The word “satire” has been derived from Latin word “Satira” which literally means “medley”. In fact, satire originated in Rome as a branch of literature. Horace and Juvenal – the two giants of satire in Rome—became the role-models for the later English satirists. These two set indelibly the lineaments of the genre known as the formal verse satire and in doing so, exerted pervasive, if often indirect, influence on all subsequent literary satire. Horace discusses the tone appropriate to the satirist who out of a moral concern attacks the vice and folly he sees around him. As opposed to the harshness of Lucilius, Horace opts for mild mockery and playful wit as the means most effective for his ends. The satirical verse, he implies, should reflect this attitude: it should be sharp when necessary, but flexible enough to vary from grave to gay. In short, the character of the satirist as projected by Horace is that of an urbane man of the world, concerned about folly, which he sees everywhere, but moved to laughter rather than rage.

Juvenal, over a century later, conceives the satirist’s role differently. His most characteristic posture is that of the upright man who looks with horror at the corruptions of his times, his heart consumed with anger and frustration. He writes satires because
tragedy and epic are irrelevant to his age. Viciousness and corruption to him, so dominate Roman life that for an honest man it is difficult not to write satire. He looks about him and his heart burns with rage; never has vice been more triumphant. Juvenal’s declamatory manner, the amplification and luxuriousness of his invective, are wholly out of keeping with the stylistic prescriptions set by Horace.

The results of Juvenal’s innovation have been highly confusing in literary history. What is satire if the two poets, universally acknowledged to be supreme masters of the form, differ so completely in their work as to be almost incommensurable? In this regard the formulation of the English poet John Dryden has been widely accepted. According to him Roman satire has two kinds: comic satire and tragic satire, each with its own kind of legitimacy. These denominations have come to mark the boundaries of the satiric spectrum, whether reference is to poetry or prose or to some form of satiric expression in another medium. At the Horatian end of the spectrum, satire merges imperceptibly into comedy, which has an abiding interest in the follies of men but doesn’t have the satire’s reforming intent. The distinctions between the two modes, rarely clear, is marked by the intensity with which folly is pursued:
fops and fools and pedants appear in both, but only satire tries to mend men through them.

In the medieval age in English Literature the two great models are Chaucer and Langland, though their satirical modes are significantly different. While the former is pleasant and jovial, the latter is harsh and blunt. Chaucer influenced Donne, Marvell, Addison, Arbuthnot, Goldsmith and Thackeray while Langland influenced Dryden, Pope, Swift, Byron, Butler and Bernard Shaw. The followers of Chaucer are mild while the followers of Langland are fierce in their attacks on the social evils. George Orwell may well be ranked along with artists like Pope, Swift and Butler who use bitter sarcasm to drive home their points.

Many writers have since defined satire in their own ways. The Encyclopedia Britannica defines satire as “the expression in adequate term of the sense of amusement or disgust excited by the ridiculous or unseemly provided that humour is a distinctly recognizable element and that the utterance is invested with literary form”. Without humour satire is invective, without literary form it is mere clownish jeering. It is perhaps rightly said that the true end of satire is the amendment of vices by correction. In a nutshell, we can say that wherever wit is employed to expose something foolish or vicious to criticism, there satire exists, whether it be in song or
sermon, in painting or political debate, on television or in the movies. In this sense satire is everywhere. Although this thesis deals primarily with satire as a literary phenomenon, it records its manifestations in a number of other areas of human activity.

In the light of above definitions when we evaluate Orwell’s novels we find that they are primarily satires, neither “invective” nor “clownish jeering”, because his novels overflow with humour and there is literary form as well. But Orwellian satire is a reiteration of the views so plainly enunciated by Arthur Koestler:

The satire is a verbal caricature which distorts characteristic features of an individual or society by exaggeration and simplification. The features picked out for enlargement by the satirist are, of course, those of which he disapproves: ‘if Nature’s inspiration fails’, wrote Juvenal; ‘indignation will beget the poem’. The comic effect of the satire is derived from the simultaneous presence, in the reader’s mind, of the social reality with which he is familiar, and of its reflection in the distorting mirror of the satirist. It focuses attention on abuses and deformities in society of which, blunted by habit we were no longer aware; it makes us suddenly discover the absurdity of the familiar, and the familiarity of the absurd.¹

In the light of the above definition of satire by Arthur Koestler we have to see whether Orwellian satire is pure satire or a mere
caricature or parody. But before we discuss this point we should better see what is caricature and parody so that a clear picture may appear before us.

