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This essay aims to research the writing of George Orwell by analysing the four main pigs in his novel *Animal Farm* from a linguistic and rhetorical perspective. The paper's purpose is to explore occurrences of chosen phenomena tied to linguistic and rhetorical theory, with the goal to create an understanding of how Orwell portrays his characters exercising leadership and how their communicative strategies differ or coincide. In order to investigate occurrences of linguistic and rhetorical phenomena, the method of qualitative content analysis with a directed approach will be applied. This method of choice leaves room for interpretation based on the chosen theories and can assist in answering the research question. The results incline towards the pigs in Orwell’s novel applying various forms of linguistic and rhetorical strategies, often to persuade, manipulate and/or deceive the animals. Additionally, it is prevalent that there are both similarities and differences in the pigs' use of leadership as well as the use of linguistic and rhetorical strategies. Lastly, the paper will discuss and reflect on the results in order to draw conclusions and answer the research question.
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1. Introduction

*Animal Farm* is a satirical book written by George Orwell (the pen name of Eric Arthur Blair), first published in 1945. It is arguably his second most famous book, after *1984*. The story revolves around the fictional, titular farm: Animal Farm. The animals on the farm rebel against their human masters in an attempt to create an egalitarian society. In the absence of humans, the pigs end up taking leadership of the farm which is initially democratically governed. However, the pigs slowly consolidate power amongst themselves and eventually become masters as oppressive and authoritarian as the humans were. It is an allegorical tale that satirises the Russian Revolution and the early Stalinist Era of the Soviet Union, with several of the characters being directly based on real-life individuals.

The works of George Orwell have already been extensively researched, including works such as Stewart (2003), Fowler (1995) and Anson (2020). *Animal Farm* has been a recurring topic in this research, but there is a notable lack of rhetorical and linguistic leadership analysis done on it. The novel depicts leaders that succeed in developing a cult of personality similar to those of real dictators. Their leadership evolves to become increasingly authoritarian, a very complex process which has happened in the real world.

Orwell is one of the most acclaimed English writers of the last century, therefore, one could argue the importance of studying his work. Though fictional, the content of the novel satirises events relevant to the real world in a way that has educational value, as it can be used to reflect on and clarify real events. The essay’s purpose is to investigate how Orwell portrays rhetorical and linguistic strategies as well as leadership styles through the characters in the novel. This is done to further the research on Orwell’s work from a rhetorical and linguistic perspective and provide a new perspective. Thus, our research question is as such: How does Orwell portray the characters in the novel making use of the power of language and rhetoric to exercise control over Animal Farm and how do the portrayed leadership styles differ or coincide?

Several pragmatic and rhetorical theories have been compiled from previous research to be used for this paper. The characters in the novel that are analysed are the four pigs named Old Major, Snowball, Napoleon and Squealer, all of which have leadership roles. They are analysed using the compiled linguistic and rhetorical theories. The results of the pigs’ leadership is first presented and compared more broadly, before being analysed in more detail to understand how Orwell has portrayed linguistic and rhetorical strategies.
2. Theoretical background / framework

The theoretical framework will present concepts which will guide the research, enabling various viewpoints in relation to how the pigs exercise leadership with the aid of rhetoric and linguistics strategies. Some of the main concepts, which will be defined, are theories connected to leadership & management, conversation, crisis communication as well as conflict management. The chosen theories are of relevance because they can be used to analyse how Orwell has illustrated the pigs’ chosen ways to handle various events and challenges. For example, crisis communication highlights how the pigs handle a crisis, whereas leadership & management theories can demonstrate their leadership styles.

2.1 Leadership & management

Darics & Koller (2018) describe five different leadership styles, ordered by how much control the leaders take. They are: authoritarian, paternalistic, participatory, delegatory and laissez-faire. Authoritarian leaders take full control of decision-making. This can make followers feel disregarded, but it has the benefit of enabling fast decision making when necessary. Paternalistic style also involves centralised control, but to a lesser extent. The paternalistic leader considers others’ opinions, but is still ultimately in charge of decision making. As the name suggests, the dynamic is similar to parents and young children. Participatory leaders value the perspectives of others and encourage sharing of knowledge, ideas and experience amongst the group, allowing more informed decision-making from the leaders. However, the process is slow. Delegatory leadership goes further by focusing on the overall vision and controlling results, allowing others the power to make decisions. Lastly, laissez-faire style has little to no central decision-making or oversight. Leadership responsibilities are held by everyone in the group and there may not be a proper leader. This gives every person autonomy and freedom of expression, but the lack of leadership can cause communication issues (Darics & Koller, 2018).

Walker & Aritz (2014) describe differences between leadership and management. Leaders produce change and movement, they create a vision for others to follow. This vision aligns people, allowing the leader to set goals, create teams and coalitions. With enough charisma, they can inspire and motivate followers, and satisfy unmet needs. Managers produce order and consistency. They plan and budget by allocating resources and setting time tables. They organise by providing structure and making rules, and they solve problems by developing incentives and taking corrective action. Leaders and managers differ in their
sources of power, and their influence tends to be different. Managers have formal authority, also called *position power*. They can use their power in an organisation to reward or punish employees. Leaders can emerge in a way that is dynamic, rather than always being appointed. They can successfully influence people and obtain power that is outside of the kind found in organisational structures (Walker & Aritz, 2014).

Walker and Aritz (2014) describe six bases of power. The first three are *reward power* (to reward), *coercive power* (punishment and corrective actions) and *legitimate power* (authority based on legitimate right to rule). These three are common amongst managers. The others are *referent power* (influence gained through admiration and respect), *expert power* (influence based on expertise, or at least, the belief in one’s expertise by others) and *informational power* (informational resource, including data, persuasion and rational arguments). These sources of power are common amongst leaders and are dependent on communicative skills (Walker & Aritz, 2014). The six bases of power are demonstrations of a leader’s method of leadership, and can be used to determine what kind of leader they are.

### 2.2 Framing

Walker & Aritz (2014) describe *framing* as a communicative leadership technique. It is to frame a situation or reality by speaking about it in a certain way to persuade the listener. For example, politicians can frame a proposed reform as “an essential measure and a step towards justice”. The reform may not be essential or just in reality, but the speaker can succeed at convincing listeners that it is by using strong, emotional language and cherry picked evidence. If the listener is convinced by the speaker’s words, the speaker has created reality in the listener’s mind. Framing can also be used to simplify a situation and compel listeners into believing it is an “either/or” situation. Framing is one way to use rhetorics to gain control and/or power of a situation or organisation. For example, one can frame oneself as a reliable expert in order to convince others to follow. How much expertise the person has is not important if they can convince others they have it. Another use case of framing is to motivate others. By using positive rhetoric to frame a situation as hopeful and progressive, others can find inspiration in the speaker's ideas and suggestions (Walker & Aritz, 2014).

### 2.3 Politeness, face & face saving strategies

Face refers to a person's public self-image and is important in communication. Respecting another person’s face is essential as ignoring it can lead to unnecessary disagreement and contention. There are two components to respecting a person’s face: positive face and negative face. Positive face refers to the need for positive reinforcement, such as friendliness, solidarity, and one’s need to be held in high esteem and approved of by others. Negative face refers to one’s need for self-autonomy, freedom and private space. Transgressing these face needs, intentional or not, is a face-threatening act (FTA), which is impolite and often contentious. Almost all interactions between people could potentially be an FTA. Politeness strategies are used to mitigate or redress the degree to which our language, requests and actions threaten face. Two politeness strategies are positive redress (positive politeness) and negative redress (negative politeness), which seek to save positive face or negative face, either for the speaker or listener, in order to maintain good relations. Typical examples of positive redress are to flatter or coax the listener with gratitude, compliments or other types of positive reinforcement. To claim common ground and common interests is another form of positive redress. Negative redress is to respect the listener’s time, autonomy, and ambitions (Miller et al., 2008). Examples of both politeness strategies can be seen by comparing the following two sentences: “Change the order to something gluten-free instead.” and; “Sorry for the inconvenience, but could you order something gluten-free instead? I would really appreciate it if you could.” The second sentence respects the other person’s autonomy by asking, rather than demanding, a change in the order. It also shows gratitude for the proposed act.

2.4 Cooperative principle

The cooperative principle is described by Grice (1989), and can be interpreted as helpful in communication. Every language and culture has social conventions that, if followed properly, make communication smoother. Grice divides these conventions into four categories, namely quantity, quality, relation and manner. Under these four categories there are rules, otherwise known as maxims, which define the categories. The maxim of quantity says that the speaker should give an appropriate amount of information, they should not skimp out on it or give it excessively. The maxim of quality states that speakers should be sincere and only say things they believe to be truthful. If the speaker lacks the ability to verify truthfulness, they should make it clear. The maxim of relation states that speakers should give relevant information to the discussion, and the maxim of manner that one should be orderly in speech and avoid
ambiguity and obscurity. A speaker who does not follow the maxims but expects the listener to still understand the messages is *flouting the maxims*. A speaker who does not follow the maxims and knows that the listener will not understand is *violating the maxims*. This can be done to confuse, deceive or trick other people (Grice, 1989).

### 2.5 Crisis communication

To understand organisational crisis and what a crisis is, Hoffman and Ford (2010) advocate the definition of an organisational crisis by Ulmer, Sellnow & Seeger (2007). A crisis in an organisation is “a specific, unexpected, and nonroutine event or series of events that create high levels of uncertainty and threaten or are perceived to threaten an organisation's high priority goals” (Ulmer et al., 2007). There are many communicative tools with the goal of mitigating or resolving an organisational crisis.

