

Instruments of Symbolic Violence in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*

M. Amir P.

Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia

Fathu Rahman

Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia

Anriadi

Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia

Abstract—This research focused on the discussion of symbolic violence in George Orwell's *Animal Farm* with respect to Bourdieu's theory of symbolic violence. *Animal Farm* is a satirical novel written by George Orwell and first published in England in 1945. The underlying theme is a criticism of communism, or at least of the way communism was implemented in the Soviet Union. This study discusses symbolic violence in Bourdieu's theory, and aims to uncover the instruments of symbolic violence in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. By using Ricoeur's hermeneutic method, the researchers analyze the instruments of symbolic violence as practiced in this novel. The results show that two instruments of symbolic violence are used in this novel, namely oral discourse and written discourse. This article also aims to present the reader with a novel perspective that they can adopt when analyzing literary work.

Index Terms—animal farm, symbolic violence, instrument, hermeneutic

I. INTRODUCTION

The development of literature and literary works plays an important role in relation to social phenomena. Literary works can reflect a particular condition of a society or social environment and the various dynamics there in (Meirysa & Wardarita, 2021, p. 745). Literary work is a reflection of the thoughts and conditions of society as outlined by the author in his work. *Animal Farm* is no exception, a literary work that is full of social and political criticism. The literary genre may be satire, social criticism, or the heroic story of a character in his time. Literature can also be in the form of historical fiction of the past that tells of a condition of society. From here, specific conditions and problems pertaining to a certain period or society can be understood through the use of literary instruments written consciously by the author including a critical look at the environment in which the author lived as well as by looking at the society in question from another point of view.

Literature is born from people's lives and also influences society. According to Rahman et al. (2019, p. 67) reading literary fiction can expand our perspectives, enable a greater appreciation of life, provide virtual experiences, aid in problem-solving in particular situations, inspire and motivate readers in their endeavors, and help readers to recognize the cultural traits of other people. Reading literature can certainly have a positive impact on the continuity and life of human beings and can touch the real life of society in many ways.

Literature is supposed very closely related to the dynamic frame of mind of the author when composing the text. A story or phenomenon that is represented in the text of a literary work is often able to describe a writer's anxiety over the social conditions they experience or witness. Literary works are capable of being an intellectual product and can reflect or catalyze economic and political processes. For example, a literary work may tell of a social struggle between the dominant class and the dominated class. Such class struggles have existed since humans recognized private property and endure to this day.

Animal Farm is a novel written by an English writer, George Orwell, who was born in India in 1903. This literary work was written in 1945, and remains a phenomenally popular work to this day. This novel tells about a practice of politics and domination which is depicted through animal characters. Translated into many languages, this novel has never lacked fans around the world because the portrait of life in the novel continues to describe and reflect the state of the world as experienced by each new generation.

This novel tells a process of social struggle between a dominant class and a dominated class, reflecting the fight for private ownership and political power, with its impacts on culture, ideology, economy and material wellbeing that has never stopped and continues to this day. It can be considered a general social law that there will always be a struggle for dominance within the structure of any given society. In the novel *Animal Farm* by George Orwell, humans co-exist with animals that are dominated and oppressed by humans. The humans can control whatever is inherent to the animals for the sake of human beings. *Animal Farm* of the title is the scene of animal rebellion to the subordinate position under

which they have been exploited by humans for a very long time. The animals ultimately agree to abolish this oppression by adopting the concept of 'Animalism'. Although the resistance of the animals resulted in victory, this is the beginning of a new system of subtle oppression that makes the victim unaware of the oppression by using subtle language media. This use of language as an instrument of oppression is called Symbolic Violence.

The researchers consider that the story portrayed in this novel reflects the general habit and tendency of authorities to engage in oppression and violence. One aspect of particular interest to the researcher is that the violence that occurs in the life of the animals is not the kind of violence that human beings use towards animals, but this violence is so crucial that causes the victims to be lulled, with their critical faculties falling asleep, and to become unconscious of their oppression. The media of the violence used is not a physical thing but the use of language to dominate. Based on these reasons, the researchers became interested in analyzing and translating the way in which symbolic violence is portrayed. In this context, the researchers also used Paul Ricoeur's hermeneutic approach to analyze the written text of the novel *Animal Farm*.

