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MAN VERSUS SOCIETY

Orwell joined the Imperial Police service in Burma. The Imperial Police, using its strong arms freely and without scruples in dealing with the subject people of the colonies, was an important and essential wing of the administration of the British Empire. By joining the force Orwell came into contact with the worst aspect of imperialism. He was most unhappy about the role he was called upon to play as a policeman in colonial Burma. He realized that imperialism degraded and dehumanized both the rulers and the ruled. Orwell was all his life haunted by the memories of what he saw and what he was made to do in Burma. By nature beign deeply patriotic he was immensely ashamed of his country and its empire. Orwell's feeling about that form of tyranny called imperialism can be gathered from his two essays, *Shooting an Elephant* and *A Hanging* as well as his novel *Burmese Days*.

He has given minute details the state of the men concerned as well as the jail conditions in those days. The cell resembled animal cages measuring about ten feet by ten, quite bare within, with a plank-bed and a pot of drinking water. The essay *A Hanging*, gives an account of the hanging of a Hindu prisoner in Burma at which Orwell assisted. He has given us a clear picture of that experience through the use of adjectives and metaphors.
The opening lines convey the fantastic atmosphere of the early morning. With 'sickly light like yellow tinfoil' an atmosphere which is in keeping with the barely suppressed nervousness of the British officers and Indian jailors, who are all quickly established for us by the economical taunt and an effective use of dialogue.

As a police officer he felt guilty in the predicament he found himself, and of the task of taking a prisoner to the gallows, which meant falling a prey to the imperialitic rule. Ironically he describes the prisoner a Hindu already a frail little man guarded by six tall Indian warders being brought out of his cell in such a manner. As Orwell beautifully puts it:

Like men handling a fish, which is still alive and may jump back into the water.

The nervous sense of the terrible comedy that is registered in this simile prevades the whole essay.

The whole party going towards the gallows waits for the eight o'clock bugle to set in motion the formal procedure of the execution. The tense situation is suddenly exacerbated when a stray dog appears and threatens to disrupt the formalised march to the scaffold. This little incident is an intolerable harassment for already ragged nerves. It was a dreadful thing.

This is followed by another incident of the prisoner trying to avoid a puddle on the way. Says Orwell:
It is curious but till that moment I have never realized what it means to destroy a healthy conscious man. When I saw the prisoner step aside to avoid a puddle, I saw the mystery, the unspeakable wrongness of cutting a life short when it is on full tide.

The tension reached its climax when the noose was fixed around the prisoner's neck, he begin to cry out to his God:

It was high, reiterated cry of Ram! Ram! Ram!, not urgent and fearful like a prayer or a cry for help but steady, rhythmical almost like the tolling of a bell.

Finally the unbearable tension of the officials is released at last, the execution has been performed, they are all seized by an uncontrolled levity. The relief is so great that strict taboos are momentarily forgotten and British officers and the Indian H.C.O's converse, joke and even have a drink together. They feel relieved because they have somehow succeeded in doing something against their will.

The essay, Shooting an Elephant deals with the incidents in Moulmein in lower Burma, where a sub-divisional police officer Orwell was compelled to deal with an elephant that had gone on the rampage and how this incident had revealed to him the true meaning of imperialism.

Here Orwell makes a hint at the anti-European feeling that was prevailing there. The Burmese did not have the guts to raise a riot but they certainly enjoyed jeering at an Englishman when he was alone. This puzzled and disturbed Orwell. Therefore he says that he had already made up his mind that imperialism was
an evil thing and the sooner he chucked his job and got out the better. Orwell felt as if he was sandwiched between the anti-European feelings of the natives as well as the evils of the British Raj.

Orwell felt a prick in his conscience, a sense of guilt to see the wretched condition of the prisoners in the stinking cages of the lock-ups, the grey cowed faces buttocks of men who had been flogged with bamboos. But Orwell could do nothing as he himself was inexperienced and ill-educated. Orwell was carrying 'the white man's burden' in a different sense. Like any other Anglo-Indian official he had a duality of thought in his mind that the British Raj was an unbreakable tyranny, as something clamped down on the wheel of prostrate people and that the greatest joy in the world would be to drive a bayonet into the Buddhist priest's guts. Feelings like these are the normal by-products of imperialism because petty officials like Orwell themselves were the victims of the natives, who were the oppressors among the oppressed. The color and race prejudice existed both ways, and therefore, hatred is always mutual.