Darics & Koller (2018) describe the crisis communication strategies. of *non-existence, distancing, ingratiating, mortification* and *suffering*. Non-existence is denying the existence of the crisis. This can be rewarding if successful, as it can spare the leaders of perceived wrongdoing. However, it is risky, as the leaders will be scrutinised more harshly if the crisis is revealed to be real. Distancing is to shift blame onto others. This strategy can be rewarding for the same reason as denial while also still functioning if the crisis is known to be real. However, the strategy backfires if the accused party proves to be innocent, and creating a scapegoat always runs the risk of souring relations. Ingratiation is the opposite strategy of distancing; to praise others for their performance and assuring that the crisis will be overcome in due time. This can keep morale up. Mortification is to accept responsibility, apologise, and/or offer compensation. If the leaders are known to be responsible, this enables them to regain trust and goodwill. It is important to follow up on the promises made. Suffering is to portray oneself as a victim of circumstances or other parties in an attempt to garner sympathy. However, one must be careful not to seem helpless, as doing so could damage one’s reputation as a leader (Darics & Koller, 2018).

A useful approach for facing a crisis, more explicitly post-crisis, is organisational apologia, which should not be confused with a simple apology. A few strategies of organisational apologia are the four basic strategies used when individuals speak in defence, coined by Ware and Linkugel (1973) (Hoffman & Ford, 2010). These strategies are explained by Hoffman and Ford (2010) as working in organisational circumstances. Three of the strategies are:
Denial: To deny responsibility. Any perceived wrongdoing on a leader’s part can be blamed on factors outside of their control. Another way of circumventing responsibility, depending on how much information is publicly available, denying an event even occurred.

Bolstering: This strategy makes use of elevating positive contributions in order to overshadow a bad event. Leaders accused of wrongdoing can deflect or distract by stating and emphasising all of the positive contributions of themselves or others.

Transcendence: Transcendence is to convert a bad event into something positive. More explicitly, transcendence is used in order to pardon an occurrence perceived as negative by stating that it was essential for achieving a greater goal or cause (Hoffman and Ford, 2010).

2.6 Conflict management

Principled negotiation serves as a comprehensive framework for managing conflicts by leveraging four essential attributes: people, interests, options, and criteria. In his insightful work, Northhouse (2018) elaborates on the first principle, which entails distinguishing between a mistake and the person responsible. This principle advocates for focusing discussions on work performance rather than personal attributes. The second principle emphasises the significance of prioritising interests over fixed positions, necessitating open-mindedness and clear communication to elucidate the rationale behind each party's stance. In other words, this principle facilitates a deeper understanding of the relevant needs and interests of all involved, seamlessly leading to the third principle. The third principle focuses on comprehending the diverse interests within a conflict, thereby fostering the identification of overlapping needs that pave the way for compromise and mutual gain. Finally, the fourth principle advocates for the application of objective criteria, such as moral and professional standards, to guide the negotiation process. These four principles collectively furnish a robust, evidence-based approach to resolving conflicts, offering a promising avenue for attaining mutually satisfactory outcomes (Northhouse, 2018). By skillfully employing principled negotiation, individuals and organisations can navigate conflicts with integrity, effectiveness, and lasting resolutions (Northhouse, 2018).

3. Method

Some methods for analysing text and transcriptions are content analysis and qualitative analysis. As described by Friginal & Hardy (2014), qualitative analysis suggests a method based on the interpretation and understanding of the material instead of on counting
frequently used words. In the section below we will elaborate on the method of content analysis from a qualitative perspective, otherwise known as qualitative content analysis. Additionally, to further pinpoint the accuracy of the essay's method the three approaches for qualitative content analysis will be presented.

3.1 Qualitative content analysis

Hsieh & Shannon (2005) describe qualitative content analysis as one method for analysing communication artefacts, in this case, a book. The research method was primarily derived from content analysis and is useful for analysing large text data. The method of qualitative content analysis was popularised by researchers studying health. The application for qualitative content analysis can be interpreted as multi-applicable. More concretely, the material can stem from various text data such as interviews, articles, books and observations e.t.c without explicit criteria for the text data (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Furthermore, this type of method roots itself in creating an understanding of specific or multiple phenomena through “the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns” (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Large amounts of data should be reduced through classifications and interpretation related to the paper’s chosen theories. It is favourable to pinpoint similarities or differences between the research subjects in order to answer the research question. When classifying and reducing the material one can choose from the three different approaches to qualitative content analysis, summative, directed and conventional. The directed approach takes advantage of, in this case, the theoretical framework when creating the coding scheme whereas the conventional coding scheme derives from the text data. Comparisons of keywords created from the researchers interest are factors of the summative approach (Hsie & Shannon, 2005). For this paper a directed approach to qualitative content analysis will be applied due to its core deriving from theory. The directed approach takes advantage of existing theory in order to create the classification system and identifying codes. Furthermore, with a directed approach the coding scheme is designed before analysis and during the analysis process new codes can be created leaving room for redesigning the coding scheme. This approach can be interpreted as following the steps of gathering existing theories, identifying the coding scheme in relation to theories, reducing the material, analysing, identifying and classifying the text data into codes. By applying this method we can further investigate which linguistic and rhetorical strategies have been portrayed by
Orwell via the pigs with the goal to answer the research question (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Friginal & Hardy, 2014).

3.2 Breakdown of analysis

For this paper the key concepts stem from the theories presented in section 2. These key concepts act as the framework for the codes used to identify and classify the linguistic and rhetorical tools which are portrayed in the novel. Furtheron, the material was reduced by sampling content from the book that represented the portrayed leadership styles, rhetoric and linguistic choices that correspond with the pigs. Other parts which gave more information about the context were also included in the text data. The actual analysis of the chosen content was ruled by the coding scheme and concluded by identifying patterns or themes that emerged. The codes we chose were as follows:

- **Charismatic Style:** An instance of referent, expert or informational power.
- **Management Style:** An instance of reward, coercive, or legitimate power.
- **Framing:** An instance of framing.
- **Positive Redress:** An instance of the positive redress strategy; respecting positive face.
- **Negative Redress:** An instance of the negative redress strategy; respecting negative face.
- **Positive Impoliteness:** An instance of ignoring positive face.
- **Negative Impoliteness:** An instance of ignoring negative face.
- **Violation of Maxim:** An instance of violating any of the maxims of the cooperative principle.
- **Denial:** An instance of denial (either non-existence or distancing).
- **Transcendence:** An instance of transcendence.
- **Ingratiation:** An instance of praising others.
- **Mortification:** An instance of taking responsibility for a crisis.
- **Suffering:** An instance of the suffering strategy.
- **Principled Negotiation:** An instance of applying the four principles.
4. Results & analysis

The following table shows the summary results of the communicative leadership by the pigs portrayed by Orwell. The table notes the codes that the pigs make use of with “✅”, and the codes they do not use with “❌”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old Major</th>
<th>Snowball</th>
<th>Squealer</th>
<th>Napoleon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic Style</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Style</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Redress</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Redress</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impoliteness</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impoliteness</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of Maxim</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcendence</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortification</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffering</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principled Negotiation</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 - Summary results of the pigs’ communicative leadership

The analysis section will make use of a multitude of excerpts from the book. The excerpts are named after their order of appearance: a number annotates the chapter the excerpt originates from, followed by a letter differentiating several excerpts from the same chapter. For example, “excerpt 2C” refers to the third excerpt from chapter 2, and “excerpt 4A” refers to the first excerpt from chapter 4. All excerpts used are also listed in order in the appendix.

In the beginning of the novel, the farm is officially led by the human Mr. Jones, who is selfish, incompetent and abusive towards the animals. Old Major is an old boar who is an unofficial leader. He is highly regarded by all the other animals. His words are what
eventually leads to the animal revolution and the expulsion of Mr. Jones shortly after Old Major’s death. In the power vacuum created, the rival pigs, Snowball and Napoleon, end up competing for the democratically elected leadership position. Squealer is a very persuasive pig who is loyal to Napoleon and supports his leadership. Napoleon eventually manages to expel all his rivals, including Snowball, by means of violence, becoming the de facto leader of the farm.

4.1 Analysis of leadership and management

Orwell’s portrayal of the pigs demonstrates different kinds of leadership and management, as well as their relation to the bases of power. Old Major was never given any position power, as all formal authority on the farm belonged to Mr. Jones. Instead, as shown in excerpt 1A, he is admired and respected by the other animals. He is considered to be wise, and he persuades the others with solid rhetorics and arguments. This is evidenced by the fact that the revolution occurred as a result of his words. He possesses referent, expert and informational power. In excerpt 1E, Old Major states:

1E: Comrades, [...] here is a point that must be settled. The wild creatures, such as rats and rabbits--are they our friends or our enemies? Let us put it to the vote. I propose this question to the meeting: Are rats comrades?

He puts the question to the vote and advocates for majority rule. Old Major is best described as a delegatory leader. He inspires the animals and creates a vision for them to follow, but does not engage in centralised decision making, instead allowing them to make their own decisions.

Snowball takes more control of the farm than Old Major did. As seen in excerpt 2B, when Mollie asks Snowball if she can eat sugar and wear ribbons, he states:

2B: No,[...] We have no means of making sugar on this farm. Besides, you do not need sugar. You will have all the oats and hay you want and Comrade, [...] those ribbons that you are so devoted to are the badge of slavery. Can you not understand that liberty is worth more than ribbons?

Snowball instructs the other animals directly and many of them follow suit. This is a recurring pattern for Snowball, he attempts to instruct and teach the animals to do what he
deems right. He sometimes exploits this for personal benefit, as seen in excerpt 3B, when he conspires with the pigs to hoard the milk and apples for themselves.

Snowball is repeatedly shown to be very charismatic. Snowball shows ambition by proposing various plans for mitigating the workload e.g building a windmill and field drains and convincing the other animals with charismatic leadership style. More concretely, this is demonstrated by Snowball in excerpt 5C: “In glowing sentences he painted a picture of Animal Farm as it might be when sordid labour was lifted from the animals' backs”. The other animals trust Snowball enough to follow his leadership when defending the farm from invaders. The animals follow his commands, as seen in excerpt 4A: “he gave his orders quickly, and in a couple of minutes every animal was at his post.” This proves that the other animals trust him enough to follow his orders in a battle of life and death. To summarise, Snowball acts like a paternalistic leader on some occasions, using referent, expert and informational power to gain trust. However, his political powers are limited, forcing him to use participatory leadership for farm policy.

