and recreation.

Socialists also proclaim the need for equal political rights for all citizens and for a levelling of status differences. They disagree, however, on whether differences of status ought to be eradicated
entirely, or whether in practice, some inequality in decision making powers might not be permitted to persist in a socialist commonwealth.

Socialism was not an innovation of seventeenth or eighteenth century. Throughout the ages, human beings have had visions of a fairer and better life for mankind as a whole, and these are reflected in many plays and legends, and even in fairy-tales. Virtually every religious text like the Bible, the Talmud and the Quran, speaks of the idea of justice.

In the course of history, many individuals have sharply criticized the social system under which they lived and proposed projects for a fairer and more humane social system. Writers in ancient Greece and Rome, medieval heretics and the programmes of some peasant uprisings in the epoch of feudalism condemned private property and extolled common property, which was a natural reaction to the prevailing inequality and man’s exploitation of man in an antagonistic society.

However, these visions of social justice can hardly be called socialist theory. Socialist ideas in true sense began to gain ground between sixteenth and eighteenth century. With the advancement of industrialization in eighteenth and nineteenth century, a yawning
gap between the capitalist and workers was created. Simultaneously the need for co-operative mode of life began to be felt more intensely in order to make workers share the fruits of their labours. The individuals who stressed co-operative type of life included Robert Owen (1771-1858), Francois Marie Charles Fourier (1772-1837) and Comte de Saint Simon (1760-1825). They were called Utopian socialists because they wished to create a new society that would solve the economic problems of the day, but their ideas lacked feasibility.

It was Thomas More who first gave full-scale critique of the system based on private property, and attempted to describe a new social system based on public property. But his ideas were also to a large extent Utopian. The idea of "utopian socialism" was advanced by Saint Simon, who showed that the establishment of a new social system was a historical necessity and a natural outcome of earlier historical development. Saint-Simon depicted the society of the future as a system based on scientifically planned large-scale industry, but with private property and classes. In that society, science and industry were to play the dominant role. Saint-Simon had some highly interesting suppositions about industrial planning which he believed was to be effected for the benefit of the majority of the members of society, especially its poorest section.
Another Frenchman, Charles Fourier, the next famous advocate of utopian socialism gave a profound and vivid critique of the bourgeois society and showed the gap between the ideas of the French bourgeois revolution and the reality it had created. Fourier believed that what he called the "phalange", made up of several production series, would be the basic cell of the future society; each member of the "phalange" had the right to work; it did away with the narrow professionalism that tended to cripple man, so that in the course of the day every member of the "phalange" would move from one type of work to another again and again, giving no more than 1-2 hours to each; this would make labour a human want and a pleasure. In this way the society would ultimately attain a high level of labour productivity and a cornucopia of material goods, which were to be distributed in accordance with the individual's labour and abilities.

The Englishman Robert Owen is one of the most prominent utopian socialists. He looked to a "new moral world" ruled by the principles of common ownership and labour, a blend of mental and manual labour, the all-round development of the individual, equality of-rights, etc. He believed that the future classless society would be a free federation of self-governing communities, each consisting of between 300 and 2,000 men.
The utopian socialists did a great deal to develop world-wide socialist thinking in the course of history but none of the utopian socialists had succeeded in taking a materialist and truly scientific view of history and identifying the motive force for transforming society on socialist lines. The utopian socialists failed to see the actual ways in which the capitalist social relations could be transformed; they repudiated revolution and naively believed that the existing order could be changed through the spread of socialist ideas. According to Lenin:

Early socialism... was utopian socialism. It criticized capitalist society, it condemned and damned it, it dreamed of its destruction, it had visions of a better order and endeavoured to convince the rich of the immorality of exploitation. But utopian socialism could not indicate the real solution. It could not explain the real nature of wage-slavery under capitalism, it could not reveal the laws of capitalist development, or show what social force is capable of becoming the creator of a new society.²

