



Journal homepage: <https://jll.uoch.edu.pk/index.php/jll/index>

Politics of Language in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*

¹Ahmed Jalal, ²Syed Hanif Rasool

¹Lecturer, Department of English, Edwardes College, Peshawar, mir_ahmad_jalal@yahoo.com

²Assistant Professor, Department of English, Khushal Khan Khattak University, Karak, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
syedhanifrasool@kukk.edu.pk

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 12 June 2023

Revised 30 June 2023

Accepted 03 July 2023

*Corresponding author:

(Ahmed Jalal)

mir_ahmad_jalal@yahoo.com

Keywords:

Animal Farm

Aristotle's model of rhetoric

modes of persuasion

politics of language

ABSTRACT

Animal Farm has been analyzed by numerous researchers from different perspectives, such as hegemony, political allegory, historicism, and symbolism. However, the linguistic aspect, especially the rhetorical features, of the novel has hitherto remained unexplored. The current study hypothesizes that rhetoric is an important aspect of Animal Farm. Using Aristotle's classical model of rhetoric as a tool of analysis on the pigs' discourse in Animal Farm, considering the three types of rhetoric i.e. Forensic, Deliberative and Epideictic, and the three modes of persuasion i.e. Logos, Ethos and Pathos, the study explores the strength and intelligibility of the pigs' complex discourse. Foregrounding the aforementioned mechanism of persuasion operational in the speech and act of the novel, particularly in the language of Major and Squealer, the study argues that politics of language can be seen as the most powerful means of acquiring and sustaining dominance. Highlighting the pigs' intricate discourse, the study concludes that revolution on the animal farm is the result of ingeniously crafted powerful rhetoric of the pigs appealing to both rational and emotional faculties of the animals and thereby directing them on the desired course.

Introduction

George Orwell, an English novelist, essayist, poet and journalist, was born in 1903 in Bihar, British India, to a Civil Servant. Later on, Orwell also joined the Indian Imperial Police and served in the colonized state of Burma. There Orwell developed a strong sense of contempt for the British Imperialist project in India. He ultimately quit his police service and returned to England in 1927. After his brief stay in London, he moved to Paris where he explored his writing potentials by writing novels and critical essays. Some of his best works include *Homage to Catalonia* (1938), *Animal Farm* (1945), *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949).

Animal Farm is a fable, starting with a meeting at a barn summoned by a twelve-year old boar—Old Major, who is the only pig of his breed and is believed to be the wisest of all other animals on the farm. Haranguing about the miserable condition of the animals, and blaming that because of Man 'no animal in England is free' and that Man should be whipped off, for the hunger and overwork in the world are due to him (11), Old Major ignites the spirit of rebellion in animals and excites the animals' leaders, Snowball and Napoleon to break into the store-shed. Mr. Jones and his men try to whip the animals, but are defeated instead. Old Major, like an old wise man, changes the name MANOR FARM into ANIMAL FARM through his philosophy of 'Animalism', painting The Seven Commandments of Animalism on the barn, of which the famous commandment reads: 'All animals are equal' (15). All other remnants of the Manor Farm are either burnt or thrown down into a well except the main building which is turned into a museum.

The farm's activities are led by Snowball and Napoleon. First, the pigs establish themselves as a distinct class with particular privileges: education, extra food and almost no physical work. The other animals are aware of the inequality, and they protest, whereas any such protest and/or question are quelled by Squealer, the pigs' sole

spokesperson threatening the other animals of Mr. Jones' return. The pigs' rule on the farm continues with a tug of war between Snowball and Napoleon, wherein the former runs away from the farm and the later becomes the sole ruler abandoning all the communal meetings, declaring that future decisions will be the pigs' prerogative. Napoleon's despotic rule continues to threaten the animals' life and peace on the farm, whereas the animals helplessly mourn the loss of their fellows and the miserable life they live. The animals are overwhelmed by the despair and start chanting the revolutionary song, *Beasts of England*. Squealer, after noticing the animals' rebellion, gives them another song, reflective of conformity: 'Animal Farm, Animal Farm, / Never through me shalt thou come to harm' (92). Napoleon ultimately becomes totalitarian, declaring the farm a Republic and claiming himself as President, whereas the animals such as Boxer, under Napoleon's rule continue to work feverishly. One day, Boxer collapses by overstraining himself, and Napoleon promises him to send him to the veterinarian, but sells him to knackers instead. Years pass and the population of the Animal Farm increases with the arrival of new animals, but there is hardly any improvement in the lives of animals. If there is any, it is in the life of pigs. One day, Squealer takes sheep to an isolated place and teaches them a new maxim: 'Four legs good, two legs better' (91), which startles the animals. The animals go to the barn and read the commandments. To their surprise, they find that all the commandments are replaced with a single maxim which reads: 'All animals are equal but some are more equal than others' (136), disregarding their initial revolutionary philosophy of Animalism, turning the Animal Farm again into the Manor Farm, abolishing all the signs of Animal Farm, prohibiting to use the word 'Comrade', abandoning the ceremonial marching round Major's skull, replacing the flag with another one having no symbol of rebellion, and disconnecting the pigs from other animals. The pigs, ultimately start wearing Mr. Jones' clothes, start reading magazines, use telephones, avoid interaction with other animals, start interacting with humans, and adopt all the characteristics of humans, whereas all the other animals watching the pigs play with humans are unable to distinguish between the humans and the pigs.