In an admittedly benevolent despotism which has theft as its final object, power did terrible things to the individuals involved, oppressors as well as the oppressed. The police official of *Shooting an Elephant*, trying to decide whether or not to shoot the beast in front of a crowd of excited Burmese, is no more in control of the situation than they are. In Orwell's words:
I perceived in this moment that when the white man turns tyrant it is his own freedom that he destroys. He becomes a sort of hollow, posing dummy, the conventionalized figure of a sahib. He wears a mask, and his face grows to fit it.

Orwell here clearly tries to depict the moment of insight that had dawned upon him - the painful realisation of the tension between the mask and the true self. No doubt the oppressor may spend the whole of his life trying to impress the 'natives' but in moments of crisis he has got to do what the natives expect of him:

A sahib has got to act like a sahib, he has got to appear resolute, to know his own mind and do definite things.

Though Orwell's was a poor shot with a rifle and had no intention of killing the elephant that had now looked quite normal. But he had only one alternative, namely to shoot the elephant, in order to avoid looking a fool in front of the natives. It was as if he was a mere puppet and the strangers were in the hands of the Burmese (natives).

There is something dehumanizing and distorting in the master-vs-slave and ruler-vs-ruled relationship. Orwell with his prophet's insight knows that sooner the white man realizes this world the better for him. A gun can in no way solve problems of human relationships.

Just as the ruler wears a mask the native too wears his. The incident such as in the Shooting an Elephant, the mask drops
and the frightening truth of relationship is revealed.

Orwell has tremendous power to analyse a situation into its finest psychological details till the situation becomes a looking-glass for studying historical relationships. Therefore Orwell's elephant shooting incident differs from Jim Corbett's shooting incidents which accompanies thrill and adventure.

The Prevention of Literature is one of Orwell's last essays in which he pulled together the two ends of the basic thread of his life, the struggle against tyranny and wrote:

Fifteen years ago, when one defended the freedom of the intellect one had to defend it against conservatives and Catholics, and to some extent — for they were not of great importance in England — against Fascists. Today, he has to defend it against communists and 'fellow-travellers'. . . . There can be no question about the poisonous effect of the Russian 'myths' on English intellectual life. Because its known facts are suppressed and distorted to such an extent as to make it doubtful whether a true history of our times can ever be written.

Whenever one defends intellectual liberty against the claims of totalitarianism, one has to face those and many more arguments based on the misunderstanding of literature. They assume that a writer is a public entertainer or he can be hired by the publisher to write according his will. The purpose of literature is to record the contemporary viewpoint and experience. So far as freedom of expression is concerned, there is not much difference between a mere journalist and a most 'unpolitical' imaginative writer. The journalist is not free when
he is compelled to write lies or crush the important news, the imaginative writer, similarly, is not free when he has to suppress and crush his subjective feelings which from his viewpoint are correct. The creative and imaginative faculties of an artist dry up if he is not allowed to come out with the subjective truth. If he keeps himself away from controversy, ever his problem remains unsolved. Genuinely non-political literature is not possible in an age where there are fears, hatreds and political loyalties. Freedom of thought can be banned. If freedom of thought is allowed it may lead the writer to think of forbidden thoughts. Totalitarianism is harmful to prose writers. A poet may not be so much affected by totalitarianism as a prose writer is. In a totalitarian society it is possible that the prose literature may come to an end.

The idea of intellectual liberty is being attacked from two sides. The theoretical enemies of intellectual liberty are the defenders of totalitarianism and its practical enemies. On the other hand, monopoly and bureaucracy. The society does not allow the writer or the journalist to remain honest. The press is in the hands of a few rich men; the rich persons have complete monopoly on books. The result is that a writer in order to live has to do something and he is sometimes hired by a publisher to write for him and earn his living. The Ministry of Information and the British Council waste the time of the writer and have complete grip over his mind, so much that they dictate
his opinion. The war has also adversely affected the writer.

The enemies of intellectual liberty always try to plead that they want discipline among the writer and not individualism. The issue truth-vs-untruth is relegated to the background. The writer who is not prepared to sell his opinion is accused of egotism. He is accused of shutting himself in an artificial shelter to keep himself away from the harsh realities of life or of oppressing the inevitable current of history for his unreasonable privileges.