In order to have a full grasp over Orwellian socialistic psychology, Marxian socialism should be understood; for it is a scientific socialism influencing almost every writer of post-Marxian days. But before Marxian dialectical and historical materialism is discussed and studied, it should be first clarified that as a socialist
Orwell renounced Marx, Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin. Yet he was quite sincere in his loyalty to the Left, and it is impossible to believe that, if he had lived long enough, he would have become a Conservative. He was a genuine radical, an opponent of orthodoxy, but he included in his opposition the orthodoxy of the Left. He was, as so many have perceived, "the Left’s loyal opposition".\(^3\)

Marx’s dialectical and historical materialism became a battle-cry of the age. Marx for the first time disclosed the historic role of the proletariat. Marx was convinced of the inevitability of the social revolution and the necessity of uniting the working class movement with a scientific world outlook. Dialectical and historical materialism is a truly scientific philosophy, in which materialism and dialectics, the materialist understanding of nature and society, the teaching about being and knowledge, theory and practice are fused organically. Marx’s philosophy is the most adequate method of cognition and transformation of the world. Marx discovered a state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat and profoundly analysed the measures adopted by the first proletarian state power. In his Critique of the *Gotha Programme* (1957). Marx further developed the theory of scientific communism. His main interest lay in the sphere of political economy. To Marx however, society is a moving balance of antithetical forces; strife is the father of all
things, and social conflict is the core of the historical process. Men struggle against nature to wrest a livelihood from her. In the process they enter into relations with one another and these relations differ according to the stage they have reached in their productive activities. As a division of labour emerges in human society, it leads to the formation of antagonistic classes that are the prime actors in the historical drama. Unlike his predecessors, Marx did not see history as simply a struggle between the rich and the poor, or the powerful and powerless; he taught that such struggles differ qualitatively depending on what particular historical classes emerge at a given stage in history.

Marx defines “class” as a grouping of men who share a common position in the productive process and develop a common outlook and a realisation of their mutual interest. Orwell too wants social revolution and unity to be established in the working class people so that the revolution could be successful in bringing about justice in society. He also believes that the common mass including the private school master and the jobless Cambridge graduate along with the clerk and the unemployed minor should join the revolution. Orwell also seems to have a belief like Marx, that hostility among men takes place because of the stages man climbs in wresting the initiative from others in his productive activities. The following lines has Marxian overtones:
Money has become the grand test of virtue. By this test beggars fail, and for this they are despised. If one could earn even ten pounds a week at begging, it would become a respectable profession immediately. A beggar, looked at realistically, is simply a businessman, getting his living, like other businessman, in the way that comes to hand. He has not, more than most modern people, sold his honour. He has merely made the mistake of choosing a trade at which it is impossible to grow rich.  

To call tramping or begging a legitimate trade wherein a person may not rise above the threshold of want is to sanction vagrancy in the name of justice. But it is also certain that Orwell differs from Marx because he is in favour of what David Wykes calls "gentle and decent revolution".  

Orwell had been conscious of social inequality, the exploitation of the economically backward section of the society by the economically sound section from the very beginning as is testified by his essay entitled "Such Such Were the Joys". He adopted socialism as a programme to bring about the kind of change in human relationships that he had made for himself in his own life. His socialist proposals are necessary safeguards against the reappearance of a class system. Orwell's emotions were most deeply invested, not in ideas or in dogma, but in relations between people.
His resignation from Burmese Police Service can be traced back to his unbearable state of conscience consequent upon the exploitation of the natives of Burma by the British Empire. The experiences that he gathered in Paris and London by living with the under-developed people made him more sensitive towards the urgent need for bringing about socialism in practical shape. While writing *The Road to Wigan Pier*, he felt the need all the more intensely. But Orwell can’t be called a true socialist because he had till then no clear political views. Orwell himself writes, “but these experiences were not enough to give me an accurate political orientation... By the end of 1936 I had still failed to reach a firm decision”.

The October Revolution of 1917 had left an impact not only on England but on the whole of Europe. Russia was then a font of inspiration for almost all western countries. In early 1930’s when Great Britain and several other countries were in the grip of acute economic crisis and mass unemployment, Russian policy became a source of inspiration to the bulk of intellectuals. In England Stephen Spender, W. H. Auden, Isherwood, Cornford; in France, Malraux and Aragon, in Italy, Silone, etc, accepted the Russian communism uncritically. The Russian Communist Policy had, therefore, acquired international acceptance and prestige. The British social democracy modelled on Russian communism did not
find favour with Orwell. He could find in it “no real aim except to
manipulate British foreign policy in the Russian interest”.

