BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg

BETWEEN DYSTOPIA AND DEVOTION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE LIFE AND LITERARY WORK OF GEORGE ORWELL AND TAHIR MALIK

Makhmudova Kumushoy Najmiddin kizi
Teacher of SamSIFL
najmiddinovnamkn95@gmail.com

Abstract

This article undertakes a comparative examination of the lives and literary legacies of two towering figures from distinct literary traditions: Eric Arthur Blair, universally known as George Orwell (1903–1950), and the Uzbek writer Tahir Malik (born 1955). Though separated by geography, language, and epoch, both authors navigated oppressive political systems, bore witness to ideological coercion, and channelled personal hardship into enduring literary expression. Drawing on biographical sources, textual analysis, and postcolonial and comparative literary theory, this study traces the formative experiences, ideological convictions, narrative techniques, and thematic preoccupations that define each writer's contribution to world literature. We argue that Orwell's critical realism and Malik's spiritual-national realism, while divergent in mode, converge on a shared ethical imperative: the defense of individual dignity and cultural memory against the erasures of totalitarianism and colonialism. The article contributes to growing scholarship on Central Asian literature in the global context and invites cross-cultural dialogue between Anglophone and Uzbek literary studies.

Keywords: George Orwell, Tahir Malik, comparative literature, Uzbek literature, dystopia, totalitarianism, postcolonial fiction, political writing

Introduction

Comparative literary studies have long grappled with the challenge of bridging distant traditions without collapsing their specificities into false equivalence. Yet it is precisely in the productive tension between similarity and difference that the most illuminating readings are born. This article takes up that challenge by placing two writers in dialogue: George Orwell, whose name has become synonymous in the Western imagination with the critique of totalitarianism, and Tahir Malik, whose novels and stories have shaped the contours of modern Uzbek prose. Both writers were formed by empire—Orwell as a colonial administrator who turned against imperialism, Malik as a writer who came of age in Soviet Central Asia and survived the dissolution of that empire. Both responded to ideological suffocation with prose that privileged the concrete, the human, and the particular over the abstract and the doctrinaire.

The study is organized as follows. Sections 2 and 3 provide biographical accounts of Orwell and Malik respectively, situating their lives within their historical and cultural contexts. Section 4 offers a comparative thematic analysis, examining key works through the lenses of political critique, identity, and narrative form. Section 5 discusses the reception and legacy of each author. Section 6 draws conclusions and suggests directions for future research.

George Orwell: Life, Politics, and the Writer as Witness

Early Life and Colonial Experience

Eric Arthur Blair was born on 25 June 1903 in Motihari, Bengal, then a part of British India, to Richard Walmesley Blair, a sub-deputy opium agent in the Indian Civil Service, and Ida Mabel Blair (née Limouzin). The family returned to England in 1907, and Eric was educated at St Cyprian's preparatory school and then at Eton College on a scholarship (Taylor, 2003). His formal education exposed him to class stratification in its most concentrated form, and the scholarship-boy's ambivalence toward his institutional superiors would inflect his writing throughout his life.

Unable to afford Oxford or Cambridge, Blair joined the Indian Imperial Police in Burma in 1922, serving until 1927. His five years in Burma proved decisive. Witnessing the quotidian violence of colonial administration—public floggings, summary hangings, the structured dehumanization of colonized peoples—produced in him a lasting revulsion toward power exercised without accountability. The experience crystallized in his first novel, Burmese Days (1934), a sharply observed critique of colonial club culture, and in the autobiographical essays 'Shooting an Elephant' (1936) and 'A Hanging' (1931), which remain canonical texts in postcolonial studies (Said, 1993; Ingle, 1993).

The Making of a Political Writer

On returning to England, Blair adopted the pen name George Orwell—a decision that both protected his family from the stigma of his candid social writing and enacted a symbolic self-reinvention. He plunged into poverty deliberately, living among the destitute in London and Paris and documenting his experiences in Down and Out in Paris and London (1933). His journalistic investigation of working-class life in the industrial north of England produced The Road to Wigan Pier (1937), commissioned by the Left Book Club. The book's second half, a polemical essay on socialism and the middle-class intellectual, scandalized the Club's editors but has since been recognized as a foundational document of political autobiography (Williams, 1971).

