

Palacky University
Faculty of Education
Department of English



Jindřich Bláha

An Alternate Orange:
The Significance and Omission of the Last
Chapter of A Clockwork Orange

Bachelor's Diploma Thesis

Supervisor:

Mgr. Nevařil Josef, Ph. D.

Alexandra Hubáčková, MA., Ph. D.

OLOMOUC 2010

*I declare that I have worked on this thesis independently,
using only the primary and secondary sources listed in the bibliography.*

.....

Author's signature

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my former supervisor, Alexandra Hubáčková, M.A., Ph. D., who guided my work until 8.6.2010, for her kind help and valuable advice.

I also owe thanks to Mgr. Josef Nevařil, Ph. D. for undertaking this responsibility since then.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	6
2	BURGESS'S ORANGE.....	8
2.1	TEDDY BOYS AND LUDOVICO	8
2.2	OUR HUMBLE NARRATOR	10
2.3	A QUESTION OF CHOICE	12
3	THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LAST CHAPTER.....	14
3.1	„CURED ALL RIGHT“	14
3.2	21 – THE AGE OF MATURITY	18
4	AN ALTERNATE ORANGE – THE OMISSION OF THE LAST CHAPTER. 22	
4.1	AN AMERICAN ORANGE.....	22
4.2	KUBRICK'S ORANGE	24
5	CONCLUSION	26
6	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	28

ABSTRACT

The aim of this bachelor's thesis is to compare the difference in philosophical messages of original Anthony Burgess's novel *A Clockwork Orange* and in its abbreviated American edition and Stanley Kubrick's film adaptation, which was based on American shortened version. This thesis analyzes the idea of free will as it is presented in first twenty chapters of *A Clockwork Orange*, focusing mainly on the conflict between behaviorist worldview and Burgess's Christian beliefs. Then it analyzes the last twenty-first chapter and shows its importance in author's concept of the book. In order to better understand the idea of the book, also some circumstances and the background of the creation of book are presented as well as the circumstances which led to the omission of the last chapter.

1 INTRODUCTION

Following the success of dystopian novels such as Huxley's *Brave New World*, Orwell's *1984* or Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*, which have defined the genre of social science-fiction literature, in 1962 Anthony Burgess finishes his legendary *A Clockwork Orange* – a masterpiece of equivalent significance as regards the problematic questions of philosophy and ethics the novel revealed to its readers. The genres of sci-fi and fantasy have always had the advantage of being placed in the boundless universe of imagination which allowed authors to make hypothetical experiments through their stories, and thus it has given them power to expose the nature of man and, consequently, of entire knowable universe. In the case of *A Clockwork Orange* (ACO), the explored idea is mainly the idea of free will, but we can also find other philosophical categories tightly connected with that such as the Manicheistic dualism and so on.

Therefore the majority of critical reviews on ACO have been focused on the topic of free will and human tendency to diverse the universe to the ultimate principles of good and evil, namely the works of Aggeler, Morris, Stinson etc. Aim of this work is of different nature, though closely related to it, so the idea of free will will be examined in parallel. Two questions supposed to be answered by the end of this work are:

1) How important is the last, twenty-first, chapter of the book, which describes the main protagonist Alex growing up, changing his worldview and retrospectively exploring his criminal past?

2) How is the output message changed in pre-86 American editions of the book and in Stanley Kubrick's film adaptation, where the last chapter has been omitted? Is this shortening fatal or pardonable?

Unlike in the overwhelming majority of book-to-film adaptations where the production is driven by the director's personal need to share his own interpretation of the book; or where it is driven by the vision of financial profit from the book's franchise; the case of Kubrick's ACO film adaptation is of vital importance. Not only it helped to spread Burgess's idea amongst more people as suggests Whissen (Whissen, 1992, p. 62), but, primarily, it is considered a cult classic film, placing seventieth in the American Film Institute's (AFI, 2007) 100 YEARS...100 MOVIES (10th Anniversary Edition) chart. It is one of the most successful attempts of making a need-to-be-told story accessible to those who are not enthusiastic readers with its own dimension of artistic significance – two masterpieces in

one. Furthermore, the reception of the film was very controversial and it was accompanied by series of important events which seriously influenced society. Therefore it is unthinkable to ignore it, and we must approach to ACO as a complex phenomenon including both book versions, Kubrick's film and the real-life aftermath.

2 BURGESS'S ORANGE

2.1 Teddy boys and Ludovico

The direct reflection of the atmosphere of the early cold-war age with its changes in structure and behavior of society is clearly seen in the background of the novel. The generation gap was becoming a relevant fact and the alienation of youth and old was growing more and more serious. The subcultures of youth were emerging, based on the aversion to everything “from the world of adults” including traditional values or establishment. In 1950's in the United Kingdom the subculture of Teddy boys was on the rise, resurrected from the boom of rock and roll music and Hollywood. Fyvel (Gelder, 1997, p. 388-390) best describes Teddy boys stating that it was “*a subculture with its own laws of dress, behaviour, and territory, in which they strutted about, looked challengingly at outsiders, chased girls, occasionally fought each other, and planned the occasional larceny.*” The movement's specifics consist in love of American pop culture, stylish haircuts and retro Edwardian clothes. But in its early days it was more associated with juvenile criminality, as a lot of early Teddy boys had links with the underworld. Fyvel again distinguishes early Teddy boys from their later followers by describing them as “*working-class youths with an itch to assert themselves against society.*”

What probably made Burgess more involved in this problematic of juvenile violent behavior was, referring to Aggeler (Aggeler, 1979, p. 134, 170), his visit to Leningrad in 1961. There he experienced similar kind of youth gang violence practiced by so called “stilyagi”, a Russian equivalent of London's Teddy boys.

