

I. George Orwell and His Fiction in History

George Orwell is a well-known writer of 20th century. He was a British historical political novelist and essayist whose pointed criticisms of political oppression propelled him into prominence towards the middle of the twentieth century. He was born in 1903 to British colonist in Bengal, India, Orwell received his education at a series of private schools including Eton, an elite school in England. As a young man, Orwell became a socialist speaking openly against the excesses of governments east and west and fighting briefly for the socialist cause during the Spanish Civil War which lasted from 1936 to 1939. Through first-hand experience, Orwell saw propaganda and the perversion of history used for the first time as instruments of war. The deliberate distortion of facts by both left and right seemed to Orwell to be even more terrible. Orwell believed the unchecked distortion of objective truth would create far worse situations for mankind than any ideological war ever could.

Unlike many British socialists in the 1930s and 1940s, Orwell was not enamored of the Soviet Union and its policies, nor did he consider the Soviet Union a positive representation of the possibilities of socialist society. He could not turn a blind eye to the cruelties and hypocrisies of Soviet Communist party, which had overturned the semifeudal system of the tsars only to replace it with the dictatorial regime of Joseph Stalin. Orwell became a sharp critic of both capitalism and communism and is remembered chiefly as an advocate of freedom and a committed opponent of communist oppression. His two greatest anti-totalitarian novels – *Animal Farm* and *1984* form the basis of his reputation.

Animal Farm is his historical novel. It tells the story of a political revolution that went wrong. It was a creative awareness of the world as a whole. Orwell regarded

himself as a political writer and through that all his writings are political consciously or unconsciously. In his essay *Why I Write* he states, "No book is genuinely free from political bias. The opinion that art should have nothing to do with politics is itself a political attitude" (102). But this is not very convincing it shows a search for an identity and a self transformation.

The major portion of Orwell's work was produce during the 1930s and 40s, and much of his writing work was done between the two world wars. He took an active part in the British war effort during the Spanish Civil War (1937) and World War II (1939-45). Quite a lot of his writing is concerned with both these wars. Besides his broadcasts from the BBC, Orwell wrote several articles about the war.

World War I brought about major changes in the form of government in several countries. The years following the war was the rise of dictatorship in Germany, Italy and Russia. The Economic Depression after 1929 further worsened the situation. By 1933, Adolf Hitler had assumed dictatorial powers in Germany after initial set backs in his political career. The fascist dictatorship in Italy under Benito Mussolini followed the breakdown of parliamentary government. Thereafter its failure to tackle the political situation after World War I. The parliamentary government was suspended in 1928 and fascist corporative state was established under the dictatorship of Mussolini. In Russia, the autocratic rule of the Czars was abolished after the Great October Revolution of 1917, and the "dictatorship of the proletariat" was established under Lenin. After Lenin's death in 1924 Stalin ran the government by terror.

Propaganda and false reporting, description of the people and the theme of the revolution betrayed, were found most convincing expression in *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty Four*. The Spanish war had a profound effect on Orwell and his

beliefs. As he himself said in his essay: "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, directly or indirectly against totalitarianism and democratic socialism as I understood it." (28)

Historical context of his contemporary period in Russia was bipolar: a tiny minority controlled most of the country's wealth, while the vast majority of the country's inhabitants were impoverished and oppressed peasants. Communism arose in Russia when the nation's workers and peasants, assisted by a class who comprised of concerned intellectuals known as the intelligentsia, rebelled against and overwhelmed the wealthy and powerful class of capitalists and aristocrats. They hoped to establish a socialist utopia based on principles of the German economic and political philosopher Karl Marx.

In *Das Kapital* (capital) Marx advanced an economically deterministic interpretation of human history, arguing that society would naturally evolve—from a monarchy and aristocracy, to capitalism and then on to communism, a system under which all property would be held in common. The dignity of the poor workers oppressed by capitalism would be restored, and all people would live as equals. Marx followed his sober and scholarly work with *The Communist Manifesto* an impassioned call to action that urged. "Workers of the World Unite !"

In Russia of 1917 it appeared that Marx's dreams were to become reality. After a politically complicated civil war, Tsar Nicholas II, the monarch of Russia was forced to abdicate the throne that his family had held for three centuries. Vladimir Ilych Lenin, a Russian intellectual revolutionary, seized power in the name of the communist party. The new regime took land industries from private control and put them under government supervision. This centralization of economic systems

constitute the first steps in resorting Russia to the prosperity it had known before World War I and in modernizing the nation's primitive infrastructure, by bringing electricity to the country side. After Lenin died in 1924 Joseph Stalin and Leon Trotsky jockeyed for control of the newly formed Soviet Union. Stalin, a crafty and manipulative politician soon banished Trotsky an idealistic proponent of international communism. Stalin then began to consolidate his power with brutal intensity, killing or imprisoning his perceived political enemies and overseeing the purge of approximately twenty million Soviet citizen.

Many developments in Soviet history before 1945 are direct parallels in *Animal Farm*: Napoleon ousts Snowball from the farm and after the windmill collapses, uses Snowball in his purge just as Stalin used Trotsky. Similarly, Napoleon becomes a dictator, while Snowball is never heard from again. Orwell was inspired to write *Animal Farm* in part by his experience in a Trotskyist group during the Spanish Civil War, and Snowball certainly receives a more sympathetic portrayal than Napoleon. Though *Animal Farm* was written as an attack on specific government, its general themes oppression, suffering and injustice have far broader application. Modern readers have come to see Orwell's book as a powerful attack on any political, rhetorical or military power that seeks to control human beings unjustly.

The historical events of the twenties and the thirties can be identified as the most painful phase of economic dislocation following the first World War. They were the years of trouble everywhere, of economic depression and widespread unemployment heralded first by the American Wall Street crash of 1929 and then again by the financial and political crisis in England in 1931. The situation helped the rise of fascism and set up an absolute dictatorship in different countries. In this thesis I have made attempts to interpret *Animal Farm* only cursorily vis-à-vis the political

events occurring in Germany, Italy, Spain about the time while reserving a detailed analysis of the historical scene in Russia.

Describing Orwell as a keen observer of the society Andrew Sanders in his book *The Short History of English Literature* says that Orwell is more at home with journalism than his novels:

His early novels *Burmese Days* (1934), *A Clergyman's Daughter* (1935) and *Keep the Aspidistra Flying* (1936), offer a little more than fictional analysis of the narrowness and idiocies of the British at home and abroad, as bring imperialists and even smugger domestic tyrants. It was an investigative social journalist that Orwell's true distinctiveness as a writer emerged. He is an acute observer and a generalization on opened eyed of essentially English fudges and comprises. (461)

Fiction was suitable to his treatment. Though he has made a fusion of history and fiction in his writings, there is an unusual mixture of description and speculation as well. They exhibit multiple themes, plain and rigorous prose. They contain a valuable body of criticism of contemporary period 'faction is the name given to a new genre which derives from earlier fiction. It is the genre of factual novels in which the border line between fiction and reality has been erased. Throwing light on George Orwell as novelist Tom Hopkinson says:

George Orwell was the best writer of reportage and documentary in a gifts of a novelist. He adopted the novel form as it is very close to the newspaper report. Orwell excelled as a journalist, he failed miserably as a novelist. (275)

He took novels because that was the genre popular in 1930's writings. In the words of Tom Hopkinson.

Orwell's reputation as a writer rests largely on his novels but his gifts are not those of a novelist, and, if the novel had not happened to be the prevailing literary form during the twenty years when he was writing, he would probably never have been attracted to it. Orwell had little imagination, little understanding of human relationship, little sympathy with individual human beings though much with humanity in general.

(273)

He was a down-to-earth writer who chose to direct his intelligence and literary skill to some of the things that matter to ordinary people well as to bookish people: problems of war and peace, work and pleasure, and the history of the time he lived in his works are closely connected to the events of his time. David Daiches makes the following remarks:

His autobiographical works, *Down and Out in Paris and London*, the *Road to Wigan Pier* and *Homage to Catalonia*, cut through the sentimentalities of fashionable leftwing reporting by stressing uncomfortable truth ignored by left as well as by right. There is an almost masochistic honesty in his works, for he insisted on living with ills he exposed before exposing them. (1169)

He wrote only about things that he had actually observed so he sought out material he could write about and used every experience of his life in books. He commented very directly on the society and times in which he lived, and his strong feelings about social injustice and oppression were the main motivating forces behind all his writings, whether essays, pieces of journalism, novels or semi-autobiographical documentaries. In his *A Critical History of English Literature*.

Review of Literature

Animal Farm is seen as a highly successful book in transmuting historical writing into an art form. It is generally seen as an attack on dictatorship of a small group of people and, in particular, the Soviet communist rule under Stalin. Many left-wing readers who were Orwell's admirers became angry with the content of the novel while others welcomed and praised it. He made to things clear in the story: first, the various episodes are taken from the actual history of Russian Revolution, and second, the complete reconciliation of the pigs and the humans in the end (what most of critics found) was not his intention. What he meant was to end on a loud note of discord.

Graham Greene reviewed Animal Farm in Standard Evening (10 Aug. 1945) as "a satire upon the totalitarian state and one state in particular" (195). Greene views the fable as "The story of a political experiment on a farm" where the animals "get organized and eventually drive out Mr. Jones, the human owner" (195). Commenting on the novel as "a sad fable," Greene writes "If it is an indication of Mr. Orwell's fine talent that it is really and sad-not a mere echo of human failings at one remove" (195).