Napoleon is not respected for wisdom, nor does he have good rhetorical skills. He prefers not to speak to the animals very often, instead using Squealer to deliver messages for him. In Excerpt 7C, Boxer initially distrusts Squealer’s story based on logical arguments, but he throws away all doubt as soon as he hears that Napoleon supports Squealer’s words. In other words, what Napoleon lacks in referent, expert and informational power, he makes up with legitimate power. In Excerpt 5E, Boxer shows that he believes Napoleon is the rightful ruler, and as such blindly follows him despite initially being unconvinced.

Napoleon also makes use of coercive power and reward power often. At one point, he demands additional work on Sundays and in order to ensure high participation, he makes use of coercive power to punish those who do not participate, as seen in excerpt 6A: “any animal who absented himself from it would have his rations reduced by half.” Additionally, in excerpt 6C, Napoleon makes use of coercive power again as well as reward power, stating: “Comrades, here and now I pronounce the death sentence upon Snowball. 'Animal Hero, Second Class,' and half a bushel of apples to any animal who brings him to justice. A full bushel to anyone who captures him alive!” In excerpt 7B, the hens rebel against Napoleon out of frustration, believing that the pigs’ demands of them are unreasonably high. Napoleon squashes this rebellion by starving the hens, yet another use of coercive power. To summarise, Napoleon is best described as an authoritarian leader, he takes full control of decision making and uses his position power to reward or punish others.

Squealer is considered as a very persuasive pig, as emphasised in excerpt 2A:
2A: He was a brilliant talker, and when he was arguing some difficult point he had a way of skipping from side to side and whisking his tail which was somehow very persuasive. The others said of Squealer that he could turn black into white.

There are many occasions where the animals appease the pigs’ demands because Squealer convinced them to, such as in excerpt 3B: “it was agreed without further argument that the milk and the windfall apples (and also the main crop of apples when they ripened) should be reserved for the pigs alone”. This phenomenon was also prevalent in excerpts 5E, 5F, 7E and 9A. However, while Squealer is very persuasive, excerpt 7A and 7C demonstrates Squealer’s position as a Manager, mainly in excerpt 7A where Napoleon “issued his orders through one of the other pigs, usually Squealer”. In simpler terms, Squealer is best described as a manager appointed by Napoleon, but he is persuasive and charismatic enough to obscure the authoritarian aspects of their leadership.

4.2 Analysis of framing

Orwell portrays the pigs as making extensive use of framing as a rhetorical and linguistic technique. Excerpt 1D can be perceived as Major creating an either/or situation by first framing humans as the source of evil: “all the evils of this life of ours spring from the tyranny of human beings [...] Only get rid of Man, and the produce of our labour would be our own. Almost overnight we could become rich and free.” He uses powerful and emotional words such as “tyranny” and “rich and free”, to create a more favourable alternate reality with humans gone. Lastly, Major instils the idea that their options are to either fight for animal freedom or live poorly in the hands of man.

Another instance is in Excerpt 3B, when Squealer frames the pigs as experts on subjects they are actually not, in this case, science. This plays a part in how they manage to usurp power on the farm. It was never stated by Old Major that only the pigs should have leadership positions, but they managed to successfully portray themselves as the only possible leaders. An example of this is seen in excerpt 5C: "The animals formed themselves into two factions under the slogan, "Vote for Snowball and the three-day week" and "Vote for Napoleon and the full manger"”. The pigs frame the complex dynamic that is leadership as a simple either/or scenario, where Snowball and Napoleon are the only options. The animals are so convinced that they fail to take the possibility of other animals leading into consideration. This is further compounded when Napoleon takes full control of the farm. In
excerpt 5E, the pigs frame the democratic Sunday debates as putting Animal Farm at risk of returning to the rule of Mr. Jones. This is another instance of framing a situation as either/or; either stop the debates or Jones will return. In other words, Napoleon exploits the fears of the other animals by framing various events or actions that he dislikes as dangerous, slowly and methodically squashing all opposition to his rule. In excerpt 6D Napoleon frames rebuilding the windmill as a necessity by saying:

6D: We will teach this miserable traitor that he cannot undo our work so easily. Remember, comrades, there must be no alteration in our plans: they shall be carried out to the day. Forward, comrades! Long live the windmill! Long live Animal Farm!

He paints Snowball as the enemy by using intense, emotional language such as “miserable traitor”. He also creates an either/or situation: rebuild the windmill so that Animal Farm wins and Snowball learns his lesson or let Snowball win and Animal Farm lose.

4.3 Analysis of politeness

In regards to politeness, Old Major exerts positive redress by repeatedly using the word “comrades” in order to instil kinship. He states that ”all animals are comrades” in excerpt 1D and is even willing to be inclusive towards wild animals which is seen in excerpt 1E by proposing that wild animals could be friends. He also respects the animals’ need for freedom and self-autonomy when proposing rebellion. Notably, Major states: “I do not know when that Rebellion will come, it might be in a week or in a hundred years.” This makes it clear that while he strongly advocates for rebellion, he does not command it. He expects rebellion, but also acknowledges that the animals he is speaking to have the option of choosing not to, which would delay the rebellion. He respects their autonomy, time and freedom.

Snowball, Squealer and Napoleon use the word “comrade” in the same way Major did, and it is their most prominent form of positive redress, reinforcing solidarity and friendliness. This is one way that they dispel doubt about the earnestness of their intentions. They use the word many times, including in excerpts 3A, 5E, 5F, 6C, 6D, 7C, 7E and 8B.

Snowball also talks in ways that emphasise their common interests which is shown in excerpt 5C and 5B where he makes suggestions regarding the overall efficiency of the farm. For example in excerpt 5C: “he declared, so much labour would be saved that the animals would only need to work three days a week” after building the windmill. These excerpts can also be seen as him respecting negative face, as his suggestions are made with the purpose of
reducing the animals’ workloads, increasing their spare time and giving them freedom to use said time as they wish.

However, there are instances where Snowball does not respect negative face. This is seen in excerpt 2B, where he states: “Ribbons [...] should be considered as clothes, which are the mark of a human being. All animals should go naked”. He forbids the animals from wearing clothes, showcasing that he does not respect the animals' negative face needs. He does frame the situation as being for their own freedom, but does not properly explain why ribbons or a straw hat would enslave them. In summary, one can say that Snowball uses positive and negative politeness while still threatening the negative face needs.

In excerpt 3B, Squealer is sent to explain why the pigs hoard the milk and apples for themselves, stating:

3B: Our sole object in taking these things is to preserve our health. Milk and apples (this has been proved by Science, comrades) contain substances absolutely necessary to the well-being of a pig. [...] The whole management and organisation of this farm depend on us. Day and night we are watching over your welfare. It is for YOUR sake that we drink that milk and eat those apples.

Squealer demonstrates the strategy of finding common ground, which is a typical positive redress strategy. In this case, Squealer attempts to coax the other animals by claiming that everything the pigs do is for the sake of the others. This allows the pigs to save face, as they can cover up their true, selfish intentions with an altruistic one. In excerpt 8B, Squealer ignores negative politeness when he casually states that they will build new windmills, completely ignoring how much of the other animals’ time and effort would be required.

Napoleon often ignores the other animals’ negative face needs. In excerpt 6D, Napoleon gives new commands that he decided on the spot, stating:

6D: No more delays, comrades! [...] There is work to be done. This very morning we begin rebuilding the windmill, and we will build all through the winter, rain or shine. [...] Remember, comrades, there must be no alteration in our plans: they shall be carried out to the day. Forward, comrades! Long live the windmill! Long live Animal Farm!

Napoleon dictates changes in the other animals’ work schedules without consulting them at all. He also does this in excerpt 5D, when he commands an end to the Sunday debates
without considering what the other animals want. Other animals often wish to protest these changes. Both Napoleon and Squealer frequently respond by abruptly putting an end to discussion. This can be seen in excerpt 7F:

7F: Frightened though they were, some of the animals might possibly have protested, but at this moment the sheep set up their usual bleating of "Four legs good, two legs bad," which went on for several minutes and put an end to the discussion.

Napoleon and Squealer often instruct the sheep to bleat loudly. This silences their critics by drowning their words in the noise of the sheep. The two pigs demonstrate that they do not care for the autonomy of the others when it comes to discussion; discussion is only allowed when the leaders desire it.

Napoleon’s pattern of impoliteness becomes more pronounced the longer he rules. In excerpt 6B, he makes use of intimidation to silence his critics. In excerpt 10A, he decides to suppress the use of the word “comrade” to quell the solidarity and friendliness that their positive redress strategies had worked to build.

There are some moments of negative politeness from Napoleon and Squealer, but in a somewhat devious and disingenuous manner. In excerpt 6A, the pigs demand additional work on Sundays. In order to keep up appearances of respecting the other animals’ autonomy, they refer to said work as “voluntary” despite using coercive power to enforce it. In excerpt 9B, Squealer stressed the fact that the animals were free as opposed to being slaves when Mr. Jones ruled, despite the fact that the animals' living conditions never had been worse by conveying the idea of, “in those days they had been slaves and now they were free, and that made all the difference”. This is done to create an illusion of respecting the negative face while simultaneously distracting them from their lack of freedom under the leadership of the pigs.

