

Appendix 4: Non-examination assessment authentication sheet

Pearson Edexcel Level 3 Advanced GCE in English Literature 9ET0/04		
Have you received advice on the title from the Assignment Advisory Service?		Y/N
Centre name:		Centre number:
Candidate name:		Candidate number:
Assignment	Marks awarded	Comments
Essay title: <i>With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's '1984' and Arthur Miller's 'The Crucible'</i>	AOs 1, 2 and 3 36 / 36 AOs 4 and 5 24 / 24	<i>See comments on script</i>
TOTAL	60 / 60	

Teacher declaration

I declare that the work submitted for assessment has been carried out without assistance other than that which is acceptable according to the rules of the specification. I confirm that the candidate has studied at least three pre-1900 texts in the examined components to meet the requirements of the qualification, and the same texts have not been studied for both non-examination assessment and examination.

Assessor name:		
Assessor signed:		Date: 3/2/23

Candidate declaration

I certify that the work submitted for this assessment is my own. I have clearly referenced any sources used in the work. I understand that false declaration is a form of malpractice. I understand that to meet the requirements of the qualification, I must answer examination questions on at least three pre-1900 texts and I must not use texts which I have studied for non-examination assessment in my answers to examination questions.

Candidate signed:		Date: 27/1/23
-------------------	--	---------------

Additional candidate declaration

By signing this additional declaration you agree to your work being used to support Professional Development, Online Support and Training of both Centre-Assessors and Pearson Moderators. If you have any concerns regarding this please email: ePortfolio@edexcel.com

Candidate signed:		Date: 27/1/23
-------------------	--	---------------

Texts coverage check

You are reminded that the text choices for the non-examination assessment must be different to the texts studied in Components 1, 2 and 3.

Please tick all texts that have been studied in the other components.

Component 1	Shakespeare		Other drama	
	Tragedy		Tragedy	
	<i>Antony and Cleopatra</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Doctor Faustus</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Hamlet</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>The Duchess of Malfi</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>King Lear</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>The Home Place</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Othello</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>A Streetcar Named Desire</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Comedy		Comedy	
	<i>A Midsummer Night's Dream</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>The Importance of Being Earnest</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Measure for Measure</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>The Pitmen Painters</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>The Taming of the Shrew</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>The Rover</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Twelfth Night</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Waiting for Godot</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Component 2	Childhood		Colonisation and its Aftermath	
	<i>What Maisie Knew</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Heart of Darkness</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Hard Times</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Atonement</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>A Passage to India</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Component 2	<i>The Color Purple</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>The Lonely Londoners</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The Supernatural		Women and Society	
	<i>The Picture of Dorian Gray</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Wuthering Heights</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Dracula</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Tess of the D'Urbervilles</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>The Little Stranger</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Mrs Dalloway</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Component 2	<i>Beloved</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>A Thousand Splendid Suns</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Crime and Detection		Science and Society	
	<i>Lady Audley's Secret</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Frankenstein</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<i>The Moonstone</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>The War of the Worlds</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>In Cold Blood</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Never Let Me Go</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>The Murder Room</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>The Handmaid's Tale</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Component 3	The Medieval Period	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geoffrey Chaucer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	The Metaphysical Poets	<input type="checkbox"/>	John Donne	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The Romantics	<input type="checkbox"/>	John Keats	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The Victorians	<input type="checkbox"/>	Christina Rossetti	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Modernism	<input type="checkbox"/>	T S Eliot	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The Movement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Philip Larkin	<input type="checkbox"/>

Non-examination assessment	Please list the non-examination assessment texts below	
	Text 1 <i>The Crucible</i>	Text 2 <i>1984</i>

With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's *1984* and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*.

With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's *1984* and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*.

