

The Emergence of George Orwell's Political Consciousness

Hirofumi WASHINO

I

It is said that most of George Orwell's early works are unsatisfactory with regard to their construction and narrative inevitability. But such criticism is not a special matter in Orwell's works; it seems that evaluations of the earlier works of writers, in which they begin their creative efforts, are often unfavourable. Orwell was not an exception; the true value of his writing was not recognised by the public until *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, which were written in his final periods. But we cannot say that he is a novelist, judging only from these successful works. It is early in the thirties that he started to write works seriously. In those days he was engaged in hackwork for daily life, and at the same time he wrote essays based on his experiences of the police service in India. Moreover he entered into the slums or spikes and wrote reports though he was from the middle-class. And again, he wrote poems, although the number was comparatively few. After all, he used several forms of literature, but his styles were gradually changed as time passed: in the last periods of the thirties he wrote such reportage as *The Road to Wigan Pier* and *Homage to Catalonia*, in the forties comparatively long criticisms, and finally a fable and a science fiction novel. Owing to this facts, it is difficult to place him within a particular genre of literature.

Concerning this problem, Alex Zwerdling says, "Most writers eventually specialize; they become interested in a particular genre and so stop being 'writers' and become poets, or novelists, or dramatists, or essayists" (143). But Zwerdling points out that Orwell was not satisfied with any existing types of literary forms and also says as follows:

He never became a specialist in any of these genres; rather, he remained a writer who employed the various forms available to him and discarded them when they no longer seemed useful.... His deepest literary commitment was to powerful and lucid *prose*, rather than to any of the particular forms in which it was used; he was finally unwilling to choose one of them and make it his own. (144)

But it seems that writers who take an attitude stated in the quotation above easily lapse into mimicries of other writers and end their writers' life just as it is. Regarding this matter, Zwerdling says we can apply the following four novels written in his early period to this case: *Burmese Days*, *A Clergyman's Daughter*, *Keep the Aspidistra Flying*, *Coming up for Air* (144). To be concrete, it means the incompleteness of the whole structure of stories, and in fact, Orwell himself admits quite readily that these works are failures. For example, regarding *Burmese Days*, in the letter to Henry Miller on 26th August 1936, Orwell wrote, "That is the only one book of my books that I am pleased with--not that it is any good qua novel, but the descriptions of scenery aren't bad, only of course that is what the average reader skips" (*CEJL* 1: 258,). Thus he implied that his own works are unsuccessful when compared with the existing forms of novels. Furthermore, as an example where he criticised own books, we can mention *A Clergyman's Daughter*, in which it is said that in the third chapter Orwell got a hint from James Joyce's *Ulysses*. In the letter to Brenda Salkeld on 7th March 1935, he wrote, "it is tripe, except for chap 3, part 1, which I am pleased with, but I don't know whether *you* will like it" (*CEJL* 1: 174), and in the same letter to Miller quoted above, he said, "That book is bollox" (*CEJL* 1: 258). And again, about this work, Bernard Crick says in a minute biography:

Years later when Orwell was putting his affairs in order, he renounced it [*A Clergyman's Daughter*] entirely. He left instructions that it was not to be translated or reprinted, and wrote to a friend that it was a book he was ashamed of and that: "This was written simply as an exercise and I oughtn't to have published it, but I was desperate for money, ditto when I wrote *Keep the A [Aspidistra Flying]....*" (258-9)

But Crick also says that Orwell was not in trouble with money so much that he starved, and from the letters which he wrote to Brenda Salkeld in those days, he writes, it is "clear that he was writing it for publication and that, while certainly an experiment in seeing whether different styles and perspectives could be combined in one narrative as Joyce had done, it was not a mere exercise" (259). We cannot know what experiment it is, but it is certain that this book gave him the key to establish his own style. This work is not the only

one in which Orwell made an experiment. Crick writes, "He had already had plenty of exercise in producing writing that did not get published" (259). Though the early works have many questionable aspects, why did he imitate the existing forms of novels and write many works before and after *A Clergyman's Daughter* was published.