Kingsley Martin writes, in *Nation and New Statesman* (8 Sep. 1945), it is a "satire, beautifully written and amusing," which if not observed merely as "a fair corrective of much silly worship of the Soviet Union," gives him an idea that Orwell "is reaching the exhaustion of idealism and approaching the bathos of cynicism" (198). Martin says, "In a world choked everywhere with suffering, cruelty and exploitation, the disillusioned idealist may be embarrassed by the rich choice of objects for denunciation" (197). And referring to *Animal Farm*, he writes "In Stalin he finds the latest incarnation of Evil" (198). Martin says the surface moral of the story is "all would have gone well with the revolution if the wicked Stalin had not driven the brave and good Trotsky out of Eden" (198). With this, Martin says, Orwell "ruins

what should have been a refract piece of satire on human life,." and invites every kind of historical and factual objection by "putting the Stalin-Trotsky struggle in the centre" (198). If we take that the revolution had failed under Stalin, it would have failed, under Trotsky, by another route. Martin, summing up his review, says: "If we read the satire as a gibe at the failings of the USSR and realize that it is historically false and neglectful of the complex truth about Russia, we shall enjoy it and be grateful for our laugh" (199).

Isaac Rosenfeld reviewed *Animal Farm* in *Nation* (7 Sep. 1946). To Rosenfeld it is "a brief barnyard history of the Russian Revolution from October to just beyond the Stalin-Hitler pact" (201). Rosenfeld, viewing the novel as 'a disappointing piece of work,' says, "The facts are straight, and all the wieldy ones are there; the interpretation, within these limits, is plain and true. The implicit moral attitude toward the real historical events is one of an indignation . . ." (202).

Rosenfeld regards its political relevance 'more apparent than real,' and says, "There are only two motives operating in the parable [. . .]; one of them, a good one, Snowball's, is defeated, and the only other, the bad one, Napoleon's, succeeds, presumably because history belongs to the most unscrupulous" (203).

Edmund Wilson reviewed *Animal Farm* in *New Yorker* (7 Sep. 1946). He takes the novel as "a satirical animal fable about the progress-or-backsliding-of the Russian Revolution" (204). He says, "the truth is that it is absolutely first-rate" (205). Examining Orwell's literary devices employed in *Animal Farm* he says:

Mr. Orwell has worked out his theme with a simplicity, a wit, and a dryness that are closer to La Fontaine and Gay, and has written in a prose so plain and spare, so admirably proportioned to his purpose, that

Animal Farm even seems very creditable if we compare it with
Voltaire and Swift. (205)

Animal Farm has been seen as a powerful satire directed against dictatorship. All satirists have a specific target to attack. So was the case with Orwell and his *Animal Farm*. Orwell was greatly shocked by the purges in Spain and Russia (1936). These two events occurring at about a time at different ends of Europe proved to be the seeds of *Animal Farm*. Orwell was more concerned with Russian events than the Spanish ones. He was determined to expose the excesses of Stalin's Rule, and that has successfully been done in *Animal Farm*.

Orwell's *Animal Farm* is a beast fable and most of the important characters are in animal skin. The story is conceived and written in the classic tradition of satire – the tradition of receding planes, which gives it precisely the depth of every reader. *Animal Farm* is an irony by analogy in which the major character and events have been identified with Russian leaders and events. In other words the novel is Russian history where only dates and names are fictional. The theme of the novel involves the rule of terror and lies.

Thus this thesis study aims to prove that Orwell's projection of reality in the fictional elements unravels the conflict of the contemporary society, there by question the authenticity of documented official history so as to blur the boundary between fiction and history. The novel allegorically illustrates the essential horror of human condition, violent conspirational revolution, lead by unconsciously power hunger people of its contemporary society.

Synopsis of Animal Farm

The story takes place on a farm somewhere in England. The story is told by an all-knowing narrator in the third person. The action of this novel starts when the oldest pig on the farm, Old Major, calls all animals to a secret meeting. He tells them about his dream of a revolution against the cruel Mr. Jones. Three days later Major dies, but the speech gives the more intelligent animals a new outlook on life. The pigs, who are considered the most intelligent animals, instruct the other ones. During the period of preparation two pigs distinguish themselves. Napoleon and Snowball.

Napoleon is big, and although he isn't a good speaker, he can assert himself. Snowball is a better speaker, he has a lot of ideas and he is very vivid. Together with another pig called Squealer, who is a very good speaker, they work out the theory of "Animalism." The rebellion starts some months later, when Mr. Jones comes home drunk one night and forgets to feed the animal. They break out of the barns and run to the house, where the food is stored. When Mr. Jones sees this he takes out his shotgun, but it is too late for him; all the animals fall over him and drive him off the farm. The animals destroy all whips, nose rings, reins, and all other instruments that have been used to suppress them. The same day the animals celebrate their victory with an extra ration of foods. The pigs make up the seven commandments, and they write them above the door of the big barn.

The animals also agree that no animal shall ever enter the farmhouse, and that no animal shall have contact with humans. This commandments are summarized in the simple phrase: "Four legs good, two legs bad." After some time, Jones comes back with some other men from the village to recapture the farm. The animals fight bravely, and they manage to defend the farm. Snowball and Boxer receive medals of honour for defending the farm so bravely. Also Napoleon, who had not fought at all,

takes a medal. This is the reason why the two pigs, Snowball and Napoleon, often argue.

When Snowball presents his idea to build a windmill, to produce electricity for the other animals, Napoleon calls nine strong dogs. The dogs drive Snowball from the farm, and Napoleon explains that Snowball was in fact co-operating with Mr. Jones. He also explains that Snowball in reality never had a medal of honour, that Snowball was always trying to cover up that he was fighting on the side of Mr. Jones. The animals then start building the windmill, and as time passes the working-time goes up, whereas the food rations decline. Although the "common" animals have not enough food, the pigs grow fatter and fatter. They tell the other animals that they need more food, for they are managing the whole farm.

Some time later, the pigs explain to the other animals that they have to trade with the neighbouring farms. The common animals are very upset, because since the revolution there has been a resolution that no animal shall trade with a human. But the pigs ensure them that there never has been such a resolution, and that this was an evil lie of Snowball. Shortly after this decision the pigs move to the farmhouse. The other animals remember that there is a commandment that forbids sleeping in beds, and so they go to the big barn to look at the commandments. When they arrive there they can't believe their eyes, the fourth commandment has been changed: "No animal shall sleep in bed *with sheets*" And the other commandments have also been changed: "No animal shall kill another animal without reason", and "No animal shall drink alcohol in excess." Some months later a heavy storm destroys the windmill, which is nearly finished.

Napoleon accuses Snowball of destroying the mill, and he promises a reward to the animal that gets Snowball. The rebuilding of the mill takes two years. Again

Jones attacks the farm, and although the animals defend it, the windmill is once again destroyed. The pigs decide to rebuild the mill again, and they cut down the food rations to a minimum. One day Boxer breaks down. He is sold to a butcher, but Napoleon tells the pigs that Boxer has been brought to a hospital where he has died. Three years later, the mill is finally completed.

During this time Napoleon deepens the relations with the neighboring farm, and one day Napoleon even invites the owners of this farm for an inspection. They sit inside the farmhouse and celebrate the efficiency of this farm, where the animals work very hard with a minimum of food. During this celebration, all the other animals meet at the window of the farm, and when they look inside they can't distinguish between man and animal.

II. Concept of History, New Historicism and Historiography

Concept of History

History is a Greek word which means enquiry, research, exploration or information. The Greeks were the earliest to define history. Dionysius gave us the idea that history is philosophy teaching by examples. By this he makes clear that history offers us the essence of human experience whose study has universal value. When lessons are drawn from real life, and when these lessons are ordered to form a coherent whole, we have history. It includes the growth of human mind in which the unique facts of life are collected, classified and interpreted in a scientific way.

Aristotle remarks "history contrasts research into the facts, with the logical task of explanation. Things in history are related to one another in a systematic and permanent manner, forming the entire story of man into one integrated whole" (Qtd. in Ali 3). Aristotle further suggests that history is an account of the unchanging past in the sense that human nature doesn't change. And that all activities that originate with the same intentions and motives differ only in the degree of details and not in their basic nature. Thus wars, conquests, expansion and exploitation are a constant factor in history although every age and every country had its own technique to achieve the objective. So history is related to something changing as opposed to something constant.

Now, history is the record of those events which indicate the growth of mans mind, man's intelligence, and how he used them to discover better ways of living, and to build up orderly societies which we call civilization or culture. Culture is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, customs and any other capabilities acquired by man as a member of societies. Therefore, history is not only a body of ideas supplying with example but it is a study of the forces social, political,

economic and psychological that shape the course of human progress. History is a noble subject that deals with the story of the past. This story should be properly examined analyzed and explained in the most intelligible and fascinating way. In other words the proper understanding of man by man is the business of history, which it does by narrating man's unique ideas, thoughts and deeds.

New Historicism

New historicism emerged in early 1980s as a turn to history in literary studies after the formalism of new criticism, structuralism and deconstruction. In place of dealing with a text in isolation from its historical context, new historicists attend primarily to the historical and cultural conditions of its production, its meanings, its effects, and also of its later critical interpretation and evaluations. The views and practices of the new historicists differ markedly from those of former scholars who had adverted to social and intellectual history as a background against which to set a work of literature as an independent entity or had viewed literature as a reflection of the world view characteristics of a period.

