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# ABSTRACT

Jehan Ahmad Tajul 1135030132. *Socio-political Issues in George Orwell’s Animal Farm*. An Undergraduate Thesis, English Department, Faculty of Adab and Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung. Advisors: 1. Dr. Ujang Suyatman, M.Ag. 2. Dian Nurrachman, S.S., M.Pd.

**Keyword** : Post-colonialism, Power, Subaltern.

In previous centuries, the power of British Imperialism have spread accross half of the nation in the world. The expansion of British Imperialism have set its own colonialism over the state that has been colonized. This term of colonialism has implied to literature for its function of the document of an era. One of the literature that has influence the tradition of colonialism is George Orwell’s *Animal Farm.* To know the effect of colonialism to the novel, the problems are formulated as 1) How is the power described in George Orwell’s Animal Farm? 2) How is the subaltern described in George Orwell’s Animal Farm? This research used qualitative method. The data are the text of *Animal Farm*. The data collected using book survey from Bogdan and Taylor (in Moleong, 2008: 282). In analyzing this research, post-colonialism used as its theoretical framework by Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (2014). The post-colonialism theory divided into sub theory: *Orientalism* by Edward Said (1975) and *Can the Subaltern Speak?* By Gayatri Chakravotry Spivak (1985). In its practice, the tradition of colonialism that has been portrait in the novel include some aspect of the power and the subaltern. The power divided into two category: authority and hegemony as successfully described to the pigs whom become the ruling class from the other animals. Then, the subaltern divided into two category: oppressed to speak and racial issues as being described by the other animals whom as the victims of the power from the pigs.

# ABSTRAK

Jehan Ahmad Tajul 1135030132. *Isu Sosio-politik dalam Novel Animal Farm karya George Orwell*. Skripsi, Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Adab dan Humaniora, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung. Pembimbing: 1. Dr. Ujang Suyatman, M.Ag. 2. Dian Nurrachman, S.S., M.Pd.

**Kata Kunci** : Poskolonialisme, Kekuasaan, Kaum Inferior (*subaltern*).

Dalam beberapa dekade, kekuasaan dari imperialisme Britania Raya telah menyebar setengah bagian dari negara di dunia. Pengembangan dari imperialisme Britania Raya telah melaksanakan kolonialisasi terhadap negara jajahannya. Terminologi kolonialisme telah mempengaruhi sastra yang dapat disebut sebagai dokumen dari sebuah era. Salah satu karya sastra yang telah terpengaruh oleh tradisi kolonial adalah novel *Animal Farm* karya George Orwell. Untuk mengetahui efek kolonialisasi terhadap novel, maka masalah yang telah diformulasikan meliputi 1) bagaimana kekuasaan digambarkan di dalam novel *Animal Farm* karya George Orwell? 2) bagaimana kaum inferior (*subaltern)* digambarkan di dalam novel *Animal Farm* karya George Orwell? Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif. Data yang digunakan meliputi buku teks berupa novel *Animal Farm.* Telaah buku dipergunakan sebagai cara untuk mengumpulkan data seperti yang dikemukakan oleh Bogdan dan Taylor (dalam Moleong, 2008: 282). Dalam menganalisa penelitian ini, teori poskolonialisme dipergunakan sebagai teori dasar yang dikemukakan oleh Ashcroft, Griffiths dan Tiffin (2014). Teori poskolonialisme pada praktiknya dibagi menjadi dua teori pendukung: *Orientalism* karya Edward Said (1975) dan *Can the Subaltern Speak?* Karya Gayatri Chakravotry Spivak (1985). Dalam praktiknya, tradisi kolonialisme yang telah tergambar di dalam novel meliputi beberapa aspek dari kekuasaan dan kaum inferior (*subaltern*). Kekuasaan dibagi menjadi dua kategori: otorisasi dan hegemoni yang mana telah sukses tergambar pada karakter para babi yang menjadi kelas berkuasa dari binatang lainnya. Maka, sebagaimana juga dengan kaum inferior (*subaltern*) dibagi menjadi dua kategori: tertindas untuk berbicara dan isu ras sebagaimana telah tergambar dalam binatang lainnya yang merupakan korban dari kekuasaan para babi.
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# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

 This chapter discusses about background, statement of problem, research objective, and research significance as a part of introduction in the whole of the first chapter.

* 1. **Background**

Some historical book has proved that in previous centuries, one of the most powerful nation in centuries, England, became the most influental for colonized half of nation. It has started in the period of Victorian Age that England becomes important role with its empire at that time. Because its expansion, rise of individual, science, and technology. Then, England at the age of Victorian have great imperialism over the nation. Imperialism in Victorian age raise swiftly when “New Zealand, Natal, territories on the West African coast and in South Asia, Australia, and Canada were occupied or annexed” (Boehmer, 1995: 30-31). This opportunity then emerged the relation between the colonized and the colonizer or it can be said that opened the relation between western world and non-western world. That is why Peters (2006: 29) argued that imperialism brought Westerners into greater contact with non-Western society, philosophy, culture, and art. As a result, the West has control to develop a perspective and an image about the East with its power and knowledge that can be used to control the ‘other’ as Ashcroft and Ahluwalia (1999, 83) said that “to know something is to have power over it, and conversely, to have power is to be able to know the world in your own terms”. Consequently, one of this terms influenced literature.

One of the work which its work influented by ‘west’ conception is Animal Farm which its content have its portrayal of ‘west’ conception. Eventhough the whole story in Animal Farm used fable character where Napoleon and Snowball become the main character in the story. However the plot that start the story is from the inherit ideology of Old Major—the old big pig—whom his ideology of the ‘spirit of animalism’ come as the ideology of the animal in manor farm. Then, this ideology come to the revolution of Animal from the humans. After the humans has been beaten by them, then this animal has all of the control of the Manor Farm. Unfortunately, this emerges a new government when the animal that has a power become of the other’s leader. This indicates a new colonialism between the powerful animals that control the farm to the animals whom is inferior of the other. Then, Harold Bloom’s (2009: vii) argued that in some way, this Animal Farm was trying to relate the author to the context that made the novel. This seems relevant “because the dangers of a computerized society carry on from Orwell’s horror of Stalinist terror, even though I find the book less than an aesthetic achievement, since a beast fable needs a psychological clarity that is lacking here”. It is obviously true that Orwell tried to encounter the popularity gained by the Soviet Union as a wartime ally. However, it is not merely about how Stalin government influenced Orwell to writes Animal Farm. There was some issues that appear in his novel that describe how the ruling class in the animal society rule its inferior class. This will just make causality from the power that used in many ways from the ruling animal to the inferiors.

Thus, this tendency appear to analyzed in the post-colonial point of view where in the colonial society there were some colonized and colonizer whom the colonized is always as an inferior class from the colonizer. This term indicates that the colonizer has power to control the indigenous society to much become pathetically an infrerior from the colonizer. Then, this colonizer could be named as the ‘subaltern’. The subaltern means ‘inferior rank’ is adapted from Gramsci “to refer to those groups in society who are subject to the hegemony of the ruling classes. Subaltern classes may include peasants, workers and other groups denied access to ‘hegemonic’ power” (Aschroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, 2013: 244). Furthermore, this hegemonic power owned by the colonizer, because of its capability to control the indigenous society from its power and intelligence. Moreover, hegemony “is the power of the ruling class to convince other classes that their interests are the interests of all” (Aschroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, 2013: 134). That is why in many ways, colonized is always be an inferior than the colonizer.

Then, this research is focused on how the power of hegemony describe in the novel within the impact over the subaltern classes. This is important because in general, the power that has ruled the inferior class could be different in some ways. As example, the colonizer will not just colonized the indigenous society with physical tendency, but also in the way of thinking or its ideology. Because of that, the colonized has also think that they are being exploited by colonizer and in the way of struggle, they could not speak because of the colonizer’s hegemony rule everything that they got. In addition, this novel attracts the researcher because it is famous to research in some academic territory. Thus, the researcher is interested to research the novel in post-colonial studies because there were some socio-political issues of colonialism perspective in the novel.

There were some related study to know that this research is authentic and there were not some researcher who analyze in the same way, whether if it was the theory or the object applied in its research.

Nurhamidah (2005) has choosen post-colonial analyses as a theory applied in her research entitled *The Authority of The White People Over The Black People in Two Novels; Things Fall Apart and Robinson Crusoe (A Post Colonial Analysis)* whom her research is capable to understand how the white people rule the black people—who portrait as an inferior over the white people or ‘the west’—in two novels of Chinua Achebe’s *Things Fall Apart* and Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe*. Another related study which has choosen post-colonial as theory was Prajamitha (2013) entitled *The Portrayal of East in Joseph Conrad’s Almayer’s Folly*. In her research, she explained the portrait of east by the narration of the west people. She proposed three problems that relate to how East is portrayed by setting, characters, Malay language and Islam. Then, she used Said’s *Orientalism* as the theoretical standpoint to analyzed the issues that exist in the novel. After that, there was Setiawan (2009) who used post-colonial as theory. His research entitled *Orientalist Ideology in Two Novels’ Joseph Conrad’s Lord Jim and Nostromo* analyzed how Orientalist ideology applied and its purposes in Conrad’s works.