II

In the essay "Why I Write" written in his last years, Orwell refers to the purposes for which writers write in prose and classifies them into four categories: 1. Sheer egoism, 2. Aesthetic enthusiasm, 3. Historical impulse, 4. Political purpose. He gives each purpose a short explanation. Firstly, about "Sheer egoism", he says, "Desire to seem clever, to be talked about, to be remembered after death, to get your own back on grown-ups who snubbed you in childhood, etc. etc. It is humbug to pretend that this is not a motive, and a strong one" (*CEJL* 1: 25). Secondly, about "Aesthetic enthusiasm", he writes, "Perception of beauty in the external world, or, on the other hand, in words and their right arrangement", and he also writes, "Please [sic] in the impact or one sound on another, in the firmness of good prose or the rhythm of a good story" (*CEJL* 1: 26). And again, he says, "Aesthetic enthusiasm" is "Desire to share an experience which one feels is valuable and ought not to be missed" (*CEJL* 1: 26). Thirdly, he explains that "Historical impulse" is "Desire to see things as they are, to find out true facts and store them up for the use of posterity" (*CEJL* 1: 26). And lastly, about "Political purpose", he uses "the word 'political' in the widest possible sense," and explains this purpose:

Desire to push the world in a certain direction, to alter other people's idea of the kind society that they should strive after. Once again, no book is genuinely free from political bias. The opinion that art should have nothing to do with politics is itself a political attitude. (*CEJL* 1: 26).

He says that every writer has these various impulses more or less, and the weight of impulses differs from person to person and from time to time. And especially, he states about "Political purpose" mentioned finally: "In a peaceful age I might have written ornate or merely descriptive books, and might have remained almost unaware of my political loyalties. As it is I have been forced into becoming a sort of pamphleteer" (*CEJL* 1: 26).

Here, it is understood that in his days the social circumstances made a writer think about politics. The thirties in which Orwell lived was literally the age of confusion. Zwerdling writes as follows:

But the 1930s were not ordinary. There was no honorable--finally perhaps no practical--way for most artists to avoid political commitment: in a highly polarized society they had to take sides. The whole concept of artistic detachment and political neutrality was thoroughly discredited by the middle of the decade, and Orwell's books became more and more blatantly political. (148)

As stated here, Orwell had to make his political position clear. As expressed in the above quotation from "Why I Write," Orwell gave four impulses to write in prose; but it was the political purpose which he was most interested in, and he put the greater weight in it than the other three impulses. He mentions the reason why he writes books:

What I have most wanted to do throughout the past ten years is to make political writing into an art. My starting point is always a feeling of partisanship, a sense of injustice. When I sit down to write a book, I do not say to myself, "I am going to produce a work of art." I write it because there is some lie that I want to expose, some fact to which I want to draw attention, and my initial concern is to get a hearing. But I could not do the work of writing a book, or even a long magazine article, if it were not also an aesthetic experience. (*CEJL* 1: 28)

Indeed, he paid attention to aesthetic enthusiasm, but it was associated with political issues. As was characteristic of his writings, he described such trifle things as movements of birds and instincts. Especially, his description of scenery is beautiful and is highly regarded by many critics, as Woodcock points out (294-95, 355). But even when he was absorbed in describing scenery, in most cases, he never forgot political matters. It is clear from the above statement where he wrote, "I do not say to myself, 'I am going to produce a work of art.'" It was out of "a feeling of partisanship" and "a sense of injustice" that Orwell always wanted to write. For example, in *The Road to Wigan Pier*, he visited a mining town and saw the dreadful life of miners' families. Orwell thought of these horrible conditions as the

outcome of mechanisation. But as he reported these terrible sights, he also found beautiful scenery covered with snow and from that scenery also derived a hope that England still was not affected by mechanisation entirely, and there was a possibility to relieve oppressed people like miners. In this way, Orwell came to believe in true Socialism. We can see his minute description not only in the scenery but also in the descriptions of characters.