Orwell wrote that the organised lying practised by totalitarian states was not merely a temporary expedient.

It is something integral to totalitarianism, something that would still continue even if concentration camps and secret police forces have ceased to be necessary . . . From the totalitarian point of view history is something to be created rather than learned . . . Totalitarianism demands, in fact, the continuous alteration of the past, and in the long run probably demands a disbelief in the very existence of objective truth.

According to totalitarian point of view history is to be created rather than learned. A totalitarian state is considered to be infallible. It therefore becomes imperative that past events are arranged in such a way as may show that this or that mistake was not made or that this or that imaginary triumph actually happened.

Totalitarianism demands the continuous alteration of the past and perhaps demands the denial of the existing objective
truth. The advocates of totalitarianism feel that since absolute truth can’t be attained, a big lie is no worse than a little lie. It is pointed out that all historical records are prejudices and are wrong or the physics has proved that the world that seems to be real is an illusion, so that the evidence of one’s sense will mean vulgarity. A totalitarian society would bring about a disconnection between thoughts, feelings and action and the laws of a totalitarian society hold good in everyday life and in certain exact sciences can be disregarded by the politicians, the historians, and sociologists. There are many persons who would consider it bad to falsify a scientific textbook, but they would not hesitate in falsifying historical fact. Totalitarianism does not create an age of faith, it brings about an age of schizophrenia that is an age of mental disease marked by a disconnection between thoughts, feelings and actions.

Good writing is not possible in orthodoxy. The author gives an example here, referring to the Spanish Civil War. This war was no doubt and experience for the British intellectual but it did not serve as a subject for writing upon whatever was said or written about this war was false, nothing written about the war was worth reading.

This is not definite whether totalitarianism has an adverse effect on verse or prose. The one reason is that bureaucrats and other ‘practical’ men generally hate a poet. Secondly they think that if a poem is translated into prose its
importance even for the poet is lost. The thought the poem contains is always simple and the primary purpose of the poem is not the thought only, as the anecdote is the primary purpose of a picture. A poem is an arrangement of brushmarks. Sometimes poetry can dispense with meanings.

Poetry might survive in a totalitarian age, and certain arts or half-arts, such as architecture, might even find tyranny beneficial, but the prose writer would have no choice between silence and death. Prose literature as we know it is the product of rationalism, of the protestant centuries, of the autonomous individual, and the destruction of intellectual liberty cripples the journalist, the sociological writer, the historian, the novelist, the critic and the poet, in that order.

A poet can easily kick himself away from the dangerous subjects and avoid expressing opinions contrary to the accepted doctrine on any subject, and even if he expressed such opinions they may not be noticed. But a good verse is not necessarily the product of an individual. Ballads and certain other kinds of poems can be compared to a group. There is still dispute about the English and Scottish ballads.

Prose cannot be written communally. One needs loneliness for writing prose; excitement may prove helpful to communal versification but not to prose writing. A prose writer cannot limit the range of his thoughts. If he does so, it means that he completely destroys his power of invention. In a totalitarian society there is no liberty. Hence the loss of liberty is detrimental to any kind of literature. During the regime of Hitler, German literature almost disappeared and in Italy also
the condition was in no way better. Russian literature also grew worse though some verses were better than prose. There has been very scanty production of literature during the last fifteen years. Catholicism is also responsible for affecting literature adversely.

There are many subjects on which one cannot write and tyranny is one of them. A good book in praise of the inquisition was never written. Prose is rational. If one has intellectual liberty, one can freely write prose. But if the intellectual liberty is destroyed, the journalist feels handicapped. The sociological writer, the historian, the novelist, the critic and the poet are crippled due to the loss of intellectual liberty.

Physical sciences, music, painting and architecture can never flourish if one is not allowed the freedom of thought. Even the writer kills his personality if he suppresses truth, adopts totalitarian outlook and falsifies reality. The writer is not in a position to make commonplace remarks even. If a writer is not allowed to jot down whatever spontaneously comes to his mind, literary creation cannot be possible and the language he uses becomes rigid. Imagination can never be high if its flight is restricted. A writer who denies this fact denies his own existence as a writer on this earth. Orwell said that literature is doomed if liberty of thought perished, whether in the whole society or in an individual. The bought-mind was the spoiled mind!
Unless spontaneity enters at some point or another, literary creation is impossible, and language itself becomes ossified. At some time in future, if the human mind becomes something totally different from what now it is we may learn to separate literary creation from intellectual honesty. At present we know that the imagining like certain wild animal, will not breed in captivity.