Aristotle's Model of Rhetoric

Just as Socrates is regarded as the father of Western philosophy, Aristotle is considered the father of rhetoric. He is generally acknowledged for laying the foundation of rhetoric, influencing the development of subsequent rhetorical theories from ancient through modern times, in his famous book *Rhetoric* (Greek: Ῥητορική; Latin: *Rhetorica*). Like his other works that have survived from antiquity, *Rhetoric* seems not to have been intended for publication; rather, it is a collection of his students' notes. *Rhetoric* was developed by Aristotle during two periods when he was in Athens: the first, from 367 to 347 BC (when he was seconded to Plato in the Academy), and the second, from 335 to 322 BC (when he was running his own school, the Lyceum). One of the most important contributions of Aristotle's approach was that he identified rhetoric as one of the three key elements, along with logic and dialectic, of philosophy. Indeed, the very first line of the book says that 'Rhetoric is a counterpart of dialectic' (3) wherein Aristotle considers rhetoric a tool for practical debate and a means for persuading a general audience using probable knowledge to resolve practical issues (Aristotle 13).

Aristotle defines rhetoric as 'the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever' (15). In the light of this definition, a rhetorician is someone who is able to see what is persuasive. Provided that he discovers the available means of persuasion, he attains a complete mastery over his method. The aforementioned definition of rhetoric implies manipulation of words aimed at persuasion and dissuasion as reflected in the etymology of the word 'rhetoric' (Greek: *rhema*), meaning the art of oratory (Corbell 1971).

Every speech is composed of three parts: the speaker, the subject matter and the person to whom the speech is addressed. It is however the hearer who decides the end of the speech for he is either the judge of the past or future, or he is a mere spectator. Therefore, there are necessarily the following three kinds of rhetorical speeches: Deliberative Forensic Epideictic. First, Deliberative rhetoric, also called legislative rhetoric, is either persuasive or dissuasive; the ultimate purpose of those speakers, who give advice in private or in public, is to persuade or dissuade' (Aristotle 33). Originally deliberative rhetoric had a political orientation; it was designed as a form of political speaking suitable to a parliamentary situation and, consequently, concerning the benefits or harm of a proposal and what should be chosen or what should be avoided. Second, Forensic rhetoric, as opposed to Deliberative rhetoric, is based on past actions, bringing truth to the forefront of the audience's mind. 'The forensic kind', Aristotle asserts, 'is either accusatory or defensive; for the litigants necessarily either accuse or defend' (33). It means that the purpose of forensic rhetoric is twofold: accusation on one hand and defense on the other. Some scholars refer to this type of rhetoric as 'judicial rhetoric' because of the manner in which it engages the audience. In a courtroom setting for instance, forensic rhetoric is demonstrating a kind of speech usually known as appeal. Third, Epideictic rhetoric is a kind of speech that "has its subject praise or blame" such as graduation speeches, obituaries, funeral orations, letters of recommendation and nominating speeches at political conventions (Aristotle 33). As the end of epideictic rhetoric is praise or blame, the

speaker must possess the knowledge of the virtues and the vices of the person. Aristotle includes the following traits in virtue: wisdom, self-control, generosity, gentleness, justice, courage, self-control and liberality (91). The 'praise' side of epideictic rhetoric is easily imaginable because it is practiced relatively often on the occasion of obituaries, wedding toasts, ceremonial introductions and dedications. On the other hand, the blame speeches, for Aristotle, focus on the opposites of those virtues. Instead of talking about bravery and gentleness of the departed, a blame-based obituary would talk about a tyrant's cowardice and cruelty. So, the first key element to remember about epideictic rhetoric is that it engages with praise and blame according to some criteria, some list of virtues that are deemed important by that community.

The Aristotelian model of rhetoric is based on three technical means of persuasion. The term 'technical' refers to those means which rest on a method and can be learnt. Contrary to other means of persuasion like witness, oaths, testimonies which are non-technical as they cannot be learnt, technical means depend upon the linguistic skills of the speaker. Aristotle asserts that the technical means are accomplished by manipulating the three integral elements of communication: the communicator's personality (ethos), the audience's emotional state (pathos) and the message itself (logos). The three means are elaborated as under:

Ethos, a kind of persuasion, rests on the speaker's moral character and social credibility. The speaker's proposition receiving immediate acceptance from the audience and his/her personal credibility, playing a key role in the circumstances where exact knowledge of the subject is not available, make the speaker the only source of knowledge. To the question of the speaker's credibility in such circumstances, Aristotle asserts that the former must be a notable person having a virtuous character, selfless attitude, good will and practical intelligence. Without the mentioned traits, the audience might doubt the speaker's credibility in solving the practical issues. Thus practical wisdom coupled with credibility and good will constitute 'the most effective means of proof' (17).