Why did he evince such behaviour? It is only because he wanted to have a person hear some facts to which he wanted to draw attention. But as is often the case with his earlier works, such behaviour is like a double-edged sword, often interrupting the stream of narrative continuity. Zwerdling says this point:

In addition, the novelist demands more imaginative work from his readers than does the essayist. He trusts his audience in a way the essayist does not, trusts it to understand things that are not explained on the surface, his attitude toward the characters, the meaning of symbolic objects or scenes, and so on. Orwell's fiction seldom suggests that he was ready to accord his readers such trust. He was afraid of being misinterpreted and was convinced that without help they would not see the point. (148-49)

Moreover, Zwerdling points out that this characteristics of Orwell's writings demonstrates his anxious political consciousness (149).

As we have seen in the quotations from the essay "Why I Write," the political purpose was a strong underlying impulse of Orwell's prose. In his explanation of the political purpose, he wrote: "Desire to push the world in a certain direction, to alter other people's idea of the kind society that they should strive after." We can say that he thought the clear, detailed description was indispensable for giving his message to other people. If a writer creates works only from the viewpoint of aesthetic enthusiasm, he or she does not need such political thought at all. But once political elements contribute the purpose to writing, not only to tell another person one's thought but also "to alter other people's idea," it is necessary for the writer to write clearly for preventing a reader misunderstanding what the writer truly wants to say. So the writer needs the special function in the form of the novel, and moreover in the whole of literary forms. In other words, the indispensable parameter is that the range of readers' imagination is limited. Therefore, in the

background where he attempted various novelistic strategies and wrote essays and also poems especially in the thirties, there was a motive for trying which form was most suitable for him to describe his thought just as he wanted. So we can say that he had an urgent need to do “plenty of exercise.”

This behaviour of his testifies to the fact that he faced up to reality and endeavoured to make the various problems in the real world clear. George Woodcock says:

The impulse to render his own experiences into some meaningful form was in fact much stronger in him than the impulse to invent original situations and sequences of events. This was largely because he felt the political issues that pressed upon a writer in his day were too urgent to allow him to stray into other worlds than the familiar. (293-94)

Orwell's interest in real world experience was a tendency already apparent at the beginning of his writer's life. In the letter to Henry Miller on 30th August 1936, Orwell pointed out that *Black Spring* published in those days was rather out of “ordinary reality” than *Tropic of Cancer*, and he wrote, “but I have a sort of belly-to-earth attitude and always feel uneasy when I get away from the ordinary world where grass is green, stones hard etc” (*CEJL*, 1: 257). And again he said the same thing in a review published in the *New English Weekly* on 24th September 1936 (*CEJL*, 1: 261). Judging from these facts, the thing in which he was most interested was what was happened on the real world surrounding him, and he simply could not stay apart from that real world.

In “Why I Write,” Orwell mentioned *Animal Farm* as the most satisfying work in which the political purpose and aesthetic enthusiasm are combined (*CEJL*, 1: 29)¹. This work is a fable in which animals expel human beings and establish their own nation, but at last a pig-centered despotic state is made, so this seems to be apart from the real world. But if we transfer the animal characters to the real world's politicians, it is easy to understand who each animal is. In a certain sense, we should say that this way limits the range of readers' imagination. In the technique of fable Orwell found out an ultimate way of description, which is suitable for fusing four purposes, especially aesthetic enthusiasm and the political purpose. And this shows that his search for a better form was continuing at that time when

Animal Farm was written.

From the early thirties, he published novels, reviews, essays and poems one after another, and experimented with their forms. Behind this attitude of his, we can see his iron will with which Orwell wanted to write satisfying works in a tense social situation. Jeffrey Meyers cites John Wain's comment on Orwell's works: "as a novelist Orwell was not particularly gifted but as a controversial critic and pamphleteer he was superb, as good as any in English literature" (Meyers 158)². This indicates that Orwell was deeply rooted in the real world, and had a keenly critical point of view. Orwell writes as follows:

So long as I remain alive and well I shall continue to feel strongly about prose style, to love the surface of the earth, and to take pleasure in solid objects and scraps of useless information. It is no use trying to suppress that side of myself. The job is to reconcile my ingrained likes and dislikes with the essentially public, non-individual activities that this age forces on all of us. (*CEJL*, 1: 28)

Orwell was concerned about real world events, and moreover, these events had close relations with politics for him as shown in the above quotation. As we have seen he used many styles of literature in the thirties, and he intensively wrote many works especially before and after *A Clergyman's Daughter* was published. This shows that he became aware of the emergence of political consciousness in his mind in those days, and he became also aware that prose would become a most convenient style for him to expose political injustice. Thus it can be said that the thirties for Orwell was the days not only for establishing his style in literature but for clarifying his aim in writing. Thus his aim was tied to politics, so we will ask what kind of political situation Orwell took.