Parody is the most aggressive form of impersonation designed not only to deflate hollow pretence but also to destroy illusion in all its forms, and to undermine pathos by harping on the trivial, all-too human aspects of the victim. Stage props collapsing, wigs falling off, public speakers forgetting their lines, dramatic gesture remaining suspended in the air, the parodist's favourite points of attack are all situated on the line of intersection between two planes: the Exalted and the Trivial.

The caricature on the other hand distorts by exaggerating features which the writer considers characteristic of the victim's appearance or personality. The second main 'trick' of caricature is oversimplification: features not relevant for the purpose are minimized or left out. A prominent nose, for instance, such as General de Gaulle's can be exploited to the extent that the rest of the face shrinks into insignificance: the part has been detached from the whole and has become a nose as such. The product of the clever caricaturist's distortions is something psychologically impossible, yet at the same time visually convincing - they have superimposed their perception on our own. For a caricature is comic only if we
know something of the victim, if we have a mental image, however vague, of the person, or type of person, at whom it is aimed even if it is an Eskimo, a cave-man, or a Martian robot. The caricature of the more ferocious type is the rape of an image, an optical debunking of the victim, in its gentler form, a semi-affectionate kick at the heel of Achilles.

Orwell is not strictly a parodist because he does not undermine the pathos by harping on the trivial; his travails on the contrary are made more pathetic. Nor is he a caricaturist in the original sense of the term because he not only considers the appearance and personality of his heroes—either Winston Smith of *Nineteen Eighty Four* or Napoleon, Squeeler or Boxer of *Animal Farm* or Flory and Dr. Varaswami of the *Burmese Days*—but also transmits wholesome moral lesson. Nor does he minimize the features which are not relevant to his purpose. The purpose of Orwell is never to create a comic atmosphere but to give a message— a message for the betterment of humanity. His attitude is never that of good humoured acceptance but one of indignant protest. His aim is to expose, to deride and to condemn. He, like Shaw, is a great humanist. So there is no question of “optical debunking” of the characters or anything like that. He is a pure satirist.
Satire is an act of creation—whether it distorts characteristic features of an individual or a society, whether it exaggerates or simplifies. Hence it is to be judged from its effect. The satire that Orwell creates produces a universal effect. The world of *Nineteen Eighty Four* or the *Animal Farm* is not of Russia and England nor of Burma of the thirties only. They are the worlds of autocracy, power hoarding, and miseries—offshoots of dirty politics. Orwell therefore creates an effect because he does not distort the features of an individual but presents the real picture of the world.

Another concomitant of satire is irony which is nothing but the expression of one’s meaning by language of opposite or different tendency, especially the adoption of another’s views or tone. In ordinary conversation irony is often expressed by a tone of voice: the words “she’s a fine example of a faithful wife” for example, can be spoken (by stressing “she’s” and “fine”) in such a way as to mean exactly the opposite of what they seem to mean. In written English an ironical intention becomes clear from the context: if a historian were to write, “the result of this wise and statesmanlike decision was one of the most destructive wars in European history,” it would be clear that “wise and statesmanlike” was being used ironically.
Thus far about satire in general. We are however here concerned with political satire. S.V. Wedgwood, while writing on "Cavalier," remarked:

The restlessness of the 17th century is a massive restlessness, reflected in gigantic convolutions of stone and tempestuous statuary. In western Europe this was perhaps the most unhappy century until our own time, and it is closer to our own than any other in the causes of that unhappiness. Between the joyous experimentalism of the 16th century and the intellectual serenity of the 18th, it interposes a period of bewilderment: a time (like ours) in which man's activities had out-run his powers of control.²

The age we are considering has much in common with seventeenth century so far as the massive restlessness is concerned. The change from a land to a money basis for society, and the conflict between state and individual are important elements in the massive restlessness of our time. The time when Orwell worked was a time of politico-economic storms which blew over Europe. A mental conflict stronger than the material quarrels had taken over the entangled dynasties and growing nations of the world against each other and had divided the mind of the individual against itself. This situation, though not unique and altogether new for mankind had always been the cause of stirring the artist's mind and had a long
history. Political satires, therefore, had their origin in the beginning of literature.