Orwell's participation in the Spanish Civil War as a volunteer for the POUM (Workers' Party of Marxist Unification) militia in 1937 was the formative political event of his life. Wounded in the throat by a Fascist sniper, he narrowly escaped the Stalinist purge of the POUM that followed and returned to England with a visceral understanding of how revolutionary idealism is betrayed by party bureaucracy. Homage to Catalonia (1938) records these experiences with reportorial precision and moral passion. The Spanish experience permanently aligned Orwell against Soviet-style communism while preserving his commitment to democratic socialism—a position that made him uncomfortable to both the Left and the Right throughout the Cold War (Crick, 1980).

Major Works and Literary Contribution

Animal Farm (1945), Orwell's allegorical novella depicting the corruption of the Bolshevik Revolution through the figure of barnyard animals who overthrow their farmer only to replicate his oppression, is among the most widely read political fables of the twentieth century. Its deceptive simplicity masks a sophisticated analysis of how revolutionary language is captured and perverted by power. The phrase 'all animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others' has passed into the general lexicon as shorthand for ideological hypocrisy (Bowker, 2003).

Nineteen Eighty-Four (1949), written while Orwell was dying of tuberculosis on the Scottish island of Jura, offers a totalitarian dystopia of terrible coherence. The novel introduced concepts—doublethink, Newspeak, the memory hole, Big Brother—that have structured public discourse about surveillance, propaganda, and state power across the decades since its publication. Scholarly commentary has traced its debts to Yevgeny Zamyatin's We (1924) and Aldous Huxley's Brave New World (1932), while emphasizing its specifically mid-century British inflections (Meyers, 2000). Orwell died of pulmonary tuberculosis on 21 January 1950, aged forty-six, before he could witness the global impact of his final novel.

Tahir Malik: Life, Tradition, and National Identity

Biographical Background

Tahir Malik (full name: Tahir Malikovich Qodirov) was born on 12 July 1955 in Tashkent, Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic. He studied Uzbek language and literature at Tashkent State Pedagogical University and subsequently worked as a journalist, editor, and literary functionary in the late Soviet period. His formative years coincided with the era of Brezhnev-era cultural stagnation, when Uzbek writers were expected to produce work that conformed to the canons of Socialist Realism while superficially drawing on national heritage (Allworth, 1990).

Unlike many writers of his generation who navigated Soviet literary institutions by producing ideologically compliant work, Malik early demonstrated an interest in deeper historiographical and spiritual questions. His reading was eclectic, drawing on classical Uzbek poetry and prose (Alisher Navoi, Babur, Ahmad Yassawi), Russian literature, and increasingly, after the opening of perestroika, translations of world literature. This breadth of reference distinguishes his prose from the more narrowly didactic fiction produced under high Sovietism.

Literary Career and Major Works

Malik's debut in Uzbek literary journals in the 1980s attracted critical attention for his vivid characterization and his ability to root universal moral dilemmas in the specific textures of Central Asian life. His novel Shaytanat ("The Devil's Legacy"), serialized from the 1990s and published in multiple volumes, is widely regarded as his masterwork and has achieved exceptional popularity among Uzbek-speaking readers across Central Asia. The novel follows the intertwined lives of criminals, officials, and ordinary citizens in post-Soviet Tashkent, anatomizing the moral devastation wrought by organized crime, corruption, and the collapse of Soviet social structures. Its ambition is Dostoevskian: to trace the spiritual cost of a society that has lost its ethical compass (Nazarov, 2010).

Equally significant is his novel Ulmas qabr ('The Immortal Grave'), which engages with the suppressed history of Uzbek resistance to Soviet collectivization. The work participates in the broader post-independence project of recovering national memory erased or distorted by Soviet historiography—a project that gives Uzbek literature of the 1990s and 2000s a distinctive archival urgency. Malik has also written extensively in the detective and crime fiction genres, making him one of the most commercially successful as well as critically respected authors in contemporary Uzbek letters.