Experiencing both of these incarnations of youngster evil, Burgess had constructed his own “droog” (from Russian word meaning *friend, companion*) or “Nadsat” (Russian suffix equivalent to English *-teen*) subculture with its own slang language, which is a mixture of Cockney-like English and Slavic vocabulary. Russian influence here is clear but, as Stinson suggests, “*it is just possible too that the ugly encroachment of Russian cultural elements is Burgess's ironically oblique way of casting a satiric eye at creeping Americanism*” (Bloom, 1987, p. 57). Anyway, there is no doubt that Burgess was not much enthusiastic about these new movements, which is understandable because of his experience, when he observed dark, violent side of youth subcultures.

ACO is obviously Burgess's reaction to B.F. Skinner or at least behaviorist movement of psychology that he was a part of. Some critics of this movement claim that they degraded human free will to Pavlovian conditioned reflex. Aggeler presents Burgess's polemic with Skinnerian doctrine via ACO and also his another work *Enderby quartet* while stating about ACO that the aim of the "attack" here were rather British politicians or, more precisely, their form of struggle with Teddy boys, which was based on reformatory program not unrelated to Skinnerian ideas (Aggeler, 1979, p. 96). Aggeler again speaks about B.F. Skinner and his work (*Walden Two, Beyond Freedom and Dignity* – this was released after ACO, in 1971) as an inspiration for a ACO later in his book on Burgess entitled *Anthony Burgess: the artist as novelist*, but suggests that much bigger influence could be his reading on actual behaviorist methods used in reformation of American criminals (Aggeler, 1979, p. 170). Similar reformatory program, in the novel presented in radicalized form as Ludovico's Technique, creates the spine of the book, the whole second chapter, when the main protagonist Alex is imprisoned for a murder and in the end, after this reprogramming and humiliating presentation of it, released from prison as a machine incapable of own voluntary actions in consequence of the treatment.

There is also another important event, far more relevant chapter of Burgess's private history, reflected in the novel. As mentioned in Stinson's *Anthony Burgess Revisited* (Stinson, 1991, p. 9), the one of the most striking and pivotal scenes of the novel – the brutal attack on F. Alexander and his spouse at HOME – is based on true events that happened to his wife in spring of 1944. She was attacked at her home when Burgess was on official journey. As a consequence of such brutal attack, she miscarried and was forbidden from having a child in future by doctors, which started a chain reaction that ended with hepatic cirrhosis caused by alcoholism more than 20 years later (1968), according to Burgess.

2.2 Our Humble Narrator*

As a mediator between the psychology of the main character and the reader serves first person narrative of the main protagonist, led in synthetic language called Nadsat. Nadsat is Burgess's very own invention, substantially elaborated thanks to Burgess's linguistic skills (he is also known and praised as a linguist and literary critic and besides that also for his active interest in music) and it is one of the most suggestive aspects of the book. Besides Kubrick's audiovisual captivating adaptation, Nadsat is the reason of ACO's development of cult classic status. Although it cannot be equated with Tolkien's Middle earth languages or Klingon, a part of sci-fi TV series Star Trek fandom, which have their own advanced complex system of grammar, phonology and alphabet and writing system while Nadsat is rather slang based on English grammar with Slavic languages borrowings, it is still one of the most memorable fictional languages in film and literature.

Burgess, with skills of minister of propaganda, uses his invented language as a sophisticated tool of manipulation with the reader, trying to ignite compassion towards Alex – a textbook case of everything we can sum up into archetype of “evil person.” He is trying to create bond between them, letting Alex narrate his life story as if he was talking to friends of him; he actually speaks about himself as of “Your (therefore recipients) Humble Narrator” and addresses his story to “brothers.” Adams (Bloom, 1987, p. 98) speculates that addressee could be identified as his future gang introduced in the last chapter, but this is very unlikely, because there is nothing changed in the structure of narration and addressee is still those unidentified “brothers” and the gang is introduced in third person: *“There was me, Your Humble Narrator, and my three droogs, that is Len, Rick and Bully because of his bolshly big neck and very glomky goloss whichwas just like some bolshy great bull bellowing auuuuuuuuuh”* (ACO, p. 140).

“Brothers”, in that case, can be only the readers and this direct addressing then gives us the feeling of unspecified relation with Alex. The best description of this effect is given by Stinson: *“This, of course, is an old novelistic trick; the reader can easily sympathize with anyone who continually tells him about his life and makes him vicariously share it. The reader in the case of A Clockwork Orange ideally becomes a sharer with Alex in the making of mayhem. Removed from his point of orientation, he might even surprise in himself some deep, dark streaks of sadism”* (Bloom, 1987, p. 58). This could be also used as an explanation of one present-day phenomenon that more and more protagonists of films, literature and other media can be described as antiheroes. As the humankind is pushing the boundaries of its

knowledge, it is possible that people starts to be more self-critical, sober in their judgments and sincere. So the old rhetorical stories with fully virtuous heroes are replaced by stories revealing the real, double-faced, nature of man with his worst sins.