Orwell’s career as a writer can be bifurcated into two parts, one pertains to his preoccupation with the delineation of the evils of imperialism, poverty and social injustice and the other revolves around the evils of totalitarianism which shall be discussed with reference to his works after 1936. After the Spanish experience Orwell saw the evils of the world in terms of democracy versus totalitarianism. The year 1936 may be said to be a watershed in Orwell’s political vision, the year when Orwell acquired a political faith. He believed that the cardinal problem of modern politics was liberty. In his essay “Why I Write” he says that “the Spanish war and other events in 1936 – 37 turned the scale and thereafter I knew where I stood. 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”\(^3\).

What Orwell means to say is that communism and fascism are aspects of the same evil—both are basically the same thing in different guises. The books and essays which deal thoroughly with the theme of evil of totalitarianism are “Homage to Catalonia”, *Animal Farm*, *Nineteen Eighty Four*, “Prophecies of Fascism”, *Literature and Totalitarianism*, *Wells, Hitler and the World State*, *
“Anti-Semitism in Britain”, The Prevention of Literature, and “Politics and the English Language”.

But Orwell is nowhere as aggressive on the evils of totalitarianism as in Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty Four. So discussion here regarding the themes of totalitarianism will mostly be with reference to these two books ---- his piece de resistance. The myth of Moscow as a heaven on earth and Stalin as God began to be exploded in England. Many intellectuals who turned to communism as a ploy to fight fascism or capitalism were disenchanted and disillusioned. They learnt to their dismay that “at no time and in no country have more revolutionaries been killed and reduced to slavery than in Soviet Russia”.

Therefore, Orwell wrote; “I consider that willingness to criticize Russia and Stalin is the test of intellectual honesty ... The thing that needs courage is to attack Russia”. Thus, the Moscow trials of the Stalinist regime proved to be an acid test for the western intellectuals. Instead of protesting against the trials, majority of the British intellectuals defended and justified them. In the same way, says Orwell, the British condemnation of the Nazi outrage was not borne out of conviction. There was no Englishman who happened to see totalitarianism from inside. After Orwell returned from Spain
he earnestly thought that the myth of justice and equality associated with Soviet Communist regime must be exploded:

... 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.  

*Animal Farm* written in 1945 is a blistering attack on Stalin and on his betrayal of Russian Revolution. Credit goes to this daring man for making such a scathing attack on Soviet Russia when everybody was praising Soviet policy in England. Unlike his contemporaries, Orwell found in Stalin a personification of political evil.

The observation of Sir Richard Rees will be relevant in comprehending the genesis of *Animal Farm*:

He begins by referring to his experience in Barcelona during the purge of the Trotskyists, when many of his P. O. U. M. friends, were shot and others were in prison for a long time or simply disappeared . . . He then describes his astonishment, when he returned to England, on finding that sensible and normally well informed people were believing both what they read in the left-wing press about the treachery of the P. O. U. M. which he knew to be false, and also the
similar stories about the guilt of the innumerable accused in the Russian mass purges. This convinced him that the myth of the justice and infallibility of the Soviet regime must be exploded before there could be any effective revival of the socialist movement in Europe.\textsuperscript{7}

This is what stirred Orwell to write \textit{Animal Farm}. In his own words:

I saw a little boy, perhaps ten years old . . . It struck me that if only such animals became conscious of their strength we should have no power over them; and that ordinary people exploit animals in much the same way as the rich exploit the proletariat.\textsuperscript{8}

Superficially \textit{Animal Farm} is a fable. It is a story in animal guise. Mr. Jones is the owner of The Manor farm. There is a storm brewing. It turns out to be a revolt against Mr. Jones. Old Major is the first to take the initiative. He summons all the animals and delivers a fiery speech:

Now, comrades, what is the nature of this life of ours? Let us face it: our lives are miserable, laborious and short. We are born, we are given just so much food as will keep the breath in our bodies, and those of us who are capable of it are forced to work to the last of our strength; and the very instant that our usefulness has come to an end we are slaughtered with hideous cruelty. No animal in England is free. The life of an animal is misery and slavery: that is the plain truth.\textsuperscript{9}
He further says that, “Man is the only real enemy we have. Remove Man from the scene, and the root cause of hunger and overwork is abolished for ever”.\textsuperscript{10}

Old Major gives them seven commandments and a national anthem of the Sovereign Republic of Animals: “... soon or late the day is coming. Tyrant Man shall be o’erthrown, - and the fruitful fields of England shall be for beasts alone”.\textsuperscript{11}

Three days later Old Major dies peacefully leaving behind his message to animals. His speech had an impact on his animal brethrens. The animals get united and turn Mr. Jones out of Manor farm. The Manor farm is changed into Animal Farm and the seven commandments given by Old Major are written on the walls everywhere. Napoleon and Snowball, the two pigs lead the revolution but Napoleon becomes more powerful and turns Snowball out of the farm. The negative ideal of personality cult reaches perfection when Napoleon begins to be worshipped like God. Snowball is driven out by Napoleon, who imposes his solitary leadership with the help of a gang of savage dogs, and slowly the seven commandments become altered or erased, until at last on the barn door appears only one sentence. “All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others”.
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The pigs who are “more equals than others”, begin to walk on two legs like man. Very soon we see that Napoleon is no different from Mr. Jones:

No question, now, what had happened to the faces of the pigs. The creatures outside looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again, but already it was impossible to say which was which.¹²

Many events in the story allude to the recent history of Russia. In Russia, before the revolution of 1917, there was undoubtedly a good deal of mass discontent against the regime of the emperor, Czar Nicholas. The sudden overthrow and expulsion of Jones is akin to the uprising by the Bolsheoiks. The seven commandments in the novel is represented by communist manifesto. Old Major represents a fusion of Marx and Lenin. The rest of the world was concerned lest the communist upheavals should spread beyond Russia’s borders, and both the U. S. A., and Britain sent troops to assist in the overthrow of Lenin’s Party, but by 1921 this “counter revolution” had failed completely, and soon the Western powers recognized the new regime and started establishing diplomatic relations with it. These trends find their parallel in the story of Jones’ reverse caused by his neighbours; their rout in the Battle of the Cowshed, and the giving up of the pretences that Animal Farm (Soviet Union) was still called the Manor Farm (Czarist Russia).
Once the threat of counter-revolution had been stalled, the communist leaders were confronted with economic chaos: the countryside was in ruins as a consequence of the civil war and foreign invasion; urban industry was at a much lower level than it had been before the Revolution, and malnutrition and starvation were widespread. But there was much enthusiasm for the new order; every one worked according to his capacity and between 1921 and his death in 1924 Lenin managed to restore some semblance of prosperity and this period of consolidation has its parallel in the events described in the chapter III of *Animal Farm*.

Lenin’s death was followed by a bitter struggle for power between Stalin (Napoleon) and Trotsky (Snowball) leading to Trotsky’s expulsion from the Soviet Union. The sale of the timber to Fredrick of Pinchfield corresponds to the Nazi-Soviet pact of 1939. Hitler invaded Russia in 1941, just as Frederick attacks the farm and blows up the windmill having deceived Napoleon with false money.

The visit of Pilkington and other neighbours (Without Frederick of course) corresponds to the mutual agreements between Stalin and Churchill in 1941.

Boxer is, perhaps, the hero of *Animal Farm*. He is the symbol of common man, a proletariat. He is the common man obeying the order of authorities, doing his work laboriously and ultimately
meeting a tragic end. *Animal Farm*, if seen with a critic's eyes, is not only a satire on Russian revolution but on all revolutions of the world which inevitably fail in their purpose. Russia is only the immediate example here. Orwell here, perhaps, has in mind the French revolution and of the Spanish Civil War as well as the Bolshovik Rebellion of 1917.

