

UP-TONERS IN THE ANIMAL LEADERS' DISCOURSE FOR THE QUEST OF TOGETHERNESS IN GEORGE ORWELL'S *ANIMAL FARM*.

Dr. Kouamé Boris KOUADIO

Institut National Supérieur des Arts et de l'Action Culturelle

kouadioboris81@gmail.com

Abstract: This paper investigates the relation between language used in discourse and social practices in *Animal Farm* by George Orwell. In the animal farm, animals are led by a human being named Mr Jones. Animals, in the long run pretend that they are maltreated by man. Therefore, they decide to revolt and expel him. In this endeavour, animals' leaders need massive adhesion for their objectives to be fulfilled. Then, they resort to up-toners as populist discourse paired with closeness and sameness to get their audience's adhesion. The objective of this work is to show the extent to which language helps fulfill aims through discourse management. This study is possible through the analysis of linguistic devices in the light of Critical Discourse Analysis approach. Qualitative method of data collection shows the way discourse is managed to account for populist strategies in the animals' discourse. By the end, animals have succeeded in expelling their master to make room for their own leadership.

Key words: adhesion, altruism, closeness, discourse, populism, sameness.

Résumé : Cet article étudie la relation entre la langue utilisée lors du discours et les pratiques sociales dans l'œuvre *Animal Farm* de George Orwell. Dans la ferme des animaux, les animaux sont dirigés par un être humain appelé Mr Jones. Plus tard, les animaux prétendent que leur maître les maltraitait. Donc ils décident de se rebeller en vue de l'expulser. Dans cet élan, les leaders des animaux ont besoin d'une adhésion massive en vue d'atteindre leurs objectifs. Alors, ils utilisent un discours incitateur lié à la proximité et l'identité pour avoir l'adhésion de leur audience. L'objectif de ce travail est de montrer comment la langue aide à atteindre notre but à travers la gestion du discours. Cette étude a été possible à travers l'analyse des outils linguistiques et à la lumière de l'analyse critique de discours. La méthode qualitative de collecte des données montre la manière dont le discours est géré pour expliquer les stratégies populistes dans le discours des animaux. Finalement, les animaux ont réussi à expulser leur maître et cela en vue de leur propre leadership.

Mots clés : adhésion, altruisme, discours, identité, populisme, proximité.

Introduction

Many people think that the ultimate use of language is to transmit a message from a speaker to a co-speaker. Thus, in the 20th century with the advent of critical discourse analysts, a new conception of language is at stake. The use of language in discourse, goes far from this previous conception in considering language use in context as a crucial factor in communicative situation. In this context, language is used in discourse to cope with power, dominance and dominance social inequality (V. Dijk, 1993). This social use of language urges any researcher involved in language study to be interested in such domains as the one understudy dealing with the populist use of language in discourse as a token of togetherness. Thus, populism is defined as a linguistic strategy used by political leaders to attract a great deal of attachment or adhesion. Populism seen under this angle makes use of some political strategies such as up-toners to reach sameness and togetherness in order for political leaders to be closer to their audience.

To account efficiently for the use of up-toners in the quest for togetherness, the linguistic devices such as superlatives, first person of singular and plural, terms of address and discourse markers have been resorted to in the corpus *Animal Farm* by George Orwell. In the corpus, political leaders who are animals are seeking to expel their master who is a human being pretexting that he is ill-treating them. To succeed in their rebellion, the whole animal community has to be united around their leaders and vice versa. The understanding of this work leads to questions: To what extent is discourse managed through up-toners in order to reach animal leaders' ends? How are the notions of sameness and togetherness resorted to through up-toners useful as altruist tool? What are the impacts of up-toners in discourse on the animal microcosm? In this study, the objective is to show the extent to which political leaders manipulate their audience in the light of togetherness and sameness as political approach. The success of this study is possible through critical discourse analysis which helps account for power dominance relation through linguistic devices. The work is composed of three major parts ranging from describing the notion of up-toners and its aspects in discourse, up-toners in political discourse as a scapegoat for altruism and to the impacts of up-toners in discourse on the animal farm.

