

## **From “Freedom from” towards “Freedom to”: A Frommian Reading of Anthony Burgess’s *A Clockwork Orange***

**Bayad, M. S.\* and Mirmasoomi, Mahshid**

*Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures, University of Tehran, Iran*

### **ABSTRACT**

Throughout history, mankind’s ideal to pursue what he reveres as freedom has proved unattainable since insurmountable obstacles have always impeded the path to freedom. Individual freedom has constantly been restricted by external forces, in most cases an authority that forces humans into submission and bondage in a way they find themselves not only physically but also spiritually constrained by these shackles. In some instances, the magnitude of the authoritative force is so considerable that the individual surrenders his freedom and abandons any hopes of liberation. One of the theorists who highly values individual freedom is the German social psychologist Erich Seligman Fromm (1900-1980). He asserts in his book *Escape from Freedom* (1941) that achieving freedom has been a prime goal for mankind throughout time. He maintains that as an individual unshackles himself from the restrictions of an authority, he tries to compensate for the lack of security which stems from his rejection of that authority and thus submits himself to another source of authority or becomes an authoritative figure himself. This paper aims to analyse Fromm’s concept of freedom in Anthony Burgess’s *A Clockwork Orange* (1962). Through the application of Fromm’s theories, this article attempts to show that freedom is not merely a release from external forces but a release from internal constraints as well, stressing the fact that spiritual freedom is the real path to happiness and internal satisfaction and that positive freedom is from within and not without.

### **ARTICLE INFO**

*Article history:*

Received: 01 April 2014

Accepted: 24 November 2014

*E-mail addresses:*

Msbeyad@ut.ac.ir (Maryam Soltan Beyad),

Mahshid.masoomi@ymail.com; Mahshid.masoomi@ut.ac.ir

(Mahshidossadat Mirmasoomi)

\*Corresponding author

*Keywords:* Freedom, Authority, Submission, Erich Fromm, *A Clockwork Orange*

## INTRODUCTION

Due to its great significance in people's lives, freedom has always been regarded as a central and controversial topic for critics and theorists, and is discussed in a whole gamut of areas such as philosophy, sociology, psychology, and politics. Throughout time, theorists have tried to define this elusive concept and set boundaries regarding the domain of individual freedom. One of the most famed of these critics was Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), who expressed his deep concern regarding individual freedom and happiness in his book *Civilization and its Discontents* (1930). He maintained that "the liberty of individual is no gift of civilization. It was greatest before there was any civilization" (Freud, 1962, p.42). Despite Freud's scathing critique of civilisation and its prohibitions, his pessimism did not allow for reconciliation between mankind's yearning for freedom and civilisation's requirements for obedience and conformity. Freud's pessimism turned into extreme radicalism with Herbert Marcuse (1898-1979), who in his *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud* (1955), reformulated Freud's ideas and assumed a revolutionary stance against all the manifestations of the authorities. However, as Freud's pessimism, Marcuse's "Great Refusal" of all institutions could not provide mankind with a satisfactory solution that could lead him towards liberation and happiness.

A humanistic philosopher and a democratic socialist, Erich Fromm also attempted at offering a viable solution

to the un-free and desperate individual. Addressing modern man's struggle to transcend the boundaries in order to regain his lost freedom, Fromm asserted that the path to freedom can be facilitated only when individuals discard their pseudo-mechanical selves and provide room for the growth of their real selves. He affirmed that by communicating and cooperating with others, man can find a safe haven in which he realises his capabilities and potentialities and is able to expand and improve them. In the sections that follow, this paper will address Fromm's theory of freedom and its application to Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange* (1962).

## THEORISING ERICH FROMM'S CONCEPT OF FREEDOM

*"The whole life of the individual is nothing but the process of giving life to himself; indeed we should be fully born, when we die- although it is the tragic fate of most to die before they are born"* (Fromm, 1955, p.32).