In sum there is nothing better to understand *Animal Farm* than seeing it in the light of following Orwell's lines:

All talk about democracy, liberty, equality, fraternity, all revolutionary movements, all visions of Utopia, 'the classless society'; or 'the kingdom of Heaven on Earth', are humbug (not necessarily conscious humbug) covering the ambitions of some new class which is elbowing its way into power . . . In each great revolutionary struggle the masses are led on by vague dreams of human brotherhood, and then, when the new ruling class is well established in power, they are thrust back into servitude.  

And again (in the same essay),

The masses, it seems, have vague aspirations towards liberty and human brotherhood, which are easily played upon by power-hungry individuals. History consists of a series of swindles in which the masses are first lured into revolt by the promise of Utopia, and then, when they have done their job, enslaved all over again by new masters.
*Animal Farm* is replete with passages and episodes of wit and humour. There are snatches of wit and humour as is abundantly clear from the first chapter of the novel itself. The following words of the Old Major testify to his intelligence and far-sightedness. He is a pig but speaks like a great orator. This provokes laughter as well:

Man is the only creature that consumes without producing ... Our labour tills the soil, our dung fertilizes it, and yet there is not one of us that owns more than his bare skin ... what have you ever had except your bare rations and a stall?15

Old Major’s slogan “whatever goes upon two legs, is an enemy. Whatever goes upon four legs, or has wings, is a friend,” is the best example of his wit and intelligence. The physical appearance of Squealer is very funnily described. This also provokes laughter:

The best known among them was a small fat pig named Squealer, with very round cheeks, twinkling eyes, nimble movements, and a shrill voice. He was a brilliant talker, and when he was arguing some difficult point he had a way of skipping from side to side and whisking his tail, which was somehow very persuasive. The others said of Squealer that he could turn black into white.16

In the second chapter of the book we see Mollie entering into the room of Mrs. Jones and combing her hair at the dressing table in
the room of Mrs. Jones. She was holding a piece of blue ribbon against her shoulder and admiring herself in the glass in a very foolish manner. This act of Mollie is simply funny. In the third chapter of the book we see the pigs forming many committees and leagues. Snowball has formed the egg production committee for the hens. There are wild Comrades re-education committee, the clean tails League for the Cows. These provoke laughter. The phrases like “no animal shall kill any other animal”, modified later to “without cause” and “all animals are equal” modified later to “but some animals are more equal than others” are very ironical and they throw a very sharp shaft at what was happening in Russia under communism. Irony can be used for making the characters seem either comic or pathetic but often both together. For example, at the end of Chapter II the animals come back after harvesting. Earlier that day the cows had been milked and someone had asked what was to become of the milk. Napoleon had told them not to mind, and had placed himself between the milk and them. When they come back they are puzzled to find the milk gone. The reader here is not the slightest bit puzzled. He knows very well that Napoleon has finished it off. This is funny but behind the innocence and simplicity of the animals there is an element of
pathos too. We sense that from now on they are to be fooled again
and again.

Another example of Orwell’s irony is the story of Snowball’s
changing role in the Battle of the Cowshed. Soon after he is
expelled Squealer prophesies that in time it will appear that
Snowball’s part in the Battle is “much exaggerated”. Later on he
tells them that Snowball had been in league with Jones all the time,
and that in fact he had attempted to get them defeated at the battle.
Eventually they are told that he had actually been the leader of the
human forces, and had charged into battle with the words “long live
Humanity” on his lips.

Unlike the animals, the reader has a very clear recollection of what
happened at the Cowshed. Snowball had bravely led the attack that
won the battle, and had been wounded in the back by Jones. The
reader remembers this, but the animals cannot. The irony here is
comic (their blind acceptance of what they are told by the
disgusting Squealer is ridiculous), but it is also pathetic; because
we know they have lost all sense of the objective truth of what
happened, and so are an easy prey of the likes of Napoleon.

There is a moral or satiric overtone to this irony as well. Orwell
seems to be saying to his reader—“look at these animals; is not the
way they are duped ridiculous. Are you sure you yourself are not
being duped by someone the equivalent of Napoleon?“ So the irony can be said to have three functions: (1) comic, (2) pathetic and (3) moral or satiric. We can make a list of examples of Orwell’s use of irony and can see that almost every episode in the book has its ironic content and that the three different aspects of irony listed above are entirely inseparable.