Next, Apriyani (2003) has choosen Animal Farm as an object of her research entitled *The Positive and Negative Effects of Marxism in George Orwell’s Animal Farm.* In her research, she though that the concept of marxism that exist in the novel could be positive and negative for an impact of the readers. Then, she used marxism social class concept to analyze her research. Umam (2016) entitled *The Potrayal of Totalitarianism in George Orwell’s Animal Farm* was used Roland Barthes Semiotics theory and Totalitarianism theory to reveal the meaning of character in Animal Farm. He analyzed all round of character that include in the totalitarianism aspect. Then, Sari (2016) entitled *The Reflection of The Russian Revolution in George Orwell’s Animal Farm* was try to relate the novel with the Russian revolutionary in 1917. She used sociology of literature and new historicism as the theory to analyze all of the aspect in the novel which had a syncronization with the Russian revolutionary in 1917.

Finally, based on the related study and the researcher’s background, this research will concern on analyzing socio-political issues which specifically analyze in the aspect of power and the subaltern that exist in the novel. Then, this paper will entitled as *Socio-political Issues in George Orwell’s Animal Farm*.

* 1. **Statement of Problem**

Based on the background of the research above, it is important to know deeply about the text that being describe in the novel, specifically in the part that describing power and the subaltern role. Then, this term could conclude the main issues of socio-political with post-colonial theory applied to analyzed the aspect of power and the subaltern in the novel.

Based on the statement above, this research will describing about:

1. How is the power described in George Orwell’s *Animal Farm*?
2. How is the subaltern described in George Orwell’s *Animal Farm*?
	1. **Research Objective**

In relevancy of the questions research above, the purpose of this research will be contain for:

1. To find out the portrayal of power that has been described in George Orwell’s *Animal Farm*.
2. To identify the role of subaltern that has been described in George Orwell’s *Animal Farm*.
	1. **Research Significance**

Significance of this research will be useful as academically and practically. Academically this research will concerned for those who learned more about literature in the university and for the reader who liked more about the context of literary works generally and the issues about how colonial role in literature. Practically, this research is directed for those who want to make some research especially for one of post-colonial as its reference to comprehensively influenced in its practical research.

# CHAPTER II

# THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

This chapter deals with general theory of post-colonialism, the context of power and the subaltern in post-colonial theory that separated in two main discussions: power and the subaltern.

1. **General Theory of Post-colonialism**

Talking about post-colonialism, there were much sense from broader view to described it. Aschroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin (2013: 205) argued that: “The simpler sense of the ‘post’ as meaning ‘after’ colonialism has been contested by a more elaborate understanding of the working of postcolonial cultures which stresses the articulations between and across the politically defined historical periods, of pre-colonial, colonial and post-independence cultures”. Then, colonial itself is originated from the word *colonia*—in Roman language—which has a meaning land of farmer or settlement (Ratna, 2015: 205). Ratna continued that terminology of etymological used in post-colonial word is not significance to exploitation, power use, mastery, and other negatif conotation. Thus, “It is clear, however, that postcolonialism as it has been employed in most recent accounts has been primarily concerned to examine the processes and effects of, and reactions to, European colonialism from the sixteenth century up to and including the neo-colonialism of the present day” (Aschroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, 2013: 205). Then, it is clear that post-colonial terms is used to analyzed all of the cultural aspects, such as: history, politics, economy, literature, and so on. Generally this cultural tendency is exist in the study of Oriental study that has been written by Orientalist which is seen as Oriental text (Ratna, 2015: 206). Thus, explicitly Ratna said that post-colonial visions is to search the ideology pattern from the Orientalist society in order to build ‘west’ superiority, with the logic cosequences emerged ‘east’ inferiority. Because of that, Ratna continued that the study of post-colonial is relevant to find the cross-culture crittics within its impact to the territory (Ratna, 2015: 207).

Furthermore, there is also an author whom his essays is stil capable for use to write about post-colonial issues to discuss. One of the author is Edward Said with his *Orientalism,* Homi K Bhabha’s *The Location of Culture*, and Gayatri Chakravotry Spivak with her *Can the Subaltern Speak?* essay.

Edward Said’s *Orientalism* told about how power of colonized societies had begun to the desk within its impact of power from the ruling class that has been control and manipulated their ideology, movement, and so on to their colonized societies. Then, it can be said that “he examines the processes by which the ‘Orient’ was, and continues to be, constructed in European thinking” (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin (2013: 185). This term is also could be called as hegemony and power that represented by Said with his essay of *Orientalism*. Much broadly from the basic meaning of Orientalist, Said (1978: 3) argue that Orientalism as the corporation for dealing with the Orient “dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient”. Then, it can be said that the western hegemony and power, pass through the scholar of the Orientalist, try to enter its ideology over the Orient by grasping over the Orient thought toward its studies over them. That is why “The Orient is not an inert fact of nature, but a phenomenon constructed by generations of intellectuals, artists, commentators, writers, politicians and, more importantly, constructed by the naturalizing of a wide range of Orientalist assumptions and stereotypes” (Aschroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, 2013:185). Then, Orientalism much become more as an example of power and authority of others. Because, in Orientalism, it is not merely about the study about how to hold down the Oriental world. Wide spreadly from that, this issue is more about how power is exerted from the west over it. Over the general assummptions of the Orient and a discourse of the Orient from the western hegemony, thus there emerged:

“.... a complex Orient suitable for study in the academy, for display in the museum, for reconstruction in the colonial office, for theoretical illustration in anthropological, biological, linguistic, racial, and historical theses about mankind and the universe, for instances of economic and sociological theories of development, revolution, cultural personality, national or religious character” (Said, 1978: 7-8).

Then, there will emerged transcultural from the impact of colonization. This transcultural terms also being called as hybridity. Hybridity recently influenced by the work of Homi K. Bhabha, “whose analysis of colonizer–colonized relations stresses their interdependence and the mutual construction of their subjectivities....” (Aschroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, 2013: 136). That is why for Bhabha, this always bring back to the contradictory and ambivalence which is will show a hierarchical purity of cultures untenable. “The relationship is ambivalent because the colonized subject is never simply and completely opposed to the colonizer” (Aschroft, Griffiths, Tiffin, 2013: 13). Then, Bhabha’s argument is that colonial discourse is compelled to be ambivalent because it never really wants colonial subjects to be exact replicas of the colonizers–this would be too threatening. This ambivalence between colonizer and colonized will show of the mimicry process between them. But, this process of mimicry from the colonizer will show of what then call ‘blurred copy’ because “mimicry is never very far from mockery, since it can appear to parody whatever it mimics” (Aschroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, 2013: 155). Mimicry therefore locates a crack of colonial dominance and its control of the behaviour of the colonized. Then, Bhabha (1994: 37) contends that all this cultural systems and statements are exist in the space that he calls as ‘Third Space enunciation’. This Third Space enunciation then more capable for both of colonized and colonizer bring a diversity and cultural exoticism as Bhabha told that it “may open the way to conceptualizing an international culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the diversity of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture’s hybridity” (Bhabha, 1994: 38).

The culture that has build from the mimicry of the dominant colonizer, contextually shows that there is some cultural hegemony between colonizer and colonized. Then, this colonized also could be named as the subaltern. Because subaltern has a meaning ‘of inferior rank’ over the hegemonic power from the colonized. According to Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin (2013: 244) subaltern is “a term adopted by Antonio Gramsci to refer to those groups in society who are subject to the hegemony of the ruling classes”. Gramsci told that this subaltern classes is always be in the subject of the ruling class hegemony even if they are rebellious on that position. That is why subaltern classes will always be in the position of ‘inferior rank’ in the post-colonial terms. Clearly they have a less access to gain their own freedom of expression because their live is clearly being control by the ruling class. Unless they gain some permanent victory (revolutionary class adjustment) to break the subordination between the ruling class and the subaltern.

Firstly, the term of ‘subaltern’ was being applied in the research of subaltern study in South Asian by Ranajit Guha. Guha (1982: vii) argued that the term of Subaltern studies “as a name for the general attribute of subordination in South Asian society whether this is expressed in terms of class, caste, age, gender and office or in any other way”. Then according to Aschroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin (2013: 245) the purpose of subaltern study “was to redress the imbalance created in academic work by a tendency to focus on élites and élite culture in South Asian historiography”.

However, those aspects that being issues in the post-colonial studies are the one of major problem that has come to the desk. Throwback to the post-colonial issues in the previous decade, the structure of this colonial regime is always placed the dominant group as the classes that rule the inferior classes during their regime. A class that always substantial with their power of authority of the others. They can expand their own ideology to the state that their has been colonized. After that, then this situations is much more become mimicry from the colonizer where there was some ambivalence in that process. Then, the colonizer is much become the subject that has not get their voice of cultural expression, because all of their move is being controlled explicitly by the ruling class of the colonized.