A social psychologist and psychoanalyst, Fromm discussed his ideas regarding individual freedom and the means to achieve such vital goals in almost all his works. He contended that despite all the achievements and great advances in science and industry, the modern man was desperately unhappy and un-free; "the great promise of unlimited progress- the promise of domination of nature, of material abundance, of the

greatest happiness for the greatest number, of unlimited personal freedom has sustained the hopes and faith of generations since the beginning of the industrial age" (Fromm, 2012, p.1). However, the modern man became more desperate and unhappy as he assumed a domineering character, gradually removed all the obstacles on his way to freedom, and released himself from all religious, political and social restrictions.

Fromm likened the story of the modern man to the growth of a child, a process which he called "individuation." A child enjoys oneness with his mother before his birth, and for some period after his birth; he feels secure and safe in this pre-individualistic state, and shares what Fromm called "primary ties" with his mother. During this period, the child is totally dependent on his mother, and does not have an opportunity for the development of his individuality and gaining freedom. Fromm went on further and observed that "the primary ties not only connect the child with its mother, but the member of a primitive community with his clan and nature, or the medieval man with the church and his social caste" (2001, p.20). Such ties deter a person from expanding his faculties and therefore eliminate any chance of obtaining independence and freedom. As the primary ties weaken, the child finds more space for the advancement of his faculties and gains physical and emotional strength. The more the child grows and the primary ties are cut off, the more it develops a quest for freedom and independence (ibid., p.23). Nonetheless, as the child undergoes the process of

individuation and enjoys his freedom, he feels more and more alone, desperate, and anxious. He finds himself as a separate entity no longer united with his mother, feels shaken and frightened, and is doubtful about taking steps forward. Therefore, the growth of identity, individuality, and freedom is accompanied by a feeling of isolation and anxiety that can disturb mankind for the rest of his life. Losing the close contact he once had with social, religious, and political institutions which gave him security and assurance, man feels petrified and desperate in his new independent position.

Fromm introduced two types of freedom: "freedom from" and "freedom to." "Freedom from" is achieved when mankind throws off all the shackles that restrict him, namely, his primary bonds and all the external restrictions that deter his progress. This kind of freedom is a negative one since it brings about powerlessness and anxiety to the life of mankind. As Fromm stated,

*Alienation as we find it in modern society is almost total... Man has created a world of man-made things as it never existed before. He has constructed a complicated social machine to administer the technical machine he built. The more powerful and gigantic the forces are which he unleashes, the more powerless he feels himself as a human being. He is owned by his creations, and has lost ownership of himself (1955, p.115).*

At this point, the newly gained freedom becomes a burden, a yoke from which mankind struggles to escape. He cannot keep going with “the burden of “freedom from”” on his shoulders; he “must try to escape from freedom altogether unless he can progress from negative to positive freedom” (Fromm, 2001, p.116). In order to discard feelings of aloneness and anxiety, an individual has two paths before him. The first and the best way for a person to escape from negative freedom is to connect with the world, enjoy the feeling of love, and provide space for the flourishing of his individuality and potentialities. The other path “open to him is to fall back, to give up his freedom, and to try to overcome his aloneness by eliminating the gap that has arisen between his individual self and the world” (ibid., p.120). According to Fromm, such a retreat is not possible since “primary bonds once severed cannot be mended; once paradise is lost, man cannot return to it” (ibid., p.29). Escaping from negative freedom cannot totally relieve the person from anxiety and may even cost the individual a whole life of bondage because this course of escape, “like every escape from threatening panic, is characterized by the more or less complete surrender of individuality and the integrity of the self” (ibid., p.121).

An individual who chooses to sacrifice his individuality in order to guarantee his feeling of safety is confronted with two means of escape which Fromm termed as “mechanisms of escape.” The two mechanisms of escape through which the individual achieves a feeling of security are

“sadism” and “masochism.” Fromm called the relationship underlying both sadistic and masochistic tendencies “symbiosis”, where the individual attempts to establish a union with the world or with another self so as to make himself dependent and forget the burden of his own self (Fromm, 1955, p.36).