Orwell’s *The Road to Wigan Pier* and “Homage to Catalonia”
incorporate the stages of his commitment to socialism. Before
leaving for Spain in the year 1936 Orwell had completed the
manuscript of the book with his satiric shafts directed against the
socialists who were socialists “in their heads; not in blood”. There
are two parts in this book, one dealing with Orwell’s first hand
account of the working class population and the other dealing with
the “clank” of the socialists with their pseudo-socialism. The first
part is a tell-tale picture of the appalling living condition, woefully
meagre pay and heart-breaking unemployment of the working class.
*The Road to Wigan Pier* is therefore Orwell’s first step along the
road to socialism. Hamish Miles has very beautifully summed up
the second part of the book in these words:

The second half of Mr. Orwell’s book, divided
from the first by a clever set of photographic
‘documentaries’, turns to an informal survey of
political implications. It is personal, unorthodox,
refreshing, pungent, and nicely calculated to vex
those who are socialists in their heads rather than
by blood ... He is not primarily concerned with
‘the Party’ or the Marxian dialectic or plans for
the next year. But he is very much concerned
with the general psychological attitude of the
Orwell's attack in *The Road to Wigan Pier* is directed against professional socialists and theoretical socialism. He was convinced that practical socialism alone could free the poor working class people from the evil capitalism. He concludes that capitalism cannot bring remedies to the economic ills of the working classes without adding to their spiritual ills:

If one judges capitalism by what it has actually achieved - the horrors of the Industrial Revolution, the destruction of one culture after another, the piling up of millions of human beings in hideous ant-heaps of cities, and above all, the enslavement of the coloured races - it is difficult to feel that in itself it is superior to feudalism.

Orwell means to say that by establishing socialism in England not only working class people will be benefited but the whole middle class as well. Orwell tells that the average thinking person was actively hostile to socialism because there was something "distasteful" about the form in which it was presented. The first
reason is that socialism as a theory was confined exclusively to the middle class. Orwell says that the middle class socialist had no sympathy for the working classes. The motive of many socialists in his view was simply a magnified sense of order.

This apparent selfishness and hypocrisy of individual socialist drove the average person away from the socialist movement although he was aware that he should be a socialist at heart. In his view socialism, therefore, was prevented from becoming a popular movement because of the exclusiveness of the middle class socialists and intellectuals. What Orwell implies is that arm-chair intellectuals cannot bring socialism on the physical plane. Orwell criticises G. B. Shaw, Barbusse, Upton Sinclair, William Morris, Waldo Frank et al. He thinks that all these writers are merely rooted in the realm of ideas and they have very little contact with reality. So Orwell clearly says that "the thing that frightens me about modern intelligentsia is their inability to see that human society must be based on common decency, whatever the political and economic form may be."\(^{10}\)

Richard Rees recalls that when socialists once told Orwell that under socialism men would not have the feeling of being at the mercy of tyrannical powers, he commented: "I notice people
always say under socialism, they look forward to being on top with all the others underneath". His conclusion in *The Road to Wigan Pier* is that the present method should be thrown overboard and that one should try to enroll everyone in the fight for socialism and against fascism and war (which he rightly sees to be disasters) by making the elemental appeal of liberty and justice. What he envisages is a great league of oppressed against oppressors. In this battle, members of all classes may fight side by side—the private schoolmaster and the jobless Cambridge graduate with the clerk and the unemployed minor; and then, when they have so fought, "we of the sinking middle class... may sink without further struggles into the working class where we belong and probably when we get there it will not be so dreadful as we feared, for, after all, we have nothing to lose but our aitches".

Among the grave faults which Orwell finds in socialist propaganda is the glorification of industrialism. Orwell finds many abuses prevailing due to over-emphasis on industrialisation by the socialists. He chalks out a solution in the suppression of anarchic capitalist industrialism by planned socialist industrialism. Orwell here does not define socialism nor does he suggest as to what he means by the term socialism. Nor does he even explain how the oppressors oppress. Nor does he define liberty and justice. But he
accepts the aims and programmes of socialism without comment. He blames the failure on to the socialists entirely.