1. The Notion of Up-toners and their Aspects in Populist Discourse

Up-toners are elements or passages in the discourse aiming at motivating or urging one's mates to prompt action. In the animal microcosm up-toners in the leaders Old Major and Napoleon's discourses and these up-toners are rather revolutionary speeches meant to incite

their mates to rebel against the human oppressor. As for populism, it is a political concept used by political leaders aiming at attracting a great deal of attachment or adhesion of people. To this extent, populist leaders tend to use a kind of discourse which tends to invite people closer to them. It is in this context that C. Mudde(2004) thinks that

populism is an ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogeneous and antagonistic groups, ‘the pure people’ versus ‘the corrupt elite’, and which argues that politics should be an expression of the *volonté générale* (general will) of the people (C. Mudde, 2004, p.543).

Through this conception of populism, it appears that populism aims at breaking the boundaries between powerful status groups and less powerful status groups. In doing so, a populist is identified through the representation of the people and speaking on the behalf of the people. A populist according to J. W. Muller (2016) is a political leader who uses opportunistic techniques to win votes through manipulative strategies. In order to reach their goal, populist leaders always associate themselves with the people pretending that they are the true embodiments of people. Populist leaders in this endeavour, make use of up-toners in their discourse. This is an example (1)

(1) ‘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.** (Orwell, 1945, p.2)

In these utterances, the leader Old major is speaking on the behalf of all the animals in the farm. He pretends to defend the rights of all the animals on the farm because they are all ill-treated by man who is their master. Old Major, as the leader of animals uses closeness or solidarity terms such as ‘comrades’ to identify and associate himself with the whole animal community. Above all, the time expression ‘now’ is revealing enough because it means that they had been deprived of their basic rights in the past, but in the present time, time has come for them to rise up. The leader’s goal which is to get people’s attachment and adhesion is shown through this phrase ‘those of us’ illustrating his involvement in the whole animals’ fate and predicament. Beside these attempts of seeking adhesion, the leader is arousing his mates’ consciousness through these words: ‘**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.**’ These utterances clearly illustrate that the leader is not a liar because everything he says is ‘**the plain truth**’. This truth concerns the fact that animals’ living conditions are worsening over time and no one should deny it. Making them aware of this oppressive situation supposes that the leader is willing to put an

end to this suffering or, he is the one likely to deal with this situation because a leader is always trustworthy.

Taking into account C. Mudde (2004)'s conception of populism, it appears that in *Animal Farm*, the society is divided into two : on one side there is man who rule as a god and considered as 'corrupt elite' by animals. On the other side, we have animals representing the oppressed people who consider themselves as 'pure people' worth being true leaders. Thus, the boundary of oppressed versus oppressor must be broken. Therefore, this is how this boundary must be broken as it is the case in this example (2) :

(2)Here, 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.** (Orwell, 1945, p. .
In these utterances, one is aware that the solution of the animals' welfare and happiness is to ' . **remove Man from the scene**'. Once the previous leader (corrupt elite) is removed by animals, their problems are solved. The removal of man from the farm is then salutary for animals. The result of the removal of man is surely the fact that '**the root cause of hunger and overwork is abolished for ever**'. The animals' leader is adopting a populist behavior in breaking the boundary between the corrupt elite and pure people. Breaking this boundary is tantamount to breaking the oppression link between man and animals.

One of their key behavior described by J. W. Muller (2016) is that when in opposition, they see their political rivals as immoral elites. When in power, they do not recognize any legitimate opposition. They are the people, "righteous and morally pure." Anyone who does not support them is illegitimate, and does not belong to "the people." The implication is that they are the "100 percent" pure and honest. To corroborate these characteristics, Muller (2016a) evokes three major characteristics. First, populists try to hijack the state apparatus, their rule is based on mass clientelism and corruption, they finally are always involved in endeavors to suppress the civil society. These examples (3), (4) and (5) are revealing enough for they help us account for populist activities undertaken by animals and their leaders