A person who shows masochistic tendencies struggles to escape from freedom by attaching himself to a source of power, from whom he gains strength which in turn compensates for his lack of security. Such a person tends to “abandon his individuality by submitting himself to an authority and sacrificing his happiness; the aim is to dissolve in another’s power and find pleasure and satisfaction within his surrender” (Fromm, cited in Funk, 2000, p.119). An individual who submits himself to a source of power such as an authoritative figure or a sociopolitical or religious institution in order not to feel powerless, jeopardizes his individuality and self-concept; while submitting themselves, these individuals “show a tendency to belittle themselves, to make themselves weak, and not to master things” (Fromm, 2001, p.122). This sense of insignificance helps the individual forget his feelings of loneliness and separation as an independent entity, and saves him from the shackles of negative freedom by relegating him to nothingness. As the masochist wishes for submission, the sadist covets domination. Under sadistic tendencies, the person desires to rule over others both physically and emotionally, and to see people being dependent on him; he also wishes to torture them physically and

mentally, and enjoys watching them suffer. As Fromm maintained, "One with sadistic tendencies seeks to destroy the will of another, make him a defenseless and will-less instrument of his own will, to dominate him absolutely, in extreme cases forcing him to suffer and to express the feelings induced by his suffering" (cited in Funk, 2000, p.119).

Positive freedom, which is "freedom to," is not achieved through the formation of sadomasochistic tendencies, but is realised when an insecure person establishes relationships based on love and comradeship with the world and individuals. As Fromm held, "Love is the only sane and satisfactory answer to the problem of human existence" (1995, p.104). Without finding any compensation for the feeling of insecurity, man gradually faces mental disturbances and severe neurosis, and precipitates his own destruction. Fromm contended that the lack of connection with others, both physically and emotionally, can lead to different anomalies. However, more devastating than "physical aloneness" is "moral aloneness"; being related to people emotionally, sharing their values, and revealing in their newly-gained advances, are what grant people the real sense of identity and freedom. Having no attachment to "values, symbols, and patterns" can be called "moral aloneness," and is "as intolerable as physical aloneness; or rather that physical aloneness becomes unbearable only if it implies moral aloneness" as well (Fromm, 2001, p.15). Living with love and loving ourselves and others are Fromm's solutions to mankind's unhappiness. "The

affirmation of one's own life, happiness, growth, and freedom is rooted in one's capacity to love", namely, "in care, respect, responsibility and knowledge" (Fromm, 1995, p.47). Fromm asserted that, "the aim of the art of living is to be connected with the outer and inner realities, and with one's own mental psychic, and physical powers in such a way that the love of life may grow" (cited in Funk, 2000, p.164).

## DISCUSSION

*Whoever insists on safety and security as primary conditions of life cannot have faith; whoever shuts himself off in a system of defense, where distance and possession are his means of security, makes himself a prisoner. To be loved, and to love, need courage, the courage to judge certain values as of ultimate concern – and to take the jump and to stake everything on these values* (Fromm, 1995, pp. 98-99).

*A Clockwork Orange* is a political satire written in 1962, which strongly castigates the society's violent restrictive measures in depriving individuals of their free will. The story happens in the near future, where the state in which the protagonist lives takes serious measures against the widespread of youth crime so as to curb public disorder and impose order. Alex, the protagonist, is a disobedient and violent teenager who, having committed such ultra-violent acts such as assault and battery and rape, is incarcerated in the state prison.

There he undergoes inhumane treatment called the Ludovico Technique, which is an aversion therapy that removes his criminal tendencies by exposing him to violent films and music while injecting him with drugs so as to make him feel sick. The suffering and the feeling of nausea, which are accompanied by drug injection, result in Alex's incapability to do violent acts after the treatment.