The free intelligence: a vigorous language; private options: the literature of liberalism, the imagination breeding only in freedom; the writer standing aside from whatever activity he may undertake; a citizen refusing to be deceived - these are the aspects of Orwell's non-fictional hero, the traditional literary intellectual.

The theme of Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-four is the same though they differ in their treatment. In the Spanish Civil War Orwell saw how the left-wingers were indulging in lies and falsehood and the so-called progressives were drawing wool over thier eyes to save the cause. The betrayal of the Left, the failure of the revolution and the consequent terror, suppression of the individual, usurpation of power by the callous Big Brother causing dehumanization of the common people had already some deep indelible impressions on the psyche of Orwell. All these constitute the main theme the two classics. He was a very sick man when he wrote his novel 1984 which portrayed a totalitarian nightmare, but to see the author as a gloomy prophet is to mistake the man for the message. He wrote this book in the drab post-war Britain and at that time he saw himself as a man
standing alone against powerful forces, the spread of dehumanising machine-society and the subjugation of the individual to the state. The book was conceived not as a prophecy but as a warning - 'Don’t let the Big Brother take your world'.

Orwell himself did not believe in the kind of society described in 1984 but he believed that something resembling it could arrive. 1984 is a Utopia.

However, Orwell had no specific ‘you’ in mind when he was writing Nineteen Eightyfour. He toyed with various dates and finally picked 1984 a reversal of 1948 - the year in which the book was written. The novel is not just about the two large totalitarian societies of his day, Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia. There are enough hints in the novel that even democratic societies were the area of straight domination is ever widening, the values of democratic civilization are threatened by the onslaught of technology and militarism, the spirit of freedom by the excesses of the state and the humanity of the ordinary people by the awesome presence of the superman. What is central to Orwell’s thesis of the prophetic novel is neither time nor place but wide spread current, a certain state of mind that is not restricted to dictatorships, either communist or fascist, but one that is endemic to the age we live in.

Moreover 1984 is neither a satire about a communist society nor just an attack on socialism some sour impression
that seems to have heartened conservatives among liberals and invited the wrath of the radicals and censures by Soviet Russia. The novel is more an attempt to portray the basic tendency of his time and the times that seem to be unfolding before him. In essence the condition of the human predicament is not very different as between the satire and the reality and Orwell's sole aim is to drive home the danger of the spread of totalitarianism and autocracy in some form or the other in various parts of the world. Orwell's warning is clear to all. Totalitarianism if not fought against, can triumph anywhere, anytime.

In 1984 the world is divided into three parts, Oceania, Eastasia and Eurasia, all perpetually at war with one another, but essentially have to seem political and social structures and a vested interest in keeping the fight going on.

The book has been divided into two parts. Part one consists of eight chapters in which the readers are introduced to Winston Smith, a member of the Outer Party, controls Oceania one of the three huge countries into which the world has been divided after the nuclear war. Major ideas, themes and conflicts are introduced in the first chapter. Through the use of euphemism the party covers up the drabness with high-sounding names. Victory Mansions is a huge tenement of one and two room apartments. To conserve electricity for the war power is cut off during day time. The elevator does not work and there is running hot water. Yet Winston Smith is a party member certainly not one
of the inner party but a privileged person nevertheless, and Victory Mansions is rather good housing especially when contrasted with the buildings in which the non-party members, the Proles, live.

Oceania, one of the three great powers in the world, consists of America, the British Isles, Australia and a few other territories. The British Isles have been renamed as Air- strip One. Nearly everything now has some sort of a military label and Winston lives in what remains of London.

Orwell's status has less to do with the fact that he was a confirmed anti-communist than with the words and phrases he coined to serve as powerful instruments in the battle against totalitarianism. 'Big Brother is watching you' - in this one simple sentence, for example, Orwell captured the central echoes of Stalinism - Stalin's massive photograph looking at you wherever you were.

a colored poster, too large for indoor display had been tacked to the wall. It depicted simply an enormous face of a man about 45, with a heavy black moustache and ruggedly handsome features... 'Big Brother is watching you'.