(3) 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.**' Orwell, 1945, p.3)
In this utterance (3), Old Major in the first time wanted togetherness or adhesion of all the animals against man. Thus, he urges the whole animals to be united around him to hate and dismiss their human master from the farm. The union of all the animals as 'comrades' means they have the same objective. And, the objective has been met since they have succeeded in

expelling Mr Jones from the farm because they see him as immoral elite. The animals even created a supreme law known as ‘THE SEVEN COMMANDMENTS’

1. Whatever goes upon two legs is an enemy.
2. Whatever goes upon four legs, or has wings, is a friend.
3. No animal shall wear clothes.
4. No animal shall sleep in a bed.
5. No animal shall drink alcohol.
6. No animal shall kill any other animal.
7. **All animals are equal.** (Orwell, 1945, p.9)

But, for the sake of hijacking the state apparatus, they transgress this law in turning for example the seventh commandment into (4)

(4) ALL ANIMALS ARE EQUAL
BUT SOME ANIMALS ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS

Populist leader behaves so because he wants to keep the power for ever so that no one can bother them for they don’t want any opponent as in (5)

(5) At this there was a terrible baying sound outside, and nine enormous dogs wearing brass-studded collars came bounding into the barn. They dashed straight for Snowball, who only sprang from his place just in time to escape their snapping jaws. In a moment he was out of the door and they were after him. (Orwell, 1945, p.21)

In this previous utterance (5), the leader is showing that populist leader wants no contradiction and desires to suppress any civil society. Up-toners are used in discourse through various rhetorical strategies because leaders in using them have an idealistic vision of the utopian future where animals live free from human tyranny and enjoy the fruits of their labour. In doing so, leaders evoke righteous anger which consists in denouncing a sort of injustice and suffering under human reign in stirring the animals’ emotions and anger. Leaders also foster unity and solidarity in emphasizing the need for unity among the animals urging them to work together for a common cause. Up-toners are also used in discourse to call action in the sense that they are meant for providing a clear and urgent call to action, in urging the animals to rise up and seize their freedom. In a word, up-toners are useful in discourse in the animal realm, because they help encourage and energise the animals, making them believe that a better future is possible and worth fighting for. These rhetorical strategies can be seen through ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ dichotomy in which shows that animals are undergoing injustice of their human master in order to prompt unity.

1.1. ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ Dichotomy as Discursive Practice for Togetherness

‘Us’ and ‘them’ division refers to a linguistic dichotomy aiming to see ‘Us’ as possessing good and positive image while ‘Them’ is seen as possessing bad or negative image according to XING ZHAO (2021). The ‘Us’ and ‘them’ dichotomy stipulates that ‘us’ side is always

considered as good people and the ‘Them’ side is seen as ‘evil doers’ or even ‘oppressors.’ In this context, Manuel Anselm (2017, p. 43) puts that

When applied to populism, the “us” coincides with the people, the “them” with the elite. If, however, people are characterized by a sense of belonging and pride, the elite are instead the target of social resentment... a populist leader is at the same time the promoter, the guarantor, the defender and the avenger of this new community and process.

‘Them’ status people being wrong doers, it is then important to denounce their bad attitude or even denigrate them as in this example (6)

(6) **No animal must ever live in a house**, or sleep in a bed, or wear clothes, or drink alcohol, or smoke tobacco, or touch money, or engage in trade. (G. Orwell, 1945, p. 4)

In this utterance(6), it is perceptible that animals are really ill-treated because some of their basic rights are denied. One case is the fact that they are deprived of the housing welfare. In this sense, any human-like attitude should be banned because these attitudes are seen as ‘them’ attitudes. Considering these acts as oppression acts, the populist leader seizes the opportunity to defend his ‘people’ in arguing that he is speaking on their behalf. And this is seen in the terms the leader uses.

1.2. Use of First Person of Plural as Sameness in Altruism Process

Sameness is defined as the fact of lacking variety in some entities. Sameness also refers to the quality of being very similar to something or someone. To corroborate this definition, Z. P. Toh puts that ‘sameness can be seen in the fact of grouping the speaker and the listener’ Z. P. Toh (2021, p.122). In the animal microcosm, the populist leaders are seeking popular adhesion through sameness as a token of altruism. This quest for sameness is possible through the use of the first person of plural. Thus, J. Wilson (1990, p.47) ‘we is usually explained in terms of politeness/power theory as communication solidarity’’. The following example (7) is a proof of grouping the leader and the other animals which constitutes his listeners.