1. **The Context of Power and Subaltern in Postcolonial Theory**

In many aspect, postcolonial studies or theory is not merely about how the post-colonial works in ruling its colonial nation. This studies are implied a few knowledge discipline to view widely from the aspect of post-colonialism studies. One of discipline that emerges in post-colonial studies are power and the subaltern issues.

* + 1. **Power**

The success of Europe colonization of the others for about eighty-four percent (Fieldhouse in Ratna, 2015: 214) is also the successful of imperial-colonial discourse and its hegemony for colonized the others. It is clear that the practice of imperialism in general is the formation of an empire within its power to control the other nation. Much less from its general sense, Edward Said used this term as “the practice, theory, and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory” (Said in Aschorft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, 2014: 139). The significant feature of imperialism is that, while as a term used to describe the late nineteenth-century policy of European. Thus, imperialism in its more recent sense is associated with the Europanization of the globe which came in three major waves: “the age of discovery during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; the age of mercantilism during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; and the age of imperialism in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries” (Aschroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin: 2014: 140). Each phase of the Europanization have its characteristic as in mercantilism age that there were competitive acquisition of wealth, particularly gold and silver, and its consolidation through the discouragement of imports by tariffs and the encouragement of exports through bounties and rebates. Lichsteim (1971: 51) argued that this genesis of purpose “was not to maximise welfare, but to promote the economic and political independence of the nation-state”. Then in its practice, this European poweers in the mercatilist age believed that the acquisition of colonies was beneficial to deprive competitors of potential wealth. Unfortunately in its practice of imperialism is much more become the profitable sense to execute the role of colonization.

As being emphasize by Said (1993: 8) that “‘imperialism” means the practice, the theory, and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory; ‘colonialism’, which is almost always a consequence of imperialism, is the implanting of settlements on distant territory”. It is clear that colonialism has been seen as a distinctive form of the more general ideology of imperialism. It can be said that colonialism as the practice of the imperialism ideological force. Thus, this formula has emerged the tension between the colonizer and colonized. This practical formula has supported by the general habit of colonizer where “colonial expansion was coterminous with the development of a modern capitalist system of economic exchange (see world system theory) meant that the perception of the colonies as primarily established to provide raw materials for the burgeoning economies of the colonial powers was greatly strengthened and institutionalized” (Aschroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2014: 54). It means that the relation between the colonizer and colonized emerged to a rigid hierarchy of difference deeply resistant to fair and equitable exchanges, whether economic, cultural or social. Unfortunately, this tendency has another meaning by the indigenous people to the stage by its inferior of the colonizer/dominant.

Their subjection was not just a matter of profit and and convenience, but also could be constructed as a natural state. By its doctrine of imperialism, “the ideology of race also a crucial part of the construction and naturalization of an unequal form of intercultural relations” (Aschroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2014: 55). Thus, this notion has demonstrated their ideological of patriarchal practices which is in this stage colonization could be represented as necessary civilizing where involved education and paternal nurture. In this phase, “colonialism developed an ideology rooted in obfuscatory justification, and its violent and essentially unjust processes became increasingly difficult to perceive behind a liberal smoke-screen of civilizing ‘task’, paternalistic ‘development’ and ‘aid’” (55). This process, then, emerged the ideology of racial superiority translated easily to the class terms. Specifically, this class terms are included to the empahize ‘othering’ where ‘the black men must forever remain cheap labour and slaves’. Thus, “race relations are not determined by economic distinction alone, rather economic disparities are maintained by ideogies of race” (Loomba, 1998: 128). Then, this racial difference is more than a ‘by-product’ of class relations, although it is firmly connected to economic structures. Thus, the terms continued to be divided into two category of authority and hegemony as one of results from imperial-colonial discourse in its practice.

1. **Authority**

Some general source has found that the base structure of authority is a way to the restructing the ‘Orient’ thinking from the ‘West’. This discourse is also been called as Orientalism by Edward Said. In his thought, Said argued that the way of thinking from the ‘Orient’ was and always to be constructed in European thinking. Then, this process is one of the process of the Orientalism. Thus, it approached by “Professional Orientalists included scholars in various disciplines such as languages, history and philology” (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2014: 185). By its practice, it is clear that Orientalism dealing with the East ‘Orient’ and the West ‘Occident’ by “dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructing, and having authority over the Orient” (Said, 1977: 3). The relation between Orient and Occident were portray in how the Occident asserts its ideology to construct the Orient thinking as the significance of Orientalism is that as a mode of knowing the other. This tendency emerged a construction of the other as a form of authority. Thus, It can be said that “The Orient is not an inert fact of nature, but a phenomenon constructed by generations of intellectuals, artists, commentators, writers, politicians and, more importantly, constructed by the naturalizing of a wide range of Orientalist assumptions and stereotypes” (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2014: 185). Then, it is a relation of power, domination, and hegemony that bond between Occident and Orient in its practices. The problem is that the West become superiority to the East as they were know how the East movement from the research over the East. The study of Orient is much more become how the West control and manipulated the way of thinking over the Orient than a true discourse over it. It support within the power and hegemony of the west within imperialism in eighteenth century. Thus, Orientalism is not, however, a Western plot to hold down the ‘Oriental’ world. It is:

a distribution of geopolitical awareness into aesthetic, scholarly, economic, sociological, historical, and philological texts; it is an elaboration not only of a basic geographical distinction (the world is made up of two unequal halves, Orient and Occident) but also of a whole series of "interests" which, by such means as scholarly discovery, philological reconstruction, psychological analysis, landscape and sociological description, it not only creates but also maintains.

(Said, 1977: 13)

 It is clear that the studies or discourse over the orient from the occident is not merely about just a research of it, but much deeply from that, it is a way of European hegemony to construct the East thinking to become the same direction or course as European’s. The effect is that this term implied the Orient to much become did not have its real culture because of there is a hand from the West to reconstruct the way of thinking from its original of the East. Then, it can be said that Orientalism is a way of a form of authority from the West over the East.

1. **Hegemony**

However, it was the means of represenation that confirmed the hegemony of the European powers in their cololonial territory. The power of imperial discourse confirmed the hegemony of imperialism itself. It is true that the role of hegemony has a relation within its impact both of imperialism and colonialism. At least there are two main role of hegemony to construct its power. As Gramsci (Adamson, 1980: 170) emphasize that the first of hegemony role is “the basis of an existing politcal systems”. It means that its domination become the main concept of hegemony rely on the state’s monopoly on the means of violence and its consequent role as the final arbiter of all disputes. Thus the importance of this conception is that “it points to the need for the proletariat to develop political strategies which undermine the consent of the present ruling class” (170). Second phase, it emerge to understands that the role of ‘economic corporative’ seems to be understood in this phase. Here the reference is that “the hegemonic level represents the advance to ‘class consciousness’, where class is understood not only economically but also in terms of a common intellectual and moral awareness, a common culture” (171). Through this class consciousness, hegemony was necessary before one could even hope for a ‘complete’ revolution—one that brings to power a coherent class formation united behind a single economic, political, and cultural conception of the world.

Thus, hegemony much broader to a sense by its function of power to colonized has a mean domination by consent as Aschroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin (2014: 134) argued that hegemony is the power of ruling class to convince the other class that their interest are interest of all.

* + 1. **Subaltern**

The term ‘subaltern’ was commonly used by Antonio Gramsci to describe someone who repressed of the power from the ruling class. This term is also emerges that the subaltern cannot speak as their voice are being controled by the ruling group that has power to control the subaltern because they will always be a subject of the dominant group. Therefore, the subaltern “have less access to the means by which they may control their own representation, and less access to cultural and social institutions. Only ‘permanent’ victory (i.e. a revolutionary class adjustment) can break that pattern of subordination, and even that does not occur immediately” (Aschroft, Griffiths, Tiffin, 2013: 245-246).

Subaltern was adapted to the post-colonial studies where the subaltern group of historians in India was emerges the term by means “to redress the imbalance created in academic work by a tendency to focus on élites and élite culture in South Asian historiography” (Aschroft, Griffiths, Tiffin, 2013: 246). Formed by Ranajit Guha, the term subaltern in post-colonial territory used “as a name for the general attribute of subordination in South Asian society whether this is expressed in terms of class, caste, age, gender and office or in any other way” (Guha, 1982: vii). Thus, this terms related to the history, politics, economics and sociology of subalternity as well as to the attitudes, ideologies, and belief systems—in short, the culture informing that condition (vii).

Understanding that subordination cannot be understood except as one of the constitutive terms in a binary relationship of which the other is dominance, then the group emphasis on the subaltern function both as a measure of objective assesment of the role of the elite and as a critique of elitist interpretations of that role (vii). This condition emerged because of the Indian nationalism has been dominated for a long time by elitism—colonialist elitism and bourgeois nationalist elitism which is counts British writers, as a part of the elitist, writes the making of the Indian nation and the development of the consciousness—nationalism—which is informed this process, were predominantly elite achievement. Then, the colonialist elitism and bourgeois-nationalist elitism originated as “the ideological product of British rule in India, but have survived the transfer of power and been assimilated to neo-colonialist and neo-colonialist forms of discourse in Britain and India repectively” (Guha, 1982: 1). This terms causes such writing cannot acknowledge or interpret the contributin made by people on their own, that is, independently of the elite.