The figure of 'Big Brother', spokesman of the party orthodoxy, dominates the psychological setting of 1984. There is a hint that Big Brother is not even a real person; he never appears in public or on the telescreen, and the other party members such as Winston Smith, do not even know where his
headquarters are. The indication is that he is merely the symbol of the party and the State, a figure created to be the subject of the party members' loyalty and love.

The slogan 'Big Brother is Watching You' is omnipresent. The concept of 'Double Think' (to know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed two opinions which cancelled out each other) is important in the psychological make-up of the characters in 1984. To convince everyone in Oceania that war is the best state possible for them, the state had developed the slogan 'war is peace'.

Freedom of thought and expression is dangerous to a totalitarian state. It is necessary, therefore, that the citizen of the state should be made to think that the deviation from orthodox thought and expression enslaves the man who allows it

The right to question and to learn is also dangerous to his state. 'Ignorance is Strength' is the third slogan of this totalitarian state. It is notable that all the ministers have been ironically named. Citizens of Oceania are not allowed to respond intellectually to their government. Their only response must be emotional.

The story centers around Winston Smith's rebellion against the party, of his hatred of Big Brother, and of the thought-crime which finally results in his destruction.
They allowed the distortion of truth and the perversion of history, while in Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia, past history was also falsified. Hence we find in *1984* that a whole department works to change the articles and the news items in *The Times* and the other periodicals and books. The idea behind this was that if all records told the same tale, the lie is passed into history and becomes truth. 'Who controls the past controls the future and who controls the present controls the past' was the slogan of the party.

According to Orwell totalitarianism not only forbids us to express, even to think certain thoughts. It even dictates what you shall think. So we find in *1984* that Winston Smith was made to believe that 2 + 2 was not 4 but 5. He said that when the general atmosphere is bad, language must suffer. But if thought corrupts language, language corrupts thought. This is amply borne out in *1984*. Hence the imperative need of the 'New Speak'. Orwell had warned that the overthrow of capitalism would not necessarily bring in democratic socialism. This happened in East Europe and other parts of the world.

Life was controlled by the regime and the party with its thought-police and its four ministries - the Ministry of Truth, which concerns itself with news, entertainment, education and fine arts, the Ministry of Peace which concerned itself with war, the Ministry of Love which maintained law and order, and
the Ministry of Plenty, which was responsible for economic affairs. Their names in Newspeak were Minintrue, Minipax, Miniluv, and Miniplenty. Winston Smith is a minor bureaucrat in the totalitarian state of Oceania. War with the world's two other superpowers, Eurasia and Eastasia, are constant, although the pattern of hostilities and allowances keep changing. Smith works at the ministry of truth rewriting the newspaper stories to conform to current party ideology. He uses the official language, Newspeak, a version of English being pared down to make unorthodox opinions impossible to conceive. Privacy has vanished. Waking and sleeping, Smith and all party members are observed by two-way telescreens, and posters everywhere proclaim 'Big Brother is Watching You'. Suddenly Smith commits a thoughtcrime -- 'Down with Big Brother'. He also begins a love affair with Julia, a co-worker at the office, another heinous offence. The Junior Anti-Sea League indoctrinates the virtue of celibacy, and procreation will soon be carried on solely through artificial insemination ('artsem' in Newspeak). All personal loyalty belongs to the party. Winston and Julia are caught by the Thought Police and hauled off to the Ministry of Love. He is relentlessly tortured, then taken to room 101, where his worst fear has been realized by interrogation. Winston Smith is tried by the most modern psychological method, according to which the victim is given mental tension through the introduction of rats or any other insects or reptiles, for which he has developed a phobia right from his childhood. That is to touch the most sensitive
part of the human psyche.

So as a cage bearing rats is being pushed towards his face. He begs that his punishment be inflicted on Julia instead. This betrayal eliminates the trace of his integrity. He has become a good party member. In 1984 the triumph of the totalitarian state is not complete until it has been demonstrated to the last resister that as a last resort, he would sacrifice the person he loves, the best in order to save his skin. Orwell sees totalitarianism as an attack on language and consequently human ability to think and imagine. It turns into language and the worst that can happen.

Newspeak's aim is to narrow the range of thought to destroy Oldspeak with all its useless shades of meaning. It is the only language in the world whose vocabulary gets smaller every year. The principles and etymology of Newspeak are interesting not only for themselves, but because they communicate the ideology behind the massive brain of Big Brother who is watching you. So Newspeak is concerned with lying, falsification, forgery, fabrication and duplicity, all emanating from the Ministry of Truth, as Newspeak would have it. Minitrue. And ideology is dictated by Ingsoc or English socialism.