(7) To that horror **we all** must come — cows, pigs, hens, sheep, everyone. Even the horses and the dogs have no better fate. (Orwell, 1945, p.3)

The use of ‘we all’ implies the inclusion of the speaker in the discourse he utters. As a leader seeking massive adhesion, he summons the whole animal community because of the urgency of the moment. His involvement in animals’ causes at the meeting is eminent when he adds ‘all’ to mean that the other animals have to attend the meeting including himself.

In the utterance (8), Old Major, the leader shows that he shares the same fate as the other animals of the farm.

(8) This single farm of **ours** would support a dozen horses, twenty cows, hundreds of sheep.(Orwell, 1945, p.2)

This utterance (8) is meant for mentioning the farm as the common property of all the animals. 'Ours' is a possessive pronoun, a possessive form of 'we' used to refer to something which belongs to or is connected with 'us.' In his discourse, it is perceptible that there is only one farm, but it belongs to the whole animal community including the leaders. All these precisions in discourse to imply that the leader is involved in the quest of a massive support for adhesion. And, the following utterances are the perfect illustrations of the speaker's implication in the animals' predicaments as in these following examples (9) and (10).

(9) 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 (Orwell, 1945, p.2).

(10) **Our** labour tills the soil, **our** dung fertilises it, and yet there is not one **of us** that owns more than his bare skin (Orwell, 1945, p.2).

These examples are the manifestation of self-awareness and consciousness of the animals about the way their common interests are under threat because they are overused by human beings. It can be observed through the use of this question to his mates 'Why then do **we** continue in this miserable condition?' The question is addressed to the animals in general and to the leader Old Major in particular. The use of '**our**' is at stake to illustrate that the farm and the labour do not belong only to the other animals only but, also to the leader when he uses '**not one of us**'. The aim of this use of first person of plural in populist discourse is to show togetherness in order to get massive adhesion at their side. This is where the word sameness originates in the altruism process to show empathy and also sympathy.

1.3. Superlatives in 'Us' Discourse for Togetherness

Superlatives are grammatical words aiming to account for the degree of something ever it is a lower or a higher position. In these examples (11) and (12), we have two samples of entities. On one side, the stupid categories which are the rest of animals apart from pigs and on the other side the 'best' composed of pigs and dogs. These are some cases below:

(11) Even the **stupidest of them** had already picked up the tune. (Orwell, 1945, p.5)

(12) 'Then Snowball (for it was Snowball who was **best** at writing) took a brush between the two knuckles of his trotter' (Orwell, 1945, p.9)

In the two utterances, the two distinct entities are clearly described. The 'stupidest' animals of the farm share the same fate since they are doomed not to rule the farm because ruling the farm is the prerogative of the 'best' animals like pigs and dogs as it is the case with Snowball in (12). No matter what category the animals belong to, togetherness is plausible because it is a sign of social identity and recognition. In a word, it is through unity and altruism they are strong.

2. Up-toners in Discourse as a Scapegoat for Altruism in *Animal Farm*

According to Randolph Quirk (2007), altruism is the fact of caring about or helping other person, even though this brings no advantage to yourself. In other words, altruism has to do with striving to defend other people's rights at all cost and without advantage. In the same vein, B. Kerr & *al.*; (2004, p.135) define altruism as a "behavior that benefits others at a personal cost to the behaving individual. However, within evolutionary biology, different authors have interpreted the concept of altruism differently, leading to dissimilar predictions about the evolution of altruistic behavior." Thus, in *Animal Farm*, altruism is pervasive in the animals' microcosm. Altruism is fulfilled in the leaders' discourses in the light of several up-toners. The animal leaders of the farm, in their attempts to get the whole animals on their sides pretend to love their mates so that they show altruism toward them. This altruism is illustrated through various markers such as terms of address.