New historicists conceive of a literary text as situated within the institutions, social practices, and discourses that constitute the overall culture of particular time and place, and with which the literary text interacts as both a product and a producer of cultural energies and codes. Thus, new historicists seek to identify hitherto unacknowledged contexts of semiotic exchange between literary and cultural history. Michael Foucault views that:

New historicism represents a sustained negotiation of those complex cultures, textual and political forces which intervene between present and past, then and now. Its central problem has thus to do dissociation. On the one hand, the part must be minimally intelligible for history to

bear any meaning at all, on the other, intelligible always remains relative to the conditions in which interpretations are made. (59)

New historicism conjectures historical and literary vocabulary as they render power visible and enable marginal or unheard voices to emerge. Although new historicists borrow quite freely from diverse works in cultural history, Marxism, psychoanalyses, theories of language and semiotics, the three key influences behind this approach to literature are the French historian of discourse Michael Foucault, the American social anthropologist Clifford Geertz and the revisionist Marxist thinker, Louis Althusser.

Foucault argued, in studies of the histories of 'madness', 'medicine', 'representation', 'punishment' and 'sexuality', that socially organizing vocabularies voiced and guaranteed by powerful institutions, have constituted the body of knowledge which constitutes western subjectivity. Michael Foucault views that:

The discourse of an era, instead of reflecting preexisting entities and orders, brings into being the concepts, oppositions, and hierarchies of which it speaks: that these elements are both products and propagators of power, or social forces; and that as a result, the particular discursive formations of an era determine what is at the time accounted knowledge and truth, as well as what is considered to be humanly normal as against what is considered to be criminal, or insane, or sexually deviant. (61)

Clifford Geertz views that a culture is constituted by distinctive set of signifying systems. His use of culture is constituted by distinctive sets of signifying systems and his use of what he calls "thick descriptions", "the close analysis or reading, or particular social production or event so as to recover the meaning it has for the people involved in it, as well as discover within the cultural system, the general pattern of

conventions, codes and modes of thinking that invest the item with those meanings" (63).

Louis Althusser views that ideology manifests itself in different ways in the discourse of each of the semi-autonomous institution of an era, including literature and also the ideology operates covertly to form and position the users of language a subjective in a discourse that of the ruling classes. Stephen Greenblatt inaugurated the current level of new historicism in his introduction to a special issue of *Genre*, Volume 15 (1982). He prefers, however, to call his own critical enterprise cultural poetics, in order to highlight his concern with literature and the arts as integral with other social practices that, in their complex interactions, make up the general culture of an era. Greenblatt's essay entitled "Invisible Bullets in Shakespearean Negotiations" (1988) serves to exemplify the interpretive procedures of a leading exponent of this mode of criticism. Greenblatt begins by reading a selection from Thomas Harriot's *A Brief and true Report of Virginia* (1588) as a representative discourse of the English colonizers of America which, without its author's awareness, serves to confirm "the Machiavellian hypothesis of the origin to princely power in forces and fraud, yet nonetheless draws its' audience irresistibly towards the celebration of power (187). Greenblatt also asserts that "Harriot tests the English power structure that he attests by recording in his *Report* the count or voices of the American Indians who are being appropriated and oppressed by that power" (187).

He identifies parallel modes of power-discourse and counter discourse in the dialogues in Shakespeare's different dramas what he finds, the dialogue and events of dramas "reveal the degree to which princely power is based on predation, calculation, deceit and hypocrisy, at the same time, the plays do not scruple to record the dissonant and subversive voices of Elizabethan subcultures" (188). His thesis is that,

in order to sustain its power, any durable political and cultural order not only to some degree allows, but actively fosters subversive elements and forces, yet in such a way as more effectively to contain such challenges to the existing order. This view of the general triumph of containment over the forces of subversion has been criticized as pessimistic and quietest by new historicist who insist on the capacity of subversive ideas and practices including those manifested in their own critical writing to effect drastic social changes.

Feminist approaches to early modern literature have maintained a cautious, somewhat skeptical dialogue with new-historicism while sharing its concern to recover the marginal, excluded and oppressed. Notably, Lisa Jardine's *Still Harping on Daughters: Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare* (1983) took something of via media between these polarities, arguing that women experienced an increased domestic responsibility under Puritanism proportionate to their decline in power, "Such study underlined the need for close, nuanced investigations into the historical situations and experiences of women in Renaissance society and literature" (qtd. in Wolf, Christ, Norris eds., 65). So, feminist historicism, must provide a sustainable critique of the political tendency to deny responsibility for the oppressed and to transfer to them culpability for their predicament.

Neither a school of critical thought nor a movement nor indeed even a methodology- new historicism remains difficult to be pinned down. Unease about its very name even among so-called practitioners warrants caution when summarizing its concerns. If the version containment debate is now regarded as sterile, it is yet nuclear as to what a more sufficient and flexible vocabulary for literary historical analysis would look like:

The anti-humanist drift of much theory associated with Lacan, Althusser and Foucault - all to some extent precursors of new historicism - has tended to write off the possibility of human agency, or at least circumscribe it heavily amid wider structures of language, ideology and discourse. (69)

Lisa Jardine's work notwithstanding, remains a critical problem for those who read for signs of opposition or contestation. No consensus seems yet to have emerged as to the after which new historicism awaits, though the ethical considerations it has raised may sustain the dialogue between Marxists, Humanists and feminists in future debates. But perhaps new historicism's most enduring legacy will be its recognition that languages, discourses, vocabularies - call them what we will - work powerfully as effects and echoes in cultural history beyond the particular moment of their articulation. And that where those effects and echoes align in the very contingencies of language - in the unexpected contexts, fragments and anecdotes - the inequalities harbored in those discourses are most sharply disclosed. It also makes possible to some degree of insight into the power configuration, especially in the aspect of class, gender, race, and ethnicity that prevail in the historicist's present culture.

Historiography

Historiography can refer to two separate notions about the study of history. In a broad sense, it can refer to the methodology and practices of writing history, in a more specific sense, it can refer to writing 'about' rather than 'of' history. At a meta-level analysis of descriptions of the past, this latter concept can relate to the former in that the analysis usually focuses on the narrative, interpretations, worldview, use of evidence, and the methods of presentation of other historians. The term can also be used of a body of historical writing; e. g. 'medieval historiography'.

The study of historiography demands a critical approach that goes beyond the mere examination of historical fact, "Historiographical studies consider the source, often by researching the author, his or her position in society, and the type of history being written at the time".(1). Historiography that is considered controversial or extreme is often pejoratively labeled as historical revisionism.

Introspection about their own location in society has not been too common among historians. The historiographical essay tends to become bibliographies, surveys of trends or movements within the academic guild, "They turn around debates about assumptions, methods, and ideological positions. Through these, historians get pigeon-holed into slots: Neo-colonial, Nationalist, Communal, Marxist, and Subaltern" (1). The existence of not one but many levels of historical awareness attracts much less attention. But outside the world of metropolitan centers of learning and research there are provincial universities and colleges, schoolteacher, and immensely varied student population, and, beyond these, vast numbers more or less untouched by formal courses, yet with notions about history and remembrance of the things past, the nature and origins of which it could be interesting to explore what is neglected is the whole question of the conditions of production and reception of academic knowledge, its relationship with different kinds of common sense.

There are so many arguments about the historiographical facts and its impact upon the tribe in which the research is leading towards. What is the quest for historical facticity has revealed is that history of own kind or another has come to occupy a position of exceptional importance in a variety of Native-American discourses, but that is the molding of many histories the best scholars often have a vary limited role, "Historical consciousness, even then fairly organized, systematic, and far from spontaneous, evidently cannot be equated with the thinking of

professional historians alone, still less with that of its highest echelons" (2). Both the importance of history and its multiple levels require further movement.

Some present explanations, relating to the combination of production and disseminations of historical awareness in today's America, are fairly obvious, and helpful—up to a point. The leading members of historians' guild write and teach mainly in English for interregional and international communication. The majority of universities and colleges have applied the regional languages and the historical common sense of the bulk of students and teachers is determined much more by textbooks of very poor quality, or media influences. After Independence history, and particularly narratives of the freedom struggle or the national movement, became a major means of legitimizing ruling groups in the postcolonial nation-state through claims of continuity with glorious past, "A very electric range of national heroes therefore had to be projected as knights in shining armour, abstracted from real life contradictions and contextual pressures"(2). Through the media and the majority schools, the message that has been constantly broadcast is that history is valuable because it stimulates pride in one's country. The other meaning of history, in these days of objective tests and proliferating quiz culture, is of random facts and dates that have to be efficiently memorized. Patriotism and quiz culture combine to ensure a very low priority, in the bulk of history-teaching to techniques of critical evaluation of narratives about the past and the development of questioning attitudes. History, in after words, tend to become histography, and this opens the way towards giving topography to the present-day status and aura of history.

Late-colonial histories were generally written by teachers for students or general readers. Very many of the topmost professional scholars also produced textbooks, and most of them published original works both in English and in

indigenous languages. There was therefore much less of gap that is evident now between the best and the worst or even average histories, "But it would be dangerous to romanticize: inadequate funding for full-time research, confinement within national or regional parameters in the absence of opportunities for wider contacts, the restrictive aspects of a nationalistic paradigm shot through with unstated class and high-class assumptions, all exerted a price"(3). The best scholarship of those times, with rare exceptions, appears unacceptably, limited, parochial and unselfquestioning today.