Alex lives with his parents with whom he shares no love or compassion. As a teenager, who has not yet achieved his full sense of self, he still covets the love, protection and care of his family so as not to feel powerless and alone. According to Fromm, "the child remains functionally one with its mother for a considerable period after birth and to the degree to which the individual, figuratively speaking, has not yet completely severed the umbilical cord which fastens him to the outside world, he lacks freedom" (2001, p.20). Having lost his primary bonds which once gave him security, Alex is in pursuit of another source of safety in which he seeks refuge, and the first place where he must find this haven is his family. His family, however, being afraid of Alex's belligerent behaviour, has long lost hope in his improvement and left him alone. As a fifteen year-old male, Alex lives in a rundown government flat block with this family who earns pitiable wages; Em, the mother, is forced by the state to work in a store stocking canned goods while Pee, the father, works in a factory (Farrar, 2009, p.2). Being a low middle-class family, his parents work very hard to earn their living and lead their existence. Busy doing their

daily drudgery, Alex's family has no time to care for their son, assist him in tackling his problems, and help him correct his belligerent behaviour.

Alex, too, has abandoned hope of receiving love and care from his family; for him, the concept of family has long lost its sense. This lack of sympathy for the notion of family reveals itself in Alex's unfriendly act of calling his parents Pee and Em instead of father and mother. Furthermore, after Alex is released from prison, to his bewilderment, he finds out that his parents have rented his room to a lodger called Joe who has now taken the place of their son, and has left Alex homeless. Instead of helping their son learn the appropriate conduct, they replace him with someone else to rid themselves of Alex's abnormal behaviour. After undergoing the Ludovico Technique, Alex encounters his parents once more. Ashamed of his inappropriate treatment of his son, his father has now come to the realisation that he and his wife did not act as caring parents. When seeing his parents, Alex confronts them aggressively:

*Well well well well well, what gives? What makes you think you are like welcome? My papa said, in a like ashamed way: You were in the papers, son. It said they had done great wrong to you. It said how the Government drove you to try and do yourself in. And it was our fault too, in a way, son. Your home's your home, when all's said and done, son* (Burgess, 1986, p.163).

Though Alex's lying to his parents and his abominable treatment of them are unfair and disgusting, his parents, rather than helping him find his real self, have abandoned him without making an attempt to mend their relationship. In the *Theory and Technique of Family Therapy*, Charles P. Barnard and Ramon Garrido Corrales assert that "the members of one's family are one's significant others par excellence" (cited in Davis *et al.*, 2002: 21); that is to say, "Family must at once provide support for integration into a solid family unit as well as differentiation into relatively autonomous selves" (ibid., 21). Obviously, Alex's parents failed to provide the room for his growth and integration of self; they denied him the chance of growing up in a household with love and affection.

Having abandoned hope to receive security from his parents, Alex attempts to finding another source of security by relating himself to others based on sadistic strivings. He is in "search for some form of 'Home'" to feel secure (ibid., p.20); and he ultimately finds this home in a gang of young criminals whom he rules over. As his parents find a substitute for Alex at home, Alex too, compensates for his parents' lack of care and affection by forming his own family on the streets. Now, instead of enjoying his life in his house, he lives with his violent friends who ultimately fail him as his parents do. "'O my brothers'" - Alex's frequent salutation both to his *droogs* ("friends" in the Anglo-Russian slang, Nadsat) and to his readers- functions as the narrative trope via which he attempts to establish family

structures wherever and whenever he can" (ibid., p.28). "In addition, the repeated use of "my brother" when addressing the reader, and the many references to himself as "your humble narrator" together help establish an intimate relationship between Alex and the reader; we experience everything with Alex, and he shapes our perceptions" (McDougal, 2003: 10). While trying to regard the readers as the members of his family, Alex informs them of his sorrows and sufferings through the first person narrative. This way, the readers enter his mind, feel sympathetic towards his sense of aloneness and pity him for his desperate attempts at having a family.