2. 1. Altruism through the Terms of Address

The populist leader Old Major makes use of solidarity terms while referring to his animal mates to show sympathy. And these terms of address are not used at random, but they are ideologically bound. Thus, in his endeavour to share the same fate as the whole animal community in order to expel their human master, Old Major addresses his mates as 'comrades' as in the following example(13)

(13) 'Now **comrades**, what is the nature of this life of ours ?'(Orwell, 1945, p.2).

Through the use of 'comrades' in plural form, the speaker is showing that there are many animals he is trying to convince in order to be at his side. Moreover, the term 'comrade' refers to two or a group of people sharing the same objectives of fighting to get the same advantages or rights. But, the case of Old major, he uses these terms for selfish intension to the detriment of the others. According to Randolph Quirk (2007), comrade is often used in meetings to refer to a friend, especially someone who shares difficult work or danger. In using 'comrades' in the meeting of all the animals, Old Major is the embodiment of a charismatic leader who wants to fight so that his mates can be free of danger. The altruism is not only unilateral, but bilateral. The first aspect is from the leader to the other animals and the second is from the other animals to their leader. Other term of address for showing altruism toward the leader who is Napoleon who replaces Old Major who is no more. Nappoleon is a charismatic leader and the dominant character who possesses strong leadership skills in *Animal Farm*. And the fact that he learns to read and write to other animals makes him more intelligent than the

other animals. To this extent, he is referred to as 'him' as if he were a human being as in this example (14)

(14) But just at this moment Napoleon stood up and, casting a peculiar sidelong look at Snowball, uttered a high-pitched whimper of a kind no one had ever heard **him** utter before. (Orwell, 1945, p.20-21)

In this example (14) Napoleon is referred to as a human being. As a leader, the other animals such as dogs owe him allegiance which is a loyalty to a leader as in this example (15)

(15) Though not yet full-grown, **they were huge dogs**, and as fierce-looking as wolves. **They kept close to Napoleon**. It was noticed that they wagged their tails to him in the same way as the other dogs had been used to do to Mr. Jones in the same way as the other dogs had been used to do to Mr. Jones. **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.** (Orwell, 1945, p.20-21)

In this example, closeness to the leader is pervasive as a sign of togetherness because the leader is guarded by 'huge dogs' which 'kept close to Napoleon' in the same way as the other dogs had been used to do to Mr. Jones'. The following example (16) shows us how the leader is venerated.

(16) Napoleon was now never spoken of simply as 'Napoleon.' **He was always referred to in formal style as 'our Leader, Comrade Napoleon,'** and the pigs liked to invent for him such titles as **Father of All Animals, Terror of Mankind, Protector of the Sheep-fold, Ducklings' Friend**, and the like. (Orwell, 1945, p.35)

Through these honorific terms toward Napoleon, animals pinpoint how the leader is important for them. In using these names such as '**our Leader, Comrade Napoleon,**' as '**Father of All Animals, Terror of Mankind, Protector of the Sheep-fold, Ducklings' Friend**', the animals manifest their submission and their mark of affection to their leader in a spirit of altruism and closeness. This closeness is not only manifested through terms of address but also through loyalty for the leader. To this extent, the good image of the leader is needed in the sense of cult of personality.

2.2 Brainwashing through the Cult of Personality as Political Discourse

Brainwashing is defined as the fact of making someone believe something is true or not by using force or continuously repeating it over a long period of time in order to confuse the co-speaker. In adopting a brainwashing strategy, political leaders in *Animal Farm* are trying to create an atmosphere of confidence between them and the other animals. This confidence-like atmosphere is possible through the cult of personality aiming to enhance pigs' self-image so that the other animals believe in them for ever.

(17) 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. (Orwell, 1945, p. 14)

In these utterances (17) above, it is perceptible that the cult of personality is pervasive through the description of what the prerogatives of pigs are. In this context, one can see that pigs are the most intelligent among all the animals of the farm in such a way that they ‘**are brainworkers**’. Napoleon, the populist leader in his discourse illustrates the higher status position of the pigs to the detriment of the other animals in that even the political environment is their portion when he utters that ‘**the whole management and organisation of this farm depend on us**’. The pigs are a sort of goddish –like beings who have the ability to ‘watch over’ the animals’ lives. As a consequence, they have to be well fed when they assert ‘**It is for your sake that we drink that milk and eat those apples**’. Populist leaders need the cult of personality to enhance their self-image so that people can be aware of their good qualities as worth being loved and followed. Another idea Napoleon, the other leader puts forward is this (18)

(18) 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 (Orwell, 1945, p. 14).