4.4 Analysis of the cooperative principle

Old Major follows the cooperative principle quite well. His speech is only as long as required to convey his message, he makes sure to use language the others can understand and he speaks in ways that he believes is truthful which is seen in excerpt 1D. The other pigs are different. They often speak in ways that are ambiguous or difficult to understand for other animals. They violate the maxims of the cooperative principle on numerous occasions.
Snowball violates several maxims when he assures the birds that a wing should be regarded as a leg to ease their protests of the new principle, as seen in excerpt 3A: “A bird's wing, comrades, [...] is an organ of propulsion and not of manipulation. It should therefore be regarded as a leg. The distinguishing mark of man is the HAND, the instrument with which he does all his mischief.” His argument is not very strong, which is why he intentionally makes use of excessive language containing irrelevant and confusing information, thus violating the maxims of quantity, relation and manner. By ensuring that the birds will not be able to understand, they also will not be able to counter-argue. They accept the argument without actually being convinced.

Squealer also violates maxims in excerpt 3B, when he makes the claims that the pigs dislike the milk and apples, and that they have scientific evidence that they are essential for their health. Squealer knows these statements to be untrue and says them to deceive the other animals, thus violating the maxim of quality. Another example when Squealer falsely claims that Napoleon was the original creator for the windmill, as seen in excerpt 5F:

5F: The windmill was, in fact, Napoleon's own creation. Why, then, asked somebody, had he spoken so strongly against it? Here Squealer looked very sly. That, he said, was Comrade Napoleon's cunning. He had SEEMED to oppose the windmill, simply as a manoeuvre to get rid of Snowball, who was a dangerous character and a bad influence. Now that Snowball was out of the way, the plan could go forward without his interference. This, said Squealer, was something called tactics.

Squealer’s explanation is also too complicated for the other animals to understand, thus violating the maxims of quality and manner.

In excerpt 2C, the animals wonder what should be done with the milk. Regarding the milk, Napoleon states: “Never mind the milk, comrades! That will be attended to. The harvest is more important”. Napoleon changes the subject by distracting them with the harvest, violating the maxim of relation. He also gives no explanation of what will happen to the milk, only giving a brief: “That will be attended to”. By being secretive, unclear and brief, Napoleon violates the maxims of quantity and manner. In excerpt 6C, Napoleon blames Snowball by saying, “Snowball has done this thing” for the destruction of the windmill despite having no concrete evidence. He violates the maxim of quality by not being sincere or telling the truth with the goal of deceiving the animals.
4.5 Analysis of crisis communication and conflict management

The leadership of humans is seen as cruel by many animals, and Old Major portrays it as a crisis that must be overcome. Major demonstrates the strategies of suffering and ingratiation in excerpt 1B:

1B: Now, comrades, what is the nature of this life of ours? Let us face it: our lives are miserable, laborious, and short. We are born, we are given just so much food as will keep the breath in our bodies, and those of us who are capable of it are forced to work to the last atom of our strength; and the very instant that our usefulness has come to an end we are slaughtered with hideous cruelty.

Old Major emphasises how much the animals have suffered under the rule of humans in order to make it clear who the perpetrators and victims of the crisis are. This example demonstrates suffering. Reading excerpt 1D there is also an example further down of ingratiation mixed with suffering where Old Major says “Our labour tills the soil, our dung fertilises it, and yet there is not one of us that owns more than his bare skin” and “Only get rid of Man, and the produce of our labour would be our own. Almost overnight we could become rich and free.”. In this example he praises the animals, emphasising on how much they have done for Mr. Jones and yet they are worth nothing and assures them that the crisis will be overcome when humans are overthrown. The use of ingratiation and suffering can be seen consequently in excerpt 1D.

Napoleon’s and Squealer’s leadership demonstrate the crisis communication styles of distancing and non-existence, the two can also collectively be referred to as denial. The first time the windmill collapsed was because of a storm. It was the fault of Napoleon, his faulty design caused mother nature to wreck the windmill. However, in excerpt 6C, Napoleon blames the destruction on Snowball, who had since long already been banished from the farm.

Squealer demonstrates denial when he denies that the destruction of the windmill is a significant problem, as seen in excerpt 8B:

8B: And the animals heard, from the direction of the farm buildings, the solemn booming of a gun.
"What is that gun firing for?" said Boxer.
"To celebrate our victory!" cried Squealer.
"What victory?" said Boxer. His knees were bleeding, he had lost a shoe and split his hoof, and a dozen pellets had lodged themselves in his hind leg.

"What victory, comrade? Have we not driven the enemy off our soil—the sacred soil of Animal Farm?"

"But they have destroyed the windmill. And we had worked on it for two years!"

"What matter? We will build another windmill. We will build six windmills if we feel like it. You do not appreciate, comrade, the mighty thing that we have done. The enemy was in occupation of this very ground that we stand upon. And now—thanks to the leadership of Comrade Napoleon—we have won every inch of it back again!"

"Then we have won back what we had before," said Boxer.

"That is our victory," said Squealer.

Squealer frames the battle of the windmill as a victory despite the tremendous losses making it a narrow victory at best. He achieves this by emphasising the importance of the land they won back. The destruction of the windmill, which the animal worked hard on for years, is brushed off as a minor inconvenience. He denies that it is a crisis at all. This strategy was not very effective, however, as the animals were still distraught over their losses. It was not until later (excerpt 8C), when Napoleon used the ingratiation strategy by praising the animals, offering apples and celebrating, that they truly felt victorious. Squealer also uses denial in excerpt 9A, when he refers to a reduction of rations as a readjustment. In excerpt 3B, Squealer also makes use of bolstering when he emphasises the contributions of the pigs to the farm in order to justify them taking the milk and apples for themselves.

One important aspect of analysis is to take into consideration not just what is said or done, but also what is not said or done. A strategy that the pigs never make use of is mortification. They never apologise or accept responsibility for anything that goes wrong. Instead, they always deny, deflect or distract. In addition, they never make use of principled negotiation to solve solutions peacefully. They do not differentiate a mistake from the one who made it. Instead, anyone who is deemed to have acted against the interests of Animal Farm is treated with hostility. An example of this is in excerpt 2B. Mollie wishes to eat sugar and wear ribbons. Snowball rejects her requests without any negotiation or trying to understand why she wants them. This escalates in excerpt 5A, when Mollie abandons Animal Farm in favour of Foxwood Farm.

The pigs rarely explain why they make the decisions they make, and when they do, they often backpedal or contradict their previous statements, leaving the other animals
confused. An example of this is excerpt 5F, where Napoleon backpedals on his stance on the windmill. They also are not interested in listening to the interests of the other animals or in finding mutual interests to plan out cooperative solutions to the internal conflicts on the farm. After Napoleon’s take over, this callousness escalates to the point where other animals are needlessly being declared traitors and executed. An example of Napoleon’s proclivity towards punishing others is seen in excerpt 7B:

7B: [...]the hens made a determined effort to thwart Napoleon's wishes. Their method was to fly up to the rafters and there lay their eggs, which smashed to pieces on the floor. Napoleon acted swiftly and ruthlessly. He ordered the hens' rations to be stopped, and decreed that any animal giving so much as a grain of corn to a hen should be punished by death. The dogs saw to it that these orders were carried out.

Napoleon pays no attention to the interests of the hens and never communicates with them to find a more amicable solution.

The violence of the rebellion does not go unnoticed by the other animals. The pigs maintain control by using the crisis communication strategy of transcendence to justify violent acts. In excerpt 4C, Snowball claims that sacrifice of animal lives is necessary for the greater good, he also justifies killing humans in excerpt 4B:

4B: Back in the yard Boxer was pawing with his hoof at the stable-lad who lay face down in the mud, trying to turn him over. The boy did not stir.
"He is dead," said Boxer sorrowfully. "I had no intention of doing that. I forgot that I was wearing iron shoes. Who will believe that I did not do this on purpose?"
"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."
"I have no wish to take life, not even human life," repeated Boxer, and his eyes were full of tears.

As seen in excerpt 7D, Napoleon occasionally executes animals on the basis that it is for the greater good of punishing criminals. In excerpt 7E, Squealer describes the numerous executions of their fellow animals as being the final act of the rebellion, and that with said act, all of their enemies had been defeated. However, the animals were still opposed to the killings the pigs committed, fearing that it might violate one of the commandments of Animalism. In Excerpt 8A, the animals decide to double check the commandments. It is
revealed that the pigs sneakily changed one of the commandments (without the other animals noticing), to state that it is acceptable for an animal to kill another if there is justifiable cause. Changing the commandment to frame the situation as being for a greater cause made the animals feel more at ease.

5. Discussion & conclusion (Assed)

Orwell portrays Animal Farm as experiencing changes in leadership styles along with its shift in leaders. Under the unofficial leadership of Old Major, the farm starts as a democratic society, as shown by Old Major himself advocating for democrating voting. However, the farm becomes increasingly authoritarian as time passes. This shift begins with the death of Old Major, who is succeeded by Snowball and Napoleon. These two are initially shown to be devout followers of Major’s teachings who follow democratic rule, but they are more assertive and aggressive in their leadership and guidance. They use their superior wits to manipulate the other animals and slowly consolidate more power and resources for themselves. In this race, Napoleon and Snowball become fierce rivals, but their power struggle comes to a conclusion when Napoleon uses force to have Snowball exiled. Napoleon seizes full authoritarian control, and his rule becomes increasingly self-serving and cruel. Eventually, his policies became indistinguishable from the humans that had preceded the pigs.

The communicative leadership that Orwell has portrayed the pigs using to achieve this consolidation of power contains a multitude of rhetorical and linguistic techniques. There are both similarities and differences in the type of techniques the different pigs use and the purposes of which they are used. Old Major was never an official leader of Animal Farm, but he managed to amass followers and listeners through his charisma and wisdom. He used linguistic and rhetorical techniques, such as framing, for the purpose of spreading his ideology. He demonstrated positive redress and the ingratiating strategy in order to instil camaraderie amongst the animals. However, Old Major did not attempt to take control of the farm. He demonstrates negative redress when he respects the other animals’ autonomy and ability to choose what to do for themselves. His communication is always clear and straightforward enough for all of the animals to understand.