Adams (Bloom, 1987, p. 98) mentions the distracting nature of Nadsat. Language of the novel, which is unfamiliar to the reader, conceals the simple reality of criminal acts and leaves behind the romanticized mysterious impression of some kind of adventure or entertainment. Reader understands from context that this malfeasance is happening, but it is possible that he feels uninvolved in the same way someone feels when he speaks in foreign language without being advanced in it. Aggeler (Aggeler, 1979, p. 171), on the other hand, demonstrates suggestive power of Burgess's slang on nicknames of weapons used in street fights between city gangs and on the parts of the human body – potential targets of violence. He mentions words like “oozy” (chain), “britva” (razor), “zoobies” (teeth), “glazzies” (eyes) and says that, used in the context of violent act, they sound more suggestive and sadistic. Take for example sentence “*I gave her a malenky (tiny) fair kick in the litso (face), and she didn't like that, crying "Waaaaah," and you could vidy (see) her veiny mottled litso going purplewurple where I'd landed the old noga (foot)*” (ACO, p. 51). It sounds almost like poetry and so it makes it definitely more suggestive than just stating he had brutally beaten somebody. There really is something perverse about the tenor of this language. Talking about violence is led cold-bloodily, with no remorse. On the contrary, Alex talks about violence and other criminality with admiration, he rhapsodize it, there is no empathy with his victims. There is just personal pleasure and fun of it. It is like writing the odes on the beauties of the world; instead, the natural beauties are replaced by the terrible visions of gore and violence. He is being hedonist in the most vicious way imaginable to a man.

The language of the novel has two vivid qualities – its aestheticism, which emphasizes the effectiveness of the story, and the second quality – its, let say, esotericism, which firstly builds up realism of constructed Nadsat subculture and, secondly, plays an important part in Burgess's hidden game or experiment. In Burgess's biography *You've had your time* he explains: “*As the book was about brainwashing, it was appropriate that the text itself should be a brainwashing device. The reader would be brainwashed into learning minimal Russian. The novel was to be an exercise in linguistic programming, with the exoticisms gradually clarified by context: I would resist to the limit any publisher's demand that a glossary be provided. A glossary would disrupt the programming and nullify the brainwashing*” (Burgess, 1990).

2.3 A Question of choice

“What does God want? Does God want goodness or the choice of goodness? Is a man who chooses the bad perhaps in some ways better than a man who has the good imposed upon him?” (ACO, p. 76) This is the question given to 6655321, as is Alex referred to through the whole second chapter, by the prison chaplain. Even though he is not presented as pure good of the novel – a character whose fineness is, according to Kennard (Bloom, 1987, p. 67), discredited by alcohol consumption and impersonal treatment of prisoners who he only calls by numbers - he is a representative of Burgess’s ethical beliefs. Burgess did not depict the chaplain as totally positive character, because he is aware of duality of human nature. Not in the sense that there are good people and bad people, but in the sense that there is something good and something bad in every single individual – we find mentioned bad qualities in the prison chaplain, but as well we find the essence of goodness in such a criminal mind as Alex is. Burgess do not tell us a story about struggle between good and evil, about main protagonist’s conflict with injustice and the cruelty of the fate – he gives us a character who symbolize all this negativity in the world and forces us to explore the goodness even in him.

This concept of absolute antihero is something really original in the novel. If we try to find other so called antiheroes in classic literature, hardly will we find character of such negative status. Notoriously known protagonists who are considered antiheroes of classic literature are for example Heathcliff of Brontë’s *Wuthering Heights* or Holden Caulfield of Salinger’s *Catcher in the Rye*. Heathcliff is a tragic hero, an outsider, but it is ridiculous to classify him as an evil man. All “evil” coming from him can be explained in typical Freudian manner – it is a revengeful reply to all injustice towards his person from the past and a result of frustration caused by unfulfilled romance with Catherine. Holden Caulfield, a rebellious teenager full of cynicism and satiety, is different type of antihero, probably much more closer to the character of Alex, who is also an adolescent. *Catcher in the rye* is known for being one of the most controversial works of literature in American society, because it offered undesirable role model. A teenager who is opened to sexual relations, drinks, smokes, uses some vulgar language and shows indifference to the educational system have represented a serious threat to the post-Puritan society. But in fact, you could find thousands of his counterparts wandering the streets of real America. Their parents probably were not proud of them, but that does not mean they are automatically some bad criminals. Alex is different – we are not introduced to his past and possible frustrations caused by society or bad treatment of his person, but we do not also feel this immediate nausea as in Caulfield case. Alex is

satisfied with his life of wrong-doing, it is his voluntary choice. And this exactly is the main philosophical/theological idea of the book: *“youthful free will having the choice of good and evil although generally choosing evil; the artificial extirpation of free will through scientific conditioning; the question as to whether this might not, in theological terms, be a greater evil than the free choice of evil”* (Burgess, 1990).

3 THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LAST CHAPTER

3.1 „Cured all right“

In order to better comprehend the significance of the last chapter, we must firstly examine what output is given to us before we meet Alex after his revitalization from the fatal consequences of the Ludovico technique. We witness the return of the old, pre-prison Alex, as we know him from the first part of the book where he introduces himself to us through narrating about degenerate adventures of him and his gang. He is, by his words, *“cured all right.”* It simply means that the effects of his imprisonment and subsequent rehabilitation program were nullified by this re-revitalization. Alex proves himself again to be the same sadistic criminal mind, an antisocial individual dangerous to the society and worthy of nothing more than prison but being released due to political machinations in the state. He is made an instrument of intrastate political struggle, paradoxically exploited for the purpose of elimination of political opposition by the same people who tested Ludovico technique on him.