The research questions were formulated as follows: (1) what instruments of symbolic violence are practiced in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*; (2). How to interpret the symbolic violence in the novel hermeneutically.

II. SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE

Symbolic violence is a specific term used and coined by Pierre Bourdieu, a prominent 20th-century French sociologist. The term appeared in his work as early as the 1970s (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990, p. 110). In the early 1990s, social science researchers and literary and cultural researchers began to use this term after they observed that what Bourdieu proposed with the term symbolic violence was not a deliberate act by a hegemonic power, but an unconscious treatment of the status quo, especially by those perpetuating a norm in social stratification. Symbolic violence might happen or be manifested across different social domains such ethnicity, gender, social stratification and even nationality (Connolly & Healy, 2004, p. 17).

Bourdieu's theory of symbolic violence further elaborates and develops Max Weber's thinking about the role of legitimacy in domination (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 160). Power requires justification and conviction. The concept of symbolic violence was created to state that the hard or overt use of power or might is not sufficient to exercise power effectively. In addition, symbolic violence is expressed through body language, behavior, self-presentation, language-based expression, and slogans.

Since the emergence of the term in the sociological lexicon, symbolic violence has been applied in various social science disciplines and in a variety of case studies. This study applies the concept to symbolic violence in the 1984 novel *Animal Farm* by George Orwell. Analyzing a literary work through Bourdieu's theory of symbolic violence demonstrates that this theory does not only apply to social studies but can also apply to literary and cultural studies. At the same time, it demonstrates that literary works can be a reflection of social life as observed by the author.

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study are formulated as follows: 1) to elucidate the symbolic violence as practiced in George Orwell's *Animal Farm* (2) to interpret this symbolic violence hermeneutically in relation to the social interactions between the characters.

The first objective can be achieved by displaying text data in the form of extracts picked up from the novel. The data were analyzed by de-contextualization. In other words, each extracted text becomes a new discourse in the frame of discussion. The second goal can be achieved by discussing the presentation of the data through the interpretation method of the symbolic violence hermeneutically in relation to the social interactions between the characters in this novel.

The researchers expect that this research can serve as an instrument of knowledge and information for readers and students everywhere who have an interest in researching the concept of symbolic violence, Paul Ricoeur's hermeneutics, and *Animal Farm* as one of the most phenomenal literary works of the modern era. This research may become authentic reference in literary research approaches, using Paul Ricoeur's Hermeneutic approach to dissect the text in the novel *Animal Farm* to analyze a form of subtle violence, namely symbolic violence that can occur during struggles within social structures.

IV. LITERATURE REVIEW

A social instrument is a tool used to measure and assess a social phenomenon that occurs in society. Such an instrument can play a very important role because it can become a very influential tool in social interaction. In this study, the role of a social instrument as a tool of power and violence is seen to play an important role in *Animal Farm*. Hermeneutics can be interpreted as the theory of the operation of understanding in relation to the interpretation of texts (Ricoeur, 1981, p. 37). As a form of philosophical study that differs from the workings of epistemology in general which emphasizes the concepts of truth and scientific rationality, hermeneutics has the ability to understand texts that are set in the cultural and historical relativity space of every human discourse. In hermeneutical theory, the process of reflective activity in human knowledge and work is always related to the questions of time, place, the

creator of the text, and the subject of interpretation.

According to Berensmeyer (2009, p. 11), the reader-oriented theories in the widest possible sense are geared towards the meditation between texts and readers. Historically speaking, they begin with hermeneutics – the art of interpretation. According to Ricoeur (1981, p. 18) and Fashri (2014, p. 9), hermeneutics is the theory of the workings of understanding in interpreting texts. So, the key idea is the realization of discourse as text, while the deepening of the categories of text will be the object of further study. Autologically, understanding is no longer considered merely a way of knowing but should be a way of being and dealing with everything that exists. As described above, he defines hermeneutics as the theory of the workings of understanding in interpreting texts. The methodical steps of Paul Ricoeur's hermeneutic understanding of text include:

A. *Realization of Language as a Discourse*

According to Ricoeur (1981, p. 18) and Fashri (2014, p. 9) when discourse is understood as an event assuming "something happens when one speaks", in the sense that discourse is an event with four accompanying traits. These are: 1) Discourse is always related to a particular place and time; 2) Discourse always has a subject in the sense of who speaks, an event occurs when someone presents a language in a particular time and place; 3) Discourse always refers to something being discussed, referring to the world it is describing; and 4) Discourse is the locus for the process of communication, the exchange of messages and events.