Snowball’s leadership showed more altruism than Napoleon or Squealer, but this pattern was less consistent than Old Major’s. Snowball did work hard for the betterment of all animals on the farm, as seen on the extensive work he put in to create the plans for the
windmill and the fact that he participated in the battles. He was charismatic enough to gain a devout following and the trust of all animals on the farm. However, the linguistic and rhetorical strategies he used to persuade the other animals were sometimes manipulative and he participated in the pigs’ ploy to hoard food for themselves. To summarise, it is evident that Snowball prioritised his own needs first, but not to the same extent as Napoleon and Squealer, nor did he ever show the same cruelty that they did later on.

Napoleon proved to be a cruel and selfish leader. He initially made use of Squealer’s excellent rhetorical and linguistic skills in order to gain the trust of the other animals. Later on, his leadership became a rule of terror. The dogs that were loyal to him made sure to threaten any that would question him by growling menacingly. In instances where this intimidation strategy failed, Napoleon made extensive use of harsh punishments, including executions, to put the other animals in line. Napoleon and Squealer were not equal comrades to the other animals in any sense, not only did they receive additional benefits, they also did not risk their own hide in the numerous battles fought on the farm.

This brings up the question: How did leaders as selfish as Napoleon and Squealer manage to attain faith and loyalty from the majority of the animals on the farm? A key aspect in the leadership was their use of positive redress, most notably their use of the word *comrade*. This word has seen use by various political groups in real life, including in the Soviet Union, which serves as the inspiration for *Animal Farm*. The word serves to instil camaraderie amongst its users. Napoleon and Squealer use the word to keep up appearances of camaraderie and kinship, often flattering the other animals with their words and speeches. In instances of crisis, Napoleon and Squealer use techniques such as non-existence, distancing and denial to shift blame of wrongdoing away from themselves, often unjustly blaming others. These strategies allowed them to make themselves seem like more benevolent and competent rulers than they actually were.

They also violate the maxims of the cooperative principle in order to dominate conversations to their own benefit. This serves to confuse the other animals enough for the pigs to convince them that the pigs are in the right. They make extensive use of framing to paint complex situations as only having one correct answer and one wrong answer. They also use the transcendence strategy to portray their cruel acts as for a greater cause. All of these techniques and strategies allow them to manipulate the other animals into doing their bidding. The differences in strategies and leadership styles result in them being viewed differently by the other animals. Old Major was believed in because he was considered to be wise.
Napoleon, on the other hand, was believed in because of blind loyalty. “Napoleon is always right” as Boxer would say.

To summarise, Orwell has portrayed the pigs' superior linguistic skills to be the most important source of their control of the farm. The novel demonstrates how language can be used to control and shape the beliefs and actions of others. The pigs find ways to control and twist the discussion on the farm to their benefit. In the scenarios where more discussion does not benefit them, Napoleon and Squealer put an end to the discussion by silencing it under the bleatings of the sheep. If their critics are unable to communicate in the most crucial moments, no proper opposition can be formed. In other words, the pigs succeed in controlling not just the nature of discussion and the words uttered on the farm, but also whether or not words should be spoken at all.

### 5.1 Limitations of the study

One of the limitations with directed approach, which this study is not an exception to, is the vulnerability to researcher bias. The theories chosen will determine the kinds of themes that can be discovered, impacting the results. There is always a risk that researchers end up overly focused on the chosen theories and miss important themes outside of their scope. Other researchers without the same expectations could have chosen different theories and themes to analyse and ended up with different results, possibly finding important patterns that our approach could not. Therefore, one can surmise that the results of this study have been influenced by our preconceived notions and expected findings.

Another limitation of this study is the actual researchers. Qualitative research is heavily dependent on the skills of the researchers involved in the analysis. As newcomers to qualitative analysis, there is the possibility that we have made basic mistakes that more experienced researchers would not. Furthermore, this study is composed of only two researchers, both of which had already read the book prior to starting the study. This introduces the risk that preconceived notions about the book from previous experiences reading it could have an impact on the analysis of the results. It is reasonable to assume that a larger subset of researchers, with some having no prior experience reading the book, could produce results that are less susceptible to bias and more reliable overall.

The limited timescope is a limitation on the study in more ways than one. Firstly, there was not enough time to analyse every paragraph from the book in detail, which is why this study relies on specific excerpts deemed representative. Second, the time limitation also
restricted the amount of previous research that could be used. Both of these limitations necessitate choices in what material to use, further increasing the risk that researcher bias will play a part in what material was chosen.

5.2 Significance of the study

The works of famous authors are frequently chosen for academic studies. Orwell's books are highly regarded as literary and political commentaries that relate to the political issues of the 1930’s and 1940’s. *Animal Farm* is an allegory for the real history of the Soviet Union and it addresses important topics, such as how linguistics and rhetoric can be used for propaganda. This makes studying them highly educational and important, one can learn valuable insights on manipulative linguistic strategies and how they play a part in upholding established leadership and power structures. The fact that these strategies can be so convincing is what makes them dangerous in the hands of authoritarian powers that wish to control the populace, an issue that is still relevant today. Several of Orwell’s books have been studied extensively, the most prominent one being *1984*. Animal Farm has also been studied previously, but it has not been properly studied from the perspective of communicative leadership. Assuming that the results are reliable and reasonable, this study can provide an increased understanding of communicative leadership in the novel and a greater understanding of Orwell’s work as a whole.

5.3 Suggestions for further research

The novel is an allegory for the Russian Revolution and the early Stalinist era of the Soviet Union. This study did not involve these real life inspirations for the novel in any significant way, instead focusing entirely on the material in the novel. A more expanded study would most likely benefit from using some of the research and theory on the history of the Soviet Union and their leaders. That way, a more extensive analysis could be made by comparing the leaders in Animal Farm to their real life inspirations.

It is also worth noting that George Orwell wrote multiple books on the topic of authoritarianism, both fictional and non-fictional. Animal Farm tells a story from his perspective, which means that any study on the novel is to an extent a study on his personal views. While Animal Farm is one of Orwell’s most successful books, it is merely one piece of his work. A more extensive study could analyse more of his work in tandem, as doing so could paint a more complete picture of his philosophy.
6. Discussion & conclusion (Jasper)

The paper has presented a wide theoretical framework to support the method, showcasing various phenomena in the results, substantiating this part of the research to discuss and answer the research question: How does Orwell portray the characters in the novel making use of the power of language and rhetoric to exercise control over Animal Farm and how do the portrayed leadership styles differ or coincide?

Orwell portrays the pigs to make interesting use of linguistics, rhetoric and leadership to exercise control over the farm. Each character showed to demonstrate different amounts of control through a participatory, authoritative or delegatory leadership style, utilising various types of the six bases of power, connected to the code charismatic or/and manager style. The portrayed characters are shown to do this with the help of, primarily, framing, violation of maxim, positive redress and strategies of denial to align the outcome with the pigs' respective goals without the use of principled negotiation or mortification. It becomes prevalent that Orwell really emphasised on the differences in the character's leadership styles as well as the rhetoric and linguistic differences between Napoleon and Old Major, see table 1. But in contrast to differences the portrayed pigs were all found to use communicative strategies, e.g framing and positive redress to get as they want, a similarity which could have surprised Orwell himself. In short, it can be perceived that Orwell portrays clear differences in their use of exercising control while the similarities between the authoritarian and democratic pigs are discreet. The answer presented above will be further motivated and detailed by summarising the characters, starting with Old Major and funnelling down to all the named pigs portrayed by Orwell.

Old Major, which differs the most from the other pigs, influences the other animals through his wisdom, persuasive rhetoric, and the respect he garners. He was the first to instil the idea of rebellion and animosity towards humans by framing humans as the evil which is explained in 4.1. Old Major can be viewed as tactical when it comes to refraining from acts which can lead to unfavourable outcomes or him being negatively perceived. One example is that Old Major is the only one of the pigs who applies negative and positive redress while also deviating from acts which threaten or disrespect either of the face needs. This is presented in section 4.3 but can also be seen in 4.5 and 4.1 where Old Major respects the animal's autonomy and instils kinship through e.g ingratiating and a democratic vote. This can be interpreted as Old Major avoiding unnecessary conflicts while still emphasising the pigs' autonomy and kinship, which Miller et al. (2008) implicate as essential in
communication. This implies Old Major's awareness to always mitigate face-threatening acts while reinforcing the positive and negative faces (Miller et al., 2008). Another instance of Old Major refraining from acts that can cause unfavourable outcomes is his use of the cooperative principle which is analysed in section 4.4. Grice (1989) implies that by not aligning with the maxims it could cause misinformation hence Old Major deviating from either flouting or violating the maxims. This manifests the pig as a kind soul aware of not causing harm and knowing the importance of collective decision-making. Compounding the other animals' belief of Old Major as a character to be respected which ties down to referent power described by Walker & Aritz (2014). It is also presented in section 4.1 that Old Major is perceived as wise which can be interpreted as holding some form of expertise relating to expert power (Walker and Aritz, 2014). Section 4.4 highlights his ability to persuade through framing by creating an either/or situation with the help of powerful and emotional language as suffering which is seen in section 4.5 and can be viewed as an effective persuasive strategy (Darics & Koller, 2018; Walker & Aritz, 2014). Being persuasive ties down to informational power (Walker & Aritz, 2014). With this stated Old Major can be viewed as a delegatory leader, allowing collective decision-making, which is seen in section 4.3 by voting, while still motivating/persuading the other animals to fight for the idea of freedom, a vision to follow (Darics & Koller, 2018).