Alex's feeling of insecurity leads him to form a symbiotic relationship with others based on sadism. Therefore, he turns to violence as a means to compensate for his lack of security. Throughout the story, in both explicit and implicit terms, Burgess's antihero shows his desire to rule as "a dictator over the city in which he lives" (Farrar, 2009, p.10). Reigning over his subjects relentlessly, Alex assumes the figure of a leader for his gang members and wears the mask of an authority to feel powerful and secure (surprisingly, he wears a mask of Benjamin Disraeli in the novel in order to hide his identity while doing violent acts). To feel powerful, "Alex also imposes his belief system upon the members of his gang. Mirroring the government's repressive force, Alex takes liberties in demonstrating to his *droogs* what should be considered acceptable and unacceptable behaviour within their social circle" (ibid., p.10). When disrespecting him, Alex confronts

his gang violently. As a lover of classical music, he desires his *droogs* to be so; he admonishes Dim who derides a woman singing in the Korova Milkbar. He goes even further in beating his *droogs* to death when they question his authority. Alex's desire to act authoritatively and violently is also represented in his attempt to sexually and sadistically abuse two ten year old girls, Marty and Sonietta. In his attempt to rule over others, he also leads an attack on the house of an old lady that causes her death. Davis and Womack (2002) maintain that by committing violent acts and attaching himself to a criminal group, Alex struggles to create pseudo-families in place of the family he never had. Alex's seeking sanctuary in his criminal gang, his sadistic behaviour, and ultra-violent acts are all indications of his powerlessness with which he disguises his shattered self and compensates for his lack of security, which he could never gain from his family or any other source.

Alex's lack of safety not only drives him to form sadistic relationship with others, but also eventuates in the creation of a pseudo self. He is an insecure fifteen year old, who, like many of his age, finds his sense of self precariously lost in a state of flux and moments of beguiling awkwardness. "Alex responds to these feelings of uncertainty and change by trying on different costumes, behavioural modes, and verbal mannerisms in an effort to establish what he perceives to be a stable sense of identity" (Davis *et al.*, 2002, pp.23-24). Violence accompanied by music, drugs, wearing different costumes (in order to change appearance), and the

use of the Nadsat gang language complete Alex's pursuit of safety. They are the safe haven in which he seeks sanctuary. "The drugs that Alex injects give him the means for numbing any true sense of self. Classical music provides him with both the demonic energy for committing his heinous acts and with the means for drowning out the cries of his luckless victims" (ibid., p.25). "His attraction to classical music gives him a sense of superiority over the other gang members. Alex attempts to establish music's standing as a refined and elegant art form worthy of respect by attacking Dim, who disrespects the woman singing in the Korova Milkbar" (Farrar, 2009, p.11). Even the use of the Nadsat contributes to Alex's use of violence and sadistic acts in the novel; "for the Anglo-American reader the Slavic words connote communist dictatorship, the society of *Darkness at Noon*, without moral values and hope" (Evans, 1971, p.409). Esther Petix describes "the Nadsat tongue as the language of the *droogs* and of the night; it is the jargon of rape, plunder, and murder veiled in unfamiliarity" (qtd. in Davis *et al.*, 2002, p.25).

Both the sadist and the masochist are dependent on their subjects to the extent that their subjects' disappearance results in the complete disintegration of their selves. The sadist's survival is based on the existence of the person over whom he has control, as the survival of the masochist is rooted in the existence of the master that rules over him. As Fromm held, "the sadistic person is as dependent on the submissive person as the latter is on the former; neither can live



without the other. The difference is only that the sadistic person commands, exploits, hurts, humiliates, and that the masochistic person is commanded, exploited, hurt, humiliated" (1995, p.16). As Alex needs his gang members' submission to feel powerful, they need Alex's authority. But Alex's pseudo-acts are mere facades to hide his real powerless self; all his efforts to form a symbiotic relationship in order to dominate others not only make him more insecure but deter his growth of self, and gradually bring about resentment, not friendship and love. Throughout time, Alex's gang members, Georgie, Pete, and Dim, grow tired of his demanding and overbearing behaviour which no longer gives them security, and begin to challenge his authority. They betray Alex to the police and abandon him. Alex deceives himself "into believing he has control over situation while his supposed subordinates and admirers disparage and thwart his attempts to elevate his ego" (Farrar, 2009, p.3). As Fromm maintained, "The realization of the submissive (masochistic) or the domineering (sadistic) passion never leads to satisfaction... the ultimate result of these passions is defeat ... while these passions aim at the establishment of a sense of union, they destroy the sense of integrity" (1955, p.36).