Whereas in Pathos, persuasion depends upon the audience's emotional disposition and the speaker learns to manipulate the audience's emotion. Emotions play a crucial role in accepting or rejecting a proposal because we do not judge the same when we rejoice or grieve, we do not respond to the situation in the same manner when we are hostile or friendly. The speaker possessing the quality of understanding and manipulating human emotion, arouses a specific emotion corresponding to the nature and purpose of the argument, particularly, when he wishes to win the audience's mind. This technique, Aristotle asserts, depends upon the speaker's knowledge regarding each kind of emotion, for example, anger be defined as 'desire, accompanied with pain, for conspicuous revenge for a conspicuous slight that was directed against oneself or those near to one, when such a slight is undeserved' (173). Having understood the nature of and associations with anger, the speaker arouses anger in the audience by referring to the accused and highlights the details that are likely to invoke anger in the listener. This is a more efficient technique, wherein the speaker does not rely on the element of persuasion outside the subject matter and he has to manipulate the element of the subject matter that corresponds to the intended emotion (pp 171-173).

Aristotle defines logos as 'persuasion by speech itself (not by character or by audience) intended to prove a certain case' (17). For the effective use of proofs, the speaker must be capable of logical reasoning and must possess a sound knowledge of various kinds of reasoning. For Aristotle, there are two kinds of reasoning: inductive reasoning and deductive reasoning. Whereas induction is from particular to universal, for instance, 'man is a rational animal' and 'man is human being', therefore, 'all human beings are rational animals', deduction is the proceeding from universal to particular, for instance, 'all human beings are rational animals', 'man is a human being', hence, 'man is a rational animal' (17).

Moreover, logical appeal to a speech or a thesis is not only rendered by the particular order of an argument, but also by clarity and evidence. The speaker must propose in the clearest possible manner. It means that the speaker must not deviate from the subject under discussion and must remain consistent in the message. Furthermore, the speaker must support the argument with credible evidence. The evidence can be drawn from the present and past. A precise, clear and reasoned speech or writing, supported with credible evidence, puts the audience and readers in a particular state of mind that can be easily manipulated by the speaker.

Grounding on the aforementioned theoretical implications and the novel's overview, this study attempts to explore how language is used as a tool of manipulation and exploitation to grab power and dominance. Highlighting the pigs' power of language to exploit other animals, foregrounding the Old Major's irresistible speech that has instigated rebelliousness among the animals, and emphasizing the manipulative tactics of other exploitative pigs, Snowball and Squealer, the study maintains that how the aforementioned rhetorical, exploitative, and political use of language can 'turn black into white' (20) as Orwell has rightly remarked. The study further argues that language has, by and large, been employed for persuasion and dissuasion to play the politics, as it will be explored in the present

study in case of the pigs using the controlling tool of language. In view of the aforementioned hypothesis, the paper attempts to explore the nature, significance, and manipulation of language by the pigs for acquiring despotic power.

Methodology

Using Aristotle's classical model of rhetorics and techniques of persuasion as tools of analysis, the study will critically evaluate the speech and act in *Animal Farm* to explicate the main argument of politics of language. Highlighting the pigs' use of ingenious and coherent use of various stylistic devices to persuade and dissuade other animals on the farm, this paper attempts to reveal the underlying logic of pigs' discourse by employing textual analysis as the research method.

Objectives

There is a common misconception about rhetoric: it is usually thought of as a means of deception aimed at tricking and outwitting the audience, wherein the speaker conceals the real objectives for the truth could be spoken without relying on any rhetorical techniques. This however is not the case. Rhetoric pertains only to the technical aspects of language that render speech irrefutable. The purpose of the speech per se, either good or evil, pertains to the ethical principles of the speaker and lies outside the domain of rhetoric. In the same vein, this study aims to explain how ingeniously pigs use language to control other animals on the farm, what rhetorical techniques they employ for exhortation and how ultimately language appears as the sole foundation of pigs' authoritative regime. Thus by highlighting the importance of language in the affairs of daily life by emphasizing on the fundamental principles of rhetoric, such as the rhetoric of the novel, the study will enable the readers to communicate effectively with the audience. Also, they will be able to understand and influence contemporary political discourse.

Literature Review

Animal Farm is a 'satirical animal fable about the progress—or backsliding—of the Russian Revolution' (Wilson 51). It is a story in which 'a group of cows, horses, pigs, sheep, and poultry which decide to expel their master and run his farm for themselves'; however, gradually the farm turns into 'something almost indistinguishable from human beings, with the pigs as a superior caste exploiting the other animals very much as the farmer did' (51). The novel was chosen by Time Magazine as one of the 100 best English-language novels winning a Retrospective Hugo Award in 1996. Adopting the form of a fable, it investigates the role of language in human affairs. Based on a series of revolutions by the animals, Orwell attempts to criticize the totalitarianism of the Stalinist regime in the Soviet Union before World War II. Revealing the scathing dictatorship, the author also satirizes England, France and other countries having diplomatic ties with the Soviets.