B. *Speech Discourse Change into Written Discourse*

According to Fashri (2014, p. 7), he explained that interpretation is not only dealing with the verbal statements compiled into one sentence, but also confronted with writings composed of many sentences. It is known and accepted that what drives the change of discourse into a work is the dialectic between the two poles of events and meanings.

C. *Text as the Core of Hermeneutics*

Text refers to the content of the manuscript, something abstract that can only be imagined. The difference between manuscript and text becomes clear when there is a new manuscript but it contains old text. The text consists of the content, the ideas or the message the author wishes to convey to the reader in particular forms: the story in a readable and learned text traces various approaches through flow, character, language, etc. (Baried, 1985, p. 70).

Based on this concept, the research in this study adopts Ricoeur's hermeneutical approach to text interpretation in the case of the work *Animal Farm*. This study does not merely present Orwell's work as it is, but performs a thematic analysis of the conceptual keywords that construct George Orwell's political thinking. In line with the spirit of Ricoeur's hermeneutic approach (Geanellos, 2000, p. 117). The researcher as the interpreter does not attempt to interpret the text as George Orwell desired as the author. According to Forceville (2013, p. 254), he concludes that symbolic violence is a form of subtle, invisible violence that hinders to conceal the practice of domination. In this study, the authors also use the theory put forward by a French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu who examines the internal violence that is used by the rulers to wield power and violence; this theory also deserves to be used in researching *Animal Farm* because the language used includes symbolic violence. Due to the process of distortion, Bourdieu's work becomes open to various interpretations. Thus, the authors as readers aim to treat the openness of the text by George Orwell and have the independence to provide meaning and make references in accordance with the capacity of the author/reader as an interpreter (appropriation).

Symbolism embodied in everyday life is one form of propaganda from the class that offers these symbols to the general public. Although the visible symbols are offered in a subtle form and as if the form and meaning of the symbols are plausible and appropriate to every class of society, behind every symbol there is a hidden meaning, so that the visible or overt meaning does not represent the true meaning of the symbols, which is the meaning used to dominate other social classes.

The symbolic system does not only act as a medium of understanding, but also has the power to give meaning to and influence social reality. Through the imaging process, the symbolic system gains abstract power to change meanings, leading the way to influence the practices of a person or a social group (Fashri, 2014, p. 7). The meaning of the symbolic system produced by the dominant class and consumed by the middle class and lower classes is as a symbol to propagate the dominant class habitus; the lower classes will consume the symbolism along with the underlying meaning that the dominant class has created to turn social practices into a dominant class advantage (Mills, 1988, p. 170).

Salomon (2002, p. 120) explains that a symbol is a medium that mediates the meaning contained in something, producing and changing the true or underlying meanings. A symbolic system is capable of doing all this because it operates as a representational system. Symbols in the text (e.g. specific words, phrase, sentences, expression, images, and the like) are used to stimulate thoughts, concepts, and ideas about things. The meaning of something depends on the interpretation and argumentation. Symbolic violence as proposed by Pierre Bourdieu is an overtly gentle, invisible form of violence, misrecognized as such, chosen as much as it is submitted to; it is a form of violence of confidence, of personal loyalty, of hospitality, of the gift, of the debt, of manipulating the ethics of honor (Bourdieu, 1987, p. 20). In the development of globalization, all forms of social practice, including violence, undergo rapid changes that make them more difficult to see, including new forms of what Bourdieu calls as a symbolic violence.