Guha asserts that those two historiographies defines Indian nationalism primarily as a function of stimulus and response. This means that the elite has go through of its process. Because there is some symbiosis between the bourgeois elitism and the colonial to bring its power to Indian nationalism. One of its process “is to describe Indian nationalism as a sort of ‘learning process’ through which the native elite became involved in politics by trying to negotiate the maze of institutions and the corresponding cultural complex indtroduced by the colonial authorities in order to govern the country” (Guha, 1982: 2). The condition then represents nationalism has been control by the elite through to the institutions, opportunities, resources that generated by colonialism. Furthermore, there is also a profit deals with the colonial rule such as: share in the wealth, power, and prestige created by and associated with colonial rule as the result of competition and collaboration between the ruling power and the native elite to constituted Indian nationalism.

Thus, consequently this conditions emerges the difference between the elite and the subaltern that lies “in the nature of political mobilization: elite mobilization was achieved vertically through adaptation of British parliamentary institutions, while the subaltern relied on the treditional organization of kinship and territoriality or class associations” (Aschroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, 2013: 245). Then, this appear elite mobilization that tended to be relatively more legalistic and constitutionalist in orientation which is subaltern mobilization, thus, relatively more violent.

The movement that operate this kind of mobilization is taken from “reflected the diversity of its social composition with the outlook of its leading elements dominating that the others at any particular time and within any particular event” (Guha, 1982: 5). This ideologicial element, asserts Guha, was of course not uniform in quality or density in all instances but it enhanced concreteness focus and tension of subaltern political action. The other set of features that lies under mobilzation is derived from “the condition of exploitation to which the subaltern classes were subjected in varying degrees as well as from its relation to the productive labour of the majority of its protagonists, that is, workers and peasants, and to the manual and intellectual labour respectively of the non-industrial urban poor and the lower sections of the petty bourgeoisie” (5). These popular mobilization in the colonial period took the form of peasant uprisings, and the contention is that this remains a primary locus of political action, despite the change in political structure (Aschroft, Griffiths, Tiffins, 2013: 245). However, the existence of this movement domain was the index of an important historical truth, that for Guha could be called as *the failure of the Indian bourgeoisie to speak for the nation* (Guha, 1982: 5). This terms contextually proved that the nation of India failed ‘to come into its own’ and this means that this “is the study of failure which constitutes the central problematic of the historiography of colonial India” (7).

* + - 1. **The Oppression of Not to Speak**

The notion that subaltern become an issues in post-colonial therory is that Gayatri Chakravotry Spivak contends within her essays ‘*Can the Subaltern Speak?*’. According to Aschroft, Griffiths, Tiffin (2013: 246) her first criticism is “directed at the Gramscian claim for the autonomy of the subaltern group, which, she says, no amount of qualification by Guha—who concedes the diversity, heterogeneity and overlapping nature of subaltern groups—can save from its fundamentally essentialist premise. Second, no methodology for determining who or what might constitute this group can avoid this essentialism. The ‘people’ or the ‘subaltern’ is a group defined by its difference from the élite”. On the response of Guha, Spivak argued that there is a further problematize from the idea of the subalterneity according to Guha’s attempt to guard against essentialism that, for Guha, there is a further distinction to be made between the subaltern and dominant indigenous group at the regional and local level. Spivak offered that “The task of research is to investigate, identify and measure the specific nature of the degree of deviation of [the dominant indigenous groups at the regional and local level] from the ideal [the subaltern] and situate it historically” (Spivak, 1985b: 27).

Furthermore, Spivak arugued that this project understood in essentialist terms must traffic in a radical textual practice of differences. Then “the object of the group’s investiagtion, in the case not even of the people as such but of the floating buffer zone of the regional elite-subaltern, is a *deviation* from an ideal—the people or subaltern—which is itself defined as a difference from the elite” (1985b: 27). Thus, This terms marginalized the subaltern because there is no unrepresentable subaltern subject that can know and speak itself. “One cannot construct a category of the subaltern that has an effective voice clearly and unproblematically identifiable as such, a voice that does not at the same time occupy many other possible speaking positions” (Aschroft, Griffiths, Tiffin, 2013: 246).Spivak continues that there is some marginalized of the women position by the dominant of the male. Then, she thus challenges a simple division between colonizers and colonized by inserting the ‘brown woman’ as a category oppressed by both. This terms also prooved that “there is no space from where the subaltern [sexed] subject can speak” (Loomba, 1998: 231). Because, elite native men may have found a way to ‘speak’, but, for those further down the hierarchy, self-represenation was not a possibility. Explicitly, the role of opressed woman cannot speak because “in the context of colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak, the subaltern as female is even more deeply in shadow” (Spivak, in Aschroft, Griffiths, Tiffin, 1995: 28).

* + - 1. **Racial Issues**

In imperial-colonial discourse, it is clear that there is such contextually margin from colonizers and colonized. One of the margin that became such an issues of it, is race. According to Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (2014: 218) race is “a term for the classification of human beings into physically, biologically and genetically disntinct groups”. The term has implied to the mental and moral behaviour of human beings, as well as individual personality, ideas and capacities, can be related to racial origin, and that knowledge of that origin provides a satisfactory account of behaviour.

Furthermore, race is a product of imperial-coloniali as being said before that the margin between colonizer and colonized uttered binary opposition between them. Thus, it become one of “imperialism’s most supportive ideas, because the idea of superiority that generated the emergence of race as a concept adapted easily to both impulses of the imperial mission: dominance and enlightment” (219).

Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin argued that race is different from racism. Then it has to be cleared of the term race and racism. Racism “can be defined as: a way of thinking that considers a group’s unchangeable physical characteristics to be linked in a direct, causal way to psychological or intellectual characteristics, and which on this basis distinguishes between ‘superior’ and ‘inferior’ racial groups” (219). That is why then, sometimes. racism is always be consider with overlook to the skin colour of the human. With the divisions of human classification of their colour: the white, the yellow and the black, the categories are more elaborately defined as ‘caucasoid’, ‘mongoloid’, and ‘negroid. These assumptions are: “first, that variations in the constitution and behaviour of individuals were to be explained as the expression of different biological types; second, that differences between these types explained variations in human cultures; third, that the distinctive nature of the types explained the superiority of Europeans and Aryans in particular; and fourth, that the friction between nations and individuals of different type emerged from innate characteristics” (220). In its practice, the negro or black African category was usually relegated to the bottom, in part because of black African’s colour and allegedly ‘primitive’ culture, but primarily because they were best known to European as slaves. Thus, the term encourage justification for the domination and at times extinction of inferior races (black) as not only an inevitable but also a desireable unfolding of natural law.

# CHAPTER III

# RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter deals with methodology of this research. It starts with research design, sample of data, source of data, technique of collecting data, technique of analyzing data.

* 1. **Research Design**

 This research applies literary criticism as a design applied which is related to qualitative design. According to Abrams (1999: 50-51) literary criticism “is the overall term for studies concerned with defining, classifying, analyzing, interpreting, and evaluating works of literature”. Thus, there are, at least, four basic approaches that determine the range of literary criticism. Abrams asserts that the four basic approaches included: mimetic criticism, pragmatic criticism, expressive criiticism, and objective criticism. Specifically for this research, the researcher use mimetic criticism, because Abrams argued that mimetic criticism “views the literary work as an imitation, or reflection, or representation of the world and human life, and the primary criterion applied to a work is the ‘truth’ of its representation to the subject matter that it represents, or should represent. This mode of criticism, which first appeared in Plato and (in a qualified way) in Aristotle, remains characteristic of modern theories of literary realism” (Abrams, 1999: 52).

 Implemented the terms from Abrams, in this research the researcher used mimetic both as an approach and a method, because this research is literary criticism and used post-colonialism as the theory which is it cannot standfree from the context. Post-colonialism also emerged the context out from the text as the base from the theory is from the discourse of imperial-colonial that exist in the previous century from the Western power over the East. In its practice, there is some aspect of post-colonial studies which is one of the aspect is power and the subaltern. Then, post-colonial used as the main theory in its literary criticism as Abrams (1999: 236) explains that post-colonial studies “sometimes encompass also aspects of British literature in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, viewed through a perspective that reveals the extent to which the social and economic life represented in the literature was tacitly underwritten by colonial exploitation”.

* 1. **Source of Data**

The data which has been choosen is a text of *Animal Farm* (1945) novel by George Orwell as a data source. It is published by the Penguin Books, copyright of 1946 and has been printed in the United States of America.