Post-independence historiographical developments, in contrast, have been marked by a dialectic which simultaneously enhanced standards vastly at elite levels, while paying for too little attention of histories being taught to the majority of college and school students as well as diffused through other means among the general public. "Advanced historical research has come to have as its intended audience one's academic peer-group, research student of the best universities, and, increasingly, international conferences"(3). Meanwhile the not very seriously dated historiography of a past generation has kept on getting reproduced and disseminated in diluted and crude forms, at other, inferiorized and neglected levels.

Recent struggles and debates around the rather tentative concept of multiculturalism in the western democracies have often fuelled discussion of minority histories. As the writing of history has increasingly become entangled with the so-called politics and production of identity after the Second World War, the questions has arisen in all democracies of including in the history of the nation the histories of groups previously excluded. In the 1960s, this list usually contained names of subaltern social groups and classes like former slaves, working classes, convicts, women, etc. This comes to be known in seventies as "history from below"

(Chakravarty 15). This tendency further increased as the history of minority during eighties and the historians had fought the exclusions and omissions of mainstream narratives of the nation. By the very result, a cult of pluralism developed and the concept of hierarchy is shattered. Minority histories, thus, succeeded to get identity as the mainstream literature.

Nietzsche and Genealogy

German born philosopher Fredrick Nietzsche was one of the major contributors in the re-evaluation of western metaphysics. He opposed the linear history, which saw itself as tracing the development to culmination, implicitly outside of time, and based on the belief of an eternal truth, a standpoint from which all can be measured. He argued that everything that was thought to be immortal must be placed within history. He questioned the hitherto existing belief about history as unquestioningly and absolutely true. He defined history as a human construction that evolves from interpretation, theorizing, inference from data and record and subjective biases of the individuals who make it up. He radically rejects the traditional idea of history (which was continuous) in his book *On the Uses and Abuses of History for Life*.

At the time of Nietzsche's birth (1844), Hegel's ideas flourished all over the Europe. Hegel's idea was that human beings are moving towards a point of perfection, which he calls the teleological point. Hegel and other idealist thinkers of that time thought that every movement is a new movement and every experience of life is new experience. Nietzsche's idea of historiography radically opposed such idea and conception about time and history. He charges Hegelian idea of being too abstract and says that there is no such superimposed idea that humanity in general is heading towards perfection. Idealist thinkers think of the 'origin' as the place of plenitude,

presence and truth. But Nietzschean archeology can find the residual traces of malice, theft, greed and disparity at the start of human history. In other words s/he discovers that a full prefigures and disfigures the purity of Genesis. This idea of genesis of unadulterated origins is shown as a supplement, or as a mythical compensation for an originary lack. Nietzsche writes, "We wish to awaken to the feeling of man's sovereignty by showing his divine birth: this faith is now forbidden, since a monkey stands at the entrance" (qtd. in Foucault, 79).

Nietzsche perceives the idealist's negation of impulse not more than a fallacy and says human creature is instinctively animalistic and lives basically on impulses. In fact, despite the suppression of the natural energies, the reality is that human beings make the best possible progress when all their potentials, the so called evils as those good are exploited. He celebrated the neglected aspects of things, which were supposed to be evil, immoral, and irrational and so on.

Nietzsche's destructive endeavor directly foreshadows the method and intent of contemporary deconstructive philosophy which scavenges in the forgotten archives of western humanism to reveal its suppressed inadequacies, ruptures and paradoxes. For Nietzsche, the outset of all emancipatory social discourse betrays the shared origins of morality and immorality.

The idealist's tendency to privilege the so-called rational is sharply criticized in his famous magnum opus *The Birth of Tragedy*. Here he has made a division between two modes of life: Apollonian and Dionysian. The Apollonian stands for order, clarity, reason etc. whereas Dionysian impulses the excitement of life of intoxication, chaos, darkness, madness and other irrational forces. He emphasized the importance of Dionysian impulses to live a healthy life that was neglected by the idealist philosophers. The contemporary supposition of history as the representation

of truth no longer existed in Nietzsche because he says life can never be understood in terms of ultimate truths. He thought that the proper creative use of history is the only useful use of it; otherwise it kills or destroys humanity in the long run. Reality is all the time revealed by suffering.

Nietzsche's critique of historicism confronts with Hegelian idea. Against the idealists' assumption that the historical process is a rational process which, in Hegel's time, has ended in a absolute movement in Zenith, Nietzsche asserts that the historical process neither is nor can be finished since the completion of history is not merely impossible but undesirable because it would lead to a degeneration of man and that history is not a rational process but is full of blindness and injustice.

It might, thus, appear that Nietzsche simply affects a return to a pre-Hegelian viewpoint which counters history as a realm of chance rather than a dimension of meaning. However, it does not mean that there is no point in which Nietzsche agrees with Hegel. His criticism on Hegel is based on a crucial area of agreement with Hegel. The implication of history for Nietzsche is not escape from the present or to deviate from life and action rather their service in the form of life and action rather their service. In the forewords of his 1873 text Nietzsche asserts:

We need history for life and action, not for a comfortable turning away from life and action or merely for glossing over the egotistical life it and the cowardly bad acts. We wish to use history only insofar as it serves living. But there is a degree of doing history and a valuing of it through which life atrophies and degenerates. (1)

In this essay, the issue of historicity is central. He begins this essay with the consideration of the animal life. According to Nietzsche what distinguishes human beings from animals is the awareness of history. Animals forget each moment as soon as it passes. Man remembers the past and can not escape from it. Every time man lives

with the awareness of history. Such awareness of the past and the passing of the time make man to suffer. If man does not forget the past, it causes unhappiness in him for he would see only the flux and change and would have no fixed twits by which to take his bearings.

But the problem with the man is that it is not possible to live without a memory of the past. Therefore, it needs man to maintain a balance between remembering and forgetting which is most conducive to him to live as a man. If such balance is not maintained, it causes pain and suffering to man. Being a man, one cannot enjoy the forgetting as animals do. Such historical knowledge of man is surrounded by unhistorical atmosphere that limits his atmosphere, which envelop man if he is to endure.

Although Nietzsche has entitled essay as "Use and Abuse of History" he concerns more with abuses than the uses. He submits three kinds of way to analyze history. He names them as Monumental, Antiquarian and Critical history. He further clarifies how history can be misused in all the aforementioned ways of analysis.

Monumental history concerns with the creation of model of past greatness but deserves the potential danger to overshadow the greatness of present. This means the misuse of Monumental history makes man neglect the present in which he is living, for the sake of past. The reverence for the past which antiquarian history fosters cannot stultify the present. So we can say that the misuse of antiquarian history carries the danger to be uprooted. Critical history, although contains less chances to be misused is also not completely safe. It may fail to realize the extent to which men are the result of the past they seek to condemn. Nietzsche asserts the potential flaw of critical history:

For when its past is analyzed critically, then we grasp with a knife at its rots and go cruelly beyond all reverence. It is always a dangerous process, that is, dangerous process for life itself. And people or ages serving life in this way, by judging and destroying a past, are always dangerous and in danger. For since we are now the products of their aberrations, passions, mistakes and even crimes. (31)

Nietzsche, thus, challenges the pursuit of origin and absolute truth. His desire is to capture the exact essence of things, their purest possibilities and their carefully protected identities because this search assumes the existence of immobile for us that precede the external world of accident and success. To disclose an original identity, Nietzsche asks to go with every kind of mask. History for him is a discontinuous process. Nietzsche's three modalities of history are the best modalities for a true genealogist through which they can find the causes of what are not brought into light and ignored instances. So, genealogy defines those instances when they remained unrealized.

Literature and History

An awareness of the voices of 'other' excluded by dominant conceptions of gender, race, class or institution needs to be brought back to a recognition of the forces—historical if nothing else—which have shaped that exclusion. And so we return to a sense of the importance of history as an accessible reality. Yet, the relationship between literary or dramatic texts and history, understood as a specific history of events, is inevitably difficult to define within a changing present, especially when that present involves the kind of extreme situations faced by many during the twentieth century, a time of extraordinary crisis and pressure that prompted, for example, Walter Benjamin's famous remark: "There is no document of civilization

which is not at the same time a document of barbarism"(433). A key figure in the development of a more open approach to historical and cultural phenomena, Benjamin draw on both Marxism and the Jewish tradition of messianic mysticism to propose provocative new ways of thinking about writing, narrative, and history. Hayden White analyses the possibilities in a way that has led to "the relativist Post Structuralism position according to which historical documents become simply texts among texts. While historians may believe their narratives to be objective their narration itself cannot escape the implications of 'textuality': that is, of the medium of language"(Said 433). By deconstructing historian's texts, White claims to show how they are silently organized according to familiar narrative and hence fictive patterns, such as 'plot'.

According to Paul de Man, for whom all language is figurative or metaphorical, critics tend to be blinded by the links they perceive or think they perceive, between reality and writing an insight bringing other paradoxes. Such as that: modernity denies the past while depending utterly up on it, "De Man has been attacked for his wartime journalism, implying a strand of Pro-Nazism that some think explains his enthusiasms for the anti-referential bias of 'deconstruction'. By a further paradox, both supporters and attackers of de Man rely on a referential conception of history" (434).

The true picture of past flits by the time being. The past can be seized only as an image which flashed up the instant when it can be recognized and is never seen again, "The truth is not run away from us" in the historical outlook of historicism these words of Goffried Keller mark the exact point here historical materialism cuts through historicism" (434).

History comes along with the victor. And all rulers are the heirs of those who conquered before them. Hence, empathy with the victor invariably benefits the rulers.