For example we may quote the episode in Chapter III where Snowball explains to the birds that wings are not wings but legs, so that they can think of themselves as four-legged creatures. and so fit the maxim of Animalism: “Four legs good, two legs bad”:

‘A bird’s wing, comrades’, he said, ‘is an organ of propulsion and not of manipulation. It should therefore be regarded as a leg. The distinguishing mark of man is the hand, the instrument with which he does all his mischief’.

*Animal Farm* is a satire upon the totalitarian state. It is a satire on the world choked everywhere with suffering, cruelty and exploitation. Kingsley Martin has observed:

There is plenty in the U.S.S.R. to satirise, and Mr. Orwell does it well. How deftly the fairy story of the animals who, in anticipation of freedom and plenty, revolt against the tyrannical farmer, turns into a rollicking caricature of the Russian Revolution: His shafts strike home ... The best thing in Mr. Orwell’s story is the picture of the puzzled animals examining the
Original Principles of the Revolution, and finding them altered: ‘All animals are equal’, said the slogan; to which is added, ‘but some are more equal than others’. The falsehoods about Trotsky, whose role in the revolutionary period, only secondary to Lenin’s, has been gradually erased from the Soviet history books, is another fair account against Stalinite methods ... Best of all is the character of the donkey who says little, but is always sure that the more things change the more they will be the same, that men will always be oppressed and exploited whether they have revolutions and high ideals or not.18

_Nineteen Eighty Four_, the last of Orwell’s novel is a prophecy about the post world war age which can be compared with a sinking ship. In an essay, “Writers and Leviathan”, Orwell talks about the age:

This is a political age. War, fascism, concentration camps, rubber truncheons, atomic bombs, etc. are what we daily think about, and therefore to a great extent what we write about, even when we do not name them openly. We cannot help this. When you are on a sinking ship, your thoughts will be about sinking ships.19

The Second World War had ended three years back with a nuclear holocaust over Japan. And the mushroom cloud that had formed there above the devastated wasteland was to become a menacing symbol of the fact that the whole scale of war had now been altered irrevocably. The face of Europe had also changed. Many of its
major cities now survived only as ruined shells. And human suffering persisted. Displaced persons roamed from country to country in search of missing relatives. War-time austerities still prevailed in the form of miserable living conditions, continued rationing, food shortages and fuel crisis.

German and Italian fascism had been defeated. But already another form of totalitarianism was establishing itself behind what had now been christened the “Iron Curtain”. Stalin was committed to reconstructing Russia’s communist state by exercising a closer control than ever before on ideological conditioning. In addition, the geographical boundaries of Russian domination had been extended, and were being enforced with aggressive rigour. The Berlin Blockade, for example, began in 1948.

By 1948, the world appeared to be dividing silently into sinister power blocks, which Orwell described as “zones of influence”.

*Nineteen Eighty Four* written in 1948 is a grim warning to the twentieth century civilization, a vision of the terror that could invade our world if all the implications of totalitarianism were put into practice. Orwell paints a vivid picture of a soulless *Brave New World*. He means to tell that he does not believe that the kind of society he describes will necessarily come into existence, but something resembling it could come. The novel is clearly a
prophetic nightmare of events in the future. The inferno atmosphere is convincingly created and maintained throughout. Here Orwell principally fantasizes the fate of an already entrenched communist dictatorship under Stalin, though in its last section, Hitler’s Germany with its ghoulish anti-Semitic holocaust is invoked as a parallel movement in tyranny. The book as a matter of fact visualizes the post- Russian Revolution, post Spanish Civil War, post- Second World War. It cannot alone be called a satire on Russian communism.

