1. Knowing Orwell’s background and his position in India, we can conclude that his perspective of the prisoners, wrong doers, were close to that of wild animals, beasts with no class. However, calling the holding cells of these prisoners an “animal cage” might be a way to help himself perceive the people within as criminals, to brace himself for the inevitable upcoming event.
2. The appearance of the dog was a deliberate harsh contrast to the eerie mood that capes the dreadful hanging grounds. It’s excitement and joy comes from the presence of humans. People bring excitement and happiness to this beast and yet we hang a brother.
3. The thesis of the essay is implicit. I believe what Orwell was trying to say is killing is not only a lawful crime, but one that goes against nature. He states his feelings “I had never realized what I means to destroy a healthy, conscious man.” (Orwell) with null expression, which was an overarching tone of the essay, one that many of us would have felt as we read this essay.
4. The crime of the man is irrelevant. When it comes to a death of a living, no matter how bad of a crime/wrongdoing, the death of one eventually all come to a single conclusion: “one mind less, one world less.” Tying back to the thesis, it would also weaken his argument and would be of no use in supporting it either. The point of the essay does not need to know what the man’s crime is.
5. Orwell’s essay heavily used imagery to persuade the readers about the environment in which the action takes place. But the last sentence of the essay illustrates a contrast of life and death, one showing a hanging man 100 yards away, while he and the others drank through the night, trying to forget the hanging. It makes the readers think about the dark side of lawful punishments, one that purposefully emphasizes the power and indestructible capital, which couldn’t have been done without the use of irony.