Orwell wants socialism to be enforced in letter and spirit. He is very much pained to see the concept of socialism fast dying out. He cites one example where it is difficult to distinguish between socialism and capitalism:

There are one or two interesting points here. The re-housing is almost entirely the work of the corporation, which is said to be entirely ruthless towards private ownership and to be even too ready to condemn slum houses without compensation. Here therefore you have what is in effect socialist legislation, though it is done by a local authority. But the corporation of Liverpool is almost entirely Conservative. Moreover, though the re-housing from the public funds is, as I say, in effect a socialist measure, the actual work is done by private contractors, and one may assume that here as elsewhere the contractors tend to be the friends, brothers, nephews etc. of those in the corporation. Beyond a certain point therefore Socialism and Capitalism are not easy to distinguish.  

The more minutely Orwell studied the world situation, the more his disappointment with the fate of socialism grew. Like G. B. Shaw and William Morris, he did not like arm-chair intellectualism. He preferred to fight against any abuse of the authority, particularly
under fascism. And so he went to Spain to ensure the survival of
socialism and to defeat fascism. He reached Catalonia in December
1936, six months after the outbreak of civil war. He joined the
Militia organised by Workers Party of Marxist Unity- P. O. U. M.
But at that time Orwell himself did not hold any clear political
views. He writes in "Homage to Catalonia":

When I came to Spain, and for some time
afterwards, I was not only uninterested in the
political situation but unaware of it. I knew there
was a war on, but I had no notion what kind of a
war. If you had asked me why I had joined the
militia I should have answered; 'To fight against
Fascism', and if you had asked me what I was
fighting for, I should have answered. 'common
decency'. I had accepted the News Chronicle -
New Statesman version of the war as the defense
of civilization against a maniacal outbreak by an
army of Colonel Blimps in the pay of Hitler'.

In the beginning Orwell was quite optimistic about the workers'
unity. All his previous dreams of classless state had come true, as it
were. When he reached Catalonia the first thing he marked was
very favourable:

It was the first time that I had ever been in a
town where the working class was in the saddle.
Practically every building of any size had been
seized by the workers and was draped with the
red and black flag of the Anarchists; every wall
was scrawled with the hammer and sickle and with the initials of the revolutionary parties; almost every Church had been gutted and its images burnt ... Every shop and cafe had an inscription saying that it had been collectivized; ... Tipping was forbidden by law; my first experience was receiving a lecture from a hotel manager for trying to tip a lift-boy.\textsuperscript{15}

But by April 1937, he was surprised to discover that the revolutionary atmosphere was taking its last breath. The role of communists was very unfavourable for the cause of socialism. Geoffrey Meyers, a friend of Orwell, has clarified this point in the following words:

\begin{quote}
The central and essential problem is the present role of the communists. Communist policy (owing chiefly to the international situation of the U.S.S.R.) is now and has been for ten years anti-revolutionary, and outside Russia Communists are more interested in gaining allies for the Soviets in the case of war than in pursuing a working-class policy in various countries. In Spain it would seem that they suppressed the truly revolutionary situation which existed in the first six months partly for the sake of efficiency, but chiefly to appease and calm the France of the Franco-Soviet pact. . . . It is arguable that thereby they have lost a great deal of working-class help without gaining the protection of those they wished to conciliate. And the 'Left Wing' Socialist Parties have been persecuted with a malignancy and sullen spite.
\end{quote}
with a cruelty and stupidity which is little better (though nevertheless still better) than fascism. The potential danger to working-class movements the world over is obvious.\textsuperscript{16}

Orwell, a representative of living truth, found himself in a critical position in Spain while seeing the cruelty and dubious role of the communists. T.R. Fyvel, a friend of Orwell, says of Orwell’s feelings:

But what opened his eyes and aroused his deep anger was the communist disregard for law and for truth. In Barcelona, he saw men who had risked their lives for the Republican cause flung into prison by the hundreds without charge. He saw thousands of ill-armed POUM militiamen suddenly described by communists’ propaganda as Trotskyists, fascists, traitors, murderers, cowards, spies and so forth. During the confused street fighting in Barcelona in May, there had been no more than 80 rifles at the POUM buildings in the city—he himself held one—and the greatest care was taken they should not be used.\textsuperscript{17}

Thus the communist role in Spain was very vile. Their prime purpose was to suppress the POUH as also to crush the Catalan liberties. Many innocent POUM workers were killed. Orwell’s friends Smilie and Kopp and others were also killed by the communist workers. At the death of Smilie, Orwell was rudely
shocked:

Smilie's death is not a thing I can easily forgive. Here was this brave and gifted boy, who had thrown up his career at Glasgow University in order to come and fight against fascism, and who, as I saw for myself, had done his job at the front with faultless courage and willingness: and all they could find to do with him was to fling him into jail and let him die like a neglected animal.¹⁸

Thus Orwell's hope in socialism was shattered just as Wordsworth's faith in French revolution was dashed by the tyranny of Napoleon in France. But to say that Orwell turned to be pessimistic about socialism is a wrong notion to hold. The period when the workers were unitedly fighting against fascism was the best period of Orwell's life. This was the period of hope and Orwell wanted the crusade to be continued for the survival of socialism.

Orwell came back from Spain disappointed, mentally upset and physically wounded. Though his faith was shattered, yet he did not adopt a negative approach to socialism. This is testified by the letter he wrote to Cyril Connolly in 1937- "I have seen wonderful things and at last really believe in socialism which I never did before".¹⁹

The failure of working class revolution in Spain was a preface, as it
were, to the world-wide triumph of tyranny and totalitarianism. After his experiences in Spain, Orwell's every work manifests his disillusionment about the fate of socialism. Essays like "Inside the Whale" and "Lion and the Unicorn" sufficiently deal with his ideas about the existing socialism of Europe. Orwell clearly writes that the world is fast becoming a domain of dictatorship where every individual is going to be stamped out of existence:

Until recently the full implications of this were not foreseen, because it was generally imagined that socialism could preserve and even enlarge the atmosphere of liberalism. It is now beginning to be realized how false this idea was. Almost certainly we are moving into an age of totalitarian dictatorship - an age in which freedom of thought will be at first a deadly sin and later on a meaningless abstraction. The autonomous individual is going to be stamped out of existence.  

"The Lion and the Unicorn", subtitled "Socialism and the English Genius", deals with Orwell's views about socialism in England. He finds that "Christianity and International Socialism are as weak as straw in comparison with it. Hitler and Mussolini rose to power in their own countries very largely because they could grasp this fact and their opponents could not".

There are many causes, according to Orwell, of the weaknesses of
socialism in England. But the major cause Orwell finds is the class division in society. “England”, he says, “is the most class-ridden country under the sun. It is a land of snobbery and privilege, ruled largely by the old and silly.” In the following words Orwell has made this fact all the more clear. He writes about England:

It is a family in which the young are generally thwarted and most of the power is in the hands of irresponsible uncles and bedridden aunts. Still, it is a family... A family with the wrong members in control.

By the phrase “England, a family with the wrong members in control”, Orwell means to suggest that the ruling class of England were not exactly the representatives of the proletariat or working class people. They had fascist minds though they masquerade themselves as anti-fascists. They were the men who step into positions of command by right of birth.

The British ruling class were not altogether wrong in thinking that fascism was on their side. It is a fact that any rich man, unless he is a Jew, has less to fear from fascism than from either communism or democratic socialism.