* 1. **Sample of Data**

In order to make this research more capable to understood, the researcher explain the whole related content with researcher’s research problem by quoting the source book as a word, sentence, and paragraph and related them into socio-political issues of power and subaltern that become the main topics to discusss.

Then the researcher discuss and analyze the quotation that exist in the novel and similaritied them into the topic applied in this research’s main topic. Here is a sample of data that include power and the subaltern issues in the novel:

1. The Portrayal of Power

The work of teaching and organising the others fell naturally upon the pigs, who were generally recognised as being the cleverest of the animals. Preeminent among the pigs were two young boars named Snowball and Napoleon, whom Mr. Jones was breeding up for sale. Napoleon was a large, rather fierce-looking Berkshire boar, the only Berkshire on the farm, not much of a talker, but with a reputation for getting his own way. Snowball was a more vivacious pig than Napoleon, quicker in speech and more inventive, but was not considered to have the same depth of character (Orwell, 1946: 25).

1. The Portrayal of Subaltern

 All that year the animals worked like slaves. But they were happy in their work; they grudged no effort or sacrifice, well aware that everything that they did was for the benefit of themselves and those of their kind who would come after them, and not for a pack of idle, thieving human beings (Orwell, 1946: 63).

* 1. **Technique of Collecting Data**

The technique of collecting data use documentary study which collecting the data from the text. Bogdan and Taylor suggested: "reading the text smartly; making code, arranging based on the typology, and reading some books related to the research problem” (1975:82-85, in Moleong, 2008:282). In applying those steps; the researcher reads the novel first, entitled Animal Farm; makes some codes based on the particular data that use in the research; arranges typology by means of collecting and classifying them into some categories related to the symbolic words data; and the last reads some books related to the research problem. The steps of collecting data is as follow:

1. Search the data from George Orwell’s *Animal Farm* that has power and subaltern issues in the novel;
2. Related to the theory that has been choosen by the researcher, which is post-colonial theory, that emphasize the power and subaltern issues to his work of *Animal Farm*.
	1. **Technique of Analyzing Data**

The technique of analyzing data uses three categories. Moleong (Jauhari, 2009: 103) explains that each data are analyzed by steps “identifying, categorizing, and interpreting thus aa which are explained by descriptive method”. Then, the steps is explained below.

1. Identifying: Identifying means to understanding the whole aspects of the novel by reading it repeatedly which could get some data that aplicated to as the main data by means of sentence or paragraph that analyze especially the similarities between the text and the theory.
2. Categorizing: After identify the data and get some data which is appropiate with the research, then the researcher classified them into two categories. They are the portrayal of power and the portrayal of subaltern that has been described in the novel within its narration.
3. Interpreting: After identifying and categorizing data, the data is interpreted using Said’s *Orientalism* to interpret the portrayal of power and Spivak’s *Can the Subaltern Speak?* To interpret the portrayal of subaltern in the novel.
4. Drawing Conclusion: Finally the last of all is drawing conclusion of the whole analysis which is the portrait of socio-political issues that has power and the subaltern in this study.

# CHAPTER IV

# SOCIO-POLITICAL ISSUES OF POWER AND SUBALTERN

This chapter deals with the analyses of socio-political issues of power and subaltern that exist in the novel. Thus, the analyses included the portrayal of power and the portrayal of subaltern to answer the following each research question above.

* 1. **The Portrayal of Power**

The relation between literature and power has a close meaning to the means by imperial-colonial discourse. In recent attention to the relationship between literature and colonialism has provoked serious reconsiderations of each of these terms. Loomba (1998: 70) emphasize that “ever since Plato, it has been acknowledged that literature mediates between the real and the imaginary”. Animal Farm could be one of the text that has some imperial-colonial discourse in it. Later, it has been found that in the narratives of the novel, there are some classifications on the use of power that the researcher’s found. The classification of the power included authority and racial issues in the novel.

* + 1. **The Practice of Authority by The Pigs**

In the relation of the power of authority, the novel began to explain in the first chapter within the speech of a respected pigs. The first and second chapter of the novel was that Animal Farm is the novel about revolution. This revolution occured some time after a speech, delivered by Major, an old respected boar as the narration below.

During the day that old Major, the prize Middle White boar, had had a strange dream on a previous night and wished to communicate it to the other animals. It had been agreed that they should all meet in the big barn as soon as Mr. Jones was safely out of the way. Old Major (so he was always called, though the lingdon beauty) 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 (Orwell, 1946: 15).

The narrative above shows “the prize Middle White boar” of Old Major plays his important role over the farm which has a meaning that this indicates for stating the power over his character, because he is “so highly regarded on the farm” that means he is the most respectful pig from the other animal in the farm. This statement of Old Major could related to the construction of the power that has its control over the colonized as the text had told above. The phrase “Old Major (so he was always called, though the lingdon beauty) 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” which can refer to that Old Major is having a highly regarded position in the farm. As Aschroft. Griffiths, and Tiffin (2013: 135) emphasize that “the colonized subject understands itself as peripheral to those Eurocentric values, while at the same time accepting their centrality”, then in this term of the text, all animals on the farm accepted Old Major as their leader as their accepting the centrality of Old Major. By means that the objective is to persuade the other animals to rebel, this step of Old Major is have relation to the discourse of Orientalism. Said (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2014: 184-185) argued that Orientalism “examines the process by which the ‘Orient’ was, and continues to be, constructed in European thinking”. As the statement above, it is clear that the speech of Old Major has a meaning to persuade the other or in the other hand to having authority by his thought.

Thus, Old Major speech to the others animals is much become an important value to emphasize in this term. Old Major’s speech of rebellion over the Man has emerged the sensitiveness of all the animal that “Man is the only creature that consumes without producing” (Orwell, 1946: 19), become the main concerns of the animal that they have to rebel against the Man (Mr. Jones) who had exploited their produce for himself. The speech declared that all animals were equal and all men were enemies; only by continuing to eschew the customs of humankind could the animals maintain their condition of equality. The doctrine from the speech of Old Major then much become the achievement of all. It is obviously true that the power can control everything within its subtle and inclusive, as Orientalism role its conception to the Orient by construct their ideology to be as European thinking (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2014: 184-185).

Thus, the position of “being the cleverest of the animals” are used to control and give their order to the other animals as they have arranged a formation to build their economic built to grown the farm much better than before as the next narration described.

“Now, comrades,” cried Snowball, throwing down the paint-brush, “to the hayfield! Let us make it a point of honour to get in the harvest more quickly than Jones and his men could do”.

“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 few minutes. Forward, comrades! The hay is waiting” (Orwell, 1946: 33-34).

The narratives above shows the hegemony of power described by the power of Snowball and Napoleon that have full order to the other animals. The first order of Snowball and Napoleon to the other animals is to harvest in the hayfield to growth their economic production. Implicitly, the pigs were not able to help the other animals as Napoleon said that he “shall follow in few minutes”. This also related to the previous aspect of the colonialism that the colonizer is always highly regarded as someone who have an authority of the others. This indicates the step of how the pigs want to have an authority over the other animal as one of the practice of Orientalism that dealing with the Orient by “dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient” (Said, 2003: 3). It can be said that the pigs by their order to the other animal have operate one of the step of authority. In its practice of the novel, the pigs were dealing with the other animal by making statements about the growth of the farm after the expulsion of Mr. Jones, authorizing views of it, describing about it, by teaching the other animal how to farm, settling it, and ruling over it. This tendency has a similarity with the Orientalism. Thus, it can be said that the pigs was definitely wanted to having authority over the other animal as Orientalism assert it as a Western style for dominating, restructing, and having authority over the Orient. By their intelligence, the pigs operate their domination over the other animal. The domination over the animals continued when some of the animals had speak for the milk from the cow that their udders was almot bursting has milked away and kept by the pigs. Again, here Napoleon shows his dominant over the others by argued that harvesting is the most important from the milk had follow from the other animals without protesting. Infact that when the other animals work for the order, the pigs “did not actually work, but directed and supervised the others” (Orwell, 1946: 35).

 In the next discussion, there is such good speaking performed by Squealer to ensure the milk that have questioned before of the other animals.

“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. (Orwell, 1946: 43).

Narratives above shows the intelligence of speaking performed by Squealer. He convince to the other animals that the milk “is to preserve our health”. This statement of the Squealer is one of how the intelligence within speak role about as being told before that the skills of Squealer can turn “black into white”. Also, the style of his speaking has undoubtfully success to convince the other animal. In this terms, Squealer has performed black propaganda to hide the truth from the other animal. As Cull, Culbert, and Welch (2003: 41) emphasize that “‘Black’ propaganda (sometimes referred to as ‘covert’ propaganda) tries to conceal its own identity by purporting to emanate from someone or somewhere other than the true source. In black propaganda not only is there deliberate distortion but the identity of the source is usually concealed or inaccurate”. It is clear that Squealer is the denial because he hide the truth about the consumptions of milk and apples that the pigs used to eat for themselves and not to share with the other animal. It can be said that Squealer has conceal the true identity of the pigs from the other animal as the truth been said that the pigs eat an apples and drink the milks is as their behaviour and not of the Squealer has been said early.

