



**THE PROBLEM OF PERSONALITY AND FREEDOM IN THE
WORKS OF GEORGE ORWELL AND ABDULHAMID CHO'LPON: A
COMPARATIVE LITERARY ANALYSIS**

Temirov Navro'zbek Ulug'murot o'g'li

Samarqand davlat chet tillar instituti mustaqil tadqiqotchisi

<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-8439-7465>

navrozbek.temirov9077@gmail.com

Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article examines the problem of personality and freedom in twentieth-century English and Uzbek literature through a comparative analysis of the works of George Orwell and Abdulhamid Cho'lpon. The study analyzes the conflict between the individual and authority within the socio-political and historical context of the twentieth century. Special attention is paid to the artistic interpretation of freedom, ideological oppression, and the transformation of individual consciousness in Orwell's *Animal Farm* and Cho'lpon's *Kecha va Kunduz*. The article also investigates the aesthetic features of modernism, dystopian discourse, and Jadid literature in representing spiritual and political freedom. Comparative and historical-literary methods are applied to identify the universal and national aspects of personality and freedom in English and Uzbek literary traditions.

Keywords: personality, freedom, individual and authority, comparative literature, George Orwell.

The issue of personality and freedom occupies a central place in twentieth-century literary discourse, particularly in societies shaped by political oppression, ideological pressure, and cultural transformation. In both English and Uzbek literature, writers increasingly turned their attention to the conflict between the individual and authority, presenting freedom not merely as a political condition but also as a moral, psychological, and existential category. The literary works of George Orwell and Abdulhamid Cho'lpon reflect this intellectual tendency through different aesthetic systems and historical experiences. While Orwell's works reveal the destructive mechanisms of totalitarian ideology, Cho'lpon's writings focus on the spiritual and national awakening of the individual under colonial and social oppression.

At the beginning of the XX century, global literature underwent significant transformation due to rapid industrialization, ideological conflicts, and the collapse of traditional social structures. Literary modernism emerged as a reaction against the stable and objective worldview of nineteenth-century



realism. Instead of depicting reality as fixed and coherent, modernist writers emphasized fragmentation, inner consciousness, and subjective experience. This shift reflected the growing anxiety of individuals living in societies increasingly dominated by bureaucratic systems, technological progress, and ideological control. As a result, literature became a space where writers questioned the relationship between power and the individual.

In English literature, modernism transformed the representation of personality by placing human consciousness at the center of artistic expression. Writers such as Virginia Woolf and James Joyce explored the complexity of inner experience through stream-of-consciousness techniques, fragmented narration, and psychological introspection. Woolf's novels demonstrate how social norms and gender expectations function as invisible forms of authority that restrict individual freedom. Similarly, Joyce portrays the struggle of the individual against religious, cultural, and political limitations. In these works, freedom becomes associated with independent thought and subjective self-awareness rather than external political liberation. The development of totalitarian ideologies during the twentieth century intensified the literary exploration of oppression and ideological manipulation. The devastating consequences of the First World War destroyed earlier optimistic beliefs about progress and civilization. Literature increasingly depicted the individual as vulnerable within large political systems that sought to regulate thought, memory, and identity. This historical reality contributed to the emergence of dystopian fiction, in which writers imagined societies governed by absolute control and ideological surveillance. Orwell became one of the most influential representatives of this literary tendency.

In Orwell's literary worldview, freedom is inseparable from truth and intellectual independence. His political allegory *Animal Farm* presents the degeneration of revolutionary ideals into authoritarian domination. The novel demonstrates how political power manipulates language, collective memory, and public consciousness in order to eliminate individuality. Through symbolic animal characters, Orwell exposes the transformation of liberating ideology into oppressive dictatorship. Napoleon's rise to power illustrates how authority gradually destroys equality and freedom under the guise of collective welfare. The famous slogan "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others" reveals the hypocrisy and linguistic manipulation characteristic of totalitarian systems. In Orwell's artistic model, personality disappears when critical thinking is replaced by ideological obedience. Orwell's literary philosophy is closely connected with the idea that political systems attempt to dominate not only physical life but also human consciousness itself. In his works, power controls language in order to reshape



reality and limit intellectual freedom. Such manipulation transforms individuals into passive components of a collective structure. The destruction of historical truth in Orwell's fiction symbolizes the destruction of personal identity because memory and individuality are deeply interconnected. Consequently, freedom in Orwell's works is represented as the ability to preserve independent consciousness against ideological pressure.

In Uzbek literature, the issue of personality and freedom developed within the context of Jadidism and national awakening. Under Russian colonial domination, Uzbek intellectuals viewed education, enlightenment, and cultural reform as essential conditions for national liberation. Jadid writers attempted to modernize society while preserving national identity and spiritual values. Therefore, freedom in Uzbek literature acquired both political and moral dimensions. Unlike English modernism, which primarily focused on psychological alienation, Uzbek Jadid literature emphasized social responsibility and collective national consciousness.