George Orwell's novel, *1984*, and Arthur Miller's play, *The Crucible*, construct analogous depictions of monolithic authoritarian regimes. These texts display, in a myriad of ways, how the construction of Hobbesian states almost always ends in ruin for individuals. A Hobbesian state is one with absolute power and control over the law; Hobbes stipulates citizens must obey the state in everything it commands, to ensure security.¹ A societal overcommitment to ideology crushes liberty and consistently destroys individuals' lives, whether through causing death or obliterating the essence of what a character once was. The intense manipulation of the legal system creates significant injustices and allows for restriction of key human rights. Whilst there are some small attempts by individuals to subvert the absolutist control of the state, the respective reader and audience can see these are largely futile. As both texts demonstrate, states that operate with such intolerance, and with such a necessity for conformity, ultimately permeate into all aspects of the environment. This causes a great oppression of the individual. Arguably both writers are denouncing the ultra vires actions of states in their contemporary societies. Miller's 1953 work serves as a critique of McCarthyism in America, whilst Orwell's 1949 novel eviscerates the Stalinist Soviet Union.

Derivation of power from a higher authority is used, in both texts, to make characters servants to much higher concepts, under states where ideology is more important than individuals. The promotion of "diametrically opposed absolutes", which Miller explores in his introduction to *The Crucible*, is symbolised in *1984* through the conflict between Big Brother and Goldstein. This presents society as dichromatic to the extreme, enabling the

¹ Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Edited by J. C. A. Gaskin, Oxford University Press, 2008

With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's *1984* and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*.

A02
evaluation
state to more easily justify punishment and elicit political compliance. This regime is the arbiter of "cruel, wicked, unforgiveable" "torture", harming many of its citizens, forcing them to adhere to the state's wishes completely. These adjectives connote a satanical evil, with the devilish Big Brother at the head of the Party, perpetuating a cult of personality that spawns misery and injustice. This "torture" serves to further reinforce the Party's authoritarian ideology. By the end of the novel, Orwell portrays a Winston who has been broken by his experience in Room 101, indoctrinated to the point where "He loved Big Brother". The final line of the novel further reinforces the ultimate supremacy of ideology over the needs of individuals, as Orwell redirects love from the deeply personal relationship Winston has with Julia, to the impersonal one the state has forced upon him.

A03
A05
Similarly, in *The Crucible*, Miller uses a literal deity in the Christian God and the devil as his "diametrically opposed absolutes". These ancient epitomes of good and evil are used by Miller to allegorically represent the increasingly polarised contemporary America in the McCarthy era. As the critic Cerjak asserts, this is achieved through the presentation of the initial targeting of those who are less pious, creating a base of authoritative righteousness from which to expand.² Just as in *1984*, by demonising one side of society, both authors show how easy it is for the state to create a polarising dividing line, perhaps commenting on authoritarianism and intolerance in the societies in which they lived. Proctor is forced into a "faction" and "partisan[ship]" which McGill attests Miller has made apparent his protagonist has tried ardently to avoid previously.³ Furthering Cerjak's argument, the authors show how

A04
Sophisticated
connected
approach

² Cerjak, Judith A. "Beware the Loss of Conscience: 'The Crucible' as Warning for Today." *The English Journal*, vol. 76, no. 5, National Council of Teachers of English, 1987, pp. 55–57, <https://doi.org/10.2307/818784>

³ McGill, William J. "The Crucible of History: Arthur Miller's John Proctor." *The New England Quarterly*, vol. 54, no. 2, New England Quarterly, Inc., 1981, pp. 258–64, <https://doi.org/10.2307/364974>

With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's *1984* and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*.

“unorthodox” characters become dehumanised.⁴ They are stripped of any perception of agency in their environment, through the perpetuation of mass consciousnesses constructed using state machinery. *The Crucible*’s protagonist is coerced into giving up his life or his name; though as Miller writes, Proctor wonders “How may I live without my name?”. This idea of the senseless tarnishing of status is enhanced by the ubiquitous motif of “name”, which has over fifty mentions in the play. This establishes it clearly as a key theme for Miller’s work. This furthers the tragedy of Proctor’s senseless persecution by branding a man, who McGill agrees the audience recognises as a “kind”, “good-tempered” and thoroughly “respected” character, as a witch.⁵ Clearly Miller indicated deviant individuals are vulnerable to wide-scale persecution by the state.