III

"Why I Write" was published in the *Gangrel* in 1946. In this essay, Orwell said which standpoint he took and what kind of consciousness writers had in those days:

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. It seems to me nonsense, in a period like our own, to think that one can avoid writing of such subjects. Everyone writes of them in one guise or another. It is simply a question of which side one takes and what approach one follows. And the more one is conscious of one's political bias, the more chance one has of acting politically without sacrificing one's aesthetic and intellectual integrity. (*CEJL* 1: 28)

Here, which standpoint Orwell takes is shown definitely, when he writes works. And furthermore, we can understand that he feels sure that whoever is a writer has political consciousness. He thinks that a writer has to take such an attitude just because of the demand of the times. In his age, several kinds of disputes were continued. After World War I, European political conditions were always unstable; for example, the rise of Nazism in Germany that were suffering from a shock of defeat and a large amount of compensation, the situation in the Soviet Union where Stalin came into political power and so on. Especially, it was the Spanish Civil War which influenced on his political thought directly. This war became an opportunity for Orwell to know the nature of Socialism in the Soviet Union under Stalinist rule, and he came to write his works from the standpoint of "democratic Socialism," as he understood it.

He gathers his experiences of the Spanish war into a book titled *Homage to Catalonia* (published by Secker & Warburg in 1938). At the beginning of this work, Orwell mentions a certain Italian militiaman whom he met in Barcelona. Orwell was deeply impressed by this man whose face implied a resolution to "commit murder and throw away his life for a friend," and at the same time, Orwell felt such friendship as soldiers fighting for a common goal felt for each other (1-2). Actually, though Orwell seldom spoke to him, Orwell kept the militiaman in mind, and writes about his mysterious feelings:

As we went out he stepped across the room and gripped my hand very hard. Queer, the affection you can feel for a stranger! It was as though his spirit and mine had momentarily succeeded in bridging the gulf of language and tradition and meeting in utter intimacy. I hoped he liked me as well as I liked him. But I also knew that to retain my first impression of him I must not see him again; and needless to say I never did see him again. One was always making contacts of that kind in Spain.

I mentioned this Italian militiaman because he has stuck vividly in my memory.

With his shabby uniform and fierce pathetic face he typifies for me the special atmosphere of that time. He is bound up with all my memories of that period of the war--the red flags in Barcelona, the gaunt trains full of shabby soldiers creeping to the front, the grey war-stricken towns further up the line, the muddy, ice-cold trenches in the mountains. (1-2)

It can be said that the Italian militiaman becomes a symbol of the Spanish Civil War for Orwell and of solidarity and loyalty of militiamen fighting for one purpose.

The name of George Orwell did not become famous until *Animal Farm* (1945) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) were published. Because of the political tendencies which these two works have, it is often said that Orwell's ideas and principles and his viewpoints had been guided only by political matters. But, actually, his viewpoints had always turned to each person, as in the description of the militiaman stated above. Later, in the essay titled "Looking Back on the Spanish War" written in autumn 1942, Orwell refers to the militiaman whom he mentioned in *Homage to Catalonia*, and says the following about him:

All the considerations that are likely to make one falter--the siren voices of a Pétain or of a Gandhi, the inescapable fact that in order to fight one has to degrade oneself, the equivocal moral position of Britain, with its democratic phrases and its coolie empire, the sinister development of Soviet Russia, the squalid farce of left-wing politics--all this fades away and one sees only the struggle of the gradually awakening common people against the lords of property and their hired liars and bumsuckers. The question is very simple. Shall people like that Italian soldier be allowed to live the decent, fully human life which is now technically achievable, or shan't they? Shall the common man be pushed back into the mud, or shall he not? I myself believe, perhaps on insufficient grounds, that the common man will win his fight sooner or later, but I want it to be sooner and not later--some time within the next hundred years, say, and not some time within the next ten thousand years. That was the real issue of the Spanish war, and of the present war, and perhaps of other wars yet to come. (CEJL 2: 305)