These utterances illustrate that the pigs are the appropriate leaders worth being well fed to the detriment of the other animals. Therefore, only pigs have the right to have access to good crops in order to be in good health as they pretend these aspects are ‘**too obvious**’. It is rather a must for the other animals to let the pigs profit from everything that is good for the pigs alone and no one else. This brainwashing process is important in populist discourse because populist always needs popular adhesion to their policies. As proof, for a leader to attract a great deal of followers, his logos should appear credible and logical. Populist leader, being ‘pure people’ also needs pure food and also pure living conditions. The aim of this brainwashing process through persuasive discourse is to make the rest of animals change their previous beliefs in order to believe fully in pigs. It is in this context that Napoleon asserts with certainty that ‘**it was agreed without further argument**’, this phrase proves that it is commonly known to the whole animal community 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 common agreement about pigs’ welfare is the representation of the common agreement around the pigs policies as a token of togetherness.

2.3. Equality in Discourse as a Mark of Togetherness

Randolph Quirk(2007) defines equality as the situation in which people have the same rights, advantages and so on. In these examples (19) and (20) one is aware that equality is of great importance in the quest of togetherness. Togetherness is a central concept in populism because populist leaders need it to make their audience be closer to them for adhesion to their policies.

(19) All animals are **equal** (Orwell, 1945, p.4).

(20) **All men are enemies. All animals are comrades.** (Orwell, 1945, p.4)

In these two utterances above, equality is pervasive in that, in order to make someone adhere to your point of view or policy, you should share a certain number of qualities or traits. Thus, in stating that ‘all animals are equal’, it is tantamount to inferring that the members of the whole animal community have the same rights and they also share the same fate. In (19) for instance, this notion of equality is also visible but expressed in another way. In the example (20), we have two opposing camps in which members of each of them share some properties together. Thus, it is clear that if ‘**all men are enemies**’ it means all the men have something in common which is the oppression of animals. Conversely, ‘**all animals are comrades**’ means that they pursue the same objectives which makes them strengthen their relationship as far as solidarity is concerned. All these rhetorical strategies in discourse have impacts on the animal farm.

3- Impact of Up-Toners in Discourse on the Whole Animal Farm

3. 1. Squealer’s Impact as a Peacemaker through Language Manipulation

Manipulation in discourse refers to the way language is intentionally used to transmit a message. To such an extent, manipulative discourses are made through the use of specific lexical or grammatical units that are linked to the speaker’s intentions. In this context, manipulation makes use of skilful and unfair language according to the speaker’s intentions. Manipulation is a communicative phenomenon through which the speaker tries to persuade his audience through the use of disguised verbal influence in order to reach a machiavellian objective. The true objective of language manipulation is linked to demagogy in political discourse in that it is meant to get people’s support. In doing so, the objective of the manipulator is to use linguistic devices to change the audience’s opinion in making him accept the speaker’s viewpoint in the light of positive image of the speaker. In the animal microcosm, political leaders manipulate people’s minds via Squealer as in this example (21) below.

(21) The others said of Squealer that **he could turn black into white.** (Orwell, 1945, p.6)

To succeed in this manipulative intention, a young porker known as Squealer is committed to set his mates in a confident-like atmosphere and maintain them in a peaceful atmosphere so as to avoid hatred against the leader. This is the reason why he is referred to as the one who 'could turn black into white', which means that he has the ability to convince people even when they are doubtful about a given situation. To this extent, he makes use of his skilful mind to settle some political problems tending to revolt his countrymen. In a word, Squealer is seen as a peacemaker on the animal farm, spending all the time enhancing the leader's good image as in these examples (22) and (23).