Historical materialists know what that means. Whoever has emerged victorious participates to this day in the triumphal procession in which the present rulers step over those who are lying prostrate. Accordingly the traditional practice, the spoils are carried along in the procession. They are called cultural treasure and a historical materialist views them with cautious detachment.

If the history book is a contribution to social history, the objective of study is the past, and will wish to retain the true facts and the valid analysis, confirmed by the work of others, and throw away the rest. Such an approach clearly believes that the past is knowable we no longer believe, now, that such knowing is unproblematic; the days of positivist history—how it actually happened—are now over, and it has become a commonplace to argue that, "history cannot give us direct access to objective facts, since the ideology and the verbal strategies of the historian will determine what he chooses to notice and how he describes it, to say nothing of the connections between events that we then establish" (43 7). In fact, the reaction against positivism is now so strong that we are often told that to regard a text the condition as a response to the society it purports to be describing is outmoded and naive, for history is simply the result of the writing and, even more, the ideology of the historian. This would mean that the past is unknowable. Since what happened a moment ago belongs to the past, it is hard to credit that such an extreme view is tenable, yet it is often stated.

III. Fictionalizing the History in *Animal Farm*

Animal Farm is a historical novel. It parallels with the Russian Revolution, many readers have assumed that the novella's central importance lies in its exposure and critique of a particular political philosophy and practice, Stalinism. In fact Orwell intended to critique Stalinism as merely one instance of the broader social phenomenon of totalitarianism which he saw of work throughout the world. In fascist Germany (under Adolf Hitler) and Spain (under Francisco Franco) in capitalist America and in his native England, as well as in the Soviet Union. The broader applicability of the story manifests itself in details such as the plot's setting – England, other details refers to political movements in the other countries as well. The Animals' song "Beast of England" for example parodies the "Internationale" the communist anthem written by 'Paris Commune' of 1871.

Communist Revolution in Russia reflected in *Animal Farm*

Orwell's *Animal farm* aims to show the dictatorship of a small group of people that seeks to annihilate all other groups. In this sense this thesis mainly focus on historical treatment of Soviet Communist rule. With Russian history in mind, the Manor farm represents Russia under the part-feudal, part-capitalist system of the tsars. The animals of the Manor farm represent the workers and peasants of Russia, in whose name the Russian Revolution's leader's first struggled. Boxer and Clover, in particular embody the aspects of the working class that facilitate the participation of the working class in Revolution: their capacity for hard work, loyalty to each other, and lack of clear philosophical direction opens them up to the more educated class' manipulation. The pigs play the role of Bolsheviks who organized and controlled the Russian Revolution. Squealer creates propaganda similar to that spread by revolutionaries via official organs such as the communist party newspaper Pravda.

Moses embodies the Russian Orthodox Church, weakening the peasants sense of revolutionary outrage by promising a utopia in the after life, Animal's Revolution against Mr. Jones represents the October Revolution of 1917 and the civil war is represented by Jones's attempts to recapture his lost farm. The important animal characters – Napoleon and Snowball represent Joseph Stalin and Leon Trotsky respectively. The old major is the composite of Marx and Lenin.

Marx and Engels studied the history of mankind and discovered the motive force of social advancement, mankind is not immobile and everything in the world is undergoing constant change. According to them, in a capitalist society the rich exploit the working class people. The old major in Animal farm like Marx, in course of interpreting his dream, perceives the true relation between the animals and their human masters. Orwell represents the exploitation prevailing on the farm when the old Major says:

Now, Comrads, 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 well keep the breath in our bodies and those of us who are of it are forced to work to the last atom of our strength; and the very in stand that our usefulness has come to an end we are slaughtered with hideous cruelty. No animal in England knew the meaning of happiness or leisure after he is a years old. No animal in England is free. The life of an animal is misery and slavery; that is the plan truth. (3)

Marxism shows that capitalists take advantage of the working class people. The capitalists do not do the physical work themselves. But they take control of the means of production and wealth of the whole country. Orwell further presents the situation

stating how the working class people have been exploited by their human master.

Drawing the lively picture of the situation on the Minor farm, Major presents the scene in colloquial words:

Man is the only creature that consumes without producing. He does not give milk, he does not lay eggs, he too weak to pull the plough, he cannot run fast enough to catch rabbits. Yet he is lord of all the animals. He sets them to work, he gives back to them the bare minimum that will prevent them from starving, and the rest he keeps for himself. Our labour tills the soil, our dung fertilises, it and yet there is not one hat I see before me, how many thousand of gallons of milks have you given during this last year? And what has happened to that milk which should have been breeding up sturdy calves. Every drop of it has gone down the throats of our enemies. (4)

Exploitation reaches its height. Then the working class can no longer tolerate the exploitation and oppression and yet every turn it clashes with the principal enemy-the capitalist class. And the struggle between them mounts steadily communist leaders make the repetitive use of the slogan "Workers of all countries unite !" They say there should be perfect unity and perfect commandship among the working class people, and their single goal is the overthrow of the exploitation class from power so in the situation in Animal Farm: "There comrades, is the answer to all our problems. It is summed up in a single word – man. Man is the only real enemy we have. Remove man from the scene, and the root cause of hunger and overwork is abolished forever." (4)

Marxism says the struggle and violence are inevitable for the overthrow of the exploiters. Echoing the same idea the old Major says that rebellion of the animal is

inevitable for the overthrow of their human oppressors. The old Major inspires and instruct other animals for the rebellion. Old Major says:

Why, work night and day, body and soul, for the overthrow of the human race ! That is my message to you comrades: Rebellion ! I do not know when that Rebellion will come, it might be in a week or in a hundred years, but I know, or surely as I see this straw beneath my feet, that sooner or later justice will be done . . . pass on this message of me in to those who come after you so that future generation shall carry on the struggle until it is victorious. (5)

The old major dreams the existence of Animal Republic as Marx envisioned a communist society. The old major presents the picture of the Animal Republic in front of the other animal where, he says:

Bright will shine the fields of England,
Paper shall its waters be
Sweeter yet shall blow its breezes
On the day that set us free. (7)

Two young boars named Napoleon and Snowball and another fat pig named Squealer elaborate old major's teachings into a complete system of thought, to which they give the name of Animalism. When the incapable farmers Mr. Jones falls asleep, the animals, several night a week, hold the secret meetings in the barn at which the pigs expound the principles of Animalism to the others. Then the animals break in the door of the store-shed and begin to help themselves from the bins. Quoting Orwell's description of the animals' uprising against their human master we have:

The next moment he and his men were in the store-shed with whips in their hands, lashing out in all directions. With one accord, through

nothing of the kind had been planned before hand, they flung themselves upon their tormenters. John and his men suddenly found themselves being butted and kicked from all sides. The situation was quite out of their control. (12)

The pigs explain that by their studies of the past three months they have succeeded in reducing the principles of Animalism to seven commandments which form an unalterable law by which all animals on Animal Farm (Snowball has just pointed out the name MANOR FARM and in its place has painted ANIMAL FARM) must live for ever after.

The seven commandments:

1. Whatever goes upon two legs is an enemy.
2. Whatever goes upon four legs or has wings is a friend.
3. No animal shall wear clothes.
4. No animal shall sleep in a bed
5. No animal shall drink alcohol
6. No animal shall kill any other animal
7. All animals are equal. (15)

Mr. Jones, the owner of the farm has been driven out. Now the farm is of animal's but situation is different. There is the struggle for leadership. There are stormy debates between Napoleon and Snowball over the farm's sowing policy, over the defense, policy, and over the building of the windmill. The struggle is finally settled down by Napoleon's possession of the savage dogs which wag their tails to him as their predecessors used to do to Mr. Jones, and which finally chase Snowball off the farm. Once this has happened Napoleon becomes a further elite of one within the elite itself. Orwell writes:

Napoleon, with the dogs following him, now mounted on to the raised portion of the floor where major had previously stood to deliver his speech. He announced that from now on the sandy morning meetings would come to an end In future all questions relating to the working of the farm would be settled by a special committee of pigs, presided over by himself. (34)

It shows the Napoleon's corrupt and power hunger motivations. He openly and unabashedly seizes power for himself, banishes Snowball with no reason and justification and shows a bald-faced willingness to rewrite history in order to further his own ends. Similarly, Stalin forced Trotsky from Russia and seized control the country after Lenin's death. Orwell's experience in a persecuted Trotskyist political group in the late 1930s during the Spanish Civil War may have contributed to his comparatively positive portrayal of Snowball. Trotsky was eventually murdered in Mexico, but Stalin continued to evoke him a phantom threat, the symbol of all enemy forces when he began his bloody purges of the 1930s.