Even Ingsoc slogans like 'war is peace', 'Ignorance is Strength' and 'Freedom is slavery' will become meaningless. "How could you have a slogan like 'Freedom is slavery' when the concept of freedom has been abolished?" - says the same
character: where the telescreens keep watching you from all directions. The telescreen will 'quack, quack' away till the face on it becomes a dummy, and it is not a brain directing speech, but just the larynx uttering unconscious noise like the quacking of a duck. And in fact, one of the words in Newspeak is duck speak. Duck Speak is an ideal Newspeak word because it has two contradictory meanings. Applied to a opponent it is abuse, applied to someone you agree with, it is praise.

History is rewritten, literature made unrecognizable, old newspapers entirely reprinted to match current ideologies and current personality-cults, and persons vapourised in print by Ingsoc. This is how the archives will communicate with in future.

Countless words such as honour, justice, morality, internationalism, democracy, science and religion are interpreted objectively. Rationalism vanishes and cannot exist in ideal Newspeak - the capsule word 'Old Think' would cover it all. So also with Jefferson's words in the Declaration of Independence about equality, rights, liberty, the pursuit of happiness - all this is expressed by a single word - 'Crimethink'.

The opening sentence of Orwell's 1984 reads - "It was a bright cold day in April, and the clocks were striking thirteen". implying peace was normal, time was ticking away.
Man is the only reality; before man was nothing. After man, if he could come to an end, there would be nothing. Outside man there is nothing. This 'collective socialism' enables the party to gain even greater power. Winston, the old revolutionary heretic, thinks that life will defeat them. The answer is 'we control life'. Winston, at all its levels'. The party also controls death, for although individual life may be shortened more and more, it does not matter in the least, for the collective organism will go on living for ever. When the collective man becomes more important than the individual, the individual loses his identity and is unknown, except by numbers. Humanity is the party. The others are outside and irrelevant. So it turns into a highly organized society, whose members exhibit a minimum of personal peculiarities whose collective behaviour is governed by a single masterplan i.e. Big Brother. It was about a society being watched over by 'Big Brother' whose description fitted Stalin very well.

In 1984 the story of Winston's adventure with the past is enacted in three parts. The first part begins with the criminal decision to keep a diary. He takes stock of the political and his personal situation by exploring his own past. We see him living through the daily utopian routine with his consciousness heightened by his search and fear of detection. It is not only the reader but the hero himself who experiences utopia, as it were, for the first time as well. While looking for fellowship Winston regards different types of Utopian citizens with newly
gamed penetration. In his various attempts at exploration he always ends up against a blank wall.

However there seems to be some hope in the person of O'Brien. The second part contains the climax and catastrophe. Winston and Julia, another individual rebelling against the state. Their love story is the consummation of their desire for the peace of past times. Their meeting with O'Brien, their oath and drinking to the past is the last decisive criminal act when having reached the highest point of his anti-utopian hubris, while trying peacefully in bed with Julia, in an old-fashioned room in the proletarian quarter, and while pursuing the secret key to utopian philosophy, nemesis steps in. Winston and Julia are arrested by the thought-police. Just as Winston is on the point of discovering the why.

The third part brings out the nightmarish revelation. In the torture chambers of the Ministry of Love. O'Brien, who turns out to be a member of the thought-police, expounds the underlying principle of Oceanian state power for power's sake. Inflicting pain and suffering heightens the consciousness of power. Therefore, the more pain there is the more powerful and godlike is the privilege of class inflicting such pains. By the application of modern science Winston's resistance is completely broken. He accepts the present, which contains the past as well as the future. As O'Brien sums up there was learning, there was understanding and there was acceptance. Winston's tragedy is
the triumph of the party, which will go on forever. 1984 is a political allegory - an amalgam of the horrors of fascism, totalitarianism and Stalinism... the seismic waves emanating from all this may not affect all of us equally. But as Newspeak's warning trend leads us to doublethink, we look back at Orwell as a seer with true human values and accept also, with his defeated hero, that the battle is already lost. Thus the novel 1984 is rightly labelled as a Orwellian nightmare. Orwell indeed comes before us as the hero of a lost battle. But who knows, such heroes may help us to win the war.
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