“We are the priests of the power”, O’Brien tells Winston, and “God is power!” But in the twisted heaven of Oceania, God is no longer a being known as our Father in 1984. Big Brother is God. His shrine is the poster and the telescreen; his eyes sees everything; his presence and influence is everywhere. His face- an image “full of power and mysterious calm”—commands a passionate emotional commitment from his worshippers. And at the climax of the Two Minutes Hate, Winston senses with horror that the sandy-haired woman sitting between himself and O’ Brien is responding not intellectually but in a spirit of religious exultation to the black-moustachio’d screen idol:

With a tremulous murmur that sounded like ‘My Saviour!’ she extended her arms towards the
In *Nineteen Eighty Four*, the old forms of religion have ceased to be sacred. The Party has assumed the place of God and Church. When O’Brien initiates Winston and Julia into the organization he calls “The Brotherhood”, he promises to send them a copy of its Bible, Goldstein’s tract, which he refers to as “the book”- And his formal questioning of them is like a religious ritual. It is described as a sort of catechism, most of whose answers were known to him already.

The world of *Nineteen Eighty Four* is divided into three great super-states—Oceania, Eurasia and Eastasia. Here the party is all powerful. Private property has been abolished. Here there is a telescreen civilization under the dictatorship of Big Brothers. Here war is peace, freedom is slavery, and ignorance is strength. The only purpose of marriage in Oceania is to beget children for the service of the party and the sexual intercourse is no more than a slightly “disgusting minor operation”. It is a world of cruel haters of love and lovers. Here lovers are ruthlessly separated and families are torn apart. Winston’s parents and sisters have been swallowed by the state in a series of purges. Children are encouraged to spy on their parents. Written communications between colleagues are strictly censored:
By a routine that was not even secret, all letters were opened in transit. For the messages that it was occasionally necessary to send, there were printed postcards with long lists of phrases, and you struck out the ones that were inapplicable.  

The hero Winston Smith is quite "unheroic". He is completely timid from within, waging a war on mental plane but ultimately surrenders to the external forces of totalitarianism and accepts unwillingly that two plus two is equal to five.

_**Nineteen Eighty Four**, the last novel of Orwell, is a satire par excellence. This is one of the most bitter satires ever written. The savagery of Swift is on display here Orwell's satirical shaft is directed towards the telescreen civilization, totalitarianism and pseudo - socialism. It is a horror novel in which the grim fate of the people has been shown. There is sickening and grim spectacle of the crumbling of free and personal life. In the words of Golo Mann:

_Nineteen Eighty Four, _his satirical novel about the future, is a warning to the world, a very vivid presentation of the terror that could occur 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. 

The canvas of _Nineteen Eighty Four_ is larger than any other satire of the past because here not only Soviet communism has been
satirized but also English socialism. Some passages from the novel can be cited as examples, which show the nature and kind of Orwellian satire. But before this Arthur Koestler can be quoted who has this to say about Orwell the satirist:

There was an emanation of austere harshness around him which diminished only in proportion to distance, as it were: he was merciless towards himself, severe upon his friends, unresponsive to admirers, but full of understanding and sympathy for those on the remote periphery, the crowds in the big towns with their knobby faces, their bad teeth and gentle manners; the queues outside the Labour Exchanges, the old maids biking to Holy Communion through the mists of the autumn mornings...²³

The whole novel is replete with ironies of different kinds. In the very first chapter we see Winston Smith muttering, "the Big Brother is Watching You". This Big Brother has an ironical overtone. It is a direct satire on the party comrades who are big because they can make others, for instance, Winston Smith, timid and nervous. The Ministry of Truth, the Ministry of Love, the Ministry of Peace are all ironical comments on what is quite contrary to what they really are. Ministry of Love "is really frightening one. There were no windows in it at all ... not within half a kilometre of it. It was a place impossible to enter except on official business".²⁴ Orwell here has a dig at all sorts of
worldliness, cunningness, hoodwinking, hypocrisy in this Department of Ministry of Love. There is everything except the ingredient of love. All doors and windows for love are closed here. In this world of telescreen civilization “war is peace”, “freedom is slavery”, “ignorance is strength”. This is an ironic comment on party policies where every thing is just the opposite of what they are made out to be. Winston Smith, the hero of the novel, spins out a miserable living. He cannot even show his love for Julia. A series of questions arise in his mind and his heart thumps like a drum. But he just can’t express his innermost feelings even through gestures for fear of being caught by the party comrades.