The important point here is that various political frictions and problems of political

allegiance stemming from which simple party and national interests are highly respected certainly have to do with individual people. And according to him, those people are divided into two categories: one consists of “common people” and the other of “the lords of property and their hired liars and bumsuckers.” Generally speaking, this dichotomous division of society is sometimes done, but in Orwell’s case, he not only divides people into two groups. He also feels indignation towards “the lords of property and their hired liars and bumsuckers” who oppress “common people” by making much use of doctrine of political parties. In *Homage to Catalonia*, he inserts a comparatively long chapters defending Trotskyists accused by suspicion of conspiring with Franco. Orwell was attacked by a certain honourable critic for which this chapter made the work mere journalism. “What he said was true,” he writes, “but I could not have done otherwise. I happened to know, what very few people in England had been allowed to know, that innocent men were being falsely accused,” and again he says, “If I had not been angry about that I should never have written the book” (*CEJL* 1: 29). As stated here, Orwell’s point of view always turned to common people and especially to those oppressed wrongly by political power. This point of view becomes one of his central subjects in *Homage to Catalonia*.

In this book, concerning the reason why he participated in the Spanish war, he writes: “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’ (188). Whenever he thinks about political party, he does not forget the viewpoint of common decency which people trying to turn society into a comfortable situation have. The following quotation from *Homage to Catalonia* shows that:

One had been in a community where hope was more normal than apathy or cynicism, where the word “comrade” stood for comradeship and not, as in most countries, for humbug. One had breathed the air of equality. I am well aware that it is now the fashion to deny that Socialism has anything to do with equality. In every country in the world a huge tribe of party-hacks and sleek little professors are busy “proving” that Socialism means no more than a planned state-capitalism with the grab-motive left intact. But fortunately there also exists a vision of Socialism quite different from this. The things that attracts ordinary men to Socialism and makes them willing to risk their skins for it, the “mystique” of

Socialism, is the idea of equality; to the vast majority of people Socialism means a classless society, or it means nothing at all. (83-84)

The position Orwell expresses here is not only that he is a Socialist. At the same time, he recognises that Socialism must be based upon the concept of equality. It can be said that he was impressed by those who were fighting for equality. No sooner had he arrived in Spain than he was conscripted into the militia against fascism: POUM. There Orwell felt fighting people's enthusiasm for getting spirit of equality. He writes about the meaning of his days in Spain in the following way:

And it was here that those few months in the militia were valuable to me. For the Spanish militias, while they lasted, were a sort of microcosm of a classless society. In that community where no one was on the make, where there was a shortage of everything but no privilege and no boot-licking, one got, perhaps, a crude forecast of what the opening stages of Socialism might be like. And, after all, instead of disillusioning me it deeply attracted me. The effect was to make my desire to see Socialism established much more actual than it had been before. Partly, perhaps, this was due to the good luck of being among Spaniards, who, with their innate decency and their ever-present Anarchist tinge, would make even the opening stages of Socialism tolerable if they had the chance. (84)

As shown here, Orwell believed in true Socialism which is deeply rooted in a concept of human decency, and in this sense, he did not regard Socialism abstractly as in empty scholarly debates. And this viewpoint derived from human decency seems to become the starting point of his Socialist thought. Especially in the word "decency" which is difficult to define and is used in his works very often, his way of thought to Socialism is expressed symbolically. Orwell found "innate decency" in other people like the militiaman; at the same time, he found that there was the emergence of human decency connected with political consciousness in Orwell himself, too.