In part two, Alex is imprisoned for murder where he undergoes the Ludovico Technique. Under the Ludovico, Alex finds himself unable to satisfy his sadistic drives through violent acts and becomes powerless and insecure. After his release from prison, he returns to his parents,

desperate and insecure, only to find out that another boy has taken his place. Wandering in the town, he encounters the people whom he caused injuries and is avenged by them. He finds the home of F. Alexander, who remembers Alex as the one who raped his wife and caused her death. Being opponents of governmental policies, he and his friends use Alex as a pawn in their political battle to reveal the ugliness of the Ludovico Technique. They leave Alex in a room where he is exposed to Beethoven's ninth symphony which he was exposed to while watching violent films under the Ludovico. Being unable to stand the music as a result of conditioning, he feels sick and desperate. Finding himself lonely and insecure, with no source of safety to turn to, he attempts suicide by jumping from the window:

*And like it was Fate there was another malenky booklet which had an open window on the cover, and it said: "Open the window to fresh air; fresh ideas, a new way of living." And so I knew that was like telling me to finish it all off by jumping out. One moment of pain, perhaps, and then sleep forever and ever and ever* (Burgess, 1986, pp.158-159).

Alex's suicide does not simply stem from his feeling of nausea or hatred of music; the main cause of his suicide is his feelings of insecurity and powerlessness. The insecure self becomes a burden for him, so he decides to discard with this feeling of nothingness by removing the

source of dissatisfaction, which is his self. Fromm asserted that “if for any reason other persons cannot become the object of an individual’s destructiveness, his own self easily becomes the object. When this happens in a marked degree, physical illness is often the result and even suicide may be attempted” (2001, p.155). Alex, being unable to direct his sadism (which gives him power) towards others, feels desperate and attempts at the elimination of his self. As Fromm contended, “The phantasy of suicide is the last hope if all other means have not succeeded in bringing relief from the burden of aloneness” (1961, p.153).

The government authorities who are afraid of the public controversy regarding Alex’s suicide reverse the Ludovico Technique, and Alex is back to his violent life. Once again, he forms another criminal gang and commits violent acts. As time passes, however, Alex comes to the realisation that his violent way of life no longer provides him with security, satisfaction and happiness. He grows tired of violence and rejects his friend’s offer to engage in violent acts: “Look, droogies. Listen. Tonight I am somehow just not in the mood. I know not why or how it is, but there it is. You three go your own ways this nightwise, leaving me out” (Burgess, 1986, p.172).

The final chapter, which was omitted in the United States, is of great significance to Burgess’s optimistic vision of Alex’s future. In chapter twenty-one, Alex grows in maturity and finds his true identity. Encountering Pete, his old friend, who is

now married and happy, Alex envisions his future life when he has his own family and lives with love: “Tomorrow is all like sweet flowers and the turning vonny earth and the stars and the old Luna up there and your old droog Alex all on his oddy knocky seeking like a mate... And all that cal” (ibid., p.177). According to Fromm, this sense of love and comradeship is the decisive factor in rescuing individuals from their negative sense of freedom, and guiding them towards positive freedom; a get away from “freedom from” to “freedom to”. Symbiotic relationships with others (masochism and sadism) are inactive or inert relations that do not contribute to the individual’s growth of self and freedom. The only path to freedom is love; “In contrast to symbiotic unions, mature love is a union under the condition of preserving one’s integrity, one’s individuality” (Fromm, 1995, p.16). In his image of future, Alex realises that enjoying a happy life and real freedom is not possible without connecting himself to others through love. As his future plans, Alex also desires to be a music composer and hopes to find his true place within the society; for Alex, true life manifests itself when he realises his potentialities.