Coincidentally, the political opposition represented by F. Alexander and his friends or party colleagues are actually the ones who are morally against Ludovico technique, probably because of the religious reasons. Remember F. Alexander philosophizing in front of Alex: *“You've sinned, I suppose, but your punishment has been out of all proportion. They have turned you into something other than a human being. You have no power of choice any longer. You are committed to socially acceptable acts, a little machine capable only of good. And I see that clearly - that business about the marginal conditionings. Music and the sexual act, literature and art, all must be a source now not of pleasure but of pain,”* and then continues that *“...the essential intention is the real sin. A man who cannot choose ceases to be a man“*(ACO, p. 122). Alex then replies that this is almost what prison chaplain told him and F. Alexander explains that it is a certainty for Christian to see things this way. Again we see Burgess's Catholic views impersonated into the novel character and again we are witnesses of his dualistic concept incorporated into the novel.

This opposition party uses Alex - in the name of the war on totalitarianism of the state, as they claim, also just as some tool of their policy. They are trying to make him, with a little bit of rhetoric exaggeration, a cautionary case to discourage people from supporting current government. One of the colleagues of F. Alexander, Z. Dolin, proves that by forcing him to play his part as *“A martyr to the cause of Liberty.”* As regards F. Alexander himself, he seems honestly helpful and his intentions seems they are coming from his deepest convictions, but

we have to face even his dark side and that is his desire for revenge, as he finds out Alex is the one had assaulted him and his wife before being imprisoned (in the novel, because he accidentally mentions his former partner in crime Dim; and in the film, because he sings a song “*Singing in the rain*” he was singing during the assault). This completes the complex Burgess’s man with all his good and his evil aspects, with his predestination to sin.

It would be hard to find an individual who would rate Ludovico method as efficient and justifiable after what we have witnessed in the narration of our main protagonist. The degradation of man to something much more resembling a machine, “a clockwork orange”, is definitely not a goal society would request. A thorny philosophical question is raised here. Who or what is man? Although the idea of humanity, of what makes us what we are, is something really difficult to define, we all have a tendency to rate human species as something transcending all other life forms on earth. The opinions about the essential quality, which should give us this privileged position, are various. Some determine this quality as being of spiritual nature, a soul, a specific relation between human and some supernatural being or force – a god, a creator. Other opinions originate in recognition of man as a rational being, in his superiority of intellect in contrast with intuitiveness of animals. What the behaviorist movement, people such as B.F. Skinner, did was that they shocked the world by questioning this fundamental conviction about human nature. The act of free will, the central theme of ACO and something which is considered a typical feature of the concept of humanity is according to Skinner only more complicated version of what is commonly known as a reflex. Physical reflexes such as vomiting or coughing are natural mechanisms of living organisms to “*free themselves from harmful contacts*” (Skinner, 2002, p. 26). In the same manner, according to this conception, we can think of entire human behavior. We all possess the power to free ourselves from anything harmful, in the meaning of undesired condition, through defensive of offensive behavior. We can face problems resulting from common social life where the aims of one are limited with the aims of the other by attacking or escaping from the threat. Applied for example on political life, if we feel dissatisfaction with existing regime, which is somehow threatening our desired actions, we can choose an escape – emigration or we can choose an attack or action against the potential – this does not immediately mean coup d’état, but for example just active participation in political life. Skinner himself points out that “*the aggressive behavior is not necessarily directed toward the actual source of stimulation; it may be “displaced” toward any convenient person or object*” (Skinner, 2002, p. 29). He then continues with a remark we may consider useful in

psychological analysis of our main protagonist Alex. *“Vandalism and riots are often forms of undirected or misdirected aggression. An organism which has received a painful shock will also, if possible, act to gain access to another organism toward which it can act aggressively. The extent to which human aggression exemplifies innate tendencies is not clear, and many of the ways in which people attack and thus weaken or destroy the power of intentional controllers are quite obviously learned”* (Skinner, 2002, p. 29-30).

Skinner’s criticism towards traditional conceptions of freedom is that it is often described through feelings, through our emotions, thus it cannot be accepted as a relevant empirical fact. He also criticizes so called “literature of freedom” stating that *“the content of the literature is the philosophy of freedom, but philosophies are among those inner causes which need to be scrutinized. We say that a person behaves in a given way because he possesses a philosophy, but we infer the philosophy from the behavior and therefore cannot use it in any satisfactory way as an explanation, at least until it is in turn explained,”* (Skinner, 2002, p. 30) and he adds a positive remark about its contributing ability to “induce people to act.”

So what we learn from this hypothesis is that the act of will is simply a complicated psychological mechanism which, therefore, can be adjusted for our purposes. And here we are back with Ludovico technique. The government in the novel is trying to apply behaviorist knowledge in practice. They are trying to improve society by turning criminals into “law-abiding” citizens incapable of recidivism because of this developed reflex. The intention of the government is obviously good, as history teaches us, all radical solutions result in tragedy. The end does not justify the means for Burgess here. For him, Ludovico technique means attack not on a concrete person, but on humanity as a whole. In ACO we have two antagonists – Alex the criminal and the government representing attack on Christian values, on Christian vision of man.