Considering Orwell's stylistic magnificence, Robert Pierce asserts that Tolstoy had a marked impact on Orwell's work. For instance 'the character of Boxer in *Animal Farm* [might] have been influenced by the long-suffering talking horse who was carried off to the knacker at the end of Tolstoy's short story 'Strider: The Story of a Horse' (56).

Baysoy in his thesis, *George Orwell's Animal Farm as a Political Satire*, attempts to analyze the author's ingenious criticism of Communism. Baysoy maintains that a complete society was under the threat of Communism, exploring the implied meanings of the story and how an innocent revolution turns into dictatorship and betrayal (31). The thesis highlights the true oppressive face of the communist leaders, the failure of the revolution, the terror and deception of the despotic regime. Baysoy highlights the similarities among all revolutions and their tyrannical despotic nature, crediting the novel as an allegory of the 1917 Russian Revolution, but that can deal with any kind of revolution, its consequences and criticize totalitarianism of any kind (31).

Hazel K. Davis, in his 'Introduction' to *Animal Farm*, submits that the novel is a brilliant story for children and high school students that can be taught collaboratively with the history department as an allegory of the Russian Revolution, allowing students to draw parallels between actual events and people imaginatively created by Orwell. Davis asserts that while examining the work as a satirical comment on the corrupting influence of power, students should be able to trace the pigs' corruption and perhaps relate their findings to individuals in their own governments succumbing to the lure of power at any cost and by any means (2). Davis universalizes the scope of *Animal Farm*, considering it a remarkable example of contemporary world politics.

Louis M. Ridenour in his article, 'Allegory with Goose Pimples' published in *The Saturday Review*, (1946) propounds that the novel is "a splendid technical job, whose easy and diverting style never once lags from beginning to end", showing how Orwell has uses a fable which so coherently runs over a hundred pages to entertain the readers, especially children through animal story—a tradition very famous since Aesop. Ridenour refutes the view that Orwell

wrote the novel for children, mentioning an incident when a bookshop in England kept *Animal Farm* on the shelf of stories for children, and Orwell requested for it to be removed from the particular shelf, and to be kept on the shelf of political works (10).

Isaac Rosenfeld, a young anti-Stalinist Jewish intellectual, claims that *Animal Farm* has utterly failed to depict the particular Russian history genuinely, however, admiring Orwell's voice for individual liberty and freedom of expression. Isaac observes that the novel lacks creative imagination, asserting that 'Animal Farm is a shallow and disappointing novel' (139), inadequate in facts about the Russian Revolution and is more politically significant than real. Likewise, Milton Blau, an American communist, proclaims that 'Animal Farm has misrepresented the product of a warped fascist-trotskyist mind that seethed with hatred for men' (140) and the novel as a fable is directed against all of mankind and against any possible vision that a Man may have for a better world.

George Orwell's *Animal Farm* is greatly influenced by Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*. The fable technique in *Animal Farm* is an adaptation of 'Part IV—A Voyage to the Country of Houyhnhnms' of *Gulliver's Travels* where Swift depicts a society using horse-like animals, the Houyhnhnms, and the yahoos—the ape-like humans. Orwell's *Animal Farm* attempts to satirize totalitarianism as a political concept, and thereby highlights the defects inherent in it. Tom Hopkins, quoted by Rodden, pronounces it a classic that can stand beside Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*. He asserts that it is as delightful a children's story as *Gulliver's Travels* or the best of Aesop. It is manifestly an attack on Stalinism. It can be read as a lament on the fate of revolutions.

The above discussions clearly suggest that the previous studies have chiefly focused on the political significance of the novel, particularly on the comparison between the narrative and the character and events of the Russian Revolution. The linguistic aspect of the novel has hitherto remained unexplored. Highlighting the linguistic splendor of the novel, this paper focuses on explicating the technical uniqueness of linguistic foundations on which the entire edifice of power stands.

Politics of Rhetoric in *Animal Farm*

Animal Farm is not merely a story about farm animals, but is an allegory of Stalin's USSR, criticizing communist dictatorship in particular and totalitarian regimes in general. This despotic story can be read at two levels: first, as a fable and second, as an allegory. Approaching the novel as an allegory, the researcher is confronted with the problem of establishing a connection between the novel's animal characters and the ones in the real-life symbolized by the animals. Such an approach results in digression from the main objective of the present study, i.e. to highlight the significance of rhetoric in the novel. Hence, the novel is treated merely as a fable and through the language of animals, the power of persuasive language is foregrounded.