The ruling class conceived war in terms of their interest:

Inevitably, because of their position and upbringing, the ruling class are fighting for their
own privileges, which cannot possibly be reconciled with the public interest. It is a mistake to imagine that war aims, strategy, propaganda and industrial organization exist in watertight compartments. All are interconnected. Every strategic plan, every tactical method, every weapon will bear the stamp of the social system that produced it. The British ruling class are fighting against Hitler, whom they have always regarded and whom some of them still regard as their protector against Bolshevism. That does not mean that they will deliberately sellout; but it does mean that at every decisive moment they are likely to falter, pull their punches, do the wrong thing.\textsuperscript{25}

Orwell as a matter of fact wants moneyed classes to be pushed out of the ruling chairs. He feels that so long as they remain in control, development will be simply a “defensive strategy”. He wants Italians to be driven out of Abyssinia. He wants Hitler to be smashed but it is, he thinks, an impossibility unless they help the German socialists and communists to grab power. Orwell thinks of England as a rich man’s paradise. He is very sad to think that while the bombed out populations of the East go hungry and homeless, the wealthier ones step into cars and flee to comfortable country houses. Orwell thinks that socialist intellectuals, apart from the ruling class, are also responsible for the failure in crossing the cultural barriers that separate them from the working class. The
style of socialist intellectuals, however disgusted him since it
seemed to heighten the class barriers that the policies of socialism
were designed to destroy. David Wykes has cleared this point:

> If you argued for socialism but showed by your speech, your amusements, your dress, your diet, by every cultural manifestation - that you were not of those with whom you claimed alliance, then to Orwell, you were undermining the cause.²⁶

Orwell for the first time has defined socialism, contributing something of his own. He accepts that socialism is certainly a common ownership of the means of production and that Social State represents the whole nation and everyone is a State employee. Orwell accepts that socialism, though not in every way, yet in certain fields is superior to capitalism because it can solve the problems of production and consumption easily. In time of war socialism proves to be more beneficial than capitalism because in capitalist class nothing is produced unless someone sees his way to making a profit out of it. Orwell is not a philosopher like Marx, yet he suggests like a philosopher something more about the philosophy of socialism:

Approximate equality of incomes (it need be no more than approximate), political democracy, and abolition of all hereditary privilege.
especially in education. These are simply the necessary safeguards against the reappearance of a class-system. Centralized ownership has very little meaning unless the mass of the people are living roughly upon an equal level, and have some kind of control over the government. 'The State' may come to mean no more than a self-elected political party, and oligarchy and privilege can return, based on power rather than on money.27

Orwell has therefore a six-point programme for the survival of socialism:

(1) Nationalization of land, mines, railways, banks industries.
(2) Limitation of incomes.
(3) Reform of the educational system along democratic lines.
(4) Immediate Dominion status for India, with power to secede when the war is over.
(5) Formation of an Imperial General Council, in which the coloured people are to be represented.
(6) Declaration of formal alliance with China, Abyssinia and all other victims of the fascist powers.28

For the strengthening of socialism in England, Orwell suggests the general mass to be conscious and revolutionary in spirit – "what is wanted is a conscious open revolt by ordinary people against inefficient class privilege and the rule of the old".29 Orwell points
out a very remarkable fact that "ambassadors, generals, officials and colonial administrators who are theoretically public servants are in fact senile or pro-fascist; they are more dangerous than cabinet ministers whose follies have to be committed in public."\(^{30}\)

Orwell is in favour of nationalisation of industries. But before this he wants "monstrosities of private incomes to disappear forthwith."\(^{31}\) He places the example of Spanish Republic—which could keep up the fight for two years because there was no gross contrast of wealth—"when the private soldiers had not a cigarette, the general had not one either."\(^{32}\) Orwell does not delink war from revolution. War is ultimately necessary for a big revolution. "The war and the revolution are inseparable. We cannot establish anything that a western nation would regard as socialism without defeating Hitler; on the other hand we cannot defeat Hitler while we remain economically and socially in the nineteenth century."\(^{33}\)

In his essay "Reflections on Gandhi" Orwell has very critically analyzed the philosophy of non-violence. He has respect for Gandhi but does not accept his theory of non-violence practicable at international level. "Non-violence is no potent weapon to resist the evils of society. But let it be granted that non-violent resistance can be effective against one's own government, or against an occupying power: even so, how does one put it into practice
Orwell says that the independence of India could be attained not due to the personal influence of Gandhi and his theory of non-violence but because of the liberal policy of the then Labour Government and the growing British public opinion sympathetic to India's independence:

On the one hand, the British did get out of India without fighting, an event which very few observers indeed would have predicted until about a year before it happened. On the other hand, this was done by a Labour Government, and it is certain that a Conservative Government, especially a government headed by Churchill, would have acted differently.