IV

Many critics have mentioned that Orwell's fundamental point of view was based upon

human decency. For example, John Atkins says as follows in his book published soon after Orwell's death:

The next step was Spain, and again the central fact of Orwell's Socialism was a perfectly simple faith in the power of common decency and the need to defend it. He said that when he went there, and for some time afterwards, he was not only not interested in the political situation but unaware of it. He knew nothing about the nature of the war, except that it was against Fascism, and he had decided that Fascism was an enemy of common decency. (186)

As we can see here, Orwell's Socialism put the main point in the defense of decency expressing human nature. This point is also mentioned by Christopher Hollis:

Men acquired a dignity and decency when they found themselves face to face with death. "The soldiers do the fighting," he wrote, "the journalists do the shouting and no true patriot ever gets near to a front-line trench, except on the briefest propaganda tours." But in the front-line political hatreds are forgotten and Orwell found no difficulty in thinking and writing even of the enemy as a normal human being. (98)

Hollis says in this way, he cites one of Orwell's experiences in the essay "Looking Back on the Spanish War." It is almost the following quotation, though not in the same way as Hollis cites: "At this moment a man, presumably carrying a message to an officer, jumped out of the trench and ran along the top of the parapet in full view. He was half-dressed and was holding up his trousers with both hands as he ran. I refrained from shooting at him..." (*CEJL2*: 291). In the same essay, Orwell gives an explanation on the reason why he did not shoot at the man. "Still," Orwell writes, "I did not shoot partly because of that detail about the trousers. I had come here to shoot at 'Fascists'; but a man who is holding up his trousers isn't a 'Fascist', he is visibly a fellow creature, similar to yourself, and you don't feel like shooting at him" (*CEJL2*: 291-92). Needless to say about his magnanimity, though he was in the strained front line, this episode shows that his greatest concern was not to think about the matter of political parties but to see individual people with gentle manner. George

Woodcock moves this matter forward by saying:

His outlook, in fact, was the reverse of sectarian, and he detested “the smelly little orthodoxies” as he called them, by which he meant all the closed systems of thought from Catholicism to communism. His own limitations of thought and feeling, his obsessions and his enthusiasms, were always personal and temperamental rather than partisan and theoretical. (56)

And again Woodcock writes:

He was mainly concerned with the implementation of those fairly general ideas which he brought together under the heading of “decency,” ideas like brotherhood, fair play and honest dealing which he had absorbed from writers like Dickens, but he was not very adept at close political discussion, and he had a temperamental reluctance to think in terms of elaborate social plans or clearly defined party platforms. (28)

His character like this is directly caused by his war experience in Spain. As he said, through the war, he came to believe in the Socialism whose philosophy is basically equality. He wrote he had come to write the works from the side of “democratic Socialism” as he understood after 1936. He does not define what “democratic Socialism” means concretely in his writings. So it is difficult to surmise what it is. But judging from the evidence in *Homage to Catalonia*, we can say his Socialism was based on the viewpoint of individual people and the equality of every people, and at least, not on the scholarly and academic political theory, and we can also say his Socialism emerged from his personal enthusiasm for decency, as pointed out in the above criticisms. But there is one question: in the days before Orwell came to believe in true Socialism based on people's equality and individual human nature, which standpoint did Orwell take? He said that he wrote works from the viewpoint of “democratic Socialism” after 1936; however, before that year, how did Orwell conceptualise his position?

V

Before going to Spain, he visited a northern mining town for collecting data of his article. This trip was made by a request of Victor Gollancz who were well-known as a left-wing published, and continued from the last of January 1936 to the last of March. He wrote the events during his trip in the book *The Road to Wigan Pier*. In this book, he says: "To this you have got to add the ugly fact that most middle-class Socialists, while theoretically pining for a classless society, cling like glue to their miserable fragments of social prestige" (162), he indicates the existing Socialism has already lost one of the original meanings of equality. And again in the same work, he also says:

To the ordinary working man, the sort you would meet in any pub on Saturday night, Socialism does not mean much more than better wages and shorter hours and nobody bossing you about. To the more revolutionary type, the type who is a hunger-marcher and is black-listed by employers, the word is a sort of rallying-cry against the forces of oppression, a vague threat of future violence. But, so far as my experience goes, no genuine working man grasps the deeper implications of Socialism. Often, in my opinion, he is a truer Socialist than the orthodox Marxist, because he does remember, what the other so often forgets, that Socialism means justice and common decency. (163-64)

