MANIPULATIVE DISCOURSE IN GEORGE ORWEL'S ANIMAL FARM

Edi Pujo Basuki, Nailul Authar
Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Surabaya
e-mail: ediayarga@unusa.ac.id

Abstract: *Animal Farm has been called George Orwell's most ferocious propaganda (Voorhees, 1961 quoted in Jasim, M. H. and Aziz, Fatimah H). This novel is a satire referring to a communist regime persistently utilizing the kind of hypocritical propaganda merely for the purpose of keeping its totalitarian regime in power.. Animal Farm demonstrates more of such manipulative discourse, and this will be the focus of the study. The contribution of this study is that understanding manipulative discourse and its strategies gives a view of manipulative mechanism and thereby help people recognizing any hegemony form by those in power. The framework of the study applied Cognitive Pragmatics for Manipulative Discourse and Relevance Theory. The result of the study describes the characters that represent manipulative discourse as well as the types of the employed strategies (both global and local, both linguistic and non-linguistic ones). Manipulative discourses employed in the novel are produced or reproduced for two main general purposes. Firstly, the political discourses produced by Old Major is to convince all the animals of the necessity to fight against the human being for the freedom of the animals. The ideology exercised by the animals is anti-human ideology. Secondly, the manipulative discourses produced and reproduced by the pigs are to exercise their domination over the rest of the animals. The ideology of the pigs' racism is exercised to gain more power, more privilege, and more access to the farm resources.*

Keywords: *Orwel Animal Farm, manipulative discourse, Critical Discourse Analysis*

1. PREFACE

Narration has important role in political discourse, particularly for a ruling party, to maintain domination and excerse their power over those dominated or less dominant. For sustained domination, narration or political discourse is puposefully framed to influence the target audience to think and act as intended by the ruler, as Fiske (1994) said, "words are never nuetral". A ruling party is the dominant party, and it tends to use propaganda (through narration). Since propaganda is manipulative in nature (Pratkanis and Aronson, 1991) and illegitimate social practice or discourse practice (van Dijk), then understanding manipulative discourse is of a necessity to uncover the unfairness of the dominant group. For this, Critical Discourse Analysis is required. And the focus of this study is manipulative discourse employed in Orwel' Animal Farm.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

The research approach of this study was descriptive qualitative research. It

relied on textual data analyzed primarily by non-statistical methods. The researcher made interpretation of the data. This included developing description, analyzing data for theme or categories, and finally made interpretation or drawing conclusions about its meanings (Cresswell,2003: 208-209;).

Speciffically the framework of this research was Critical Discourse Analysis in general and Manipulative Discourse Analysis in particular "integarting (a) analysis of text, (b) analysis of processes of text production, consumption, and distribution, and (c) socio-cultural analysis of discursive event (in this case, a political speech)" (Fairclough, 1995: 23).

From the discourse structures employed in the speech and by applying the principles of the ideological strategy operation (manipulation concept), the ideological content or mission could be investigated and identified. The structure of ideology of mission are be investigated and identified, and each discourse structure is linked with the ideology structure or mission. After identified, the link is discussed in details so as to show the cognitive process or the strategies or discurse structure construction controlled by the ideology mission. in effort to win the consent of the animal. The results are displayed in categories, each showing how the manipulative discourse structures employed are affected by the identified ideological structure, mission or intention. Finally, conclusions are drawn to answer all the research questions.

3. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Manipulative discourses employed in the novel are produced or reproduced for two main general purposes. Firstly, the political discourses produced by Old Major is to convince all the animals of the necessity to fight against the human being for the freedom of the animals. The ideology exercised by the animals is anti-human ideology. Secondly, the manipulative discourses produced and reproduced by the pigs are to exercise their domination over the rest of the animals. The ideology of the pigs' racism is exercised to gain more power, more privilege, and more access to the farm resources.

Specifically, the answers to the first and the research question are grouped under two main themes: (1) human domination and (2) the pigs' domination deployed into sub-themes:(a) the pigs' hegemony, (b) history manipulation covering (b-1) war history manipulation, (b-2) political system manipulation

Period of Human Domination

Under the domination of Man, the manipulative discourses produced by Old Major are intended for framing (1) the very suffering of the animals, (2) the greed and the cruelty of Man toward the animals, (3) in-group ideology of the animals(4) the generaton-to-generation's dream of the golden future time.