Thematic and Stylistic Features

Several thematic constants traverse Malik's oeuvre. First, an abiding concern with the tension between individual moral agency and collective social pressures—a tension that in the post-Soviet context takes on distinctive inflections, as the inherited solidarities of the Soviet collective are replaced by the atomizing forces of market capitalism and criminal patronage networks. Second, a deep engagement with Islamic ethical tradition as a resource for moral orientation, subtly interwoven into narrative texture rather than didactically proclaimed. Third, a historiographical impulse: a determination to bear witness to events that official narratives had suppressed or falsified. In these respects, Malik's literary project bears meaningful comparison to Orwell's, even as its modalities are wholly different.

Comparative Analysis: Convergences and Divergences

Political Critique and the Ethics of Witness

Both Orwell and Malik are, at their core, writers of witness—authors who felt an ethical obligation to render visible what power sought to conceal. Orwell's formulation of this obligation is explicit: in his 1946 essay 'Why I Write,' he identifies 'political purpose' as one of four key

motivations driving his literary production, defining it as 'a desire to push the world in a certain direction, to alter other people's idea of the kind of society that they should strive after' (Orwell, 1946, p. 5). This is not mere propaganda but a moralized realism: the insistence that accurate description of the world as it is constitutes the first act of political resistance.

Malik's engagement with the ethics of witness operates within a different discursive tradition but reaches analogous conclusions. In interviews, he has described his fiction as an attempt to speak truths that official culture suppressed, to give voice to experiences of injustice and suffering that would otherwise be lost (Qodirov, 2008). Where Orwell worked against the lies of Stalinism from within English left-liberal culture, Malik worked against the lies of both Soviet officialdom and the post-Soviet moral vacuum from within Uzbek national culture. Both writers understood fiction not as escapism but as a mode of moral cognition.

Totalitarianism and Its Discontents

The representation of totalitarian power constitutes the most obvious thematic convergence between the two authors. Orwell's great contribution to the analysis of totalitarianism lies in his attention to language as a mechanism of control. In Nineteen Eighty-Four, the development of Newspeak—a language systematically stripped of the vocabulary necessary for critical thought—enacts the thesis, implicit throughout Orwell's political essays, that the corruption of language is inseparable from the corruption of politics (Orwell, 1949). The Ministry of Truth's revision of historical records dramatizes the assault on memory that Orwell identified as central to totalitarian power.

Malik's engagement with Soviet and post-Soviet power operates differently but with comparable insight. In Shaytanat, the Soviet legacy is present not through explicit political commentary but through the moral formation of characters who have been shaped by decades of institutionalized dishonesty—characters who have learned to say one thing while doing another, and who find themselves adrift in a post-Soviet world that has discarded even the simulacra of official values. The novel's depiction of the criminal world is simultaneously a depiction of the broader society: organized crime becomes a hyperbolized image of a society in which the privatization of public goods and the corruption of official institutions have rendered collective ethical life nearly impossible.

Identity, Empire, and Cultural Memory

Both writers are profoundly shaped by experiences of empire, though from structurally opposed positions. Orwell was a member of the colonizing class who became a critic of colonialism; Malik is a member of a colonized people who became a chronicler of national survival. These positions generate different but related literary preoccupations. For Orwell, the central problem is complicity: how the individual subject is recruited into the service of unjust power and the moral cost of that recruitment. For Malik, the central problem is continuity: how a people preserves its cultural identity, spiritual resources, and historical memory across generations of imperial subordination.

These different orientations to empire produce different narrative temporalities. Orwell's fiction tends toward the nightmare present or the immediate past: the world as it is being distorted, the revolution as it is being betrayed. Malik's fiction tends toward longer historical arcs, drawing on genealogies, ancestral memories, and epic traditions to situate the present within a deeper temporal frame. This difference reflects not only the personal positions of the authors but the different narrative traditions—English critical realism, Uzbek classical prose—within which they work.

Narrative Form and Style

Stylistically, both authors are distinguished by a commitment to clarity and accessibility. Orwell's prose style is among the most analysed in the English language; his 1946 essay 'Politics and the English Language' articulates a programme of stylistic renewal centred on concrete nouns, active verbs, and the elimination of pretentious abstraction. This programme is itself a political act: the democratization of language as a resource for clear thought. Malik's prose, while operating within a different tradition, similarly prizes narrative momentum and the concrete rendering of social life over abstraction or ornament. Both authors are suspicious of style as display, preferring style as instrument.