Language is exclusively a human endowment working amazingly in shaping our thoughts and deeds, helping us grasp new realities, and widening our ideas about things around us. Contrarily, if the development of language is restricted, our ideas and communication are confined. Orwell has lucidly illustrated the blossoming as well as the limiting power of language in his dystopian novels, *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. These novels have portrayed the absolute ability of language to do and undo human thoughts, showing that the effective use of words can manipulate psychological functions supreme-handedly, thereby leading popular thought to a certain target to attain complete control over people's mind and action.

Animal Farm starts with the stirring speech of Major drawing the attention of animals towards their 'miserable, laborious and short' (pp 10-11) life to which they were hitherto ignorant, convincing them that the root cause of their miserable life is Man and that it is because of Man that their lives are reduced to 'bare ration and a stall'; it is because of Man that they 'own nothing more than bare skins' (12). Major adds that the animals can regain their happy natural life only if they remove Man from the scene, convincing them to become rebellious and the animals are overwhelmed and subdued by the wonderful rhetorical play cunningly devised. This amazingly elaborate piece of speech is an example of Aristotle's classic model of rhetoric, loaded with the devices like the introduction of the matter, appeal to ethos, appeal to pathos, rhetorical questions and efficient conclusion.

In Aristotle's model of rhetoric, exordium provides a sample of the subject wherein the hearers may know beforehand what it is about, and that the mind may not be kept in suspense, Major replicates the same model in his speech. Prior to presenting the actual argument, he introduces the subject of his speech to the animals. In the novel, all the animals on the farm in particular and those of England in general are absolutely ignorant of their miserable life. Major shrewdly draws their attention towards their 'miserable, laborious and short' lives on the farm, deprived of the true reward of their labor by Man who gives them little food to keep their bodies merely breath to be alive. Major warns them of the harsh consequences of their labor, the way they are made to work till the last atom of their strength, and the miserable state when any of them, such as Boxer who loses its strength will meet the cruel knife of the butcher at the end.

Exordium also evokes the audience's excitement, subsides their prejudices, and awakens their indignation, wherein the speaker defends himself and accuses the opponents, unveiling their evils. Highlighting Man's evil, Major improvises exordium, claiming that Man is their only enemy and that he is the only creature that 'consumes without producing', 'does not give milk', 'does not lay eggs', and is 'too weak to pull the plough, and who 'cannot run fast enough to catch rabbits', '[y]et he is lord of all the animals' and 'sets them to work, he gives back to them the bare minimum that will prevent them from starving, and the rest he keeps for himself. Our labor tills the soil, our dung fertilizes it, and yet there is not one of us that owns more than his bare skin' (12). Major reiterates the accusations and reinforces the atrocities that Man has committed upon the poor animals, including the young porkers screaming their lives at the slaughtering-block, the horses being sold to knacker when they lose their strength, the dogs being thrown into the nearest pond when they grow old and toothless.

Whereas ethos, i.e. personal credibility is an important component of Aristotle's model of rhetoric, Major has been regarded as the most credible animal on the farm. His credibility is manifested by the fact when he summons the animals to a meeting, 'everyone was quite ready to lose an hour's sleep in order to hear what he had to say' (10) and animals are convinced that his wisdom and benevolence is the result of his 'long life', that he has had 'much time for thought' and that he 'understands the nature of life on the earth and of the animals now living' (10).

In addition to ethos, Major also employs the rhetorical device of questions to further the effect of his speech. He implores the cows as 'how many thousands of gallons of milk have' they 'given during this last year? And what has happened to that milk which should have been breeding up sturdy calves?' (12). To hens, he asks, 'how many eggs have they 'laid in this last year, and how many of those eggs ever hatch into chickens? And from Clover, he enquires, where those four foals are that he bore, 'who should have been the support and pleasure' of his 'old age?' (12). Through such questions, Major highlights the injustices the animals have suffered for long at the hand of Man. Invoking every single species of animal, Major strikes their resentment and indignation to defy and resist Man's oppression.

Major's speech is elaborated with heavily connoted words and imagery. His diction is appropriate to arouse the desired effects in animals' minds to which intense emotional response is natural. For instance, he arouses the feeling of being oppressed by asserting that 'no animal escapes the cruel knife in the end' and that every one of us will scream our 'love out at the block...to that horror we all must come' (13). The subtle use of pictorial vocabulary also creates horrific imagery in the minds of animals, generating strong hatred and resentment against Jones. He expounds on the many grievances the animals have suffered, even listing the gruesome fates of individual animals, stating that Boxer will be sold to the knacker, who will cut his 'throat' and will boil him and that Jones will tie 'a brick round the dogs' necks and drowns them' (13), thereby, turning the animals against Man by exposing the latter's oppressive treatment. Major's use of illustrative words makes his speech compelling and irresistible, utilizing hyperbole in appealing to the pathos of animals. He claims that no 'animal in England knows the meaning of happiness or leisure after he is a year old and no 'animal in England is free' (11) even though the case is otherwise. Major manipulates exaggerated discourse in order to provoke fury in animals and to arouse their sense of injustice, so that they follow any direction proposed to them.