Building on Enteen’s argument, one may argue both authors present the relationship between the individual and the state as one where the ultra vires intrusion of the state consistently undermines and limits the privacy of the individual.⁶ This creates a fearful society. The personal space of individual characters is functionally non-existent, as seen when Parris observes the girls’ frivolities in the woods and shames them for “dancing like heathens.” To contemporary audiences, this seems like a gross overreaction. Children seemingly having innocent fun, is instilled with an immorality and impurity by Parris. It is evident from the outset of *The Crucible* that even personal enjoyment and harmless activities are under extreme scrutiny, through which Miller draws a comparison between Puritanical

⁴ Cerjak, Judith A. “Beware the Loss of Conscience: ‘The Crucible’ as Warning for Today.” *The English Journal*, vol. 76, no. 5, National Council of Teachers of English, 1987, pp. 55–57, <https://doi.org/10.2307/818784>

⁵ McGill, William J. “The Crucible of History: Arthur Miller’s John Proctor.” *The New England Quarterly*, vol. 54, no. 2, New England Quarterly, Inc., 1981, pp. 258–64, <https://doi.org/10.2307/364974>

⁶ Enteen, George M. “GEORGE ORWELL AND THE THEORY OF TOTALITARIANISM: A 1984 RETROSPECTIVE.” *The Journal of General Education*, vol. 36, no. 3, Penn State University Press, 1984, pp. 206–15, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27797000>

With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's *1984* and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*.

Salem and the McCarthyism of the 1950s. Miller's choice of the omniscient, omnipresent god as the source of legal and moral authority generates a panopticon-like premise and reveals the state's inescapable purview. This is evident when the first man brought in to solve the issue of suspected witchcraft in Salem is Hale, a "minister of the lord". He serves as a mouthpiece for God and reinforces the notion that agents of God are sources of solution and knowledge. Through Hale's assertion that, "marks of the devil are precise, they are definite as stone", Miller imparts audiences with the impression that Hale is wise and certain, and that because of his religious training he is intelligent enough to detect witchcraft with complete accuracy. This instils members of society with a sense of fear at his power. The confidence in Miller's dialogue choices for Hale make it seem to other characters as though the presence of witches is guaranteed, furthering the climate of fear created by those in positions of power. Audiences see the extent personal space is invaded through Miller's use of stagecraft and spacing, from the opening scene of *The Crucible* onwards. The scene begins with just Betty and Parris, in close proximity "beside a bed", with society milling on below. This reinforces the idea of a higher power by placing the highest ranked man in the town (at the plays opening) physically separate and above everyone else as a member of the clergy. However, by the apex of Scene One, the majority of the play's characters occupy the room, creating a fractured and chaotic atmosphere, suggesting a disruption of the natural order and destruction of privacy. This chaos and fearful "disruption" is artificial. It is fuelled by operatives of the state, first by Parris and subsequently Hale and Danforth. They exacerbate panic among the townspeople, to further their own causes, destabilising the lives of individuals to the extent where "rebellion's spoke" with serious intent.

With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's *1984* and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*.

As previously suggested with the initial mention of Enteen's literary interpretation, Orwell likewise uses a deified figure to create a panopticon.⁷ He illustrates the invading of individuals' personal space with the faux-fraternal construction of the hyper-Stalinist Big Brother always "WATCHING YOU." Orwell's witnessing of a figurehead exploiting the masses, during his time as a British officer in Burma, influenced his construction of the tyrant, and mirrors Miller's use of a religious figurehead in *The Crucible*.⁸ The capitalisation and ubiquity of the message reflects the aggressive pervasiveness and sinisteress of the regime. The simultaneously universal yet personal direct address is used to instil fear into the Oceanic people. Orwell elucidates the existence of constant surveillance and the complete absence of privacy. The fear that "someone might be watching", and report Winston to the Thought Police, is shown by Orwell to plague him almost constantly in the "world of fear" he inhabits. Orwell exposes this by utilising the internal intrusion of the third person narrative voice, garnering the reader unique access to Winston's internal monologue. It is something ingrained by the state propaganda, of "telescreens", "posters" and slogans, which serves to repress the lives of individuals in the same way that the fear of God does in Salem.⁹