Snowball talking about the advantages of the windmills says that the fantastic machines 'Would do their work for them while they grazed at their ease in the fields or improved their minds with reading and conversation' (Animal Farm 30). Napoleon like his historical model, gives priority to agriculture. Orwell writes "Napoleon, on the other hand, argued that the great need of the moment was to increase food production and that if they wasted time on the windmill they would starve to death" (31). After Trotsky's expulsion from the country Stalin did not deny the need of industrializing Russia. Stalin adopted Trotsky's policy of industrialization in his first five years plan. Echoing the same Orwell writes: "On the third Sunday after Snowball's expulsion, the animals were some what surprised to hear Napoleon

announce that the windmill was to be built after all. He did not give any reasons for having changed his mind.”(36)

Chasing snowball away, Napoleon now makes all the plans by himself with the support of nine dogs which he has reared up for the protection. His trusted dogs can be composed with the Checka (All Russia Extraordinary Commission) who helped in executing or sending million of people top labour camps for various changes and helped Stalin rule by terror. After Stalin became dictator, he made Soviet historians revalue the leading role of Trotsky in the October Revolution and in the Civil War and his own role appear far greater than it really was. He named cities after himself. Trotsky was said to have been associated with the Mencheriks in their vile campaign against Lenin and the other Bolsheviks. After that revolution, he decided to join Bolsheviks party when he saw that its prestige was rising in the country. Similar are the charges on Snowball when Squealer says: “We had thought that Snowball's rebellion was caused by his vanity and ambition. But we were working, comrades. Do you know what the real reason was? .Snowball was in league with Jones from the very start ! He was Jones' secret agent all the time.” (50)

Napoleon and Squealer have so systematically perverted the truth that the animals can not recognize their leaders' duplicity even when they witness it directly. Karl Marx had theorized the need for "dictatorship of the proletariat" during the early years of his prescribed revolution, under which democratic freedom would take second place to stamping out resistance in the bourgeoisie. In Soviet Russia Stalin and his colleagues used Marx's theories as a justification for their increasingly violent and tyrannical actions. Moreover they used this one Marxist principle to justify their neglect of the other principles. The Stalinist government, for example quickly altered the noble ideals of equal work and equal compensation in order to favour the

politically and military power. Even when the machinations of the government became clear to everyone in Russia. In the novella, we see such a moment when the animals catch squealer literary rewriting the law on the side of the barn no signification popular revolt among the working classes ever occurred. Similarly, the animals show no signs of rebellions when Benjamin says:

Clover asked Benjamin to read her the sixth commandment, and when Benjamin as usual said that he refused to meddle in such matter. She fetched Mariel. Mariel read the commandment for her. It ran "No animal shall kill any other animal *without cause*" some how or other the last two words had slipped out of the animals' memory. But they saw, now that the commandment had not been violated, for clearly there was good reason for killing the traitors who had leagued themselves with Snowball. (57)

Minimu's poem provides compelling evidences for the anima's largely uncritical attitude towards the regime that oppresses it. Though the poem is outrageously inflated and tastelessly sentimental, the animals do not question it instead they allow it to speak for them. With the poem Orwell creates a passage of great irony and a wonderful satire of patriotic rhetoric. Much of the poem's humour arises from its combination of high and low language exposing the ridiculousness of what it intends to celebrate. Thus the poem praises Napoleon as "Fountain of happiness?" but also "Lord of the swill-bucket " While it glorifies the under Napoleon, it emphasis its simple triviality: This stylistic use of contrast helps render the poem's tone of utter devotion, poem ran as follows:

Friends of the fatherless

Fountain of happiness

Lord of the swill-bucket ! Oh how my soul's on
 Fire when I gaze at they
 Calm and commanding eye,
 Like the sun in the sky
 Comrade Napoleon ! (59)

There were many events in Russian history which were falsified to suit Stalin's own needs against Trotsky. Stalin after the gigantic distortion of Russian history dominates the party machinery. Like his historical model Napoleon dominates the party machinery and controls the education of the young. Napoleon always criticizes Snowball. When Snowball begins to form different committees, Napoleon takes no interest in it. Orwell writes:

Napoleon took no interest in Snowball's committees. He said the education of the young was more important than anything that could be done for these who were already grown up. It happened that Jessie and Blueball had both whelped son on after the hay harvest, giving birth between them to nine sturdy puppies. (22)

After having identified the characters of Animal Farm with their historical models, here in the political actuality of Soviet Russia which has been allegorically hinted at in the novel.

Lenin had regarded the agricultural cooperation as the most accessible and understandable means of drawing the peasants from individual to collective socialist farming. The party launched a campaign with the propose of showing the peasants the advantages of collective arming. Meanwhile (in 1928) the crop failed in Ukraine and the North Causasus, and there was a heavy shortage of food. The rich peasants wanted to take advantages of the situation and hid their grain. This led to starvation in

Ukraine. Then the government took the peasants into custody and confiscated their grains. Not only this the communist workers went to the extent of forced collectivization in early 1930s. The peasants were forced to join collective farm: and Russian socialism conversed not only the basic means of production but also the entire livestock including poultry. The peasants did not like it, and in desperation they destroyed livestock with the result that livestock population began to diminish rapidly.

In *Animal Farm*, it is made known to the hens that Napoleon wants them to surrender their eggs which is to pay for more grains and meal to keep the farm going till summer as there is a shortage of food on the farm. When the hens hear this, they revolt and there is a minor rebellion. This rebellion echoes the protest against forced collectivization in Russia. Orwell writes:

Led by Three young Black Minorca pullets the hens made a determined effort to Thwart Napoleon's wishes their method was to fly up to the rafters and there lay their eggs, which smashed to pieces on the floor. Napoleon acted swiftly and truthlessly. He ordered the hens' relations to be stopped and decreed that any animal giving so much as a grain of corn to a hen should be punished by death. (48)

In the actual Russian history, millions of people were forced to confess their crimes and were executed during Stalin's rule. There was no end to Stalin's tyranny. In 1953, Stalin felt that the eminent doctors of Russia were engaged in hatching conspiracy to kill him and the other Bolshevik leaders many of them were arrested and by usual means were forced to confess that they had murdered various eminent people. Stalin even shot the chief of the secret police service Nikolay Yezhov Beria who has been standing by Stalin in carrying out the Purges became the head of the secret police but he too was executed in December 1953. Stalin ruled by terror. Orwell presents the

rule by terror through Clover's following thought: "These scenes of terror and slaughter were not what they had looked forward . . . instead – she did not know why they had come to a time when no one dared speak his mind, when fierce, growing dogs roamed everywhere, and when you had to watch your comrades torn to pieces." (54-55)

The frightened farm animals, who are watching farm outside the parlour, are no longer able to distinguish the pigs' face from the man's. What Orwells means to signify that animal revolution is betrayed owing to selfishness of the greedy pigs. The pigs like communist leaders in Russia, controls the farm. The beginning and that the living conditions of the animals are, in the end no better than they are under their human exploiters. Life on the Animal Farm seems indistinguishable from the life led of manor farm. The story complete a circle and exploitation always prevails inside it. The rule by terror helps to glorify the ruler.

Russian Historical Connotation in Animal Farm

Animal Farm exposes basically the reflection of Russian Rule under the dictatorship of Stalin-but not only in a limited sense but also in broader sense Animal Farm show every totalitarian state or society and how absolute power corrupts its rulers despite their best intentions. Every revolution aims at removing the tyranny of the ruling government, but after success, these very revolutionaries also become tyrants and start following the policies of the government they toppled.

Farm house in the story Animal Farm represents in many ways the very place where greed and lust dominate. Unlike the barn, which is the fortress of the common man, the genuine concept of socialism, the farm house, where Napoleon and pig take over, shows the Kremlin. Even today the Kremlin is an important place for Russian

leaders, who, instead of embracing Marxism, have created their own distorted view of communism and have shoved it down their peoples' (animals') throats.

The concept of animalism is used by Orwell to signify generic view of socialism. This view was first expounded by Karl Marx (Old Major), who, in Orwell's opinion was naïve in thinking that his philosophy would actually work. Orwell, although agrees with the overall concept of equality through socialism, was critical of Marx because he did not take into account the greed and jealousy which would eventually undermine the entire cause. This idea was shown through Napoleon and the other pigs, who through persuasion and force became the dominant authority on the farm.

Orwell shows the Battle of Cowshed which is a clear metaphor for the overthrow of the old Russian government based on Czars (Mr. Jones). In Russia, this change took the Soviet union out of World War I and eventually led to the rise of Lenin and Stalin. The violence used in the battle, however was not condoned by Marx (Old Major) or Orwell, who both believed in pacifism. Snowball and Napoleon though, were too greedy and were required to use force in order to establish their corrupt government.

Orwell uses milk to represent the care and love that mothers give to their children. When Napoleon taken the milk for himself and the other pigs he is an essence stealing the very core of the people. How he can raise the children (other farm animals) as a tool of the state. No longer in the power in the family; now the cornerstone of civilization is in the totalitarian government of Napoleon (Stalin).

Orwell uses the alcohol to represent the "old" Russia. The first notes that the reason Jones lost control of farm and began being cruel to the animals war because of alcohol. It illustrates more than anything, a corrupt government – a government drunk

on prosperity. But its eventually this drunkenness which ruins and leads to the inevitable collapse of this system. Jones lost power over the animals where he become drunk and lazy, even Napoleon will eventually be over thrown because of alcohol he intaker. Orwell alludes to this near the end of the book when he says that in generations to come these will be still more uprisings. 'Some day it was coming: it might not be soon, it might not be within the life time of any animal now living, but still it was coming" (82-83).

Alcohol was originally seen as a grave evil of the new regime. Old major repeatedly warns the animals against taking on man's ways, but in his concerns one not headed. Really it was the issue of alcohol that made many of the animal's suspicious of the pigs. Thus, Napoleon had Squealer change the commandments. It is interesting that even today many of the Russian leaders have a drinking habit.

The windmill is used by Orwell to show Soviet industry. The windmill was destroyed several times before it finally was complete. This represents the trials the communists in Russia went through to establish their ornament –production industry however, Russian industry did stabilize, despite the lack of safety precautions and trivial concern for the people's well beings.

Orwell did not write a final collapse of the windmill, which would perhaps have shown the USSR's failure in the cold war. In 1990 the Russian Communist government collapsed due to lack of funds. Of course, Orwell could not have known this, although he did forecast a future rebellion on animal farm which happened in Russia later on.