(22) 'I trust that every animal here appreciates the sacrifice that Comrade Napoleon has made in taking this extra labour upon himself. Do not imagine, comrades, that leadership is a pleasure! On the contrary, it is a deep and heavy responsibility. No one believes more firmly than Comrade Napoleon that all animals are equal ? (Orwell, 1945, p.21).

(23) 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. (Orwell, 1945, p.23).

In these examples, one can see how language can be skilfully used to settle some social problems such as preserving peace and also prevent conflicts. Squealer as a faithful disciple of Napoleon is so versed in persuasion that he always succeeds in calming down the opponents. He is also an endless self-image preserver. Through manipulation of language, he makes the opponents 'accept his explanations without further questions'. In this sense, one can observe that owing to language, peace has been preserved among animals. And the peaceful atmosphere has brought about solidification of animals' social relations which succeed in expelling Mr Jones.

3.2 Common Interest as Altruism through Denigration of Man in Political Discourse

Common interest refers to things that brings advantages that two or more persons possess as only one entity. Thus, in the animal microcosm, in a first time, all the animals have a common interest which is to get rid of human beings from the farm. This unicity of interest urges the leader Old Major to join his forces with the rest of animals in order to succeed in their common mission. To this extent, it is perceptible that Old Major's altruism is on purpose. Behind this altruism, there is a hidden and subtle objective. The true objective in using up-torners in Old Major's discourse is to arouse righteous anger among animals and also urge them to rise up and seize their freedom. This can be seen in his discourse as in these words (24)

(24) **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. (Orwell, 1945, p.2)

In these utterances, one can understand that, in the search for togetherness, altruism is needed by Old Major to get the whole animals at his side. This can be observed through the denigration of man who constitutes their common enemy. Considering man as enemy is profitable to Old Major because populist leader admits no controversy in political affairs and no opponent. To this extent, hating and denigrating the opponent is advantageous for them in the quest of political power over the animal farm. In this denigration process, man is seen as **‘the only creature that consumes without producing’**, which means that all over the world, man has been singled out as the ‘only creature’ that profits from the nature without bringing anything new or positive. In a word, man is the only one useless creature of God. As a consequence, **‘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’**. The description of the uselessness is shown in the light of the mark of negation ‘not’.

Therefore, man is negative on the farm and on top of that, what is boring in this situation is that, despite his uselessness, **‘yet he is lord of all the animals’**. The uselessness of man is also shown through the oppression exerted on the animals. The reason is that man is seen as a torturer because **‘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’**. The following example (25) is revealing enough on the denigration process in the quest of common interest.

(25) **‘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.** (Orwell, 1945, p. 3)

Here, it is perceptible that men and animals have not the same interests. The proof is that Old Major asserts : **‘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’**. There is a discrepancy between men and animals in terms of interest in that **‘Man serves the interests of no creature except himself’**. This selfishness of man urges animals to unite as a whole. To this extent, what seems necessary is unity of animals as the leader Old Major can suggest : **‘among us animals let there be perfect unity, perfect comradeship in the struggle’**. Old Major suggests that since all the animals have the same interests, they should all unite to expel man from the farm in order to rule perfectly since man constitutes a threat for animals.

3.3. Loyalty as Mark of Togetherness in Political Discourse

Randolph Quirk (2007) defines loyalty as the fact of remaining faithful to our friends, principles or our countries. Loyalty also has to do with the strong feeling of support for someone or something. In the animal microcosm, populist leaders are endlessly looking for togetherness as a political token in order to get people at their side. Their objective is that together, they are strong enough to expel man from the throne and also have control over their political opponents. Their attitudes are thus pervasive through the use of some terms in their discourse. For instance, animals show their loyalty to the leader through Squealer's terms as in (26)

(26) **'Under the guidance of our Leader, Comrade Napoleon, I have laid five eggs in six days'; or two cows, enjoying a drink at the pool, would exclaim, 'Thanks to the leadership of Comrade Napoleon, how excellent this water tastes!'**