A03/4
A02
A02
A04
integrated approach

This need for surveillance, or at least the perception of it, is crucial to the state's maintenance of control. Something epitomised in the climax of *1984*, when it is revealed that the kindly Mr Charrington is "a member of the Thought Police". There is a distinct juxtaposition between the safety and intimacy of the upstairs of the shop and the danger and surveillance

⁷ Enteen, George M. "GEORGE ORWELL AND THE THEORY OF TOTALITARIANISM: A 1984 RETROSPECTIVE." *The Journal of General Education*, vol. 36, no. 3, Penn State University Press, 1984, pp. 206–15, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27797000>

⁸ Orwell, George. "How a Nation is Exploited- The British Empire in Burma." *Le Progrès Civique*, CW 86, The Orwell Foundation, 1929, <https://www.orwellfoundation.com/the-orwell-foundation/orwell/essays-and-other-works/how-a-nation-is-exploited-the-british-empire-in-burma/>

⁹ Ibid.

With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's *1984* and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*.

that waits below. Orwell's characterisation of Mr Charrington as somewhat mundane and bland makes the reveal of his espionage all the more shocking, Orwell's first description of him outlines Charrington as a man who "had inhabited this shop for thirty years". The length of time he has occupied this role adds a stagnancy to his character. The reader assumes this "sixty-three" year old "widower" would not be capable of the devious betrayal and orchestration of Winston's ensnarement that Orwell later narrates. In a Benthamite sense, the fear of the possibility of being watched is what precipitates the conditions for "orthodoxy [to be] unconsciousness", which is emblematic of the lack of privacy and freedom in Oceania. The undermining of individual privacy in both texts creates a culture of fear and repression; possibly, as Roelofs stipulates, Orwell shows individuals in such authoritarian states as husks of human beings.¹⁰

When examining the relationship between the state and the individual, it is important to consider the unethical manipulation of the law that both writers expose. Orwell's world is one where "nothing was illegal since there were no longer any laws". This is incredibly revealing in presenting the state as a persecuting Hobbesian leviathan, as it means the state has full and opaque control over what is permitted.¹¹ Orwell's essays show that ideas deemed "genuinely unpopular" are "almost never given a fair hearing", particularly in corrupt states, much like when he initially tried to publish *Animal Farm*.¹² Blakemore notes that the absence of laws in Oceania is utilised by Orwell to convey how its citizens' lives are

¹⁰ Roelofs, H. Mark. "George Orwell's Obscured Utopia." *Religion & Literature*, vol. 19, no. 2, The University of Notre Dame, 1987, pp. 11–33, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40059340>

¹¹ Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Edited by J. C. A. Gaskin, Oxford University Press, 2008

¹² Orwell, George. "The Freedom of the Press." *Times Literary Supplement*, The Orwell Foundation, 1972, <https://www.orwellfoundation.com/the-orwell-foundation/orwell/essays-and-other-works/the-freedom-of-the-press/>

With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's *1984* and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*.

destabilised.¹³ Without the knowledge of clear legal boundaries, every action or thought is potentially criminal, such legal uncertainty instils a climate of fear. This reflects Orwell's negative sentiments regarding the Stalinist Soviet state and its relationship with its citizens. Dikotter outlines a USSR characterised by unlawful punishment, Benthamite surveillance by the NKVD, and persecution for unknown reasons.¹⁴ This renders it clear to the reader that the Oceanic society Orwell constructs, in which Winston falls victim to much of the same, draws heavily on aspects of the Soviet Union. Orwell describes how "in the vast majority of cases there was no trial", enabling readers to see there is no semblance of fairness or justice in Oceania. Persecution is arbitrary, as elucidated in the novel's conclusion, with the "agonising pain" of Winston's "torture". With the absence of laws, any notions of due process evaporate, and the citizens find themselves infinitely more at risk of being made an "unperson". Orwell's neologism is emblematic of Ingsoc's intolerant and dehumanising regime. In wider society, Orwell notes euphemistic language is often used in "defence of the indefensible", as in Oceania.¹⁵ By using political fiction, Orwell more accurately portrays the totalitarianism instituted by 20th Century dictators. He shows how the legal instruments of the state can, as Fry asserts, be like "a boot stamping on a human face—for ever" in the oppression of individuals that they can cause.¹⁶