The Historical Reflection of Germany in the *Animal Farm*

When First World War was ended situation of Germany was changed. They were humiliated in Versailles. They were forced to accept the full responsibility of the

war, to give up their colonies and some land in Europe, to reduce their armed forces and to pay unspecified amount of money to repair war damages. Like all European countries, Germany was utterly exhausted. Hitler took over the reign of weak and humiliated Germany when his Nationalist Socialist Party gained power in 1932 leading to his chancellorship in 1933. In the same year, he established his dictatorship, issued his first decree and denounced both the disarmament conference and the League of Nations.

Hitler then used the "strong arm" squads, first recruited by Ernst Rohm, for his protection. We have a heavy similar idea in Animal Farm when we come to know that Napoleon has privately reared up dogs. Orwell says:

They were the puppies whom Napoleon had taken away from their mother and reared privately. Though not yet full grown, they were huge dogs, and as fierce-looking as wolves. It was noticed that they wagged their tails to him in the same way as the other dogs had been used to do to Mr. Jones. (34)

Those storm trooper had aims irreconcilable with those of the officers of the regular army, and Hitler had to choose between them. Hitler chose to sacrifice his former supporters, and they were executed in the bloody purge of June 30, 1934.

Not only the Jews who had been the first and foremost victims of the Nazis but some thousand of real or supposed enemies of the Nazis were imprisoned without trial for varying periods. They would usually face the suffering such as beating up, starvation, hard labour and even death. After the purges, Hitler announced that the victims had been the criminals of the deepest hue. A very similar idea has been expressed by Orwell in Animal Farm when Napoleon tries to deal with situation involving potential danger to himself. Orwell shows his idea thus:

In the middle of the summer the animals were alarmed to hear that three hens had come forward and confessed that, inspired by Snowball, they had entered into a plot to murder Napoleon. They were executed immediately, and fresh precautions for Napoleons safety were taken. Four dogs guarded his bed at night, one at each corner, and a young pig named Pinkeye was given the task of tasting all his food before he ate it, last it should be punished. (60)

Just as Hitler, losing faith in his army, had set up and mobilized storm troopers to act as his body guards, Napoleon in to be protected by his trusted dogs. Echoing the same Orwell writes:

When they were all gathered together Napoleon emerged from the farm – house, wearing both his medals (for he had recently awarded himself 'Animal Hero, first Class' and 'Animal hero, Second Class') with his nine huge dogs frisking round him and uttering growls that sent shivers down all the animals' opines. They all covered silently in their places, seeming to know in advance that some terrible thing was about to happen. (52)

All German newspaper were eventually under Nazi control and were forced to support their ideas and actions. Only those writers who strongly supported the Nazi and Hitler's dictatorship were approved and given due place and honor. In Animal Farm, poet minimus is highlighted for his talents for glorifying Napoleon and his policies. Repeatedly broadcast speeches of Hitler's and others' containing the ideas such as "expansion eastward hatred of the Jews" made many people believe in them, as prepuited advertisements make the consumers believe in the quality of the advertised products. A very similar policy of clever and repetitive propaganda is used in Animal

Farm. The pigs, led by Napoleon formulate the rules, and change them to suit their own selfish needs. A fine example of this in the modification of the seven commandments. Another maxim "Four legs good, two legs bad" which contains the essential principle animalism is changed to "four legs good two legs better" Abolition of Sunday meetings in Animal farm reminds us of Hitler's suspension of Civil Liberties and the abolition of all trade unionism.

Italian History Reflected in *Animal Farm*

The period of 1930s was also know as the period of rising fascism in Italy. Italy was searching the state leader to pull her out of the post war economic dislocation and unemployment. Mussolini took over the control of Italy in 1922. The government was beset by the problems of political inexperience, poverty and general national disillusionment which subsequently led to the rise of fascism.

The economically depressed Italy fall into the hands of Mussolini's leading to the rise of fascism. Perhaps this was the need of the time also. In Orwell's Animal farm the mismanaged 'manor farm' falls the hands of the pigs after the animals' rebellion. The situation which compels the animals on the Manor farm to rebel against Mr. Jones may be graphically presented by Orwell's following lines:

Mr. Jones went into willingdon and got so drunk at the Red Lion that he did not come back till mid-day on Sunday. Then men had milked the cows in the early morning and then had gone out rabbiting.

Without bothering to feed the animals. When Mr. Jones got back he immediately went to sleep on the drawing-room sofa with the News of the World over his face, so that when evening came the animal's were still unfed. (11)

Mussolini became dictator of Italy through the medium of clever publicity and tough organization. It is also said that Mussolini ran the government in terror the same way as Napoleon ran. He spent much time dealing with propaganda and this also made him lose sight of real issues. Some of the propaganda appeared ludicrous but he knew that if something was stated after enough and loud enough, it would stick in the mind of people, especially when started in a neat slogan. 'Mussolini is always right' is a fascist slogan. Orwell has made a very effective use of the slogan. "Napoleon is always right" is the slogan used by the pigs in order to make it stick on the minds of other stupid animals on the farm.

Mussolini approached the economic problems as a series of battles when the impact of the American Wall Street Crash was felt in Italy. The United States demanded the repayment of loans in an effort to steady her economy, as a result the Italian Lira dropped in value. Mussolini was determined not to devalue the lira. This battle of lira was launched to save the national currency. Workers were ordered to take a cut in wages to fight for their national economy just as the workers in Italy had to practise various austerity measures, the "working class" animals on the Animal Farm too have their ration reduced. The situation is pointedly referred to by Orwell's following lines:

In January feed fall short. The corn ration was drastically reduced, and it was announced that an extra potato ration would be issued to make up for it. Then it was discovered that the greater part of the potato crop had been frusted in the clamps, which had not been corered thickly enough. The potatoes had become soft and discoloured, and only a few ere edible for days at a time the animals had nothing to eat but chatt and mangels. Starvation seemed to stare them in the face. (46)

Problems were not solved. It was become very serious. Further Orwell writes, "Meanwhile life was hard. The winter was as cold on the last one had been, and food was even shorts. Once again all rations were reduced, except those of pigs and dogs" (70-71).

Mussolini tried to capture the imagination of Italian Youth in order to retain fascism, and thus the same ideology was taught at schools. Apart from education he concentrated on the press and fascist films. This attempt of Mussolini has been hinted at by Orwell in his *Animal Farm* through Napoleon's followings thought. "He said that education of the young was more important than anything that could be done for those who were already grown ups" (22).

Spanish History Reflected in *Animal Farm*

Orwell went to Spain in 1936 as a journalist. But, there he joined POUM (Partido Obrero de Unification Marxista" meaning "Worker Party of Marxist Unity") milita and took part in the Spanish Civil War which had broken out six months before. He witnessed certain events in Spain, but later he read the distorted history of those events. Many of his POUM friends were executed for various false charges. Some of them were accused of being the secret agents of France. Through his extensive readings, Orwell found that the purge in Spain was a minor supplement to the great purge going on in Russia about that time. He wanted to reveal the fact. *Animal farm* reveal how greed, arrogance and hunger for power drive the groups in power to betray even their own comrades.

Franco had an important position in the Spanish Militia. But after the downfall of monarchy in 1931, the antimilitary policy adopted by the leaders of the new Spanish Republic brought Franco's rising career to a temporary halt. After the conservative forces gained control of the republic in 1933, Franco's position was

restored and in May 1935, he was appointed chief of the Spanish Army's General Staff. He then began the work of frightening and strengthening military institutions, both seriously weakened by the republic's earlier antimilitary policy.

The leftist popular front proved victorious in the elections of 1936, but the new government was unable to prevent the accelerating dissolution of Spain's social and economic structure. Taking this into consideration and to stop the further ruin of the country's economy. Franco began his military rebellion in July 1936. On October 1, 1936, he became head of state of the new nationalist regime.

Franco presided over a government that was basically a military dictatorship. He carried out the execution of the hundreds of people and ruled by terror. He allowed no one to challenge his power. Napoleon in *Animal Farm* carries out the executions of many animals to avoid the situation involving the potential danger to him. Orwell's graphic presentation of the situation is as follows: "They were all slain on the spot. And the tale of contentions and executions went on, until there was a pile of corpses lying before Napoleon's feet and the air was heavy with the smell of blood" (53).

In the Spanish Civil War, Franco was a careful and systematic leader, and he won a complete and unconditional victory in April, 1939. Napoleon, in *Animal Farm* carries out his plans successfully. He first chases Snowball off the farm, carries out the executions of his opponents and finally becomes the unanimously elected president. Now Napoleon's position is unchallengeable. Orwell writes, "In April, *Animal Farm* was proclaimed a republic, and it became necessary to elect a president. There was only one candidate, Napoleon, who was elected unanimously" (73).

Napoleon can be taken on the symbol of Franco because both of them aspire to work for the welfare of their subjects before they rose to power, but later proved a

tyrannical dictator himself. In the name of frightening and strengthening discipline both became an absolute dictator. Quoting from the novel itself we have:

Bravery is not enough, said Squealer. Loyalty and obedience are more important. And as to the Battle of Cowshed. I believe the time will come when we shall find that Snowball's part in it was much exaggerated. Discipline, comrades iron discipline ! That is the watchword for today. (35-36)

Franco's rule was unquestionable because of the executions he carried out. This rule by terror of Franco's has been hinted at in *Animal Farm*. Through the feelings that ran in Clover's mind. Orwell writes, "Instead- she did not know why they had come to a time when no one dared. Speak his mind, when fierce, growling dogs roamed everywhere, and when you had to watch your friends turn into pieces" (55).