The strategies employed for the framing (1) utilize (i) narrative to touch them how miserable the whole life they lead with (ii) high level of details regarding their shortened life-span and the terrifying way their life shall end and (iii) lexicalization with diction such

"miserable", "laborous", "short life" and (iv) paraphrasing to intensify the level of their miserable life and further emphasize with (v) language style of paradox so as to make the animals unhappy.

The strategies employed for the framing (2) utilize (i) argumentation genre to identify the cause of their misery or who to blame by employing (ii) negative lexicalization for Man to emphasize the evil of Man and (iii) contrast to show the wide gap between the biggest contribution of the animals to Man and the zero contribution of Man to the animals. Injustice or unfairness of Man's consduct is emphasized.

The strategies employed for the framing (3) utilize (i) a negative presupposition to frame negative presentation of an out-group called Man with a negative predicator "evil", in term of ideology, called "enemy" or "antagonist", (ii) contrast to promote anti-human norms and values or not to adopt human habits, (iii) lexicalization such as maxim "Four legs good, two legs bad" and egalitarian addresses like "brothers", "friends", and "comrades", and all these are intended to unite all the animals into one strong group with an in-group' system of beliefs commonly called group ideology. But the main goal of such framing is to overthrow Man. In short, for rebellion.

The strategies employed for the framing (4) utilize (i) narrative in the form of song to describe the animals' dream from generation to generation as vision and missions of the in-group's struggle for their future victory, (ii) lexicalization to encourge the animals to fight with the choice of word " beasts" to

represent them as strong creatures, and (iii) metaphor "golden future time" to motivate them to struggle harder for their freedom and future.

Finally, of the manipulative discourses produced under human domination, the global coherence was constructed that the animals' ironic suffering- for the fact that their soil is fertile and capable of providing abundance of food for them-was due to, firstly, the greed of Man who only takes and never givesand, secondly, his very cruel treatment in the way he takes their lives. The implicature conveyed is then "Remove Man" meaning rebellion is the only solution. Besides freedom, motivation to have a bonus of "golden future time is the very reason for their independence.

Period of Pigs' Domination
Under the domination of the pigs, the manipulative discourses produced by the pigs are intended for (1) hegemony over the animals and (2) history manipulation covering (b-1) war history manipulation, (b-2) political system manipulation

Pigs' hegemony
Hegemony by the pigs is no longer to unite the animals to fight for freedom but to gain more power for the pigs' domination and to gain more privilege which both lead to moreaccess to the resources of the Animal Farm.

The strategies employed for (1) hegemony utilize (i) lexicalization by labelling "brainworkers" to themselves, (ii) presupposition (by claiming) "We the pigs are brainworkers" or "[we] are the brain of the farm" to convey implicature that the pigs deserve better position and

higher privilege, (iii) passive sentence to detopicalize the in-group actor of selfish action verb to downgrade the negative things of the pigs, and (iv) disclaimer not to be considered as selfish pigs although consuming the nice food resource, "the whole milk and apples" using (v) argumentation with scientific reason.

Regarding the food resources, the hegemony is intended to build global coherence that their role is vital for the good of the Animal Farm which means all the animals, that is, having enough food and preventing external threat referring to the come-back of Jones.

Political system

At the beginning the policy making procedure was already established as stated in the novel that " it had come to be accepted that the pigs, who were manifestly cleverer than the other animals, should decide all questions of farm policy, though their decisions had to be ratified by a majority vote". They had democracy in decision making.