It is important to say that the actual Skinner’s work *Beyond Freedom and dignity*, which was used as a main source of this chapter, was released in 1971 - that means about nine years after ACO - but similar ideas, Skinner’s and others, were here some time prior to ACO release. It is also important to mention that Skinner himself has not intended to apply his theory in this form; his approach was rather based on rewarding the requested behavior, on so called *positive reinforcer*. In the Lauren Slater’s work *Opening Skinner’s box* (Slater, 2008, p. 23-37), which is retrospective nonfiction book about important psychological experiments of the twentieth century, she is quoting one experimental psychologist who mentions that for

example traffic lights were constructed on these principles and we know from our own experience as well as from the statistics that their presence is beneficial. Slater is also questioning daughter of B.F. Skinner, who describes him as a pacifist and loving father and points out that a lot of criticism on her father originate in misunderstanding of his work. Nevertheless, it does not matter how radical Skinner's ideas of ideal society led by behaviorist engineers look to us; it does not matter how much we can agree or disagree with the idea of, as it Slater describes, "extreme freedom through conformity"; we must appreciate Skinner's/behaviorist significance and accept also this view, which is in direct opposition to Burgess's, as possible.

3.2 21 – The age of maturity

So far we have been analyzing the message given to us in twenty chapters of ACO that is when the abbreviated American version ends. The output message that these twenty chapters try to tell us is that in ethics, in distinction of good and evil the essential thing is volitional act. Fulfilled intention is all that matters, otherwise we cannot label actions by good/evil categories. If some action is mechanized, it is out of these categories in the same way as we do not consider forces of nature evil if someone is struck by lightning. But the original version's twenty-first chapter has something more to say.

Before we start analyzing the last chapter, we have to explore one more feature of the third part of the book. It is the possible hidden meaning and symbolism of the character of F. Alexander. We know from the novel that Alex is surprised when he discovers that the name of his former victim and present savior is also Alex. As suggests the essay of Philip E. Ray (Aggeler, 1986, p. 132) this presumably means that F. Alexander stands for "future" Alex, the man Alex is going to become when he grows up. Some similarities with author's life and F. Alexander explained in the first part of this thesis also implies that Burgess himself may have seen his own person as grown up Alex - not exactly the brutal criminal Alex - but what he stands for – the inexperienced, rebellious, callow youth. Every single individual must go through his own personal evolution, and this evolution is essential aspect of human nature. Each of us definitely did in his early years something which he is not proud of as a grown up individual, or at least something which he sees just as some juvenile escapade. We deny ourselves, us from the past, in this act of personal evolution, we change our attitudes and beliefs and with that obviously our behavior. In terms of temporality, which is the field inevitable to human being, an individual is becoming "someone else" in particular chronological units – as far as we consider human personality the summation of his behavior, individual psychological state and some other factors. But we also know other view on personality from philosophical and theological perspective and that is the one based on the eternal human soul. We know biblical teachings about the "original sin" – a Christian belief that evil present in human is hereditary since "Fall of men" and that man is due to this predestined to sin. The question of predestination, which deals with human freedom, has been one of the most debated ideas of Christianity. Bipolarity of this idea is represented by St. Augustine; who actually formed this idea of predestination, and who says that because of the Adam's/Eve's sin are all their descendants burdened by this sin, and thus they are not born free, but they are doomed to be sinners and, therefore, are not allowed to live for eternity; and

Pelagius, who was in opposition to Augustine, and who believed that people are born free and sinless and if they will follow the path of Christ they are able to avoid sin on their own. (Storig, 2000, p. 176) This Pelagian/Augustinian conflict is according to Aggeler main philosophical and theological resource for what Burgess tried to say in the last chapter of ACO, *“that the individual is capable of learning through suffering and error and choosing goodness. Suffering, fallen human beings, not behavioral technology or the revolutionary schemes of idealists, bring goodness into the world.”* (Aggeler, 1979, p. 101-102)

The number 21 – the number of chapters of the original ACO – is supposed to symbolize maturity. For Burgess was this arithmetical concept important. As a big music enthusiast and a musician himself he saw the symmetry of composition as something indispensable (Burgess, 1986). The importance of this last chapter also consists in its optimistic accent, in hope that it offers. By the end of the twentieth chapter, the legacy is rather pessimistic, teaching a reader that even modern wonders of science are not able to eliminate or reduce evil in society. We do not witness the ultimate victory of good over evil. We find ourselves in the very beginning. No lesson is learned by our main protagonist, neither probably by the government, another wrong-doing representative of the novel. But the twenty-first chapter shows us a change. Alex – now hanging around with another gang but apparently with the old manners – finds himself dissatisfied with this stereotype. He is seeking something different, although not able to define it. Then, one of his “droogies” finds out Alex is keeping a cut-out picture of a baby in his pocket. Alex excuses himself from the night “entertainment” and as he wanders the streets alone, thinking of his future, he meets Pete - one of his former brothers in crime - in the cafeteria. Alex finds out, that Pete is married and lives the life of the law-abiding citizen. But instead of mockery, Alex discovers that maybe this what he lacks in life and he envisions himself having a son. He realizes that he is growing up and he explains his juvenile delinquency in this monologue: *“Youth must go, ah yes. But youth is only being in a way like it might be an animal. No, it is not just like being an animal so much as being one of these malenky toys you viddy being sold in the streets, like little chellovecks made out of tin and with a spring inside and then a winding handle on the outside and you wind it up grrr grrr grrr and off it itties, like walking, O my brothers. But it itties in a straight line and bangs straight into things bang bang and it cannot help what it is doing. Being young is like being like one of these malenky machina.”* (ACO, p. 148) Burgess sees the violence of youth as something inevitable, something we cannot absolutely eliminate. Destruction is simply a part of young people nature because it originates