The song, 'Beasts of England', is the conclusion of Major's argument, summarizing the objectives of the speech and offering means to achieve them, emphasizing upon the idea of hope for the fields of England 'to be trod by beasts alone' and 'riches more than mind can picture' (17). The last stanza offers the means to materialize that hope, i.e. 'to toil for freedom's sake' (17). The song is so effective that it 'threw the animals into wild excitement' to the degree that 'the uproar awoke Mr. Jones' (17). Overall, the speech is effective because, 1) Major manipulates the setting and the content in such a manner that he establishes himself an irrefutable authority and 2) the content of his speech is aimed at arousing the desired emotions in the audience, which he easily accomplishes. The speech epitomizes Aristotle's deliberative and epideictic rhetoric appealing to both reason and emotion.

Major's speech also ignites the spirit of rebellion in animals and one day, spurred by hunger, the animals attack Jones, making him run off the farm. Animals win over Man and the dream of rebellion— foreshadowed by Major—is realized. Now MANOR FARM is renamed as ANIMAL FARM and Major's dream of the philosophy of Animalism is realized. The Seven Commandments of Animalism are painted on the barn, of which the famous commandment reads: 'All animals are equal' (28).

After the animals have established their rule in the farm, the responsibility of running the activities of the farm falls upon Snowball and Napoleon. Napoleon, however, yearns for power and always disagrees with Snowball. As the story progresses, the pigs establish themselves as a distinct class with particular privileges: the right to education, the access to extra food and abstinence from labor, and the most striking of the privileges is language. The pigs understand the importance of language, knowing that they can dominate and exploit the other animals through language, the early manifestation of which is Major's speech and its influence upon the animals. To empower

themselves, the pigs secretly educate ‘themselves to read and write’ from Mr. Jones’ children’s old spelling book (27). In three months, the pigs have enabled themselves to reduce the principles of Animalism to seven unalterable commandments. The commandments are written on the wall. Snowball reads them aloud to other animals and they nod in complete agreement.

The pigs’ seven commandments are the seven ways to condition the thoughts and behaviors of other animals on the farm. After a few more months’ reading and writing, the pigs undergo enormous mental growth. The knowledge of language makes them superior to other animals, enabling them to dominate animals practically. Orwell asserts that ‘with their (pig’s) superior knowledge [of language], it was natural that they should assume the leadership’ (31). The pigs make every possible use of language to control the animals’ thoughts and actions. Snowball makes a green flag on which are painted a hoof and a horn in white, a symbolic representation of the animal’s rule in a fertile green farm, persuading the animals that the rule is theirs and the food is in abundance, which is an explicit example of dramatic irony.

The farm’s other animals are aware of the inequality and sometimes they protest, but protests and questions are quelled by Squealer who intimidates the animals with Mr. Jones’ return. Squealer is an outstanding rhetorician who ‘could turn black into white’ with the power of his language (20). For instance, the animals assume that milk, apples and orchard-grass will be shared equally among the animals and one day, it is ordered that these items shall be brought to harness-room for the use of pigs. Some of the animals murmur, but Squealer attempts to convince the other animals the pigs use Man’s food to preserve their health and that it is not due to any ‘selfishness and privilege’. Actually they ‘dislike milk and apples’, but Science has proved that such things contain ‘substances absolutely necessary to the well-being of a pig’ who ‘are brainworkers’ solely busy in the ‘management and organization’ of the farm, working day and night, taking care of the animal; therefore, the pigs have to drink milk and eat apples for the welfare of the other animal. Squealer warns them that if the pigs failed in their duty, ‘Jones would come back! Yes, Jones would come back!’ and no one wants to see Jones come back (40).

Squealer’s speech is another outstanding example of pig’s rhetorical manipulation. Mark his use of the word ‘comrade’ which gives the animals a sense of equality and they no longer feel inferior to the pigs. Furthermore, the use of rhetorical questions renders credibility to Squealer’s argument. The animals accept the fact that pigs are their friends who work for their welfare. Squealer not only persuades the animals emotionally, but also convinces them logically by manipulating their ignorance, telling them that according to science, milk and apples are rich in substances which are useful for the health of pigs. Thus such an indirect implication of the logic manifests that if the pigs are in good health, they could work more efficiently for the welfare of the rest of the animals. Besides emotional and logical persuasion, Squealer also exploits their apprehension and the animals who do not want Jones to come back, accept Squealer’s explanation willy-nilly.

Another incident reinforces the power of rhetoric in the novel. After Snowball has been expelled from the farm, Napoleon announces the construction of a windmill. All the animals are shocked at hearing this because Napoleon has hitherto opposed the idea of windmill. They find the sudden volte-face of Napoleon incomprehensible. Napoleon asks Squealer to convince the animals and the latter exploits ceremonial rhetoric to win the animals’ minds in favor of Napoleon. He argues that the idea of windmill was initially devised by Napoleon which Snowball stole from him and Napoleon, therefore, ‘opposed the windmill simply as a maneuver to get rid of Snowball’ (62). Squealer calls it tactics and the term is hitherto unintelligible to the animals who have no choice but to agree with Squealer.