But due to the conflict resulted from the rivalry between Napoleon and Snowball, which led to dogs' attack at Snowball, Napoleon made use of the situation to stop the democracy and to start a totalitarian system. Sunday meeting is no longer for a meeting but receiving instruction to work. The strategies employed for (2) political system manipulation utilize (i) discourse form of argumentation to convince the animals by using (ii) presupposition that impirically "discussion and voting is ineffective and inefficient" The fact, the meeting caused conflict and chaos (the dog's attack) and "wasted time", The

main goal is to avoid debate and voting to zero the animals' chance of interfering the pigs' interest and finally to gain more power. The global coherence regarding the policy making was constructed that the fact is "the disagreement in a meeting caused conflict", "the fact is the dogs attacked Snowball", Napoleon stated his conclusion "they were unnessary and wasted of time". The corrective action then is "no more Sunday meeting". The subtitute of it is "a speacial commttee of pigs" presided by Napoleon. Sunday meeting becomes the day of receiving order from the pigs. And, the implication is this new system gives chance of gaining absolute power to Napoleon.

Windmill project

Originally the windmill project was the idea of Snowball, but finally the idea of windmill project was realized by Napoleon. Manipulative discourse was produced to maintain the positive representation of Napoleon. Squaeler created manipulative past narrative to deceive the animals that the idea of building a windmill was actually the idea of Napoleon not Snowball. The goal of such manipulative past narrative is to frame Napoleon as a super competent pig to trust and rely, and ,on the contrary, to frame Snowball as a "dangerous character" or "a thief" to blame. The final goal is to control the resources, the productive windmill. The strategies employed for (3) the windmill project history manipulation utilize (i) presupposition consisting of negative predicator "stolen" an negative actor, Snowball, and the stolen important object "the plan of the wind mill" belongs to

Napoleon to frame the negative Snowball, but to frame the positive Napoleon and (ii) lexicalization for negative labelling to Snowball and positive labelling to Napoleon. The coherence constructed shows that the relation between the proposition "Snowball made the plan of the windmill project" and the proposition "The plan of the windmill which Snowball drew on the floor had been stolen from among Napoleon's papers" is contrast.

Animalism principles manipulation

The original principles of Animalism are those as presented by Old Major before his death (see Quote 5). But after the rebellion the principles of Animalism, one by one, were manipulated by the pigs. Finally, all of the principles, after manipulated, were erased and subtitute with a singel maxim. Nine stages of manipulation were done by the pigs. The manipulated principles changed into the opposite in meaning, that is cronologically, (a) resolution against trades and money becomes legal, (b) resolution against living in a house, (c) resolution against a bed. (d) resolution against killing other animals, (e) resolution against alcohol, (f) anything goes on two legs is an enemy (g) anything goes on four legs or with wings is a friend, (h) resoultion against clothes, (i) all animals are equal.The main goal of all the principles manipulation is to gain absolute power. The strategies employed for all manipulation made to the principles of Animalism mostly utilize presupposition.

For the resolution against a house, the pigs used presupposition "the pigs the

brain of the farm" has implication that the pigs deserve higher privilege, moreover the pig Napoleon is "Leader". An exception for the pigs is necessary for the dignity of "Leader". For the resolutions against "a bed", "killing other animal", and "alcohol", the pigs used redefinition presupposition strategy so that the meanings change by secretly adding two words to each resolution for the benefits of the pigs. The resolution "No animal shall sleep in a bed" is added with "with sheet", then it reads "No animal shall sleep in a bed with sheet. The original is against "a bed", then it is against "sheets". So, what is forbidden is shifted from "bed" to the newly added "sheet". The resolution "No animal shall kill other animal" is added with "without a cause", then it reads "No animal shall kill other animal without a cause. So, the pigs can kill other animal by stating cause like "traitor". The resolution "No animal shall drink alcohol" is added with "to excess", then it reads "No animal shall drink alcohol to excess. So, it is ok for the pigs to drink. This strategy is effective because most of the animal cannot read and never pay attention any writing. For the first commandment, the second commandment, the fifth commandment and the seventh commandment, the pigs used hegemony and propaganda.". Finally, when the shocked animals checked the Seven Commandment. They found all were gone, subtituted with a single maxim: *All Animals Are Equal But Some Animals Are More Equal Than Others*