V. SKETCH OF THE WORK

Animal Farm is Orwell's most famous work and is an in-depth critic of the history and rhetoric of the Russian Revolution using the medium of a fable. This work depicts the coming to power of the dictator Joseph Stalin. In this novel, the resistance to Mr. Jones by the Animal Democratic Coalition paved the way for the consolidation of power among pigs. The feud that arose between Leon Trotsky and Stalin is reflected in the rivalry between the pigs Snowball and Napoleon. It is clear in both historical and imaginary cases that the idealists (Trotsky and Snowball) were less powerful politically and were eventually expelled from the revolutionary state by ruthless (evil and cruel) usurpers (Stalin and Napoleon). The novel is full of irony that stands out as a feature of the work. Orwell describes an animal form of the corruption of power, where *Animal Farm* doesn't overtly condemn tyranny or despotism at all as true hypocrisy. However, through the fable medium, this novel criticizes the violence of the Stalinist regime against the people it leads and also shows how the violence of Soviet communism could be enacted against logic as well as against humanitarian language and ideals.

Some of the following sketches— *Animal Farm*: George Orwell) can help to illustrate the themes presented in *Animal Farm*. They are the societal tendency towards class stratification, the danger of a naïve working class, the abuse of language as a tool to achieve the abuse of power, the links between corruption and power, the failure of intellect, and the exploitation of animals by humans (or of one group by another).

A. The Societal Tendency towards Class Stratification

Animal Farm is a story about the rise of tyranny and the tendency of humans to establish a class structure even in societies that allegedly stand for total equality. This novel clearly illustrates how classes can be unified to face a common enemy, as the animals are against the humans in this book. The classes can become divided internally when those enemies are eliminated. The expulsion of Jones created a vacuum of power after which it took some time before the next oppressor managed to gain totalitarian control.

B. The Danger of a Naïve Working Class

One of the most impressive achievements of this novel is the depiction not only of powerful figures but also of people who are extraordinarily oppressed. From the storytelling aspect, this novel is not written from the viewpoint of certain characters. *Animal Farm* successfully demonstrates how the inability to protest against authority and to avoid the oppression of ruling groups can arise.

C. The Abuse of Language as a Tool for the Abuse of Power

One of Orwell's hallmarks as a writer, particularly in *Animal Farm*, is the way language is manipulated as a means of control. In *Animal Farm*, the pigs gradually twist and distort the rhetoric of the initial egalitarian (socialist) revolution to justify their behavior and render the other animals incapable of doing anything to resist their new oppression. For example, it is instructive to look at how the animals wholeheartedly supported Major's struggle for the cause of socialism. However, after Major died, the most powerful or power-hungry elements slowly changed the meaning of his words. As a result, the other animals became deceived and were unable to fight the pig Napoleon, let alone challenge the "alternate reality" presented to them. Orwell makes excellent use of language deviation in the words attributed to the characters at *Animal Farm*, with allegorical events recognizably reflecting real world processes and events.

D. Corruption and Power

Animal Farm is predicated on the idea that power is always corrupt or always corrupts. The heavy use of foreshadowing in the novel, especially in the opening chapter, creates the impression that the events in this story are unavoidable. Not only was Napoleon's rise to power inevitable, the novel strongly suggests that other potential rulers would be just as bad as Napoleon.

E. The Failure of Intellect

This novel demonstrates in various ways that intelligence fails to be useful or to be used for good. Benjamin was a literate man, but he vehemently refused to read, thereby showing that intelligence is meaningless without the moral sense or strength to get involved in politics and the courage to act. The dogs were all nearly as literate as the pigs, but they were "not interested in reading anything but the Seven Commandments".

F. The Exploitation of Animals by Humans

Besides being an allegory about how humans exploit and oppress each other, *Animal Farm* also presents an argument in a literal manner: humans exploit and oppress animals. Furthermore, animal revolts are generally judged to be comical in tone, ending on a serious note when they "wipe the last traces of the government that Jones hates. Everything changed: the armor room at the end of the stable was broken into; the cut, the nose ring, the leash, the cruel knife that Mr. Jones used to castrate pigs and sheep, all thrown into the well." In this way *Animal Farm* demonstrates a strong allegorical relationship between the exploitation of animals and the exploitation of human workers.