in their inability too transform their superfluous energy to the act of creation, so instead they find release of that energy in destruction. (Burgess, 1990). Young people are inexperienced, naïve and sometimes seek out radical solutions of their problems. In several conceptions of developmental psychology, adolescence is connected with search for identity and with autonomization of an individual. This logically often result in confusion so because of lack of stable worldview with its own moral values young people often tend to commit something they would not do in the age of maturity. This is the reason why the age plays important part in legal systems. Nevertheless, it does not mean that juvenile crimes are justifiable to the full extent. There is no excuse for what Alex did. It is still a pathological deviation and it still harms society and so the punishment is unavoidable. But what Burgess wants reader to realize is that criminal behavior was, is, and will be a part of society but also that the individual, through personal growth and through enlightenment, is able to reach personal redemption and that he is able to find the “right way.” Even Alex, such a human monster, realizes that what used to be his meaning of life was bad and stupid and is aware of the possibility that his future son will be the same, that he will follow the wrong path and that Alex will probably not be able to change this fact.

This last chapter of ACO is therefore Burgess’s message of hope, an optimistic twist following twenty pessimistic chapters as we know them from the shortened American version. Even though ACO is set in a fantasized world, we may see the novel as a realistic one. The optimistic moment of the novel, the last chapter, in conflict with pessimism of belief in eternal existence of evil makes Burgess’s worldview sober and unbiased. Burgess does not end with moral revolution, with preaching what man should do, what is the right path to follow. We witness something like an eternal return in the novel – F. Alexander, Alex and his future son – they all are just parts of single archetype of man, of good and evil duality in our world , or more precisely, in the way we think, in the way we are. It is easy to blame others, especially those who we do not know if they commit something immoral, but Burgess wanted to draw reader’s attention to the fact that no one is actually purely innocent, that there is an unspecified amount of evil essence in all of us. Even the author himself proves that somewhere deep inside hides a monster which may or may not be awoken. If the writer is able to impersonate into an evil character and if the reader is able to sympathize with this character and is able to enjoy his malicious actions then this is proof that human being are in principle same by nature. Then what makes us good or evil (in terms of common language) is a choice, a realized agreement with some moral principle. And if someone does not agree with this

agreement in present and acts against it, it does not mean he will not be able to change his actions according to this agreement in the future. All people grow up, that is what Burgess wanted to say in the last chapter. This does not concern only young people, but it is a universal thought and we must be aware of it. We must not judge people only by their past, but we must also consider their present state of mind.

4 AN ALTERNATE ORANGE – THE OMISSION OF THE LAST CHAPTER

4.1 An American Orange

The first American edition of ACO meant a fatal strike for Burgess's concept. The last chapter, the whole idea of Alex's achievement of maturity, was refused by New York publisher W. W. Norton Inc. as not being "tough" and realistic enough for American audience, who according to the publisher representative Eric Swenson can better face and accept the sad facts of reality. Burgess describes this disagreement in foreword to US re-edition from 1986 called ACO Resucked (Burgess, 1986) in these words showing direct reference to American politics: *"My book was Kennedyan and accepted the notion of moral progress. What was really wanted was a Nixonian book with no shred of optimism in it."* Since this 1986 edition, the last chapter is included also in American versions. The fact that is omission appeared only in United States versions not in the others, European translations, can be diagnosed as a vivid sign of cultural differences between two shores of Atlantic in the second half of twentieth century. Nowadays, with the world globalized through new communication technologies, the differences slowly seem to vanish, but in those days were more significant.

Main dissatisfaction on which Burgess commented in couple of interviews (Aggeler, 1986, p. 34-35) comes from the Burgess's opinion that the omission of the last chapter transformed ACO from a novel to a parable or fable. For Burgess, the reason for writing a novel is to question reader's ethical or philosophical attitudes and to show possibility of changing them. As he says: *"When a fictional work fails to show change, when it merely indicates that human character is set, stony, unregenerable, then you are out of the field of the novel and into that of the fable or the allegory. The American or Kubrickian Orange is a fable; the British or world one is a novel"* (Burgess, 1986). However, Burgess had been having some financial problems those days, so he decided to accept requirements of his American publisher and let him release this alternative version to the world.

Nevertheless, despite Burgess's dissatisfaction with the fact of existence of this alternative version of his novel we cannot percept American edition of ACO just as a non-complete copy of the original. He himself admitted in the interview with Cullinan (Aggeler, 1986, p. 37) that both versions are relevant and that the omission of the last chapter is an

interesting phenomena which can tell us something about cultural differences between these two countries. Things went far away beyond Burgess – reincarnated ACO started to live its own life – American edition (and later especially the film) became an “evil twin” of the original. The younger brother who has not reached maturity but still remains deeply philosophical, having a lot to question.

4.2 Kubrick's Orange

Stanley Kubrick was undeniably one of the most important people in the film industry of the twentieth century. His films such as *2001: A Space Odyssey*, *Dr. Strangelove*, *Paths of Glory* and others are considered directorial masterpieces and their influence is still seen in cinematography of the new millennium. One of the reasons of such popularity is of course also the selection of themes for his films, which often touched controversial areas - most notably- violence and sexuality. Prior to the adaptation of ACO, Kubrick had to face sharp criticism of his work, which led to rigorous censorship. His film *Spartacus* was blamed for showing too much authenticity in the scenes of violence and for depicting clear hints of homosexuality. He even hired midgets and amputees to wear prosthesis in order to make scenes look more realistic. (Sova, 2005, p. 174-176) Also his adaptation of Nabokov's *Lolita* had to wave of criticism due to unacceptable theme of relationship between elderly teacher and a young girl. (Sova, 2005, p. 178-181) So, for such a controversial director with interest in provocative themes, ACO was the right challenge.