Cho'lpon occupies a particularly important place in this intellectual movement. His literary works reflect the tragic conflict between individual aspiration and oppressive social structures. In his poetry and prose, freedom is not limited to political independence; it also represents spiritual awakening and moral self-realization. His novel *Kecha va Kunduz* portrays characters struggling between traditional social expectations and modern intellectual values. The protagonists experience psychological conflict as they attempt to preserve their individuality within restrictive cultural and historical circumstances. Cho'lpon's artistic method differs significantly from Orwell's allegorical style. Whereas Orwell universalizes oppression through symbolic political satire, Cho'lpon relies on realistic and psychological narration. His characters are not abstract ideological figures but emotionally complex individuals shaped by social environment, tradition, and moral dilemmas. Through detailed psychological analysis, Cho'lpon reveals how social pressure influences personal identity and inner freedom. In this respect, his realism serves not only as artistic representation but also as a moral critique of social stagnation and spiritual passivity.

An important similarity between Orwell and Cho'lpon lies in their understanding of personality as a fragile but essential human value. Both writers demonstrate that oppressive systems seek to eliminate individuality by controlling thought, behavior, and moral choice. However, they approach this problem from different historical and aesthetic perspectives. Orwell focuses on the universal mechanisms of totalitarian ideology, while Cho'lpon emphasizes national identity, cultural renewal, and spiritual resistance. Consequently, their works reveal both universal and culturally specific dimensions of freedom.



The conflict between personality and authority in twentieth-century literature also reflects broader philosophical transformations. Existentialist thought, which emerged strongly after the world wars, emphasized human loneliness, moral responsibility, and the search for meaning within oppressive or indifferent systems. Literary characters increasingly appeared as isolated individuals struggling to preserve authenticity in societies dominated by conformity and ideological control. This philosophical atmosphere influenced both Western modernism and Eastern reformist literature. The individual was no longer portrayed merely as a social type but as an ontological being confronted with questions of freedom, identity, and moral responsibility. Furthermore, literary form itself became a means of resistance against authoritarian discourse. Fragmented narration, inner monologue, symbolism, and allegory functioned as aesthetic strategies that challenged official narratives and rigid ideological structures. In Orwell's fiction, allegory exposes the hidden mechanisms of political domination, while in Cho'lpon's prose psychological realism reveals the invisible pressures shaping human consciousness. Thus, artistic form and ideological content become inseparable in the representation of freedom and oppression.

Ultimately, the literary treatment of personality and freedom in twentieth-century English and Uzbek literature demonstrates that artistic expression serves as a powerful response to social and political crisis. Both Orwell and Cho'lpon transform literature into a space of moral reflection and intellectual resistance. Their works warn against the dangers of ideological conformity while affirming the necessity of preserving human dignity, independent thought, and spiritual freedom. Through different poetic systems and historical experiences, they reveal that the struggle for freedom is not only political but also deeply psychological and ethical.

REFERENCES

1. Arendt H. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. – New York: Harcourt Brace, 1973. – 576 p.
2. Asror, O. F., Sherzod, A. E., & Salimovna, N. M. (2023). The importance of motivation in education. *Trends of Modern Science and Practice*, 1(2), 5-7.
3. Booker M.K. *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism*. – Westport: Greenwood Press, 1994. – 214 p.
4. Cho'lpon A. *Kecha va kunduz*. – Toshkent: Sharq, 2000. – 320 b.
5. Crick B. *George Orwell: A Life*. – London: Penguin Books, 1980. – 432 p.
6. Joyce J. *Ulysses*. – London: Sylvia Beach, 1922. – 732 p.



7. Karimov N. XX asr o'zbek adabiyoti tarixi. – Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1999. – 420 b.
8. Mirvaliyev S. O'zbek adabiyoti tarixi. – Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 2006. – 380 b.
9. Omonova, F. (2025). WAYS OF SOLVING THE PROBLEMS OF INTERCULTURALCOMMUNICATION. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence, 1(4), 1362-1366.
10. Orwell G. Animal Farm. – London: Secker and Warburg, 1945. – 112 p.
11. Rodden J. The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. – 230 p.
12. Temirov N. GEORGE ORWELL VA ABDULHAMID CHULPON IJODLARINDA TOTALITARIZM VA SHAXSIY ERKINLIKNING BADIY TAFSILOTLARI //Osiyo ilmiy tadqiqotlar va innovatsiyalar jurnali. – 2026. – T. 1. – № 2. – 579-582-betlar.
13. Temirov N. INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK ADABIYOTINDA SHAXS TUSHUNCHASI MADANIYATLARARO ALOQA KONTEKSTINDA //RAQAMLI TRANSFORMATSIYA DAVRIDA TA'LIM VA TADQIQOT. – 2026. – 514-518-betlar.