VI. METHODS AND DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

In this research, the researchers applied analytical descriptive methods using a hermeneutic approach and the symbolic violence concept. A library research method was also used to collect supporting data related to this research from books, journals, articles, and from the internet. Data in this research were divided into two categories: the primary data is from 'George Orwell's novel *Animal Farm*, and the secondary data are any data which support the analysis, namely books, journals, and articles.

In this research, the techniques used in collecting data were: (1) finding and identifying the symbolic violence used in the novel by reading the novel carefully and comprehensively; (2) identifying the language used in the text; (3) classifying the language discourse and symbolic violence; and (4) hermeneutical interpretation of the symbolic violence.

The data collected were analyzed using the hermeneutic approach of Paul Ricoeur combined with the theory of symbolic violence by Pierre Bourdieu. The researchers did not analyze all the text but only the text (discourse) related to dominance and containing symbolic violence.

The analysis also aimed to describe the interaction between the dominant class and the subordinate class of characters in the novel. The researchers highlighted extracts from the novel indicating symbolic violence. In turn, these extracts were interpreted using a hermeneutic approach to the symbolic violence theory.

VII. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Findings

The novel *Animal Farm* tells about a farm initially managed by Mr. Jones. Due to the arbitrary treatment they receive, the animals in the farm feel they have to fight the oppression they are experiencing. An animal rebellion against humans is the beginning of the conflict in this story. This idea of resistance was first put forward by Major, an old pig, and he called his theory or movement "Animalism".

After the animals had won the battle against the humans, the animals celebrate their victory with joy. However, after this victory a new oppression will begin. Napoleon, a pig, seized power, creating hegemony of pigs to control *Animal Farm*, changing the meaning of Animalism according to his perception or to suit his needs. The way in which Napoleon exerts his leadership and the actions of several other animals includes for the practice of symbolic violence to dominate and control the farm.

1. Oral Discourse

The practice of symbolic violence in this novel in the form of an oral discourse instrument is employed by Snowball. The practice of oral discourse can be seen as follows:

Extract 1

The distinguishing mark of man is the hand, the instrument with which he does all his mischief (Orwell, 2021, p. 13).

Hands are the human appendage seen as a key part of the identity of humans but the discourse put forward by Snowball above equates the hand with evil. If this discourse is understood as true, then all human beings are evil. If this understanding is accepted by all animals then they will be hostile to all humans. This discourse is used to change perceptions or ways of thought.

By presenting human organs as identical to being human, this discourse is made to lead the listener to conclude that the human hand was created or meant to commit crimes. This term makes humans who have hands as a tool for their activities become a symbol of violence. In this way, humans are now considered as beings that are intrinsically and forever very close to violence. This oral discourse certainly aims to instill hatred for humans in all animals on the farm, so they will be inclined to hate and fight humans in any way.

This oral discourse is disseminated through oral text and disseminated to all animals. This discourse later became an ideology that was used to build strength against humans who were claimed to be creatures who were only capable of causing damage on earth. By using this instrument, the other animals do not realize that, in order to get rid of humans, they are being moved or set on the road towards the hegemony by Snowball. Symbolic violence in the form of oral discourse instruments can also be seen as follows:

Extract 2

...."No sentimentality, comrade!" cried Snowball from whose wounds the blood was still dripping. "War is war. The only good human being is a dead one.".... (Orwell, 2021, p. 17)

The statement by Snowball is trying to convince the other animals that it would be better if the humans all died rather than leaving them alive. Dead people are good people can also be interpreted as meaning that living humans are bad humans. This discourse contains a symbolic violence that tries to change the view of other animals that humans can never be good if they live, on the contrary it will be very good if humans die. Then the war against humans can be justified and continued.