Kubrick followed American shortened edition. He learned that the original version includes twenty-one chapters when he was in the middle of production of ACO, so it was too late to for reshaping the concept (Aggeler, 1986, p. 35). Having seen Kubrick's *Lolita*, Burgess was afraid that the visual adaptation will prioritize the sexual and violent aspects of the book which will weaken for Burgess more important lingual side. On the other hand, he appreciated Kubrick's work, especially his visual perfectionism he showed in *2001: A Space Odyssey* and as a couple of screenplays had been rejected (including his own), he recognized Kubrick as an ideal candidate for the job (Burgess, 1990). After seeing the film, Burgess was impressed by the preciseness of it and praised it, though there was still one thing which, according to him, remained to be called perfect by him – the last chapter. They became friends and - because of their shared interest in Napoleon - Burgess even dedicated his later novel *Napoleon Symphony* to Kubrick.

It is not difficult to imagine what outrage there was over Kubrick's adaptation of ACO. The book itself was considered unacceptably brutal and realistic visualization of this brutality was simply scandalous. The Catholic press labeled the film as a glorification of violence and other critical replies followed soon. This was the time when Burgess realized “*how little impact even a shocking book can make in comparison with a film*” (Burgess, 1990). Even though the book itself was very provocative, majority of debates and analyses of the story and its meaning appeared after film premiere in 1971 (Aggeler, 1986, p. 8). Despite

Kubrick's and Burgess's efforts to justify the form their moral message took, the film was banned in 1973 from British cinemas (it appeared again after 27 years) due to alleged influence on the crimes of violence in years 1971-1973 (Munday, 2008).

5 CONCLUSION

It is understandable that such a radical intervention to author's work as the omission of the whole chapter is goes hand in hand with controversy. But who is the competent person to judge legitimacy of arguments for and arguments against? This is actually more difficult than it seems on the first sight. Even though Burgess was not fully satisfied with American reduction of his novel, it was his last word which led to the release of the abbreviated version on American market. And what is more, even he himself, as was mentioned before, pointed out that this version is also important and it is entirely on the reader to criticize. Books are intellectual property of their authors - this is undeniable - and therefore authors logically possess rights to manipulate with them according to their own will. But once they are out of drawer they become part of culture. And one of the pillars of culture is its flexibility. What I want to say is that in the case of New York publisher's revision of the novel, the problem of omission of the last chapter may be classified as a weak devaluation of the work, but in the case of Kubrick's motion picture, we are talking about new work. Films based on original novel or screenplay of someone else than director are demonstration of cultural ability to enable debate between an author and a reader. Directors, screenwriters and other members of filmmaking crew who are responsible for the final shape of adaptation are basically answering to author's calling to the world because they show how they understand what he wanted to say. Writings are monologues from which their adaptations and remakes make dialogues. And as well as it is possible to absolutely misunderstand the essential message of the original, it is possible to upgrade it with aesthetical or philosophical features. This is the reason why so many themes are repeated in literature, film, philosophy etc.

My opinion is that W. W. Norton Inc representative Swenson misunderstood Burgess's concept of personal redemption in the last chapter and thought of it as of redundant extra chapter, as of weak echo of Burgess's sentiment. He did not realize how much will this "small" adjustment change the message author wanted to pass on to the world. In reality, it is probable that the majority of people know ACO via Kubrick's film. Kubrick is definitely not the one to blame as he knew only the shortened version and his understanding of ACO is therefore influenced by this fact. Nevertheless, the point is that both versions became classics and that the message of both is so deep that the discussion about which one is more valuable is pointless. All professional criticism can maximally help reader to orientate or reveal non-obvious ideas hidden in the novel. But aside from that, every critic is only a reader as well as every reader is kind of a critic. The importance of literature consists in its ability to arouse an

inner discussion; discussion not in the sense of dialectics but in the sense of indirect sharing of the world experience. Through narrating a story, even if anything you want to say is not said directly, you hand over a snapshot of your worldview and thus the message transferred is more complex than it could ever be by the means of dialogue.

The omission of the last chapter just offered a worldview different from Burgess's philosophy that every man is able to reform himself. People who supported the opinion that the last chapter spoils the harmony of the novel simply just have not shared Burgess's hope in the ultimate goodness in every human being or the reason could be their different aesthetic taste. If the reasons were purely aesthetic then it is pointless to look for arguments. Aesthetic sense is a part of emotional or spiritual side of human being and a logical argumentation cannot be supported by anything. If the reasons originated in deep conviction that an individual such as Alex cannot change then Burgess's final lecture failed, concerning these people. The premise given in first twenty chapters – that it is immoral to reform people by mechanization of their external behavior – seems to have impressed bigger part of the audience. We can only speculate if the reason for this conclusion is that the idea of free will is sacred for most people, that it is something we believe forms our identity as human beings. If the answer is “yes” then in this case Burgess succeeded.

6 BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

BURGESS, Anthony. *A Clockwork Orange*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex : Penguin Books, 1972. 143 s. ISBN 0140032193.

SECONDARY SOURCES

AGGELER, Geoffrey. *Anthony Burgess: the artist as novelist*. Birmingham : University of Alabama Press, 1979. 245 s. ISBN 0817371060.