Napoleon, which can be regarded as the opposite of Old Major, strives for a totalitarian rule leaving the principles of democracy to dust. Napoleon's leadership style differs significantly from Old Major where the only common derivatives are framing, positive redress and ingratiating; this is prevalent in Table 1. In regards to the theory of politeness, Napoleon disrespects both the negative and positive face needs. This is seen multiple times and is explained in section 4.5 where Napoleon disregards the other animals' autonomy, time and kinship by deciding what should be done and when as well as suppressing the word comrade, which was used to instil kinship. Napoleon's acts disrespect both face needs which can be hurtful in conversation (Miller et al., 2008). Although Napoleon's acts can be viewed as disrespectful the other animals do not notice that due to his use of framing, violation of maxims and strategies tied to denying. Napoleon takes advantage of these strategies to manipulate the other animals, as violating the maxims and framing, could work to deceive and create beneficial scenarios in order for Napoleon to rule (Grice, 1989; Walker & Aritz, 2014). One example is presented in section 4.6 where he violates three out of the four maxims, quality, quantity and manner, by consciously being brief, untruthful and obscure. Being dishonest and obscure is commonplace for Napoleon and ties down to strategies such
as non-existence, denial and distancing. One example is highlighted in section 4.4 where he applies framing with the aid of distancing and denial, shifting the blame to Snowball, fully knowing it was his own fault and due to Snowball's position as an outcast he could not refute or defend the claims making it a valid communicative move by Napoleon (Hoffman & Ford, 2010; Darics & Koller, 2018; Grice, 1989; Walker & Aritz, 2014). These actions can be viewed as Napoleon slowly but surely distancing himself from any wrongdoing through manipulative communication compounding himself as a formal authority. Napoleon is not only manipulative but also takes advantage of his position power, mainly created by manipulation to reward and punish actions he deems right or wrong which is seen in sections 4.1 and 4.5. This connects to Daric & Koller's (2018) view on an authoritarian leadership style where Napoleon is the only decision-maker leaving no room for discussion. More concretely, this can be seen when Napoleon orders the death sentence upon Snowball with the help of reward power. He also applies coercive power to starve the hens with the goal to suppress opposing views making Napoleon an authoritarian leader with the help of reward and coercive power (Darics & Koller, 2018; Walker & Aritz, 2014).

Snowball, which is depicted in the novel as Napoleon's rival, is viewed as an innovative thinker proposing ideas for the benefit of the farm. But in regards to politeness Snowball and Napoleon are not so different in their way of disguising negative impoliteness by violating the maxims and applying framing. One example is prevalent in section 4.3 as he disregards the animals' autonomy through the banning of clothes, taking away the animals' right to choose. He does this by framing clothes as something bad while also violating the maxim of quantity by being brief, not really explaining why human clothes would be explicitly bad (Grize, 1989; Miller et al., 2008; Walker & Aritz, 2014). These actions are similar to how Napoleon takes advantage of framing and violation of maxims in order to exercise control. The difference is that Snowball applies both negative and positive redress while never threatening the positive face. Snowball's politeness actions display his strong will for the end goal of liberty and leisure for the animals. This is further shown in sections 4.3 and 4.1 where he shows his ambition by proposing multiple plans to mitigate the workload and increase the animals' spare time which emphasises their common interests and respects both face needs (Miller et al., 2008). The animals deem Snowball as a leader, explained in 4.1, as the animals, in combat warfare, take orders from Snowball without hesitation. It can also be interpreted that his use of positive and negative redress is similar to Old Major, thus receiving the same respect as he did. These actions connect Snowball to Daric & Koller's (2018) definition of a participatory leader due to his ambition of sharing knowledge and consideration of the other
animals by not forcing them to act when e.g. building the windmill or drains. He takes advantage of referent, expert and informational power in the same way as Old Major. Referent and expert power emerged through his bravery and brains discussed in section 4.1 whereas informational power can be noticed through his persuasive speech, regarding building off the windmill (Walker & Aritz, 2014). After the war, Snowball makes it quick to apply transcendence to justify killing which is also used by Napoleon seen in section 4.5. This is done to pardon an event claiming it was essential for the greater goal, once again framing a situation to align with the pigs' ideals and opinions (Walker & Aritz, 2014; Hoffman & Ford, 2010).

Lastly, there is Squealer, Napoleon's right hand who does most of his biddings using techniques of persuasion. Squealer shows the same usage of positive redress and framing as the other pigs. One example of Squealer's positive redress can be seen in 4.3 where he tries to find common ground (Miller et al., 2008). Although Squealer is seen respecting the positive face needs he also disrespects the negative face needs the same way as Napoleon. In other words, applying framing, violation of maxim and reward power to disguise their damaging act of threatening the negative face.

In regards to crisis communication, is Squealer similar to Napoleon, which is seen in section 4.5 as they frame the battle of the windmill through transcendence and non-existence which quickly shifts the animals focus away from the crisis (Hoffman & Ford, 2010; Darics & Koller, 2018). It is also worth mentioning the similarities between Squealer’s, Napoleon’s and Snowball’s violation of maxims as they all violate one or more of them to persuade or/and deceive the animals (Grice, 1989). Being persuasive is one of Squealer's foremost attributes tying down to possessing informational power just like Old Major and Snowball. This can be why Napoleon, who averts from informational power, appoints Squealer as his spokesperson reinforcing Napoleon's leadership style which is implied in section 4.1. This makes Squealer a manager, possessing the same bases of power and authoritarian attributes as Napoleon, with informational power like Snowball and Old Major (Walker & Aritz, 2014; Darics & Koller, 2018).

6.1 Final reflections

Once again, it is important to note that the fictional pigs’ characteristics derive from real persons but are interpreted, portrayed and written by Orwell. By analysing the pigs the research has created a greater understanding of Orwell's portrayal of exercising control. With this knowledge one can argue how correct Orwell is in depicting rhetoric, linguistic and
leadership strategies tied to real individuals. This paper's findings have showcased how Orwell has portrayed the named pigs’ use of exercising control in *Animal Farm* and as such can be adopted for further research on the Stalin/Russian revolution area due to the novel's allegorical theme. If Orwell seems to be correct in his depiction of e.g linguistic or/and rhetoric strategies, tied to real individuals, future studies can make use of Orwell's work to examine, reflect and clarify real events. But in order to put this idea into action further research has to be done on more of Orwell's characters as well as e.g Stalin, primarily, from a linguistic, rhetoric and leadership perspective to then compare the different findings and determine its authenticity. And although Orwells work is fictional, this research still applied a method and theoretical framework that can be used to investigate how control, to some extent, is exercised in the real world. It is also worth noting that the word comrade was only investigated by its explicit and not implicit meaning. Leaving room to further investigate the words connotation and impact in Orwell’s writing.

The research process went without significant problems, however there were constraints. More time would have allowed this research, for a comprehensive analysis of the intricacies between *Animal Farm* and the Stalin/Russian revolution area, drawing linguistic and leadership parallels from Orwell’s fictional characters to real characters. The goal would be to investigate how accurate Orwell’s depiction of real life persons tied to the Stalin/Russian revolution area are, in regards to rhetoric and linguistics, which we excluded due to time limitations and can be interesting, as stated in the paragraph above, to further research. Preconceived opinions and knowledge were also limitations, which may have hindered objective thinking. Both authors had prior knowledge of the allegorical theme in *Animal Farm*, which could have biassed the research in favour of Orwell’s underlying ideals in the novel. Bias was another challenge regarding the nature of the research method. Due to the method being dependent on, in this case, the theories it becomes easy to dictate and manipulate the findings as the theories rule which phenomena that should be investigated (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). This could have contributed to only choosing theories which explore phenomena that align with the researcher’s hidden intentions, thus indirectly manipulating the research findings (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

This research tried to mitigate the limitation of bias related to the method by using a wide array of theories, inherently including multiple perspectives to welcome various results, excluding narrow research findings. This leaves another research proposition to reenact this study without any deeper understanding of the novel or its author and later compare those results with this research to determine its objectivity. Another limitation was the lack of
research on the characters in *Animal Farm*. More specifically, research on the portrayed characters in *Animal Farm* from a linguistic, rhetoric and leadership perspective. Making this paper’s research, on how Orwell has portrayed the pigs from a rhetoric, linguistic and leadership perspective as new/specific, compounded solely by the theoretical framework without aid from previous research. Averting from previous research done on *Animal Farm* could mitigate this study's authenticity, but at the same time explore new ground, leaving room for further research to be done on the novel and Orwell’s writing from a linguistic, rhetoric and leadership perspective, indiscriminate to the intention of validating or invalidating this research.
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Appendix

Chapter 1

1A: Word had gone round during the day that old Major, the prize Middle White boar, had had a strange dream on the previous night and wished to communicate it to the other animals. It had been agreed that they should all meet in the big barn [...]. Old Major [...] was so highly regarded on the farm that everyone was quite ready to lose an hour's sleep in order to hear what he had to say.

1B: “Now, comrades, what is the nature of this life of ours? Let us face it: our lives are miserable, laborious, and short. We are born, we are given just so much food as will keep the breath in our bodies, and those of us who are capable of it are forced to work to the last atom of our strength; and the very instant that our usefulness has come to an end we are slaughtered with hideous cruelty. No animal in England knows the meaning of happiness or leisure after he is a year old. No animal in England is free. The life of an animal is misery and slavery: that is the plain truth.

“But is this simply part of the order of nature? Is it because this land of ours is so poor that it cannot afford a decent life to those who dwell upon it? No, comrades, a thousand times no! The soil of England is fertile, its climate is good, it is capable of affording food in abundance to an enormously greater number of animals than now inhabit it. This single farm of ours would support a dozen horses, twenty cows, hundreds of sheep--and all of them living in a comfort and a dignity that are now almost beyond our imagining. Why then do we continue in this miserable condition? Because nearly the whole of the produce of our labour is stolen from us by human beings. There, comrades, is the answer to all our problems. It is summed up in a single word--Man. Man is the only real enemy we have. Remove Man from the scene, and the root cause of hunger and overwork is abolished for ever.”
1C: Man is the only creature that consumes without producing. He does not give milk, he does not lay eggs, he is too weak to pull the plough, he cannot run fast enough to catch rabbits. Yet he is lord of all the animals. He 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 labour tills the soil, our dung fertilises it, and yet there is not one of us that owns more than his bare skin. You cows that I see before me, how many thousands of gallons of milk have you given during this last year? And what has happened to that milk which should have been breeding up sturdy calves? Every drop of it has gone down the throats of our enemies. And you hens, how many eggs have you laid in this last year, and how many of those eggs ever hatched into chickens? The rest have all gone to market to bring in money for Jones and his men. And you, Clover, where are those four foals you bore, who should have been the support and pleasure of your old age? Each was sold at a year old--you will never see one of them again. In return for your four confinements and all your labour in the fields, what have you ever had except your bare rations and a stall?