In the same way as in *Homage to Catalonia*, we can find that Orwell conceived the base of Socialism not in an abstruse theory and doctrine on which "orthodox" people insist, but in individual human decency. For example, in a review for *The Novel Today* by Philip Henderson, published in the *New English Weekly* on 31st December 1936, "The basic trouble with all orthodox Marxists is that", wrote Orwell, "possessing a system which appears to explain everything, they never bother to discover what is going on inside other people's heads" (*CEJL* 1: 290). Here, Orwell points out that orthodox people withdraw only into their thoughts and become such an exclusive group that their thoughts will not be accepted if out of the group. Furthermore, in the letter to Jack Common dated 5th October 1936, he begins with the words "Dear Comrade Common" half-jokingly, and he makes a comment on this: "I hope by the way you share my prejudice against that accursed word 'comrade', which has kept many a likely recruit away from the Socialist movement" (*CEJL* 1: 262). Judging from

the fact that he says: "One had been in a country... where the word 'comrade' stood for comradeship and not, as in most countries, for humbug" as we have seen in *Homage to Catalonia* above (83-84), he thinks of the word "comrade" which he used in the letter to Common as mere a formal word without contents and as a meaningless word.

In this way, before he went to Spain, Orwell had posed questions to the existing Socialism; furthermore, his consciousness of ordinary people's human nature and simple equality of people had already emerged. The Spanish Civil War reconfirmed and solidified Orwell's political consciousness. Before the Spanish war, although Orwell did not have such an unshakable purpose for writing for "democratic Socialism," he had already knew that there was various political powers which forced dreadful life upon common people through his experiences: police service in India, lives in slums, spikes and lower orders, and a trip for gathering material on the depressed areas in the north of England. He wrote many works by using many literary forms in the thirties. It is because he tried to confirm which way was mostly acceptable to tell a reader current political situations. In this sense, we can say that there was the emergence of political consciousness in his mind in the thirties.

Notes

- 1 When he wrote "Why I Write," he had not written *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.
- 2 Cf. Wain's original article, "The Last of George Orwell," *The Twentieth Century* CLV. 923(1954): 71.

Works Consulted

- Orwell, George. *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters*. Eds. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. 4 vols. London: Penguin, 1970. (abbreviated to *CEJL* in this paper)
- . *Down and Out in Paris and London*. 1933. London: Secker & Warburg, 1986.
- . *Burmese Days*. 1934. London: Secker & Warburg, 1986.
- . *A Clergyman's Daughter*. 1935. London: Secker & Warburg, 1986.
- . *Keep the Aspidistra Flying*. 1936. London: Secker & Warburg, 1987.
- . *The Road to Wigan Pier*. 1937. London: Secker & Warburg, 1986.
- . *Homage to Catalonia*. 1938. London: Secker & Warburg, 1986.
- . *Coming Up for Air*. 1939. London: Secker & Warburg, 1986.
- . *Animal Farm*. 1945. London: Secker & Warburg, 1987.

---. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. 1949. London: Secker & Warburg, 1987.

Atkins, John. *George Orwell*. London: Calder, 1954.

Crick, Bernard. *George Orwell: A Life*. New ed. London: Penguin, 1992.

Green, Martin. "British Decency." *Kenyon Review* 21 (1959): 502-532. Rpt. in *A Mirror for Anglo-Saxons*. London: Longman, 1961. 95-127.

Hollis, Christopher. *George Orwell*. London: Hollis, 1956.

Meyers, Jeffrey. *A Reader's Guide to George Orwell*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1984.

Okuyama, Yasuharu. *George Orwell*. Tokyo: Waseda UP, 1983.

Stansky, Peter, and William Abrahams. *The Unknown Orwell*. London: Constable, 1972.

Wain, John. "The Last of George Orwell," *The Twentieth Century* CLV. 923(1954): 71-78.

Woodcock, George. *The Crystal Spirit: A Study of George Orwell*. Boston: Little, 1966.

Zwerdling, Alex. *Orwell and the Left*. London: Yale UP, c1974.