Orwell's 'Situatdness' in the Novel

Orwell has given the historical reflection in the novel *Animal Farm* that depicts the 'situatdness' of the text and its writer. *Animal Farm* is therefore an expression of history by a person who can never detach himself from historical context.

While developing the novel as a personal history Orwell blurs the demarcation between history (Communist Rule in Russia under Stalin, Germany under Hitler, Spain under Franco, and Italy under Mussolini) and fiction (the novel).

Therefore the fact that the novel both refers and is referred to by the above mentioned history becomes clear with Orwell's technique of fictionalizing the history. Throughout the novella, Orwell has told the story from the animal's point of view. The animals remain naively hopeful up until the very end. Although they realize that the republic foretold by Old Major has yet to become a fruition, they stalwartly insist that it will come "someday" their assertions change the final events of the story with an

intense irony. *Animal Farm* has not created a society of equals but has simply established a new class of oppressors to dominate the name came class of oppressed – a division embodied, as at the opening of the novella, by the farm house wall.

The driving force behind *Animal Farm* was Orwell's intense disgust with totalitarianism, combined with an even stronger disgust with its defenders among left-wing intellectuals in Britain, from 1935 onward Orwell had begun to feel more and more convinced that Russian had taken wrong path and become a tyrannical dictatorship. He, therefore thought it necessary in the interests of the world socialism to expose the Stalin myth. He wrote *Animal Farm* to expose the reality of the Russian Revolution and the betrayal of Revolution by Soviet regime under Stalin. *Animal Farm* is the book which brings into clean focus Orwell's hatred of, an antagonism towards, the working of the communist system in Russia. In Orwell's view every revolution is in the long run betrayed by the new leadership, which emerges and which soon itself becomes dictatorial like the regime it had ousted.

Orwell's depicts the revolution from perspective of the revolutionaries in an allegorical form. He is in the side of Trotsky (Snowball) and shows his disgust towards Stalin (Napoleon) his location is in the between the these two groups i.e. Stalin and Trotsky. He picks out the drawback of Trotsky also. Orwell persuades all readers to take side towards the Trotsky (Snowball).

IV: Conclusion

In the preceding chapters, we saw that Orwell's main focus on fictionalizing the history in *Animal Farm*. It has been to question the basic relationship between historical actuality and fiction and to show how realities are constructed so as to expose the contradiction in the official history written by power holders. *Animal Farm* fictionalized the Russian history under Joseph Stalin, German history under Adolf Hitler, Spain history under Franco and Italian history under Mussolini. It reflects the situation of world history as well in the fictional form so as to blur the boundary between fiction and history.

Animal Farm is written in simple language but in capsulation, lively and emotional tone. It presents the picture of the animals' activities on the farm. In the beginning of the animals on *Manor Farm* are ignorant of the ways of their own life, but they are somehow living happily.

The Old Major is the only source of inspiration for the animals to carry out Rebellion against Mr. Jones, their only enemy, on the farm. The old Major admits that he will not be with the animals for many months longer, and says "before I die I feel it my duty to pass on to you such wisdom as I have acquired" (3). He further claims: "I may say that I understand the nature of life on this earth as well as any animal now living" (*Animal Farm* 3). He vividly presents cruelty, oppression, over work, longer and hardships they are facing. He dreams of a society in which:

"Riches more than mind can capture
Wheat and barley, oats and hay
Clover beans and mangel – wurzels
shall be ours upon that day" (7).

Just a day after the successful Rebellion, animals are surprised to see the turn about on the principle of animalism – all animals are equal – with the disappearance of milk. Milk is mixed everyday into the pigs' mash. It is the turning point in the fable : beginning of the new means of exploitation. The story now starts slightly losing touch with romance, and a bundle of tragic and shocking events taken place finally resulting in the execution of a number of animals. Not only the animals but also the readers are at difficulty to speculate rightly, the real intention hidden in Major's prophetic speech, whether it is Animal Republic where the animals except pigs and dogs "were generally hungry" "slept on the straw" drank from the pool" and were troubled by the cold and flies (91).

At last the farm is established as a going concern, but the animals are surprised to find their life no better. To tell the truth it is even worse. More than this the pigs have taken to walking on two legs along with the alteration of "All Animals are Equal". It has been given a qualifying clause – "But some animals are more equal than others" animal farm in thus the portrayal of the ways showing how revolution goes wrong.

Right from its publication 'Animal Farm has been seen as a powerful historical novel which has exposed the dictatorship. Orwell shown the purges in Spain and Russia (1936). These two events occurring at about a time at different ends of Europe proved to be the seeds of Animal Farm. Orwell was more concerned with Russian event than the Spanish ones. He was determined to expose the excesses of Stalin's Rule, and that has successfully been done in Animal Farm. In other words the novel is Russian history where only dates and names are fictional. The theme of the novel involves the rule of terror and lies.

One most effective analogy, Orwell has made, is the question over the building of windmill with Trotsky's policy of industrialization. This, episode in *Animal Farm* makes readers remember the history of Soviet Union in spite of its universal application.

Orwell has really inclined himself to Trotsky (Snowball) and has expressed his hatred for Stalin (Napoleon). But he does not fail to point out Trotsky's drawbacks when he worked as a privileged brain-worker. Orwell attempts to persuade his readers to side with Snowball except when all pigs including Snowball, are in agreement on reserving windfall apples and milk for themselves only. "All the pigs were in full agreement on this point, even Snowball and Napoleon" (*Animal Farm* 22). This has been a global problem-all law makers agree, at least, in one point – for providing more facilities and privileges to themselves by seemingly legal means.

Animal Farm exposes the corruptibility of man, showing how the reformer misuses power when he seizes it from a tyrant, and how a revolutionary situation the most ruthless man will outset his colleagues as rivals, and exploit the workers by cruelty and lies.

Orwell's *Animal farm* exposes the animals revolution against exploitation, unjust and inequality. In the story Snowball's opposition to Napoleon and the condition of poor Boxer, who works himself to death for supposed common good and their change in seven commandments allegorically illustrate the essential horror of human condition, violent conspirational revolution, led by consciously power hunger people of its contemporary society. Orwell's projection of reality in fictional elements unravels the conflicts of the contemporary society, thereby questions the authenticity of documented official history so as to blur the boundary between fiction and history.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th ed. New Delhi: Harcourt, 2003.
- Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays*. Cambridge: OUP, 1971.
- Bennett, A. Cerf, et al. eds. *The Philosophy of Nietzsche*. New York: Random House, 1997.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "Minority Histories, Sabaltem Pasts." *Postcolonial Studies*. Vol.1.1: 15-29.
- Daiches, David. *A Critical History of English Literature*. Rev. Ed. 4 vols. Delhi: Allied Publishers Limited, 1979.
- - -. *The Prophet Unarmed Trotsky*. New York: OUP, 1970.
- Foucault, Michael. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and Discourse on Language*. Trans. A.M. Sheridan Smitt. New York: Pentagon Books, 1971.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. "Towards a Poetics of Culture." *The New Historicism*. Ed. H. Aram Veaser. Cambridge: CUP, 1989: 12-26.
- Greene, Graham. Rev. *Animal Farm*, by George Orwell. Evening Standard 10 Aug. 1945: 6. Meyers Ed. George Orwell. *The Critical Heritage*, 1975. 195-96.
- Greetz, Clifford. "Thick Description: Towards an Interpretative Theory of Culture." *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Cambridge: OUP, 1973.
- Hopkinson, Tom. *George Orwell*. Rev. ed. London: British Council, 1955.
- Kohn, Hans. "Russian Revolution." *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. 15th ed. vols. 13-14. New York: Macmillan, 1963. 474-91.
- Leostrass, and Joseph Cropsey. "Fredriche Nietzsche." *History of Political Philosophy*. New York: OUP, 1972: 282-802.

- Martin, Kingsley. Rev. *Animal Farm*, by George Orwell, *Nation and New Statesman* 8 Sep. 1945: 165-66, Meyers Ed. George Orwell: *The Critical Heritage*, 1975. 197-99.
- Marx, Karl. "The Communist Manifesto". *The Creation of Knowledge*. Ed. S.P. Lohani et al. 2nd ed. RPT. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar, 1997. 20-35.
- Orwell, George. *Animal Farm*. New Delhi: Adarsh Books, 2003.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich "The Use and Abuse of History" *Intellectual History Reader*. Ed. Beerendra Pandey. Kathmandu: M.K .Publishers, 2005: 21-80.
- Rosenfeld, Issac. Rev. *Animal Farm*, George Orwell. *Nation* 7 Sep. 1946: 273-74. Meyers ed. George Orwell: *The Critical Heritage*, 1975. 201-04.
- Sanders, Andrew. *The Short Oxford History of English Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 2000.
- The Oxford English Dictionary*. Soanes, Catherine, et al. eds. 2nd ed. London: OUP, 1998.
- Wilson, Edmund. Rev. *Animal Farm*, by George Orwell. *New Yorker* 7 Sep. 1946: 89. Meyer's Ed. George Orwell: *The Critical Heritage*, 1975. 204-05.
- Wolf, Knell Christ and Christopher Norris, eds. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*. vol. 9. Cambridge: CUP, 2001.
- Woodcock, George. "George Orwell, 19th Century Liberal Politics" *Nation* Dec. 1946: 384-88. Meyers ed. George Orwell: *The Critical Heritage*, 1975. 235-46.