Orwell is therefore a revolutionary socialist who wants socialism in practice, not in theory. He says that they need to fight against bribery, ignorance and snobbery, the bankers and the large businessmen, the landowners and other such officials. Only then can socialism in true sense of the term prevail:

A socialist movement which can swing the mass of the people behind it, drive the pro-fascists out of positions of control, wipe out the gross injustices and let the working class see that they have something to fight for, win over the middle classes instead of antagonizing them, produce a workable imperial policy instead of a mixture of humbug and Utopianism, bring patriotism and intelligence into partnership for the first time, a movement of such a kind becomes possible.
Orwell was therefore getting more revolutionary by the day. He concluded that socialism in England could not be successful until and unless the myth of Soviet socialism was destroyed. He therefore clearly states: “And so for the past ten years I have been convinced that the destruction of the Soviet myth was essential if we wanted a revival of the socialist movement.”

The destruction of Soviet myth was very necessary because it was contaminating the whole atmosphere of England. Orwell felt the urgent need to expose the evils of Soviet socialism to the middle class of England. He observes:

It was of the utmost importance to me that people in Western Europe should see the Soviet regime for what it really was. Since 1930 I had seen little evidence that the U.S.S.R. was progressing towards anything that one could truly call socialism. On the contrary, I was struck by clear signs of its transformation into a hierarchical society, in which the rulers have no more reason to give up their power than any other ruling class. Moreover, the workers and intelligentsia in a country like England cannot understand that the U.S.S.R. of today is altogether different from what it was in 1917, it is partly that they do not want to understand (i.e. they want to believe that, somewhere, a really socialist country does actually exist), and partly that, being accustomed to comparative freedom and moderation in public life, totalitarianism is completely incomprehensible to them.
Animal Farm, written in 1944, intends to expose the lie of Stalinist Russia. It was supposed to be a Socialist Union of States, but it became a dictatorship. Not only that, there were socialists in Britain and in the Western countries who were so eager to advance the cause that every thing the Soviet Union did, had to be accepted. The Soviet Union, in fact, damaged the cause of true socialism.

In Animal Farm Orwell therefore attacks the evils of specific totalitarian ethos developed under Stalin. This is an attack from the left, a socialist’s criticism of the perversion of the basic socialistic ideals in Soviet Russia. Animal Farm does not however strike at the self-confidence of the working class. Orwell discovered in the workers the real qualities of heroism, dignity and decency; and he does not assign to them a role that is inert and helpless. Stalin, and other contemporary political circumstances had, no doubt, reduced socialism in the 1940’s to the position of a patient whose case was hopeless, but not so hopeless as to leave socialists completely defeated and helpless. What he obliquely hinted at in his essay “The Lion and Unicorn”, finds here a fitting expression in animal guise.

During the last days of his career as a writer Orwell was so much fed up with the existing condition of the world that he foresaw a bleak future undermining individual freedom. Nineteen Eighty
Four, his satirical novel about the future, is a warning to the world, a very vivid presentation of the terror that could became real in the near future if all the implications of totalitarian ideas were put into practice and we were all forced to live in a world of fear. Behind Nineteen Eighty Four there is a sense of injustice, a tormented sense of the way in which political systems can suppress individual thought and emotion, and of man’s inhumanity to man. The book aims at exposing this oppression and inhumanity. Orwell is also concerned with the fundamental lie, upon which the whole political structure of his imagined England of Nineteen Eighty Four depends, and that is the Party’s insistence that there is no such thing as objective truth. The future of Ingsoc-English Socialism is very ghastly where dehumanization of man has reached its nadir. Here war is peace, freedom is slavery, ignorance is strength. Love, art, comfort, sexual emotion—all have been recognized as the consumer-products of the society.