With the power of rhetoric, the pigs occupy Mr. Jones’ house where Napoleon raises himself to the status of a dictator, rarely appearing before the other animals and instead sends his orders through Squealer or the other pigs. Squealer is detailed to keep persuading the animals with logos and pathos, convincing them that it is absolutely necessary for the pigs to work in a peaceful environment as pigs ‘are the brains of the farm’ (70) and that is also befitting for the dignity of Leader Comrade Napoleon who leads all the animal and who works for their interest.

At this point of the story a remarkable and astonishing thing happens. The pigs start altering the seven commandments one after another. The principles of Animalism are altered by the pigs for the sake of luxurious living like that of Man. The very first commandment says that ‘whatever goes upon two legs is an enemy’ (28) and ‘all men are enemies’ (14), and therefore animals should never engage in friendship and any sort of trade with Man, whereas Napoleon decides to sell hay-stock and timber to Man through Mr. Whymper. Since the animals have a vague remembrance of not having ‘any deal with human beings’ not engaging in trade with them and never making any ‘use of money’ (67), therefore Squealer attempts to deceive the animals that it was only an imagination and a lie crafted and circulated by Snowball. He further asks them if they have ‘any record of such resolution?’ and if it has been ‘written down anywhere?’ (68). Surely, there is no written principle which says that animals should abstain from

trading with Man and therefore, the animals are convinced that there exists no such principle which prohibits interaction with Man.

In Mr. Jones' house, the pigs use beds for sleeping. Of other animals, Clover and Muriel go to the barn and see the fourth commandment that reads 'No animal shall sleep in a bed with sheets' (28), but Squealer, who is passing by, puts the matter in order telling Clover and Muriel that a bed is merely 'a place to sleep in'; a 'pile of straw in a stall is also a bed', whereas the rule was actually 'against sheets which is human invention' (71). Squealer further says that, following the spirit of Animalism, they have replaced the sheets with blankets and the pigs need a more comfortable place to accomplish all the brainwork. Thus the animals accept the privilege and say no more of it.

Exploiting ceremonial rhetoric, Napoleon and Squealer keep the animals terrified and under control. When a storm brings down the windmill, Napoleon holds Snowball responsible for the destruction of the windmill, exclaiming that 'the traitor, Snowball, crept here under the cover of night and destroyed our work of nearly a year' (74). Moreover, when the animals are terrified by the secret activities of Snowball, Squealer exploits the opportunity and labels Snowball a secret agent of Jones. This, he says, is written in secret documents found at the farmhouse. He further states that Snowball is hiding in the neighboring farms, and has been conspiring to attack Animal Farm.

Napoleon not only utilizes rhetoric to direct the thoughts of animals, but also uses terror to deprive the animals of their speech. He executes only those animals who speak against the decisions of Napoleon. These animals, in fact, possess comparatively higher linguistic abilities. The four pigs executed are those 'who had protested when Napoleon abolished the Sundays Meetings' (86). The animals' execution is justified through alteration in the sixth commandment, the altered version of which reads: 'No animal shall kill another animal without cause' (93) and the same justifies the execution of animals, who were 'the traitors' leaguering 'themselves with Snowball' (93). Moreover, Napoleon wishes to wipe out the thoughts of rebellion from the minds of animals. To achieve this end, he abolishes the song of rebellion which baffles others animals, but Squealer puts their minds to ease, exclaiming that in the song, "Beasts of England" the pigs expressed their 'longing for a better society in days to come', but such a 'society has now been established'; hence, the 'song has no longer any purpose' (91). Instead, Napoleon introduces another song, which is actually another desired thought: promise of devotion. The song goes, 'Animal Farm, Animal Farm/ Never through me shalt thou come to harm!' (92).

The pigs continue to enjoy the luxuries of life at Mr. Jones' house. One day, they find a huge stock of beer in one of the cellars. They start drinking and soon become addicted to it. As the stock is limited, Napoleon decides to start brewing in the farmhouse and he issues a decree that no other animal shall drink. Those who are found guilty of drinking shall be punished to death. The pigs, however, continue drinking. One morning, the animals wake up to read the commandment: 'No animal shall drink alcohol to excess' (111).

In the summer Moses, the raven, suddenly appears on the farm. talking to animals about Sugarcandy Mountain, painting the picture of the magical place, pointing to the sky with his large beak — 'up there, just on the other side of that dark cloud that you can see — there it lies, Sugarcandy Mountain, that happy country where we poor animals shall rest for ever from our labors!' (118). Moses is a tactic applied by Napoleon in the times of extreme distress and misery when the animals are in dire need of some hope for a better life. Through Moses, Napoleon creates a hyper reality which is magically beautiful giving the animals false hopes to tolerate the miseries which will take them to Sugarcandy Mountain.