1D: "And even the miserable lives we lead are not allowed to reach their natural span. For myself I do not grumble, for I am one of the lucky ones. I am twelve years old and have had over four hundred children. Such is the natural life of a pig. But no animal escapes the cruel knife in the end. You young porkers who are sitting in front of me, every one of you will scream your lives out at the block within a year. To that horror we all must come--cows, pigs, hens, sheep, everyone. Even the horses and the dogs have no better fate. You, Boxer, the very day that those great muscles of yours lose their power, Jones will sell you to the knacker, who will cut your throat and boil you down for the foxhounds. As for the dogs, when they grow old and toothless, Jones ties a brick round their necks and drowns them in the nearest pond.

Is it not crystal clear, then, comrades, that all the evils of this life of ours spring from the tyranny of human beings? Only get rid of Man, and the produce of our labour would be our own. Almost overnight we could become rich and free. What then must we do? Why, work night and day, body and soul, for the overthrow of the human race! That is my message to you, comrades: Rebellion! I do not know when that Rebellion will come, it might be in a week or in a hundred years, but I know, as surely as I see this straw beneath my feet, that sooner or later justice will be done. Fix your eyes on that, comrades, throughout the short remainder of your lives! And above all, pass on this message of mine to those who come after you, so that future generations shall carry on the struggle until it is victorious."
"And remember, comrades, your resolution must never falter. No argument must lead you astray. Never listen when they tell you that Man and the animals have a common interest, that the prosperity of the one is the prosperity of the others. It is all lies. Man serves the interests of no creature except himself. And among us animals let there be perfect unity, perfect comradeship in the struggle. All men are enemies. All animals are comrades."

"Comrades," he said, "here is a point that must be settled. The wild creatures, such as rats and rabbits--are they our friends or our enemies? Let us put it to the vote. I propose this question to the meeting: Are rats comrades?"

Chapter 2

All the other male pigs on the farm were porkers. The best known among them was a small fat pig named Squealer, with very round cheeks, twinkling eyes, nimble movements, and a shrill voice. He was a brilliant talker, and when he was arguing some difficult point he had a way of skipping from side to side and whisking his tail which was somehow very persuasive. The others said of Squealer that he could turn black into white.

The stupidest questions of all were asked by Mollie, the white mare. The very first question she asked Snowball was: "Will there still be sugar after the Rebellion?"

"No," said Snowball firmly. "We have no means of making sugar on this farm. Besides, you do not need sugar. You will have all the oats and hay you want."

"And shall I still be allowed to wear ribbons in my mane?" asked Mollie.

"Comrade," said Snowball, "those ribbons that you are so devoted to are the badge of slavery. Can you not understand that liberty is worth more than ribbons?"

Mollie agreed, but she did not sound very convinced.

[...]

"Ribbons," he said, "should be considered as clothes, which are the mark of a human being. All animals should go naked."

"What is going to happen to all that milk?" said someone.

"Jones used sometimes to mix some of it in our mash," said one of the hens.

"Never mind the milk, comrades!" cried Napoleon, placing himself in front of the buckets. "That will be attended to. The harvest is more important. Comrade Snowball will lead the way. I shall follow in a few minutes. Forward, comrades! The hay is waiting."
Chapter 3

3A: "Four legs good, two legs bad." This, he said, contained the essential principle of Animalism. Whoever had thoroughly grasped it would be safe from human influences. The birds at first objected, since it seemed to them that they also had two legs, but Snowball proved to them that this was not so.

"A bird's wing, comrades," he said, "is an organ of propulsion and not of manipulation. It should therefore be regarded as a leg. The distinguishing mark of man is the HAND, the instrument with which he does all his mischief."

The birds did not understand Snowball's long words, but they accepted his explanation, and all the humbler animals set to work to learn the new maxim by heart.

3B: The mystery of where the milk went to was soon cleared up. It was mixed every day into the pigs' mash. The early apples were now ripening, and the grass of the orchard was littered with windfalls. The animals had assumed as a matter of course that these would be shared out equally; one day, however, the order went forth that all the windfalls were to be collected and brought to the harness-room for the use of the pigs. At this some of the other animals murmured, but it was no use. All the pigs were in full agreement on this point, even Snowball and Napoleon. Squealer was sent to make the necessary explanations to the others.

"Comrades!" he cried. "You do not imagine, I hope, that we pigs are doing this in a spirit of selfishness and privilege? Many of us actually dislike milk and apples. I dislike them myself. Our sole object in taking these things is to preserve our health. Milk and apples (this has been proved by Science, comrades) contain substances absolutely necessary to the well-being of a pig. We pigs are brainworkers. The whole management and organisation of this farm depend on us. Day and night we are watching over your welfare. It is for YOUR sake that we drink that milk and eat those apples. Do you know what would happen if we pigs failed in our duty? Jones would come back! Yes, Jones would come back! Surely, comrades," cried Squealer almost pleadingly, skipping from side to side and whisking his tail, "surely there is no one among you who wants to see Jones come back?"

When it was put to them in this light, they had no more to say. The importance of keeping the pigs in good health was all too obvious. So it was agreed without further argument that the milk and the windfall apples (and also the main crop of apples when they ripened) should be reserved for the pigs alone.
Chapter 4

4A: Jones and all his men, with half a dozen others from Foxwood and Pinchfield, had entered the five-barred gate and were coming up the cart-track that led to the farm. They were all carrying sticks, except Jones, who was marching ahead with a gun in his hands. Obviously they were going to attempt the recapture of the farm.

This had long been expected, and all preparations had been made. Snowball, who had studied an old book of Julius Caesar's campaigns which he had found in the farmhouse, was in charge of the defensive operations. He gave his orders quickly, and in a couple of minutes every animal was at his post.

4B: All the men were gone except one. Back in the yard Boxer was pawing with his hoof at the stable-lad who lay face down in the mud, trying to turn him over. The boy did not stir.

"He is dead," said Boxer sorrowfully. "I had no intention of doing that. I forgot that I was wearing iron shoes. Who will believe that I did not do this on purpose?"

"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."

"I have no wish to take life, not even human life," repeated Boxer, and his eyes were full of tears.

4C: The animals had now reassembled in the wildest excitement, each recounting his own exploits in the battle at the top of his voice. An impromptu celebration of the victory was held immediately. The flag was run up and 'Beasts of England' was sung a number of times, then the sheep who had been killed was given a solemn funeral, a hawthorn bush being planted on her grave. At the graveside Snowball made a little speech, emphasising the need for all animals to be ready to die for Animal Farm if need be.

Chapter 5

5A: One day, as Mollie strolled blithely into the yard, flirting her long tail and chewing at a stalk of hay, Clover took her aside.

"Mollie," she said, "I have something very serious to say to you. This morning I saw you looking over the hedge that divides Animal Farm from Foxwood. One of Mr. Pilkington's men was standing on the other side of the hedge. And--I was a long way away, but I am almost certain I saw this--he was talking to you and you were allowing him to stroke your nose. What does that mean, Mollie?"
"He didn't! I wasn't! It isn't true!" cried Mollie, beginning to prance about and paw the ground.

"Mollie! Look me in the face. Do you give me your word of honour that that man was not stroking your nose?"

"It isn't true!" repeated Mollie, but she could not look Clover in the face, and the next moment she took to her heels and galloped away into the field.

A thought struck Clover. Without saying anything to the others, she went to Mollie's stall and turned over the straw with her hoof. Hidden under the straw was a little pile of lump sugar and several bunches of ribbon of different colours.

Three days later Mollie disappeared. For some weeks nothing was known of her whereabouts, then the pigeons reported that they had seen her on the other side of Willingdon. She was between the shafts of a smart dogcart painted red and black, which was standing outside a public-house. A fat red-faced man in check breeches and gaiters, who looked like a publican, was stroking her nose and feeding her with sugar. Her coat was newly clipped and she wore a scarlet ribbon round her forelock. She appeared to be enjoying herself, so the pigeons said. None of the animals ever mentioned Mollie again.

5B: Snowball had made a close study of some back numbers of the 'Farmer and Stockbreeder' which he had found in the farmhouse, and was full of plans for innovations and improvements. He talked learnedly about field drains, silage, and basic slag, and had worked out a complicated scheme for all the animals to drop their dung directly in the fields, at a different spot every day, to save the labour of cartage.

In glowing sentences he painted a picture of Animal Farm as it might be when sordid labour was lifted from the animals' backs. His imagination had now run far beyond chaff-cutters and turnip-slicers. Electricity, he said, could operate threshing machines, ploughs, harrows, rollers, and reapers and binders, besides supplying every stall with its own electric light, hot and cold water, and an electric heater.

5C: The whole farm was deeply divided on the subject of the windmill. Snowball did not deny that to build it would be a difficult business. Stone would have to be carried and built up into walls, then the sails would have to be made and after that there would be need for dynamos and cables. (How these were to be procured, Snowball did not say.) But he maintained that it could all be done in a year. And thereafter, he declared, so much labour
would be saved that the animals would only need to work three days a week. Napoleon, on the other hand, argued that the great need of the moment was to increase food production, and that if they wasted time on the windmill they would all starve to death. The animals formed themselves into two factions under the slogan, "Vote for Snowball and the three-day week" and "Vote for Napoleon and the full manger."