Orwell has masterfully defined power and its purpose. He indirectly gives a message that we must learn something regarding how to break free of the clutches of power otherwise we shall like Winston Smith, fall sooner or later into the hands of O’Briens of the East who will “break our bones until we scream with love for the Big Brother”. O’Briens tells Smith:
The party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of others; we are interested solely in power ... Power is not a means, it is an end. One does not establish a dictatorship in order to safeguard a revolution; one makes a 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. Now do you begin to understand me? ... And how does one human being assert his power over another human being? By making him suffer, of course. For obedience is not enough. Unless he is suffering, how can you be sure that he is obeying your will and not his own? Power is inflicting pain and humiliation. Power is in tearing human minds to pieces and putting them together again in new shapes of your own choosing.\textsuperscript{39}

An in-depth study of \textit{Nineteen Eighty Four} makes us to observe that Orwell is no original thinker of socialism like Lenin, Trotsky and Edward Bernestein. Orwell was also not a creator of any new economic or political system. He had no sense of historic movement or of economic process and he never thought in terms of elaborate economic policies and political plans. What is notable about his political ideas is his political ethics. His political belief was based on common sense. Orwell himself observes, "I became pro-socialist more out of disgust with the way the poor sections of the industrial workers were oppressed and neglected than out of
any theoretical admiration for a planned society." This statement of Orwell proves how he was drawn to the socialist fold - by what he saw with his naked eyes rather than any theoretical knowledge. Orwell disagrees with Marx basically on two points. He does not agree that abolition of private property leads to equality among human beings. He says that "the abolition of private property does not itself put food into anyone's mouth. It is merely the first step in a transitional period that is bound to be laborious, uncomfortable and long." He finds that Marxian socialism is still not clearly defined. He wants it to be re-defined and re-established; otherwise it will still bear the utopian elements in it. That is the reason perhaps that Alex Zwerdling finds in Marxian socialism a flaw which Orwell noted, "he treated Marxism as the dialectical system of thought and it claimed to be not a repository of final truth." Orwell was hence more afraid of dictatorship of theorists than of any other kind of dictatorship. The other flaw which Orwell finds in Marxian and Engelian socialism is their failure to grasp the significance of psychological forces which determine human behaviour. They have studied society in terms of historical and economic processes but not made a psychological study of human mind.
Orwell like other socialists feels the need for industries to be widely spread and he links socialism with machine world. He believes that "conquest of poverty and the emancipation of the working class demand not less industrialization but more and more." Unlike Wordsworth he wants machine to be identified with mankind because the present world cannot progress without machine. At the same time he feels that a solely materialistic approach to life is bound to lead to disastrous consequences. So he pleads for humanizing the machine world. In a nutshell we can say that Orwellian socialism is based on morality and his political view is ethical and based on the hard rock of truth. Orwell is against any sort of hypocrisy and double-think within and without the self. He sees socialism with the eyes of a saint. In the previous pages it has been discussed that Orwell, in order to establish socialism, favours revolution but he is against war and believes that world economic resources should be utilized for eradicating poverty and creating equality in true sense.

It is then quite apparent that Orwell does not advocate the establishment of a golden world free from all sorts of exploitations. What he in fact wants is a reformation of the society. He is conscious of the fact that complete transformation of the society is impossible. It is an utopian view. He knows that injustice, pain and
suffering of the poor and wickedness and corruption of the richer section of the society will persist. They cannot be totally removed. What socialism can do is to mitigate them to a fairly large extent. Thus Orwell’s concept of socialism is entirely ethical. He believes in social democracy and ethical politics. In the words of David Wykes - “Orwell wanted a democratic educational system, and his proposal for getting it was to abolish those aspects which his own experience had shown to be undemocratic.”

He respects the English tradition but wants to destroy hierarchical aspect of British society. He does have faith in ordinary people’s decency. He wants revolution and sometimes even violence but only to curb the evil forces of society. He believes in the ultimate goodness of human nature. But he thinks that until and unless that goodness of human nature is brought into limelight, society will continue to reek with corruption and exploitation and discontent. Orwell was, in a nutshell, anti-Marxian but quite sincere in his loyalty to the Left. He was with the powerless. His particular animosity towards the Soviet Union was fuelled by his knowledge that the one society on earth that proclaimed his own ideals was in fact a hideous travesty of them, “a sham covering a new form of class privilege.”
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