¹³ Blakemore, Steven. "Language and Ideology in Orwell's 1984." *Social Theory and Practice*, vol. 10, no. 3, Florida State University Department of Philosophy, 1984, pp. 349–56, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23556571>

¹⁴ Dikotter, Frank. *How to Be a Dictator: The Cult of Personality in the Twentieth Century*. London, Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. 2019

¹⁵ Orwell, George. "Politics and the English Language.", *Horizon*, The Orwell Foundation, 1945, <https://www.orwellfoundation.com/the-orwell-foundation/orwell/essays-and-other-works/politics-and-the-english-language/>

¹⁶ Fry, Stephen. "Introduction to: Orwell Collection, *Animal Farm* and *1984*." Audible Studios, 2021

[REDACTED]
With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's *1984* and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*.

In the same vein, the court of *The Crucible* often acts ultra vires. The audience sees society and public opinion overruled by insistences upon following Puritanical Christianity to a dogmatic extent. The idea of the court acting ultra vires is most apparent through Miller's use of staging. Throughout *The Crucible*, Miller changes sets yet keeps some agent of the court ever present, showing the ubiquity and inescapable nature of this corrupt state.

Initially the court operates just in part of the church, which in itself is indicative of the commingling of religion and law; the court then expands its operations outwards and begins invading homes, exemplified when "Cheever enters" Proctor's house. This is emblematic of the lack of privacy and ability for free activity in Salem. Additionally, when Corey refuses to answer in a conversation with Danforth, the judge threatens to "declare the court in full session here". Miller's ironic abandonment of the legal process elucidates the corrupt and unjust nature of the court. Religion's presentation as inextricable from political function (something Miller uses as an allegory for the Red Scare) illustrates how the legal system may be co-opted by forces that have no place in a court room, an argument congruent with Appling's interpretation.¹⁷

Ardolino implies *The Crucible*'s legal injustices are caused by blind religious devotion, especially that of Danforth.¹⁸ His stubbornness evokes outrage and frustration in the audience, especially modern ones accustomed to the complete separation of church and state. Indeed, Danforth's willingness to ignore the burden of proof and "accept no deposition" because of the "invisible" nature of the supposed crime is a hyperbolic satirised

¹⁷ Appling, L. Troy. "Liturgical Legacies of Arthur Miller Uses of Religion as Ideological (De)Construction in the Plays of Christopher Durang." *The Arthur Miller Journal*, vol. 4, no. 1, Penn State University Press, 2009, pp. 1-7, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42908966>

¹⁸ Ardolino, Frank R. "Miller's Use of 'Doubting Thomas' in 'The Crucible.'" *The Arthur Miller Journal*, vol. 7, no. 1/2, Penn State University Press, 2012, pp. 107-12, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42909494>

With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's *1984* and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*.

version of the Christian tenet of faith and not needing proof to believe in God.¹⁹ In matters of religion, this is not necessarily harmful, but when this is used to drive a court, it proves fatal. Preceding the climax of the play, Miller reveals there are "seventy-two condemned to hang by [Danforth's] signature". The revelation that he is such an avid prosecutor alters audience expectations, heightening both tension and fear, after it is realised how dangerous the character of Danforth is. He is so powerful he can order capital punishment with an arbitrary signature. This immense legal potency further reinforces the oppressive and dangerous hold the state has over individuals. Miller may have constructed Danforth to mirror the notorious Senator McCarthy, allowing audiences to see how persecution by the state is an archaic practice that should have no place in Miller's contemporary America. By setting *The Crucible*, so far in the past, in "the Spring of the year, 1692", and by allowing audiences to draw such obvious parallels between seminal American society and the contemporary era, Miller conveys a lack of societal development, emphasising the barbarism and outdated nature of McCarthy's own legal processes. The abandonment of the rule of law in both texts, is both a critical comment on the writers' contemporary societies and perhaps a wider warning about the dangers of intolerance and unlimited state power without clear boundaries.