Another character, Napoleon, also practices symbolic violence in the form of oral discourse:

Extract 3

... Napoleon took them away from their mothers, saying that he would make himself responsible for their education... (Orwell, 2021, p. 13)

Some of the young animals born on the farm were later taken by Napoleon. Taking the child was coercion by

Napoleon. But by saying that the children would be educated and Napoleon would be responsible for their education is a discourse to cover up a practice of violence by Napoleon when seizing the children of animals and separating them from their mothers. In the end, the children were used as soldiers to subdue their own mothers and fight the other animals. In another discourse it is stated that:

Extract 4

...Napoleon was now never spoken of simply as "Napoleon." He was always referred to in formal style as "our Leader, Comrade Napoleon," and the pigs liked to invent for him such titles as Father of All Animals, Terror of Mankind, Protector of the Sheep-fold, Ducklings' Friend, and the like.... (Orwell, 2021, p. 34)

This discourse was designed to raise and defend the position and power of Napoleon, by making the discourse present Napoleon as a responsible and responsible leader, to support and defend his position as ruler. This oral discourse is used to give the impression that Napoleon has always been a protector of animals and has always fought humans. But in fact, Napoleon actually oppressed other animals and made friends with humans. This discourse instrument is used indirectly to maintain Napoleon as a ruler on the farm at the expense of the other animals.

2. Written Discourse

The instrument of written discourse is also evident in the practice of symbolic violence that occurs in this novel. Written discourse can be seen in the following examples:

Extract 5

"FOUR LEGS GOOD, TWO LEGS BAD", was inscribed on the end wall of the barn, above the Seven Commandments and in bigger letters... (Orwell, 2021, p. 13).

Four Legs Good, Two Legs Bad is a discourse that contains elements of symbolic violence. Four legs good is a discourse that indicates that all living beings that walk on four legs (i.e. animals) are good beings. While any creature that walks on two legs is bad is a discourse which attacks the creature called human, as only human beings walk on two legs. Man is considered a bad creature or intrinsically evil in nature, simply because he walks on his two feet, in other words he is evil because he is different. This discourse is used by the hegemony to make the other animals willing to fight and eliminate the "other", i.e. humans, who are claimed to be intrinsically bad creatures.

This discourse is not only used to convey the meaning that humans are evil creatures and must be exterminated from the face of the earth, but also to convey the idea that all animals that have four legs are good creatures even though some animals practice violence, in particular the members of the hegemony. Another example of symbolic violence found is shown below:

Extract 6

...Clover asked Benjamin to read her the Sixth Commandment, and when Benjamin, as usual, said that he refused to meddle in such matters, she fetched Muriel. Muriel read the Commandment for her. It ran: "No animal shall kill any other animal without cause." Somehow or other, the last two words had slipped out of the animals' memory. But they saw now that the Commandment had not been violated; for clearly there was good reason for killing the traitors who had leagued themselves with Snowball... (Orwell, 2021, p. 34)

From the author's side, a written order or rule is now changing. The rule that used to prohibit the killing of animals has now changed. The law now allows the killing of some animals. This change means that the practice of killing in this farm can be justified and become something that not only could but should happen – under certain circumstances.

This discourse not only justifies what has been done, but becomes a subtle threat to all animals, as any who dare to fight Napoleon will be killed for any reason that can be made up by the hegemony. The killing of animals that was once strictly prohibited is now changing in line with the interests of those in authority. Finally, murder is permissible if there is a reason.

The original discourse, impressed the meaning that murder should not be done by the animals; but to legalize the actions of Napoleon who had killed some rebels, he used the discourse "No animal shall kill any other animal without cause" which means that killing is permissible if there is a cause, and therefore, the murder committed by Napoleon was legal. Other symbolic violence instruments practiced are illustrated below:

Extract 7

But a few days later Muriel, reading over the Seven Commandments to herself, noticed that there was yet another of them which the animals had remembered wrong. They had thought the Fifth Commandment was "No animal shall drink alcohol," but there were two words that they had forgotten. Actually the Commandment read: "No animal shall drink alcohol to excess."... (Orwell, 2021, p. 40)

In order that Napoleon's habit of drinking alcohol can be considered legal, Napoleon alters the Animalism principle of "No Animal shall drink alcohol" to "No animal shall drink alcohol to excess". Of course this altered rule will not hinder his new habit, and will enable Napoleon to keep drinking alcohol, because Napoleon can say that he only drank low quantities of alcohol. This rule then legalizes the habit of Napoleon. Animals will assume that drinking alcohol originated in a natural way.