By erasing the Seven Commandments and subtituting it with maxim "All animals are equal, but some

animals are more equal than the others", the pigs were trying to confuse the animals, then they would rely on and obey the pigs. The hidden intention of changing the Seven Commandments into one maxim is to leave zero chance for the animals to question or think of the manipulated principles of Animalism and with their presuposition "the pigs are more equal or above the non-pig animals to constantly exercise the pig's domination over the rest of the animals. No more Animalism for Animal Farm but racism, the ideology of the racist pigs. The global coherence built during the pigs domination is to frame the pigs positively with presupposition "we the pigs are the brain of the farm" and lexicalization "brainworkers". The political system was changed into totalitarian by making use of conflict situation they created. Finally all the principles were erased when the pigs reached the to position to control the animals and resources of the farm.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In general, manipulative discourse employed in the novel was, firstly, to move all the animals to fight for their freedom from human domination and, secondly, to exercise the power of the pigs for their domination over the rest of the animal. Under the domination of human, anti-human ideology was exercised to frame the suffering of the animals due to the greed of human, to frame the cruelty of human, and to offer the only action to take for their freedom: throw out the human being. The framing strategies included lexicalization to create

negative labeling for the human being, high level of details of the animals' suffering description to emotionally drive them to do rebellion against the human being, and contrast to show the wide gap between the human's well-being and the animals. The linguistic strategies employed covered lexicalization, implication building, level-of-details building, contrast, disclaimer, propositional structure exploitation, narrative, argumentation, language style of paradox and syntax exploitation, all to convince the animals in order that they trust and follow the pigs. Presupposition strategies, particularly definition and redefinition presuppositions, were employed for the Animalism's principle manipulation. The constructs of both global and local coherence were made to benefit the pigs by framing the positive representation of the pigs and consequently they shall cognitively deserve better status with better privilege and finally with better access to resources.

5. REFERENCES

Abrams, M.H.. (1981), *A Glossary of literary Terms* Newyork: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Alabi, V.A. et al. (2007), Lexico-syntactic, phonological and graphological patterns, choices And devices in Discourse.- inO. Obafemi, G.A. Ajadi, V.A. Alabi (eds.), *Critical Perspectives on English Language & Literature*, Ilorin: The Department of English, university of Ilorin.

Batubara, Amrin (2011) Ideology of Power Relations Embedded in Barack Obama's Electoral

Speeches: A Pragmastylistic Approach. Disertasi Prodi PendidikanBahasa*danSastra, Program Pasca-sarjanaUniversitasNegeri Surabaya.*

Campbell (1868) *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*.New York : Harper

Clark, H. (1996) *Using Language. Cambridge*: Cambridge University Press

Cresswell (2003) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed method Aproaches*.(2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.de Saussure

Louis (2005). Manipulation and Cognitive Pragmatics: PreliminaryHypotheses. In de Saussure Louis & Peter Schulz (Eds), *Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century: Discourse, Language, Mind*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 113-146.

Dornyei, Z (2007) *Research Method in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Elias, N. and Scotson, J.L. (1965)*The Established and the Outsiders.* London: Cass.

Fairclough (1989)*Language and Power*, London: Longman.

Fairclough(1995)*Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Longman.

Fairclough, N., &Wodak, (1997) Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-284). London, England: SagePublications

Fiske and Taylor (1991) *Social Cognition,* McGraw-Hill Higher Education

Fowler, R. (1991) *Language in the News. Discourse and Ideology in the Press.*

London: Routledge.

Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G. and Trew, T. (1979) *Language and Control.*London:

Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Horvarth, J (n.d.) *Critical Discourse Analysis of Obama's Political Discourse.* Retrieved April 5, 2013, from http://www.pulib.sk/elpub2/FF/ Ferencik2/ pdf_doc/6.pdf

Hurford et al. (2007) *Semantic: Course Book (2nd edition).*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Johnson-Laird (1983)*Mental Models: Towards a Cognitive Science of Language, Inference, and Consciousness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jørgensenand Phillips (2002)*Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*, London,Thousan Oaks, New Dehli: Sage Publications Ltd.

Leechand Short (1981), *Style in Fiction: A linguistic introduction to English Fictional prose,* London: Longman.

Lin eat al. (2008) *A Joint Topic andPerspectiveModel for Ideological Discourse, i*n the Proceedings of the European Conference on Machine Learningand Principles and Practice of Knowledge Discovery in Databases,

Luke, A. (1995). Text and discourse in education: An

 introduction to criticaldiscourse analysis*. Review of Research in Education, 21,* 3-48.