In both texts, the persecution of women is generally more unjust than that of men. It is less proportionate to their actual moral rectitude and provides an insight into the lives of some of the people most oppressed by the state. The exposure of yet another injustice is critical in fully understanding the relationship between the state and the individual in both texts, and

¹⁹ Ardolino, Frank R. "Miller's Use of 'Doubting Thomas' in 'The Crucible.'" *The Arthur Miller Journal*, vol. 7, no. 1/2, Penn State University Press, 2012, pp. 107–12, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42909494>

With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's *1984* and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*.

furtheres Orwell's critical argument that such states always cause moral corruption.²⁰ For

Abigail and Julia there seems to be less leeway to deviate from social norms than male

characters, showing the more stringent limitations placed on women under authoritarian

states. In *1984*, Julia must appear to be one of "the most bigoted adherents of the Party" in

order to survive. Her status is largely connected to her chastity. Orwell immediately

introduces her membership of the "Junior Anti-Sex League" through her emblematic "scarlet

sash". This places sexuality forefront in the mind the reader, highlighting its cruciality.

Orwell shows she must publicly remove an aspect of herself and her femininity for societal

advancement, exemplifying the more rigorous control of women. Simultaneously, by linking

her outwardly to the idea of sex, Orwell highlights the bestial nature assumed of women.²¹

This heavily mirrors Stalin's Great Retreat, whereby he removed many of the advancements

in women's rights made before he came to power. Most notably, contraception and abortions

were outlawed, and divorces were made more difficult, showing the state's desire to limit an

individual's sexual activity and justifying Orwell's criticism of the USSR.

Similarly, the harsher persecution of women is elucidated when *The Crucible*'s Abigail is

made an outcast because of her adultery, whereas the married John Proctor remains

"respected". Despite Proctor's lustful "sweat[ing] like a stallion", and committal of the sin of

adultery, Miller makes it evident that Abigail has suffered the most severe societal

consequences of this affair. Her name is "blacken[ed] in the village" and "lies" are spread

about her, even though many in the audience may hold her at less fault than the married

father, Proctor. However, through the gender discrimination of the state, Abigail is

²⁰ Orwell, George. "Notes on Nationalism." *Polemic*, The Orwell Foundation, 1945, <https://www.orwellfoundation.com/the-orwell-foundation/orwell/essays-and-other-works/notes-on-nationalism/>

²¹ Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman: with Strictures on Political and Moral Subjects*. 1845.

With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's 1984 and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*.

paradoxically able to gain power and aid in the persecution of others. Abigail, like Julia, can only gain power when she is useful to the machinations of the state, even then it is only through deceit and manipulation. By exploiting patriarchal assumptions about the honesty and meekness of women, there is marked "astonishment" at the idea Abigail could be orchestrating a "marvellous cool plot". This elucidates the diegetic perspective of Puritan culture's views on women, which restricted their advancement, highlighting the repressive nature of this state for women. Polster contends that, from an extradiegetic viewpoint, Miller may be commenting on how those who informed (or fabricated claims) on colleagues, bosses, and even family members, often gained from doing so.²² Polster's Marxist reading suggests some were motivated by their own egoism, a criticism of capitalistic materialism propagated by the state to weaken individual familial ties.²³ Perhaps these expositions of the unjust treatments of women reflects both writers' views on the overt sexism in the relationship between the state and the individual in the societies they are commenting on.

By the culmination of both texts, societal order is restored at the cost of deviant individuals. This harks back to traditional Greek and Shakespearean tragic works. One text sees the death of the protagonist, the other, the complete dismantling of him. Miller and Orwell provide warnings against authoritarianism and acceptance of "diametrically opposed absolutes" for the creation of a unipolar world. Ultimately, the state's intolerant oppression, in the name of unity, and the maintenance of its own power, creates great danger for the individual.

Word Count: 3000

Sophisticated and impressive piece with sustained textual examples and sophisticated expression and use of terminology.

Evaluate writers' methods and context, using a sophisticated, connective approach. Evaluates a wide range of critical interpretations and uses these to

²² Polster, Joshua E. "Beyond Plays of 'Foolish' Passions and Sympathies: 'The Crucible' as Marxist Drama." *The Arthur Miller Journal*, vol. 7, no. 1/2, Penn State University Press, 2012, pp. 43-61, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42909490>

²³ Polster, Joshua E. "Beyond Plays of 'Foolish' Passions and Sympathies: 'The Crucible' as Marxist Drama." *The Arthur Miller Journal*, vol. 7, no. 1/2, Penn State University Press, 2012, pp. 43-61, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42909490>

highly sophisticated; close analysis; eval. approach to A03; consistent use of A05 to devlp own arg. synthesises throughout.

full marks agreed CO + CSS.