Burgess “likes to portray the universe as a “duoverse;” that is, a cluster of contending opposites which agitate moderation. “The thing we’re most aware of in life,” he writes, “is the division, the conflict of opposites, good, evil; black, white; rich, poor, and so on”” (cited in Firestone, 1977, p.46). Without the last chapter, there will be no reconciliation between the good and bad

of which Burgess speaks. Without Alex's hopeful vision of future, the reader still finds Alex under the rule of authority, as an un-free being. It is just in the last chapter of the novel that he finds reconciliation between his violent tendencies and the goodness inherent in his nature; "finally grown up and fully prepared to accept the difficult challenges of selfhood, Alex no longer chooses the easier road to ultra-violence, opting instead to embark upon a lifetime of familial commitment and human renewal" (Davis *et al.*, 2002, p.33). Under the Ludovico, and with the absence of his potential for evil, Alex becomes unable to grow sense of goodness and freedom, incapable of finding reconciliation between his tendencies, and becomes a creature with no sense of commitment. Agent Hillier, the protagonist of Burgess's *Tremor of Intent*, calls the people who lack any commitment to goodness or wickedness "neutrals", and concludes that "neutrals are morally inferior to evildoers" (Rabinovitz, 1979, p.46). As a result of their neutrality and lack of commitment, they cannot find the true course of their lives, and therefore cannot achieve a true sense of self. By depicting Alex's commitment to love and life, Burgess fulfilled his duty as an artist and expressed his approval of what Fromm asserted regarding the power of love and commitment. According to Burgess, "the artist is an alchemist, drawing on the inherent disorder and dissonance of the human experiences and somehow transmuting them into a dazzling display of order and harmony. Contending forces which divide

our allegiances in the real world are tamed and reconciled in the artistic creation, or at least seem to be so, and the illusion of unity is the final product of this creative process" (Firestone, 1977, p.46). When Alex gains maturity and succeeds in maintaining harmony, he also paves his way towards liberation and happiness.

## CONCLUSION

While reading *A Clockwork Orange*, notions of freedom and un-freedom and happiness and unhappiness, all key concepts not only in the literature of the Sixties but also in public's mind, come to the fore. In the novel, Burgess castigated the repressive system that restricts individual freedom, and also represented a resistant body to this system who is not merely a fictitious character but representative of the author who rebels against the oppressive and authoritarian state in which he dwells. Embodying rebellion and opposition like his protagonist Alex, Burgess asserted that "I lean towards anarchy; I hate the State. I loathe and abominate that costly, crass, intolerant, inefficient, eventually tyrannical machine which seeks more and more to supplant the individual" (cited in Rabinovitz, 1979, pp.48-49). During the Second World War, his pregnant wife was attacked on the streets, resulting in a miscarriage and later her death. The incident had a devastating effect on Burgess's life and is depicted in *A Clockwork Orange*, in Burgess's representation of the character of Alexander whose wife is attacked by Alex's gangs.

While reading the novel, the fundamental yet unanswered question which occupies our mind is whether there is an escape from such oppressive systems and whether individuals can find their path to freedom despite all the obstacles. Can the negative freedom of which Fromm spoke be discarded and replaced with positive freedom? With today's oppressive governments in which the slightest disobedience is perceived as a tremendous threat and reprimanded as such, we doubt about the possibility of enjoying freedom. "Meaningful for the authorities is not the manifest act of inadaptation, but the possible revolt which has to be crashed before maturation" (Nicolau, 2012, p.303). Burgess ends his novel with a spirit of optimism with Alex envisioning a future in which he enjoys his freedom and happiness. However, the readers ponder whether Alex's sanguine vision of future is a mere mirage or is capable of realisation; whether his attempts to have free will are doomed to failure, and whether his dreams of enjoying freedom are going to become true.