AGGELER, Geoffrey. *Critical essays on Anthony Burgess*. Boston, Mass. : G.K. Hall, 1986. 231 s. ISBN 0816187576.

BLOOM, Harold. *Anthony Burgess*. New York : Chelsea House Publishers, 1987. 183 s. ISBN 0877546762.

GELDER, Ken; THORNTON, Sarah. *The subcultures reader*. 1. vyd. London : Routledge, 1997. 599 s. ISBN 0415127270.

MORRIS, Robert K. *The consolations of ambiguity: an essay on the novels of Anthony Burgess*. Columbia : University of Missouri Press, 1971. 89 s. ISBN 0826201122.

SLATER, Lauren; KOSEK, Jan. *Pandořina skříňka: nejvýznamnější psychologické experimenty dvacátého století*. 1. vyd. Praha : Dokořán, 2008. 303 s. ISBN 9788072039852.

SKINNER, B. *Beyond freedom & dignity*. Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett Pub., 2002. 234 s. ISBN 0872206270.

SOVA, Dawn B; RANDOVÁ, Nad'a. *Zakázané filmy: 125 příběhů filmové cenzury*. 1. vyd. Praha : Knižní klub, 2005. 318 s. ISBN 8024213834.

STINSON, John J. *Anthony Burgess revisited*. Boston, Mass.: Twayne, 1991. 165 s. ISBN 0805770003.

STÖRIG, Hans Joachim. *Malé dějiny filosofie*. 7., přeprac. a rozš. vyd. Kostelní Vydří : Karmelitánské nakladatelství, 2000. 630 s. ISBN 8071925002.

WHISSEN, Thomas R. *Classic cult fiction: a companion to popular cult literature*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1992. 319 s. ISBN 031326550X.

INTERNET SOURCES

AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE. *AFI's 100 Years...100 Movies – 10th Anniversary Edition*. [online]. American Film Institute, 2007. [cit. 3.4.2010] Dostupné z URL <<http://connect.afi.com/site/DocServer/100Movies.pdf?docID=301>>

BURGESS, Anthony. *Anthony Burgess on A Clockwork Orange – excerpts from “You’ve had your time”*. [online]. 1990. [cit. 2.6.2010] Dostupné z URL <<http://www.visual-memory.co.uk/amk/doc/burgess.html>>

BURGESS, Anthony. *A Clockwork Orange Resucked*. [online]. 1986. [cit. 24.5.2010] Dostupné z URL <<http://www.visual-memory.co.uk/amk/doc/0062.html> >

MUNDAY, Rod. *The Kubrick FAQ*. [online]. 16/11/2008. [cit. 11.6.2010] Dostupné z URL <<http://www.visual-memory.co.uk/faq/>>

RESUMÉ

Tato bakalářská práce se zaměřuje na porovnání výstupního poselství, jak jej známe z originální verze románu Anthonyho Burgesse *Mechanický pomeranč*, s poselstvím ve zkrácené americké edici, na které stavěla i slavná Kubrickova filmová adaptace románu.

V první části knihy se práce v zájmu lepšího ponoření se do tematiky věnuje seznámení čtenáře s okolnostmi vzniku knihy, přesněji s historickými událostmi, které byly přímou inspirací pro napsání románu. Jedná se o vznik nových subkultur v poválečném světě, vzrůstající mladistvé násilí, scientifikaci politického života, a také autorovi osobní tragédie. Věnuje se rovněž formě knihy (především její jazykové stránce) a nastiňuje hlavní ideu knihy.

Druhá část práce analyzuje, do jaké míry byl narušen autorův původní koncept, a zabývá se tematikou prvních dvaceti kapitol knihy, ve kterých je řešena otázka svobodné vůle dle autorova křesťanského světonázoru v kontrastu s psychologickým behaviorismem 20. století. Dále je rozebírána samotná poslední kapitola, její signifikantní role v autorově konceptu, a je poukázáno na rozdíly mezi sdělením, jež nabízí zkrácená a kompletní verze knihy.

V poslední části je čtenář stručně seznámen s okolnostmi, které provázely vypuštění kapitoly Burgessovým americkým vydavatelem a vznik Kubrickovy filmové adaptace.

ANOTACE

Jméno a příjmení:	Jindřich Bláha
Katedra:	Anglického jazyka
Vedoucí práce:	Alexandra Hubáčková, MA., Ph. D. Mgr. Josef Nevařil, Ph. D.
Rok obhajoby:	2010

Název práce:	Alternativní pomeranč: Význam a vynechání poslední kapitoly Mechanického pomeranče
Název v angličtině:	An Alternate Orange: The significance and omission of the last chapter of A Clockwork Orange
Anotace práce:	Bakalářská práce analyzuje výstupní poselství poslední kapitoly Mechanického pomeranče a srovnává ho s poselstvím daným v jeho zkrácené americké verzi. Také seznamuje čtenáře s okolnostmi vzniku a revize románu z důvodu lepšího pochopení významu obou verzí.
Klíčová slova:	Svobodná vůle, lidský růst, behaviorismus, dystopie, antihrdina, násilí, predestinace
Anotace v angličtině:	This bachelor thesis analyzes the output message of the last chapter of A Clockwork Orange and compares it with message given in its abbreviated American version. It also introduces reader to the circumstances of both creation and revision of the novel in order to better understand the significance of both versions.
Klíčová slova v angličtině:	Free will, human growth, behaviorism, dystopia, antihero, violence, predestination
Rozsah práce:	31
Jazyk práce:	Anglický jazyk