With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's *1984* and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*.

Works cited:

Appling, L. Troy. "Liturgical Legacies of Arthur Miller Uses of Religion as Ideological (De)Construction in the Plays of Christopher Durang." *The Arthur Miller Journal*, vol. 4, no. 1, Penn State University Press, 2009, pp. 1–7, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42908966>

Ardolino, Frank R. "Miller's Use of 'Doubting Thomas' in 'The Crucible.'" *The Arthur Miller Journal*, vol. 7, no. 1/2, Penn State University Press, 2012, pp. 107–12, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42909494>

Blakemore, Steven. "Language and Ideology in Orwell's *1984*." *Social Theory and Practice*, vol. 10, no. 3, Florida State University Department of Philosophy, 1984, pp. 349–56, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23556571>

Cerjak, Judith A. "Beware the Loss of Conscience: 'The Crucible' as Warning for Today." *The English Journal*, vol. 76, no. 5, National Council of Teachers of English, 1987, pp. 55–57, <https://doi.org/10.2307/818784>

Dikotter, Frank. *How to Be a Dictator: The Cult of Personality in the Twentieth Century*. London, Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. 2019

Enteen, George M. "GEORGE ORWELL AND THE THEORY OF TOTALITARIANISM: A 1984 RETROSPECTIVE." *The Journal of General Education*, vol. 36, no. 3, Penn State University Press, 1984, pp. 206–15, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27797000>

With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's *1984* and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*.

Fry, Stephen. "Introduction to: Orwell Collection, Animal Farm and 1984." Audible Studios, 2021

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Edited by J. C. A. Gaskin, Oxford University Press, 2008

McGill, William J. "The Crucible of History: Arthur Miller's John Proctor." *The New England Quarterly*, vol. 54, no. 2, New England Quarterly, Inc., 1981, pp. 258–64, <https://doi.org/10.2307/364974>

Miller, Arthur. (2000). *The Crucible*. Penguin Classics.

Miller, Arthur. "Tragedy and the Common Man." *The New York Times*, 1949, <https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/books/00/11/12/specials/miller-common.html?mcubz=1>

Orwell, George. (2021). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Penguin Classics.

Orwell, George. "How a Nation is Exploited- The British Empire in Burma." *Le Progrès Civique*, CW 86, The Orwell Foundation, 1929, <https://www.orwellfoundation.com/the-orwell-foundation/orwell/essays-and-other-works/how-a-nation-is-exploited-the-british-empire-in-burma/>

Orwell, George. "Notes on Nationalism." *Polemic*, The Orwell Foundation, 1945, <https://www.orwellfoundation.com/the-orwell-foundation/orwell/essays-and-other-works/notes-on-nationalism/>

Orwell, George. "Politics and the English Language.", *Horizon*, The Orwell Foundation, 1945, <https://www.orwellfoundation.com/the-orwell-foundation/orwell/essays-and-other-works/politics-and-the-english-language/>

With reference to wider critical and contextual reading, compare how the writers present the relationship between the state and the individual in George Orwell's *1984* and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*.

Orwell, George. "The Freedom of the Press." *Times Literary Supplement*, The Orwell Foundation, 1972, <https://www.orwellfoundation.com/the-orwell-foundation/orwell/essays-and-other-works/the-freedom-of-the-press/>

Polster, Joshua E. "Beyond Plays of 'Foolish' Passions and Sympathies: 'The Crucible' as Marxist Drama." *The Arthur Miller Journal*, vol. 7, no. 1/2, Penn State University Press, 2012, pp. 43–61, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42909490>

Roelofs, H. Mark. "George Orwell's Obscured Utopia." *Religion & Literature*, vol. 19, no. 2, The University of Notre Dame, 1987, pp. 11–33, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40059340>

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman: with Strictures on Political and Moral Subjects*. 1845.