Boxer, the strongest animal on the farm, gets weakened in the summer. His appearance gradually alters, his hide grows less shiny and his great hunches shrink. Despite his deteriorating health, Boxer's courage does not falter and he does not complain of his weakness and pain. However, one evening in the summer, a rumor runs that Boxer has fallen off the slope and cannot get up. Napoleon tells the animals that he is sending Boxer for treatment to Willingdon, but instead, sells him to knackers. Boxer is being sent away in a van on which these words are written: 'Alfred Simmonds, Horse Slaughterer and Glue Boiler, Willingdon. Dealer in Hides and Bone-Meal. Kennel Supplier' (123). Benjamin, on seeing the label of knacker, suddenly realizes the whole situation, but it is too late to stop the van. Later, Squealer convinces the animals that the 'van had previously been the property of the knacker, and had been bought by the veterinary surgeon, who had not yet painted the old name out. That was how the mistake had arisen' (126) and the animals got relieved to hear this, whereas Squealer continues to give them further graphic details of Boxer's death-bed, the care he received and the expensive medicines he was given, and all their doubts disappear and they are relieved by the thought that Boxer died happily.

Years pass. A time comes when all the animals, which have knowledge of the old days before the rebellion, die. The newborn animals are absolutely ignorant of the rebellion and Animalism. They accept what is taught to them by the pigs. The philosophy of Animalism is reduced to merely one commandment which reads: 'ALL ANIMALS ARE EQUAL BUT SOME ANIMALS ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS' (136). The only commandment left

on the wall of the barn reflects the distinguished status of the pigs. Through continuous distortion of Animalism, promising equality among the animals, Napoleon acquires dictatorial powers and privileges and the pigs even become friends with humans, and it is impossible for the animals to distinguish between the pigs and human beings.

Conclusion

The power of language has overwhelmed the situation on the Animal Farm, making the pigs the ultimate rulers of the farm. This exclusively language-focused enterprise is the result of the working of rhetoric, which effectively controls the notion of reality throughout the story. Whereas the animals, other than the pigs, possess no linguistic skills, they cannot read and cannot think and decide. Moreover, Animals are incapable of comprehending the manipulative discourse of the pigs. On the account of linguistic impotence and deficient semantic memory, the animals are completely subdued by the linguistic skills of the pigs. The primacy of rhetoric is established in the very beginning of the story when Major prophesied a fantastic animal kingdom through his emotive language and extorts the animals to rebel against the tyranny of Man. Through ingeniously crafted discourse, Major creates two contrasting worlds: a dystopian human world and a utopian animal world. After the rebellion is accomplished, the tyrannical power is sustained through the pigs' manipulation of the power of language manifested by the linguistic devices of Aristotle's classic model of rhetoric. Pigs, through Napoleon, Snowball, and Squealer are the uncontested owners of language, using their word skills to form narratives and construct ideologies, projecting their linguistic images onto the innocent minds of the other animals, making facts of fiction, thereby directing all other animals on the pigs' desired course. The pigs continue corrupting the philosophy of Animalism, but Squealer assures the animals that everything is done in the spirit of Animalism. Using the three modes of persuasion i.e. ethos, pathos and logos as means of acquiring despotic power, deception and coercion, the pigs craft language that appeals to emotion and reason of the uneducated animals, which renders them command over the psyche of other animals. Once the pigs control the thoughts of the animals, they direct the animals on the desired course of rebellion against Man. After the rebellion is accomplished, the pigs exploit rhetoric to defend their own privileges and rule over the farm.

References

- Aristotle. *The Art of Rhetoric*. London, New York: William Heinemann, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1926.
- Basoy, Didem. *George Orwell's Animal Farm as a Political Satire*. (1996). SCRIBD. Retrieved August 17, 2023, from <https://www.scribd.com/document/488335569/1584377822-pdf#>
- Corbell, E.P.J. *Classical Rhetoric for Modern Students*. 1971.
- Davis, Hazel K. *Animal Farm*. Stewart, Ohio, 1963.
- George Orwell: *A Life in Letters* by. New York, London: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 2013.
- Orwell, George. *Animal Farm*. Fingerprint Classics, 2016.
- Pearce, Robert. "Orwell and Tolstoy." *Bloom's Guides: Animal Farm*, edited by Harold Bloom, Chelsea House Publishers, 2006, 55-57.
- Ridenour, Louis M. "Allegory with Goose Pimples." *The Saturday Review* (August 25, 1946): 10.
- Roden, John. *Understanding Animal Farm: A Student Casebook to Issues, Sources and Historical Documents*. London: The Greenwood Press Westport, 1999.
- Nawaz, Sana, T. Rao, and F. Afzal. "Allegory and satire in *Animal Farm* by George Orwell." *International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection* (2005).
- Orwell, George. *Why I Write*. London: Gangrel, 1946.
- Wilson, Edmund. "Effectiveness of the *Animal Fable*." *Bloom's Guides: Animal Farm*, edited by Harold Bloom, Chelsea House Publishers, 2006, 51-52.



@ 2023 by the author. Licensee University of Chitral, Journal of Linguistics & Literature, Pakistan. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).