These utterances in (26) are the manifestation of the recognition of the leader by the animals through the progress the leader inspires. The leader is even praised by his mates for all the joy of life he embodies. Napoleon's leadership in a sense, is more advantageous than Mr Jones' so that animals prefer being with Napoleon than being enslaved by man. And, in their attempt to show their gratitude to the leader Napoleon, a poem entitled 'Comrade Napoleon' has been dedicated to him as follows in the example below(27)

(27) **Friend of fatherless!**
Fountain of happiness!
Lord of the swill-bucket! Oh, how my soul is on
Fire when I gaze at thy
Calm and commanding eye,
Like the sun in the sky,
Comrade Napoleon!
Thou are the giver of
All that thy creatures love,
Full belly twice a day, clean straw to roll upon;
Every beast great or small
Sleeps at peace in his stall,
Thou watchest over all,
Comrade Napoleon!
Had I a sucking-pig,
Ere he had grown as big
Even as a pint bottle or as a rolling-pin,
He should have learned to be
Faithful and true to thee,
Yes, his first squeak should be
"Comrade Napoleon!" (Orwell, 1945, p.36)

This poem above materialises a strong feeling that animals have toward their leader in such a way that they are not going to betray him in their lifetime. Napoleon deserves all this attention because he also gives love to his countrymen as in 'Friend of fatherless!' and 'Fountain of happiness', which illustrate how caretaker he is for his mates. As the poem mentions '**Thou**

are the giver of All that thy creatures love' to refer to the tremendous marks of affection the leader has for his people. For all the kindness of Napoleon, people find it necessary to be **'Faithful and true'** to him and this faithfulness has led to the cohesion of all the animals around the leader which has led to the expulsion of Mr Jones and the supremacy of the animals.

CONCLUSION

This study describes the way political leaders manipulate their audience through the skilful use of language to fulfill populist objectives. Animal leaders' discourses are meant to set the audience in a sort of lethargy. In this process, up-toners are resorted to in order to fulfill sameness and togetherness as scapegoat to exploit people. When political leaders' interests are at stake, the discourse is oriented toward sameness and togetherness. In a word, when politicians need people to support their ideology, they often use language as if they were darting a girl, but once their objectives are fulfilled, they oppress the same people who sacrifice their lives for them. In their political endeavour, the leaders have succeeded in manipulating the whole animal community to expel their human master. But later on, the fight has returned against animals themselves. Pigs and dogs consider themselves as more important than the other animals. And, the fight among animals springs from the fact that other animals consider themselves superior than the others. There, it can be noticed a divergence of interest that leads to war-like situation the more deserving ones and the less deserving ones.

Bibliography

- ADAMCZEWSKI Henri, 1982, *Grammaire linguistique de l'anglais*, Paris, Armand Collin.
BEARD Adrian, 2000, *The Language of Politics*, London, Routledge.

MUDE Cas, 2004, "The Populist Zeitgeist," *Government and Opposition*, 39 (4), Pp.541-563.

DIJK Van Teun Adrianus, 1993, 'Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis' in *Discourse and Society*, N°2, P.249-283.

GALLET Blanchard Liliane and Brossard Jean, 1990, *L'anglais pour l'informatique: Comprendre, pratiquer, communiquer: Comprendre, pratiquer, communiquer*, Paris, Dunod Informatique, Bordas.

MÜLLER Jan-Werner, 2016b, "Trump, Erdoğan, Farage: The Attractions of Populism for Politicians, the Dangers for Democracy," *The Guardian*.

MÜLLER Jan-Werner, 2016a, *What is Populism?* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, Kindle edition.

MULLER Simone, 2005, *Discourse Markers, in Native and Non-Native English Discourse*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

ORWELL George, 1945, *Animal Farm*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.

TOH Zorobi Philippe, 2021, *Aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis*, Cote D'Ivoire, L'Harmattan.

TOH Zorobi Philippe, 2014. "Contribution of Adverbs in Argumentation in *FRAGMENTS.*", LTML.Pp.1-12.

TOH Zorobi Philippe, 2011, "Singing Heroism: A Semantic Analysis of Modals and Their Presuppositions in Beasts of England in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*", in *Revue Ivoirienne des Langues Etrangères (RILE)*, n°3, Pp. 1 – 13.