In the statement, Muriel realized that the rule that prohibits animals from drinking alcohol like humans has now changed to legalize the consumption of alcohol. By changing the rules to allow animals to drink alcohol but not to excess, this amended rule legalizes the practice of drinking alcohol by the group in power or hegemony in this novel. Finally, drinking alcohol which was previously prohibited is now allowed but by using an ambiguous instrument that it

is only allowable to drink if not to excess, the ruling class get to decide what is excessive. This discourse is symbolic violence which in effect conveys the meaning that if the ruler drinks alcohol then it does not violate the rules of Animalism.

B. Discussion

After carefully reading *Animal Farm*, the researchers found six figures who practiced symbolic violence; they were Major, Snowball, Moses, Napoleon, Squealer, and Minimus. The researcher simply looked for symbolic violence practices in dialogues between characters and descriptions to find incidences of the practice of symbolic violence, of which a selection are presented above.

As explained earlier, there are two types of discourse, namely oral discourse and written discourse. Oral discourse can be in the form of communication interactions (in literary works, interactions between characters) that can cause violence, while written discourse can be in the form of announcements, slogans and or notices from certain parties to other parties which also contains elements of violence. The concept of *symbolic violence* in this research is used to explore the ways in which the *discourses* are used in practice, as the way some people are *spoken* to is different.

By combining the hermeneutic approach of Paul Ricoeur and the theory of Symbolic Violence of Pierre Bourdieu, symbolic violence in this novel can be seen to be practiced through text (dialogues between characters) which is then converted into either Oral Discourse or Written Discourse.

1. Oral Discourse Aspects

Oral discourse can be found in *Animal Farm*, as illustrated by the examples are shown in this article. The practice of symbolic violence in this novel can be seen in the oral discourse attributed to Snowball, for example his statement that "The distinguishing mark of man is the hand, the instrument with which he does all his mischief" (see extract 1 above).

From the semantic aspect, the word hand can mean a tool to control other people. And this is interpreted as such, even though the hands can also be used to help. Compare that to the text "*No sentimentality, comrade!*" cried Snowball from whose wounds the blood was still dripping. The only good human being is a dead one" (extract 2). On the one hand, this rallying cry can be seen as a really a stupid statement; but on the other hand it can be perceived as highly motivating.

The next illustration of symbolic violence can be found in extract 3 where Napoleon also practices symbolic violence in the form of oral discourse. By saying that the children would be educated and Napoleon would be responsible for their education, this discourse is designed to cover up a practice of violence carried out by Napoleon, by seizing the children of the animals. Not only were they separated from their mothers, but they were coerced by Napoleon into becoming soldiers to subdue their own parents and fight for the hegemony against the other animals. In another discourse, it is stated that "...Napoleon was now never spoken of simply as "Napoleon." He was always referred to in formal style as "our Leader, Comrade Napoleon," and this pigs liked to invent for him such titles as Father of All Animals, ..." Thus, once again, this statement contains elements of symbolic violence in the context of oral discourse, as it implies the dominance of Napoleon and reinforces the power of the hegemony.

2. Written Discourse Aspects

Symbolic violence in the form of written text is called the written discourse aspect (see extract 5 above). It is clear that "FOUR LEGS GOOD, TWO LEGS BAD" was inscribed on the end wall of the barn in capital letters. Another example is found in extract 6, where one of the rules or Commandments of Animality is changed to read "No animal shall kill any other animal without cause." The animals were led to believe that they had been mistaken, that "somehow or other, the last two words had slipped out of the animals' memory". This gaslighting tactic was used to normalize the conduct and power of the hegemony, as the animals "saw now that the Commandment had not been violated", and thus accepted the oppression and violence perpetrated by the new ruling class.

A further clear incidence of the practice of written discourse as a symbolic violence instrument can be seen in the change made to the Fifth Commandment (extract 7). This commandment was originally written as "No animal shall drink alcohol". However, once again the animals were led to believe that "there were two words that they had forgotten". As the new written version of the Commandment read: "No animal shall drink alcohol to excess", thereby effectively normalizing the drinking of alcohol, at least by the leaders, as they could determine what constituted an allowable level or an excess.