Then, it should be note that two developments in these early days of revolution. First, the pigs kept the milk and apples for their own use, because these particular foods were so important to brainworkers as milk and apples “has been proved by Science”. All the pigs were in full agreement on this point. They did not actually like the milk, but needed to preserve their health and brainpower for the good of the whole animal community: a noble sacrifice. Second, the pigs did not actually do any work but directed and supervised the other animals. With their superior knowledge, it was “natural that they should assume the leadership”.

The next discussion emerge the power from the pigs institutions that want to spread their spirit on rebellion against the Man.

By the late summer the news of what had happened on Animal Farm had spread across half country. Every day Snowball and Napoleon sent out flights of pigeons whose instructions were to mingle with the animals on neighbouring farms, tell them the story of the Rebellion, and teach them the tune of *Beast of England* (Orwell, 1946: 44).

Narratives above show the power of imperialism. In their thought, the success of rebellion in the manor farm had to spread to the other farm with the expectacy the other animal in other farm could rebel against the Man too for get their freedom. Yet, this terms has successfully gain other animals that want to rebel against the man. It was said that “rumours of a wonderful farm, where the human being has been turned out and the animals managed their own affair, continued to circulate in vague and distorted forms, and througout that year a wave of rebelliousness ran through the countryside. It can be said that the propaganda which is being planned has reach their success. This phase has some relation of colonial-imperial discourse. As Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (2014: 140) emphasize that “Imperialism in its more recent sense—the acquisition of an empire of overseas colonies—is associated with the Europeanization”, it can be said according to the statement of “By the late summer the news of what had happened on Animal Farm had spread across half country” the animals has contextually move or spread the spirit of rebellion to the other farm to join the rebellion against the Man. Implicitly, the animal want to spread their ideology to gain the support from the other animal to against the Man. Thus, it is clear that the statement above has a relation to the phase of imperialism where Europanization or in this context of discussion ‘Animalism’ were spread out of the nation to gain the support from the other farm.

* + 1. **The Practice of Hegemony by The Pigs**

In relation to the hegemony, the pigs whom portrait as the dominant of the others were being the one who always have its hegemony to control the other animal with their order. Thus, this hegemony to control were not become a good decision, but more often it always deals with other animals that oppressed of their policies. The struggle of the position, too, become one of the hegemony that appeared within the two dominant pigs (Snowball and Napoleon) as being described in narrative below.

Snowball and Napoleon were by far the most active in debates. But it was noticed that these two were never in agreement: whatever suggestion either of them made, the other could be counted on to oppose it. Even when it was resolved—a thing no one could object to in itself—to set aside the small paddock behind the orchard as a home of rest for animals who were past work, there was a stormy debate over the correct retiring age for each class of animal (Orwell, 1946: 38).

The narration above shows the conflicts between two dominant elite of Snowball and Napoleon. This two elites of the pig have different views on controlling the farm as a statement of “whatever suggestion either of them made, the other could be counted on to oppose it”. It goes to show that the power to handle the farm is being sacked by their rivalry to gain the position of the farm. By means that domination, Snowball and Napoleon have different ideologies to control the farm. In the practices the other have to relegate in some point of the position in the farm.

As the hegemony operate its existance, Napoleon as one of the elite pigs sets the education for the other animal to use the tools that exist in the farm as being described below.

The pigs had set aside the harness-room as a headquarters for themselves. Here, in the evenings, they studied blacksmithing, carpentering, and other necessary arts from books which they had brought out of the farmhouse. Snowball also busied himself with organising the other animals into what he called Animal Committees. (Orwell, 1946: 39)

The narratives above shows how Napoleon arrange the committee of the animal to gain better education for animal. The lack of this committee was that the re-education committee of the rats and rabbits where it broke down almost immediately. The success of the committee was the reading and writing classes as the dogs learned well in writing but the lack is that they were not intereting in reading except to read the Seven Commandments. All the animals have their difficulties of themselves as Boxer could not remember the alphabet more than four alphabet. Thus, “he did learn E, F, G, H but by the time he knew them, it was always discovered that he had forgotten A, B, C and D” (Orwell, 1946: 45). However, the terms come to the step of the evolution of the animal as their learned reading and writing. This could be related to the colonial discourse of the ‘evolution of mankind’ with the doctrines of imperialism. As the result of these formulation, then “colonization could be (re)presented as a virtuous and necessary ‘civilizing’ task involving education and paternalistic nurture” (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2014: 55). In its practice, by making the division of the committee, implicitly Snowball has made a new civilizing of the animal by involving education of writing and reading over it. Thus, it much become colonialism that operate by Snowball developed an ideology rooted in obfuscatory justification.

In the next discussion, describe the hegemony from the pigs as being the cleverest from the other animal that have to make policy and their decisions had to be ratified by a majority vote as being described below.

Snowball had made a close study of some back number 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. Napoleon produced no schemes of his own, but said quietly that Snowball’s would come to nothing, and seemed to be biding his time. But of all their controversies, none was so bitter as the one that took place over the windmill (Orwell, 1946: 53-54).

The narratives above shows how Snowball and Napoleon arrange the activity that exist as being “the cleverer than the other animals”. Then, the other animals has to vote to the policy that the pigs has requested. Then, a division of labour came naturally into being. First of all, Snowball wanted to make an innovations and improvements as he has made a close study of some back number of the Farmer and Stockbreeder which he had found in the farmhouse. It can be said that Snowball was trying to make industrialization in the farm even if Napoleon has disagreed about the plans that Snowball has arranged before. In the terms of colonialism, it is clear that the impact of such evolution include the economic production in it. Thus, “The development of such territorial designators as ‘Protectorates’, ‘Trust Territories’, ‘Condominiums’, etc. served to justify the continuing process of colonialism as well as to hide the fact that these territories were the displaced sites of increasingly violent struggles for markets and raw materials by the industrialized nations of the West” (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2014: 55).

There seems to be inevitability about the sequence of events on *Animal Farm* thereafter. Formal Meetings were held on each Sunday and at each meeting resolutions were agreed upon concerning the work. But these resolution always came from the pigs. Snowball was the assiduous in organising the animals to increase productivity: the Whiter Wool Movement for the sheep, the Egg Production Committee for the hens, and even the Wild Comrades’ Re-education Committee to make the rabbits and rats more responsible comrades. And always in the background the sheep chanted Snowball’s maxim: “four legs good, two legs bad”. Then it goes to show that Napoleon is always had no interest on Snowball’s committee.

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).

..........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 (Orwell, 1946: 55).

 The narration above shows the economic strategy and the idea over Snowball and Napoleon. Snowball has offer to build the windmill even if it will be a difficult business as gathering stone would not be an easy work to gather. But, he emphasize that the success of built the windmill “would be saved that the animals would only need to work three days a week. Different from Snowball, Napoleon has disagreed with the policies of Snowball. He declared that “the great need of the moment was to increase food production” (Orwell, 1946: 55) and emphasize that if they are too focus on the windmill, they would all starve to death.

It became apparent that though the pigs were unchallenged in their authority, there was increasing tension between Snowball and Napoleon, and that although the former often seemed to get the better of the arguments, the latter was adept at drumming up support for his position, especially with the sheep, who would frequently interrupt Snowball with their bleating of “four legs good, two legs bad”. There were ideological differences between the two: Snowball, as being told above, wanted to stir up insurrection on other farms and thus spread the revolution, whereas Napoleon wanted to concentrate on homeland defence and to come to negotiate in some terms with local farmers. Finally, they collided on policy. The former’s reading habits had taken on a technical flavour and he had mastered theories of bricklaying, electricity and so on. Quoted on the terms of Snowball: “so much labour would be saved that the animals would only need to work three days a week”, the researcher suggest that this narration of the Snowball has a relation to the power of colonialism in the perspective of the working class. Gramsci (1978: 10) argued that “Worker’s power has and can only have, its raison *d'elre* and its source within the working class itself; in the political capacity or the working class: in the real power that the working class possesses, as an indispensable and irreplaceable ractor or production and as an organization or political and military force”. it can be said that Snowball try to emerge the spirit of power in the worker’s (the other animal) power to gain a mass vote of his will in industrialising the farm.

The next discussion described the hegemony within Snowball through his power of military that came from the dogs to shut and unarguably the other animal to speak their thought.

Some of the pigs themselves, however, were more articulate. Four young porkers in the front row uttered shrill squeals of disapproval, and all four of them sprang to their feet and began speaking at once. But suddenly the dogs sitting round Napoleon let out deep, menacing growls, and the pigs fell silent and sat down again. Then the sheep broke out into a tremendous bleating of ‘Four legs good, two legs bad!’ which went on for nearly a quarter of an hour and put an end to any chance of discussion (Orwell, 1946: 59).