These assumptions can undermine our whole faith in the existence of freedom and can throw doubts on the notion of free will too; they unveil the fact that what we regard as freedom of choice is a mere mirage, since it is the authority's will that determines our way life and normalises our behaviour. Under such circumstances, an individual lives not with his own will but with a pseudo-will. Through conditioning, Alex is transformed into a powerless being with a pseudo-will, who is unconsciously responding to the will of the authority.

Robert Kane maintains, "We believe we have free will when (a) it is 'up to us' what we choose from an array of alternative possibilities and (b) the origin or source of our choices and actions is in us and not in anyone or anything else over which we have no control" (cited in LaFisca, 2008, p.11).

Despite all the pessimism regarding the concept of freedom, achieving freedom should not be discarded as a far-fetched goal. According to Fromm, bondage can be replaced with positive freedom only when a person finds his true self in relationships with people and the world. He held that:

*I believe that love is the main key to open the doors to the "growth" of man. Love and union with someone or something outside of oneself, union that allows one to put oneself into relationship with others, to feel one with others, without limiting the sense of integrity and independence. Love is a productive orientation for which it is essential that there be present at the same time: concern, responsibility, and respect for and knowledge of the object of the union (1994, p.101).*

In *A Clockwork Orange*, too, Burgess expresses his concern over the meaninglessness of such notions as free will and happiness under the rule of repressive governments and rises in rebellion, as his young protagonist. By juxtaposing individual will versus the state's will and portraying his ultimate hopeful vision of

Alex's future, Burgess also places his hope not in the failure of human freedom, but in the potentiality of love to generate freedom and happiness. Authorities may remove freedom through restrictive measures such as the Ludovico Technique, but they can never remove the sense of hope in a life full of hope and love. They can restrict individuals but can never prevent them from growing a sense of internal and spiritual freedom.

## REFERENCES

- Burgess, A. (1986). *A Clockwork Orange*. New York: Norton.
- Davis, T. F., & Womack, K. (2002). 'O my brothers': Reading the anti-ethics of the pseudo-family in Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange*. *College Literature*, 29(2), 19-36.
- Evans, R. O. (1971). Nadsat: The argot and its implications in Anthony Burgess' *A Clockwork Orange*. *Journal of Modern Literature*, 1(3), 406-10.
- Farrar, R. (2009). *You can't eat the orange and throw the peel away—a man is not a piece of fruit!: A comparative study of the characters and the dystopia in Anthony Burgess' A Clockwork Orange and Arthur Miller's death of a salesman*. Diss. Tarleton State University.
- Firestone, B. M. (1977). Love's labor's lost: Sex and art in two novels by Anthony Burgess. *The Iowa Review*, 8(3), 46-52.
- Freud, S. (1962). *Civilization and its discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Fromm, E. (1955). *The sane society*. New York: Rinehart.
- Fromm, E. (1961). *Escape from freedom*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Fromm, E. (1994). *On being human*. New York: Continuum.
- Fromm, E. (1995). *The art of loving*. London: Thorsons.
- Fromm, E. (2001). *The fear of freedom*. London: Routledge.
- Fromm, E. (2012). *To have or to be*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Funk, R. (2000). *Erich Fromm: His life and ideas: An illustrated biography*. New York: Continuum International Group.
- LaFisca, K. A. (2008). *Free will in selected twentieth century British novels*. Diss. California University of Pennsylvania.
- McDougal, S. Y. (2003). What's it going to be then, eh? Questioning Kubrick's clockwork. In S. McDougal (Ed), *Stanley Kubrick's A Clockwork Orange* (pp. 1-18). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nicolau, F. (2012). Lobotomizing the virtual violators of the establishment's guardians. *Philologica Jassyensia*, 8(1), 303-08.
- Rabinovitz, R. (1979). Ethical values in Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange*. *Studies in the Novel*, 11(1), 43-50.