Based on the discussion above, it is clear that the principles enable a clear distinction between oral discourse and written discourse. These principles can then be used to interpret any specific occurrence of symbolic violence by utilizing two theories, namely the Hermeneutic interpretation theory of Paul Ricoeur and the theory of Symbolic Violence of Pierre Bourdieu.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above some points are highlighted: a) social discrimination; b) the mistreatment of oppressed groups; c) injustice; and d) human rights. The researcher concluded that the novel *Animal Farm* by George Orwell tells a story illustrating social conflicts where the actors use symbolic violence in social practice. In the world of the novel,

the dominant classes use the practice of symbolic violence to dominate, seize power and retain power.

This symbolic violence occurs over both oral and written domains of discourse communication. The discourse is organized in ways involving the creation, reinforcement and retention of the power to dominate other classes so that the goals of the leaders (hegemony) can be achieved.

In this novel, in addition to the upper class struggle to dominate or control the lower classes, symbolic violence is also used within the same class, i.e. within the dominant class, where the success or failure of the efforts to dominate others depend on how much capital each rival would-be hegemonic group can gain and retain.

The results of this study indicate that the instruments of symbolic violence in this novel are oral discourse and written discourse, both of which are used by animals to control and practice violence against other animals. Violence is practiced so subtly that the victims do not realize that they are becoming the victims of this symbolic practice of violence. The implication of this study is that, after reading this literary work, the reader will find new perspectives from seeing the relation between the literary work and social life.

REFERENCES

- [1] Baried, S. B. (1985). *Pengantar Teori Filologi*. Jakarta Timur: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- [2] Berensmeyer, I. (2009). *Literary Theory: An Introduction to Approaches, Methods and Terms*. Klett Lerntraining, Germany.
- [3] Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- [4] Bourdieu, P. (1987). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- [5] Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture (Vol. 4)*. Sage: Sage Publication Ltd.
- [6] Connolly, P., & Healy, J. (2004). Symbolic violence, locality and social class: the educational and career aspirations of 10-11-year-old boys in Belfast. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 12(1), 15-33.
- [7] Fashri, F. (2014). *Pierre Bourdieu: Menyingkap Kuasa Simbol*. Yogyakarta: Jalasutra.
- [8] Forceville, C. (2013). Metaphor and symbol: searching for one's identity is looking for a home in animation film. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics. Published under the auspices of the Spanish Cognitive Linguistics Association*, 11(2), 250-268.
- [9] Geanellos, R. (2000). Exploring Ricoeur's Hermeneutic Theory of Interpretation as a Method of Analyzing Research Texts. *Nursing inquiry*, 7(2), 112-119.
- [10] Mills, C. A. (1988). "Life on the Upslope": The Postmodern Landscape of Gentrification. *Environment and planning D: Society and space*, 6(2), 169-190.
- [11] Meirysa, S., & Wardarita, R. (2021). Social Context and Literature Sociological Functions in the Novel about You by Tere Liye. *JPGI (Jurnal Penelitian Guru Indonesia)*, 6(3), 742-747.
- [12] Orwell, G. (2021). *Animal Farm*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [13] Rahman, F., Amir P, M & Tammase. (2019). Trends in Reading Literary Fiction in Print and Cyber Media by Undergraduate Students of Hasanuddin University. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(2), 66-77.
- [14] Ricoeur, P. (1981). *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [15] Salomon, G. (2012). *Interaction Of Media, Cognition, and Learning: An Exploration of How Symbolic Forms Cultivate Mental Skills and Affect Knowledge Acquisition*. London: Routledge.



M. Amir P. is a lecturer at the Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. He is now Head of the English Language Studies Program (PhD level) at the Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University. His research interests are Literature, Philosophy and Cultural Studies.

Fathu Rahman is a Professor of Literature and Culture at the Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University, South Sulawesi, Indonesia.

Anriadi is a voluntary researcher, alumni of the Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University. Her research interests are Literature and Feminism.