 The narrative above shows the hegemony of Napoleon has shown within its guard from the dogs to ensure his domination from the other animal. It can be said that in this sense, Napoleon has a full power to control the other within his order. In this case, Napoleon has operate one of the principle of imperialism within his power. Said (1993: 8) emphasize that “Neither imperialism nor colonialism is a simple act of accumulation and acquisition. Both are supported and perhaps even impelled by impressive ideological formations which include notions that certain territories and people require and beseech domination, as well as forms of knowledge affiliated with that domination”. Thus, it can be said that Napoleon used his ideological perspective of power and made his domination over it. This domination was unarguably by the other animal as he formed it with the protection of his guard. Then, economic, political and military dominance enabled the dissemination of Napoleon’s ideology through the powerful agencies of military forces that came from the dogs.

* 1. **The Portrayal of Subaltern**

It has come naturally that the emergence of subaltern is one of the result of the power causes by colonization. The dominant group have always surpressed to the people which is inferior from them. This tendency appear to the issues that othering become one of a major problem that exist in the colonization. Furthermore, the subaltern or inferior group are always have some relation to the racial issues that come to the discussion.

Then, this is one of an impact of colonizaiton to the subaltern as a result from the power of colonization and its hegemony nor authority. The two major problem in the impact of colonization is always be represented in this part of research include othering and racial issues that have come as an impact of power in the novel.

* + 1. **The Oppression of Not to Speak of the Other Animals**

In the relation of othering portrayal in the novel, it has some points in the section where Old Major speech about his thought to the other animals. It goes to show that one of his speeches is told about the nature of the animals as being described in the discussion below.

“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”. (Orwell, 1946: 18).

 Narratives above describes the nature of the animal about their labourious creature that exist to expolited by the Man. The speech of Old Major has come to the live of full miserable that has to face. The fact of “the life of an animal is misery and slavery” is the truth as Old Major speech for it. In this sense, it has close relation to the post-colonialism theory that slavery is become one of the main focuses of this term.

 As Aschroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (2014: 188) emphasize that “Othering refers to the social and/or psychological ways in which one group excludes or marginalizes another group”. It is clear that in this discussion there were some group which is dominant from the others. It can be said that the Man is the dominant group over the animals. This marginalize term has come to a meaning that the dominant always exploited to what the inferior have as in this discussion told that the animals were the labourious creature over the man. The statement of the Old Major that argued “our lives are miserable, laborious, and short” has a close meaning to the means that they were inferior over the dominant. Thus, it can be said that this discussion is one of the process that the Man has succesfully othering the animals by his power to control the farm.

 In the relation to othering the inferior group, the impact of this othering has emerged in the next discussion that the inferior group could not speak for himself even if they know that their thought were a matter of fact for what they saw as in the narratives below.

In spite of the shock that Snowball’s expulsion had given them, the animals were dismayed by this announcement. Several of them would have protested if they could have found the right arguments. Even Boxer was vaguely troubled. He set his ears back, shook his forelock several times, and tried hard to marshal his thoughts; but in the end he could not think of anything to say (Orwell, 1946: 59).

Narratives shows how the others animals cannot speak for their argument over the expulsion of Snowball. In the previous story, it is true that when Snowball try to told his thougt over the all animals in the farm about the construction of the Windmill. Napoleon clearly has a different ideology to the means by how the farm works after the succesful of the rebellion over the Man. Thus, Snowball’s thought was always interrupted by the sheep—whom declared to vote Napoleon as their leader—to oppose Snowball’s speech by always saying “four legs good, two legs bad” as their always and only could speak for that sentence after all. Finally Napoleon try to stop the thought of Snowball by appearing the dogs “whom Napoleon had taken away from their mothers and reared privately” (Orwell, 1946: 58). Then, after the expulsion of Snowball has been success to execute, Napoleon with his dog implicitly declared himself as the leader over the animals and speech to the other animals that all questions relating to the working of the farm would be settled by a special committee of pigs, and presided over himself. This tendency over the pigs that wants all the decisions were being the pigs to handle were clearly declared themselves as the dominant class of the others. As being discuss in the previous discussions, whenever there is some dominant class there will always the subaltern that always oppressed by the power from the ruling class.

 Thus, in this discussions that the animals could not speak for their own argument could be related to the discourse of the post-colonialism. Abrams (1999: 237) argued that “The subaltern has become a standard way to designate the colonial subject that has been constructed by European discourse and internalized by colonial peoples who employ this discourse”. It means that the other animals, except the pigs, are the subject of hegemony from the European or the ruling class (the pigs). The impact of being subject in this term has emerged that they are could not speak for their own arguments as their speak were being controlled by the ruling animals within Squeler has always successfully turn the black into the white. In the matter of fact that the animals could not speak for themselves is also has a close meaning to the argumentations of Spivak (in Aschroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 1995: 27) that emphasize “there is no unrepresentable subaltern subject that can know and speak itself. One cannot construct a category of the subaltern that has an effective voice clearly and unproblematically identifiable as such, a voice that does not at the same time occupy many other possible speaking positions”. In this discussions, it is clearly that the animals cannot speak for themselves as their speak were being surpressed by the dominant group.

 Once again, what comes to the next discussions describes of how the voice of the other animals were being shut by the intelligence of Squealer. Previously, Squealer try to persuade the other animals that leadership “is a deep and heavy responsibility” (Orwell, 1946: 59). He praised that Napoleon is the right choice to choose for leader of all the animals. Then, he argued that the animals have a wrong choice for choosing Snowball as their leader then emphasize that Snowball was no better than a criminal. Hearing of what Squealer has stated over Snowball, the other animals, whose his character was unknown, speak to convince their belief of Snowball as he said “He fought bravely at the Battle of the Cowshed,’ said somebody”. Squelear with his skill of convincing of the other animals has succesfully convince the other animals to trust him as he warned that “Loyalty and obedience are more important” relating to the bravery of Snowball. He declared one false step could bring Jones back as the other animals did not want him back. Then, the answer of the other animals relating to the way of speak from Squealer describe in the quotation below.

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 (Orwell, 1946: 60).

Narratives above shows how the other animals could not counter the statement that has been stated by Squealer. In this discussions it is clear that this is a portrayal of the animals that could not speak because of their inferiority against the dominant. In this terms of their subalterneity, Baudrillard (in Loomba, 1998: 232) argued that “the masses are the leitmotif of every discourse, they are the obsession of every social project which claims to make the oppressed speak”. As the notion displayed by Spivak, implicitly the animals in this discussions cannot counter over the hegemonic power of the pigs as they themselves cannot speak for it.

 In the next discussion found that how Squealer shut the other argument by his power and the dogs whom always be stay with him wherever he go as described below.

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 (Orwell, 1946: 62).

The narratives above shows how the power of Squealer against the argumentation of the other animals by his superiority. In previous story, it has been described that Squealer is trying to re-thinking about the idea of the Windmill. Clearly, the idea of Windmill is from the thought of Snowball instead as Napoleon has a different thought over Snowball. But, Squealer once again was trying to convince the other animal that the idea of the Windmill was firstly come to the idea of Napoleon as he said that “it was he (Napoleon) who had drawn on the floor of the incubator shed had actually been stolen from among Napoleon’s paper” (Orwell, 1946: 61). Then, he arranges that the Windmill was the creation of Napoleon. When somebody ask ‘why’ to the statement that Squealer has told about, implicitly Squealer try to make a reason that Napoleon use his own tactics to turn his idea back to the hand as being showed above.

Once again the animals cannot rebel nor speak against the sly of Squealer within his speak. The power that used to persuade the other animals was assisted by the dogs who always be in his circle barking whether his argumentation must always be accepted without being interrupted by other animal.

In all of the discussions that has some related to the oppressed to speak is clearly necessary to lure how the impact of power role to the results from the subaltern classes which is always be inferior from the dominant. It is clear that the dominant is always be high regarded than the inferior as they have power to control and persuade the other to follow its ideology. Squealer within his intelligence and his strong bodyguard of the dogs has succesfull to show his hegemony and authority over the other animals and cut all of the argumentations that the other animals used to questioning what exactly they know before such as the rule from Old Major. As being told by the story, Squealer could turn black into white, then in this part of discussions he succesfully turn the truth by opressed the other animals to speak against him as the dominant class from the other animal.

* + 1. **The Other Animals as the Victims of Racial Issues Roled by the Pigs**

The racial issues has emerged to the Animal Farm when the pigs—after the speech of Old Major—have turn they rebellion into their another government over the farm by the pigs. Then, it became much clearly of the racial issues that the pigs is always dominant of the others as they have strategic position to control the other animals. Thus, the racial issues have emerged as the impact of the pigs control their government by the used to the other animals of labouring in its process.

The racial issues first come for instant after the speech of the Old Major and the death of him, then the rebellion over the Man has successfully executed. The gain of victory of the animals were happening as quick as they were never thought. Next step of the animals after the successful rebellion over the Man is to built a government to live their life. After that, the power that used to Old Major could handle over all the animals has move to the pigs as the narratives told next.