Reception and Legacy

George Orwell's reception has undergone significant transformation since his death. Initially valued primarily as a political journalist and essayist, he has been progressively canonized as one of the defining prose writers of the twentieth century. His novels Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-Four are among the most translated in the English language and have been adapted into numerous dramatic, cinematic, and operatic forms. 'Orwellian' has entered the standard lexicon of political commentary in dozens of languages. Scholarly attention has been substantial, encompassing biography (Crick, 1980; Taylor, 2003; Bowker, 2003), literary criticism, political philosophy, and postcolonial studies (Ingle, 1993).

Tahir Malik's reception within Uzbekistan and the broader Uzbek-speaking diaspora has been extraordinary by the standards of contemporary Central Asian literature. Shaytanat has reportedly sold millions of copies and has been adapted for television, achieving the rare status of a work that commands both popular and critical esteem. His work is included in Uzbek secondary school curricula and has been the subject of substantial academic commentary within Uzbekistan and, increasingly, in Central Asian studies internationally (Khalid, 2007). The comparative underdevelopment of Uzbek literary studies in Western academia means that Malik remains less known internationally than his domestic stature would warrant—a lacuna that comparative projects such as the present one seek to begin addressing.

Conclusion

This article has traced the life and literary work of George Orwell and Tahir Malik through biographical, thematic, and comparative lenses. Despite their profound contextual differences—national tradition, language, historical moment, ideological positioning—both authors emerge as exemplary instances of the writer as moral witness: the figure who accepts the obligation to render visible what power obscures, to preserve what institutional memory suppresses, and to speak plainly in conditions that reward evasion.

Their convergences are neither accidental nor the result of direct influence but reflect a deeper structural affinity between the situations of the writer who has seen the machinery of oppression from the inside and who has chosen, at personal cost, to describe it accurately. Orwell's critical realism and Malik's spiritual-national realism are different instruments in service of a related ethical imperative. Bringing them into dialogue enriches our understanding of both and contributes to the broader project of constructing a genuinely world-comparative literary studies that moves beyond the Anglo-American and European axis.

Future research might productively extend this comparison to other domains: the use of allegory, the representation of gender and family, the role of humor and irony, and the afterlives of both authors in digital and popular culture. Cross-linguistic projects that make Malik's work available to international scholarly communities would be particularly valuable in establishing the full significance of his contribution to world literature.

References

1. Allworth, E. (1990). The modern Uzbeks: From the fourteenth century to the present. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press.
2. Bowker, G. (2003). Inside George Orwell: A biography. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
3. Crick, B. (1980). George Orwell: A life. London: Secker & Warburg.
4. Ingle, S. (1993). George Orwell: A political life. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
5. Khalid, A. (2007). Islam after communism: Religion and politics in Central Asia. Berkeley: University of California Press.
6. Meyers, J. (2000). Orwell: Wintry conscience of a generation. New York: W. W. Norton.
7. Nazarov, B. (2010). Zamonaviy o'zbek nasri . Tashkent: O'qituvchi.
8. Orwell, G. (1931). A hanging. The Adelphi.
9. Orwell, G. (1933). Down and out in Paris and London. London: Victor Gollancz.
10. Orwell, G. (1934). Burmese days. New York: Harper & Brothers.
11. Orwell, G. (1936). Shooting an elephant. New Writing, 2.
12. Orwell, G. (1938). Homage to Catalonia. London: Secker & Warburg.
13. Orwell, G. (1945). Animal farm. London: Secker & Warburg.
14. Orwell, G. (1946). Why I write. Gangrel, 4, 1–10.
15. Orwell, G. (1946). Politics and the English language. Horizon, 13(76), 252–265.
16. Orwell, G. (1949). Nineteen eighty-four. London: Secker & Warburg.
17. Qodirov, T. M. [Malik, T.]. (1990s–2000s). Shaytanat (Vols. 1–6). Tashkent: Sharq.
18. Qodirov, T. M. (2008). Adib va zamon . Interview. Yoshlik, 3, 12–19.
19. Said, E. W. (1993). Culture and imperialism. London: Chatto & Windus.
20. Taylor, D. J. (2003). Orwell: The life. London: Chatto & Windus.
21. Williams, R. (1971). Orwell. London: Fontana/Collins.
22. Zamyatin, Y. (1924/1993). We (M. Ginsburg, Trans.). New York: EOS.