McArthur (ed) (1992) *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mey, J. (1993) *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Balackwell. Miles, M.B. &Huberman , A.M. (1994)

Qualitative Data Analysis (2ⁿᵈ edition),
California: Saga Publication,Inc.

Mosher, D.L. (1991) Ideological Presuppositions: Rhetoric in Sexual Science, Sexual Politics, and Sexual Morality', *Journal of Psychology andHuman Sexuality 4(4):* 7-29

Semin, G. R. & Fiedler, K. (1989*)*Relocating attributional phenomenawithin a language-cognition interface: The case of actors' and observers'perspectives*,*
*European Journal of Social Psychology Vol. **19, 491-508***

Semin, G. R. & Fiedler, K. (eds) (1992*). Language,Interaction and Social Cognition,* London: Sage Publications.

Semino (2013) *Ideological Discourse Analysis of Obama's Cairo Speech.* Surabaya: PascasarjanaUniversitasnegeri Surabaya

Sperber & Wilson, (1986*)Relevance Theory.* retrieved   April 6 2013 from
http://people.bu.edu/bfraser/Relevance%20Theory%20Oriented/Sperber%20&%20Wilson%20-%20RT%20revisited.pdf

Thomas, R.M. (2003) *Blending Qualitative& Quantitative Research Methods in Theses and Dissertations.*Thousan Oaks: Corwin Press.

Turner, Giles (1981*)Intergroup Behavior.*Chicago: University of Chicago Press, van Dijk, (1977) *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics andPragmaticsofDiscourse.*London: Longman.

van Dijk(1980) *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Studv of GlobalStructures in*

*Discourse, lnteraction, and Cognition.*Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

van Dijk&Kintsch (1983)*Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*: New York,
London: Academic Press.

van Dijk(1984) *Prejudice in Discourse: An Analysis of Ethnic PrejudiceCognition*
and Conversation. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

van Dijk, (1985) 'Cognitive Situation Models in Discourse Processing: The Expression of Ethnic Situation Models in Prejudiced Stories', in J.P. Forgas (ed.)*Language and Social Situations,* pp. 61-79. New York: Springer.

van Dijk(1988) *News as Discourse.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

van Dijk (1988) *News Analysis.*Hillsdale:Erlbaum

van Dijk, T.A. (1991) *Racism and the Press.* London: Routledge.

van Dijk (1993). *Elite discourse and racism.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Inc.

van Dijk (1995) Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis in Wenden, A. and

Schaffner, C. (1995) (eds) *Language and Peace.*Dartmouth: Aldershot.

van Dijk (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach.*London: Sage Publications Ltd.

van Dijk (1995) *Discourse Semantics and Ideology*: Sage Publication.

van Dijk, (1999) Context models in discourse processing . In: van Oostendorp, Herre&Goldman, Susan R. (Eds.), The construction of mental representations during readingMahwah, NJ. USA:

Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 123-148.

van Dijk (2000) *Ideological Discourse Analysis. Rettriev*March 15,2013, from

http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Ideological%20discourse%20analysis.pdf

van Dijk, (2003) 'Critical discourse analysis', in Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D.,Hamilton,

H.E. (ed), *The handbook of discourse analysis.*Oxford: Blackwell,pp. 352-371.

van Dijk (2006) Discourse and Society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk (2006) Discourse and Manipulation in*, London: SAGE Publication Vol 17 (2): 359-383*

van Dijk (2006) Ideology and Discourse Analysis in*Journal of Political Ideologies*

(June 2006),11(2), 115-140:Routledge

van Dijk, (2006) 'Politics, ideology, and discourse', in Brown, K.(ed), *The*

*Encyclopedia of language and linguistics.*Vol. 9 Oxford ; New York:

Pergamon Press, pp. 728-740.

van Dijk, T. A. (2008).*Discourse and power.*New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan

van Oostendorp & Goldman(1999)*The Construction of Mental Representations:*

Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Incorporated.

Yule, G. (1996) Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H. (2000). Critical Practices: On Representation and the Interpretation of

Text. In: S. Sarangi & Malcolm Coulthard (Eds.), *Discourse and social life*. Harlow: Pearson Education.