In the second chapter of the novel Orwell’s attack on the future world is very severe. The small children have been trained in such a manner that when they meet any new man they shout “traitor” and “thorough criminal”. They have pistols in their hands which reminds Winston Smith of the tiger cubs which will soon grow into man-eaters. Orwell shudders to think of the future world to be ruled by these very children who will soon grow into men. The sentence “we shall meet in the place where there is no darkness” is very ironical. The possibility is quite contrary to this. There shall be no light either. The Department in which Winston Smith is working is not the department of friend. “Perhaps friend was not exactly the
right word. You did not have friends nowadays, you had comrades”.^
Every thing of the past will not be traceable in the future world of 1984 – “The whole literature of the past has been destroyed. Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Byron – they’ll exist only in Newspeak versions, not merely changed into something different, but actually changed into something contradictory of what they used to be”.
In chapter VI Orwell has severely satirized the anti sex league – “Sexual intercourse was to be looked on as a slightly disgusting minor operation, like having an enema”. The word “disgusting minor operation” is ironical and it makes this a rather mechanical action. In chapter VII of the book Winston Smith writes in his diary – “until they become conscious they will never rebel. and until after they have rebelled they cannot become conscious”. Here Orwell wants the general mass not to take things lying down. Their consciousness of the evils rampant must egg them on to rebel.

The whole novel is packed with ghastly scenes. In the third part Winston Smith is in the torture chamber and is gnawed at by the rats. The image of rat has come several times in the novel. No doubt there is little of amusement and laughter in the novel compared to other novels of Orwell yet at some places he slightly
changes track. For example, there is a scene of lovemaking between Smith and Julia:

He pressed her down upon the grass, among the fallen bluebells. This time there was no difficulty. Presently the rising and falling of their breasts slowed to normal speed, and in a sort of pleasant helplessness they fell apart. The sun seemed to have grown hotter. They were both sleepy. He reached out for the discarded overalls and pulled them partly over her. Almost immediately they fell asleep and slept for about half an hour.²⁸

This is an interesting scene, the irony being a few green grasses in the burning desert of 1984. There is another example of "happy melancholy" when the lady in chapter IV of the third part sings a song:

They sye that time eals all things, they sye you can always forget; But the smiles an' the tears across the years they twist my' eart-strings yet;²⁹

*Nineteen Eighty Four* is replete with the ironical images. London is a dusty city. In the Ministry of Truth there were enormous furnaces which were hidden somewhere in the recesses of the building compound. Winston Smith is a wounded hero in *Nineteen Eighty Four*. He is maimed physically. And he is also intellectually fallible. He falls into errors of judgment frequently and these are profoundly ironic. After catching O'Brien's eye during the Two
Minutes Hate, he concludes wrongly that “such incidents never had any sequel”. When O’Brien invites him to visit his home, Winston is mistakenly confident that he has understood exactly “where this tended”. And even his moments of insight are often blunted. He sees that O’Brien’s valet has the air of an actor – it “struck him that the man’s whole life was playing a part”. But he fails to grasp the significance of the charade that is now in performance.

To sum up *Nineteen Eighty Four*, we can quote Diana Trilling:

Here is Mr. Orwell’s vision of the future. The fact that the scene of *Nineteen Eighty Four* is London and that the political theory on which Mr. Orwell’s dictatorship is based is called Ingsoc, which is Newspeak for English socialism, indicates that Mr. Orwell is fantasizing about the fate not of an already established dictatorship like that of Russia but also that of Labour England: and indeed he states very clearly that by the fourth decade of the twentieth century all the main currents of political thought were authoritarian ... every new political theory, by whatever name it called itself led back to hierarchy and regimentation... What he was telling us is that the path the Russian revolution has followed has led to the destruction of all the decent human values that have stood for the best of ideals of modern social enlightenment. It is this idealism he has wished to jolt into self-awareness. In the name of a higher loyalty, treacheries beyond imagination have been committed; in the name of socialist
equality, privilege has ruled unbridled; in the name of democracy and freedom, the individual has lived without public voice or private peace – if this is true of the Soviet Union, why should it not eventually be equally true of the English experiment? In other words, we are being warned against the extremes to which the contemporary totalitarian spirit can carry us, not only so that we will be warned against Russia but also so that we will understand the ultimate dangers involved where power moves under the guise of order and rationality.
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