5D: Napoleon, with the dogs following him, now mounted on to the raised portion of the floor where Major had previously stood to deliver his speech. He announced that from now on the Sunday-morning Meetings would come to an end. They were unnecessary, he said, and wasted time. In future all questions relating to the working of the farm would be settled by a special committee of pigs, presided over by himself. These would meet in private and afterwards communicate their decisions to the others. The animals would still assemble on Sunday mornings to salute the flag, sing 'Beasts of England', and receive their orders for the week; but there would be no more debates.

5E: "[...] Discipline, comrades, iron discipline! That is the watchword for today. One false step, and our enemies would be upon us. Surely, comrades, you do not want Jones back?"

Once again this argument was unanswerable. Certainly the animals did not want Jones back; if the holding of debates on Sunday mornings was liable to bring him back, then the debates must stop. Boxer, who had now had time to think things over, voiced the general feeling by saying: "If Comrade Napoleon says it, it must be right." And from then on he adopted the maxim, "Napoleon is always right," in addition to his private motto of "I will work harder."

5F: That evening Squealer explained privately to the other animals that Napoleon had never in reality been opposed to the windmill. On the contrary, it was he who had advocated it in the beginning, and the plan which Snowball had drawn on the floor of the incubator shed had actually been stolen from among Napoleon's papers. The windmill was, in fact, Napoleon's own creation. Why, then, asked somebody, had he spoken so strongly against it? Here Squealer looked very sly. That, he said, was Comrade Napoleon's cunning. He had SEEMED to oppose the windmill, simply as a manoeuvre to get rid of Snowball, who was a dangerous character and a bad influence. Now that Snowball was out of the way, the plan could go forward without his interference. This, said Squealer, was something called tactics.
He repeated a number of times, "Tactics, comrades, tactics!" skipping round and whisking his tail with a merry laugh. The animals were not certain what the word meant, but Squealer spoke so persuasively, and the three dogs who happened to be with him growled so threateningly, that they accepted his explanation without further questions.

Chapter 6
6A: Throughout the spring and summer they worked a sixty-hour week, and in August Napoleon announced that there would be work on Sunday afternoons as well. This work was strictly voluntary, but any animal who absented himself from it would have his rations reduced by half.

6B: Once again the animals were conscious of a vague uneasiness. Never to have any dealings with human beings, never to engage in trade, never to make use of money--had not these been among the earliest resolutions passed at that first triumphant Meeting after Jones was expelled? All the animals remembered passing such resolutions: or at least they thought that they remembered it. The four young pigs who had protested when Napoleon abolished the Meetings raised their voices timidly, but they were promptly silenced by a tremendous growling from the dogs.

6C: Napoleon paced to and fro in silence, occasionally snuffling at the ground. His tail had grown rigid and twitched sharply from side to side, a sign in him of intense mental activity. Suddenly he halted as though his mind were made up.

"Comrades," he said quietly, "do you know who is responsible for this? Do you know the enemy who has come in the night and overthrown our windmill? SNOWBALL!" he suddenly roared in a voice of thunder. "Snowball has done this thing! In sheer malignity, thinking to set back our plans and avenge himself for his ignominious expulsion, this traitor has crept here under cover of night and destroyed our work of nearly a year. Comrades, here and now I pronounce the death sentence upon Snowball. 'Animal Hero, Second Class,' and half a bushel of apples to any animal who brings him to justice. A full bushel to anyone who captures him alive!"

6D: "No more delays, comrades!" cried Napoleon when the footprints had been examined. "There is work to be done. This very morning we begin rebuilding the windmill, and we will
build all through the winter, rain or shine. We will teach this miserable traitor that he cannot undo our work so easily. Remember, comrades, there must be no alteration in our plans: they shall be carried out to the day. Forward, comrades! Long live the windmill! Long live Animal Farm!"

Chapter 7

7A: In these days Napoleon rarely appeared in public, but spent all his time in the farmhouse, which was guarded at each door by fierce-looking dogs. When he did emerge, it was in a ceremonial manner, with an escort of six dogs who closely surrounded him and growled if anyone came too near. Frequently he did not even appear on Sunday mornings, but issued his orders through one of the other pigs, usually Squealer.

7B: For the first time since the expulsion of Jones, there was something resembling a rebellion. Led by three young Black Minorca pullets, for five days the hens held out, then they capitulated and went back to their nesting boxes. Nine hens had died in the meantime. Their bodies were buried in the orchard, and it was given out that they had died of coccidiosis.

7C: [...] Boxer was still a little uneasy. "I do not believe that Snowball was a traitor at the beginning," he said finally. "What he has done since is different. But I believe that at the Battle of the Cowshed he was a good comrade."

"Our Leader, Comrade Napoleon," announced Squealer, speaking very slowly and firmly, "has stated categorically--categorically, comrade--that Snowball was Jones's agent from the very beginning--yes, and from long before the Rebellion was ever thought of."

"Ah, that is different!" said Boxer. "If Comrade Napoleon says it, it must be right."

"That is the true spirit, comrade!" cried Squealer, but it was noticed he cast a very ugly look at Boxer with his little twinkling eyes.

7D: The four pigs waited, trembling, with guilt written on every line of their countenances. Napoleon now called upon them to confess their crimes. They were the same four pigs as had protested when Napoleon abolished the Sunday Meetings. Without any further prompting they confessed that they had been secretly in touch with Snowball ever since his expulsion, that they had collaborated with him in destroying the windmill, and that
they had entered into an agreement with him to hand over Animal Farm to Mr. Frederick. They added that Snowball had privately admitted to them that he had been Jones's secret agent for years past. When they had finished their confession, the dogs promptly tore their throats out, and in a terrible voice Napoleon demanded whether any other animal had anything to confess.

The three hens who had been the ringleaders in the attempted rebellion over the eggs now came forward and stated that Snowball had appeared to them in a dream and incited them to disobey Napoleon's orders. They, too, were slaughtered. Then a goose came forward and confessed to having secreted six ears of corn during the last year's harvest and eaten them in the night. Then a sheep confessed to having urinated in the drinking pool--urged to do this, so she said, by Snowball--and two other sheep confessed to having murdered an old ram, an especially devoted follower of Napoleon, by chasing him round and round a bonfire when he was suffering from a cough. They were all slain on the spot. And so the tale of confessions and executions went on, until there was a pile of corpses lying before Napoleon's feet and the air was heavy with the smell of blood, which had been unknown there since the expulsion of Jones.

7E: He announced that, by a special decree of Comrade Napoleon, 'Beasts of England' had been abolished. From now onwards it was forbidden to sing it. The animals were taken aback.

"Why?" cried Muriel.

"It's no longer needed, comrade," said Squealer stiffly. "'Beasts of England' was the song of the Rebellion. But the Rebellion is now completed. The execution of the traitors this afternoon was the final act. The enemy both external and internal has been defeated. In 'Beasts of England' we expressed our longing for a better society in days to come. But that society has now been established. Clearly this song has no longer any purpose."

7F: Frightened though they were, some of the animals might possibly have protested, but at this moment the sheep set up their usual bleating of "Four legs good, two legs bad," which went on for several minutes and put an end to the discussion.

Chapter 8

8A: A few days later, when the terror caused by the executions had died down, some of the animals remembered--or thought they remembered--that the Sixth Commandment decreed "No animal shall kill any other animal." And though no one cared to mention it in the
hearing of the pigs or the dogs, it was felt that the killings which had taken place did not
square with this. 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.

8B: And the animals heard, from the direction of the farm buildings, the solemn booming
of a gun.

"What is that gun firing for?" said Boxer.
"To celebrate our victory!" cried Squealer.
"What victory?" said Boxer. His knees were bleeding, he had lost a shoe and split his
hoof, and a dozen pellets had lodged themselves in his hind leg.
"What victory, comrade? Have we not driven the enemy off our soil--the sacred soil
of Animal Farm?"
"But they have destroyed the windmill. And we had worked on it for two years!"
"What matter? We will build another windmill. We will build six windmills if we feel
like it. You do not appreciate, comrade, the mighty thing that we have done. The enemy was
in occupation of this very ground that we stand upon. And now--thanks to the leadership of
Comrade Napoleon--we have won every inch of it back again!"
"Then we have won back what we had before," said Boxer.
"That is our victory," said Squealer.

8C: But when the animals saw the green flag flying, and heard the gun firing again--seven
times it was fired in all--and heard the speech that Napoleon made, congratulating them on
their conduct, it did seem to them after all that they had won a great victory. The animals
slain in the battle were given a solemn funeral. [...] Two whole days were given over to
celebrations. There were songs, speeches, and more firing of the gun, and a special gift of an
apple was bestowed on every animal, with two ounces of corn for each bird and three biscuits
for each dog.

Chapter 9
9A: The winter was as cold as the last one had been, and food was even shorter. Once again all rations were reduced, except those of the pigs and the dogs. [...] In any case he had no difficulty in proving to the other animals that they were NOT in reality short of food, whatever the appearances might be. For the time being, certainly, it had been found necessary to make a readjustment of rations (Squealer always spoke of it as a "readjustment," never as a "reduction"), but in comparison with the days of Jones, the improvement was enormous.

9B: Truth to tell, Jones and all he stood for had almost faded out of their memories. They knew that life nowadays was harsh and bare, that they were often hungry and often cold, and that they were usually working when they were not asleep. But doubtless it had been worse in the old days. They were glad to believe so. Besides, in those days they had been slaves and now they were free, and that made all the difference, as Squealer did not fail to point out.

10A: He did not believe, he said, that any of the old suspicions still lingered, but certain changes had been made recently in the routine of the farm which should have the effect of promoting confidence stiff further. Hitherto the animals on the farm had had a rather foolish custom of addressing one another as "Comrade." This was to be suppressed. There had also been a very strange custom, whose origin was unknown, of marching every Sunday morning past a boar's skull which was nailed to a post in the garden. This, too, would be suppressed, and the skull had already been buried. His visitors might have observed, too, the green flag which flew from the masthead. If so, they would perhaps have noted that the white hoof and horn with which it had previously been marked had now been removed. It would be a plain green flag from now onwards.