The work of teaching and organising the others fell naturally upon the pigs, who were generally recognised as being the cleverest of the animals (Orwell, 1946: 25).

It is clear then the pigs are the dominant class from the others as they work “of teaching and organising feell naturally upon the pigs”. Thus, the pigs are described as “being the cleverest of the animals”. Then, during the previous three months the pigs had taught themselves to read and write—not forbidden by Major—and they wrote the Seven Commandments of what they call Animalism on the big barn wall. These stipulated that all animals were friends, all humans were enemies, and that no animal should indulge in any activities that defined humanity, such as smoking, drinking, sleeping in beds, wearing clothes. And crucially, it was stipulated that all animals were equal. It means that in the narratives above, the pigs show its power by their intelligence and it is not by the power of physics merely. Contextually, this could be a general classification by its race over the pig that has its intelligence of all the animals. Aschroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (2014: 218) argued that race is “a term for the classification of human beings into physically, biologically and genetically distinct groups”. In this case, the pigs were the dominant race of all because all the work institutionalized by the dominant group, that is the pigs. Then, the term move forward to the rise of colonialism, because the division of human society in this way is inextricable from the need of colonialist powers to establish a dominance over subject peoples and hence justify the imperial enterprise. It can be said that in this term, the pigs were trying to implicitly rule the “subject peoples”—other animals—in the perspective of colonization in it.

In the impact of the racial purposes over the other animals, in the next discussion over boxer is a fine example as being the character that suspected racial issues in it as being described below.

Boxer was the admiration of everybody. He had been a hard worker even in Jones’s time, but now he seemed more like three horses than one; there were days when the entire work of the farm seemed to rest on his mighty shoulders. From morning to night he was pushing and pulling, always at the spot where the work was hardest. (Orwell, 1946: 36-37).

The narratives above shows how boxer become the opposition from the pigs. It can be said that Boxer is truly a labour that has ruled of the pigs whom in the previous discussion the pigs have described as the intelligence because the work of teaching and being the cleverest over the animal were the pigs. Thus, the term has a relation between post-colonialism theory which is often called as binary opposition. Aschroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (2014: 26) emphasize that “binary oppositions are structurally related to one another, and in colonial discourse there may be a variation of the one underlying binary—colonizer/colonized—that becomes rearticulated in any particular text in a number of ways”. It can be said that in this discussions, Boxer become the binary opposition from the pigs. As the pigs declared contextually that they were the colonized considering that the order to doing some work were done by the pigs, then the other animals except the pigs were all the labour of all.

Considering the impact of the binarism, in the next discussion shows how this binarism work to the colonized society, which refers to the other animal, has role naturally upon them as described below.

All that year the animals worked like slaves. But they were happy in their work; they grudged no effort or sacrifice, well aware that everything that they did was for the benefit of themselves and those of their kind who would come after them, and not for a pack of idle, thieving human beings (Orwell, 1946: 63).

The narrative above shows how the other animals worked, as being described, like a slaves. It seems like the spirit of rebellion have always into their mind that all the work that they have done “was for benefit of themselves and those of their kind who would come after them”. In the other hand, they sacrifice eveything on that work. One of sacrifice that they must pay is working with less food that the pigs used to give. However, in post-colonial perspective, this could be related to the term of labourious process which is the negro from the imperialism of British empire has come to the desk. It takes to a note then that the labourious process is a part to divided race into a few categorical means . Loomba (1998: 124) emphasize a tendency of race is that “the first, which stems from marxist analyses, can be referred to as the ‘economic’ because it regards social groupings, including racial ones, as largely determined and explained by economic structures and processes”. In its practice, this labouring process muchh more become one of the part of the conception of the racial issues in the text.

As being told in the previous discussion that the other animals whom inferior could describe of they live of poor because they have less access to gain their superiority. Meanwhile, the pigs as the dominant break the Seven Commandments rule as being described by narrative below.

The animals reassured him on this point immediately, and no more was said about the pigs sleeping in the farmhouse beds. And when, some days afterwards, it was announced that from now on the pigs would get up an hour later in the mornings than the other animals, no complaint was made about that either (Orwell, 1946: 70).

 The narratives above shows how the dominant classes or the pigs used their hegemony to break the rules and change the rules that exist before in the farm. The fact that “no animal shall sleep in a bed” seems to break by the founder itself that is the pigs. Thus, the racial issues has emerged with the pigs upon their power has move on their own. Different from the pigs, the other animal did not get to what they want even they are contrary poor of everything. As Aschroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (2014: 218) emphasize that “the term implies that the mental and moral behaviour of human beings, as well as individual personality, ideas and capacities, can be related to racial origin, and that knowledge of that origin provides a satisfactory account of the behaviour”. Considering the terms that has been stated, then in the relation to this discussion, it can be said that the behaviour of the pigs to live as they want to live and the exploitation over the other animals to work is a racial production where mental and moral behaviour of that origin (the other animal) provides a satisfactory account of the behaviour.

 In previous discussion that has been discussed, the racial issues that exist in the novel were implicitly appeared by the notion of the labourious other animal and the dominant of the pigs. It can be said that the impact of the racial issues in all of the discussions has also emerged the binary opposition from it. Thus, racial issues always appear in general of the colonial discourse or the relation in literature. Then, Animal Farm is one of the work that describe racial issues as the impact of colonization.

# CHAPTER V

# CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter deals with the conclusion of all the discussion that has been describe and the suggestion for furthermore information.

1. **Conclusion**

Regarding to the previous centuries when British Imperialism became a major power of the world, its domination had spreadth accross the other nation by its power to colonized the other nation. British Imperialism had successfully operated its colonization and gained some profit from it. The impact of this imperial-colonial discourse also implied of the culture, language, and also literature. It is clear that in imperial-colonial discourse had some influence to literature. The portrayal of the imperial-colonial discourse has been described in all of the literary works. One of literary works that has been described the portrayal of imperial-colonial discourse is George Orwell’s *Animal Farm*. in respect of how the role from the ruling pigs operated its power to the other animal, it was clear that the novel portrait imperial-colonial discourse in the literature. Because one of the aspect that also became the main focus of imperial-colonial discourse is about the colonizer and the colonized. Both of this aspect was much became a sign of power for the colonizer and a sign of the subaltern or inferior classes for the colonized.

In its practice for analyzing of how the portrayal of imperial-colonial discourse in both aspect of power and subaltern, post-colonialism became a major theory that related the text within its context because post-colonialism could not standfree from the context with mimetic both used as an approach and method because mimetic views literary works as an imitation of the world and human life or the works that always relied on the context.

It is clear that in the terms of the novel, the portrayal of power and subaltern were successfully describe mostly in the character that rule in the farm, that is the pig. Thus, the portrayal of the subaltern were describe in the character that became a victims from the ruling class, that is the other animal. There was a further conclusion from the power and the subaltern issues as below.

* + - 1. Power

In its practice, the pigs whom describe as the ruling class used their power to control and manipulated the other animals and argued that the works that they (other animal) have done is for themselves. Then, to control and manipulated the others animal by its word, the pigs used his authority over the other animals and claimed its hegemony to convinced the other animal that his will is everybody’s will through their order.

The authority that has been operated by the pigs was more than such a discourse of Orientalism. The pigs was try to spread their ideology to the other animal by making statement about the other animal and to convinced the other animal that the goals of the rebellion is the way to make Mr. Jones did not came back again as the other animal freakened of Mr. Jones. Then, implicitly over the statements of it, the labourious concept was made by the pigs over the other animal to gained economic support for their own. Thus, the pigs were succesfully operated his authority by the power of making statement to conviced the other animal to follow their order. The success of the pigs is the success of their hegemony over the other animal. The role of hegemony controled the other animal as they wanted to do and arrange the committee divisions to get the other animal an ‘evolution’ beside the goal is to produce the other animal for economic production of the farm. The hegemony operate also its important role that the leader were being sacked between Napoleon and Snowball when in the end there was an expulsion to the Snowball as Napoleon wanted to gain the only position that he could order as he wanted.

* + - 1. Subaltern

The practice of authority within its hegemony have influenced to the other animals as the inferior class from the pigs. It can be said that the practice of authority and hegemony have an impact to the other animal. Thus, they oppressed to speak and there is some racial issues where the other animals being regarded as the inferior from the pigs.

In its practice, the subaltern much more become the inferior from the ruling class as they were being described as hegemonic power in the farm. the other animal was the vitims over the powerful hegemonic power from the pigs. For instance, the labourious process was being done by the other animal because the pigs was only to managed and supervised the other animal. This term was included the racial issues between the pigs and the other animal. As being said before that the racial issues emerged when they were social class when the economic process had operate in the farm. then, it can be said that the other animal were exploited their labour power to the owner of production (the pigs).

1. **Suggestion**

The suggestion to everyone, especially student in English department, whom is interested to analyze all of the literary works: poetry, drama, prose that uses post-colonialism perspective, the researcher suggest that the reference that has to be in hand is the book of Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (2014) *Postcolonial Studies: Key Concept*. It is helpful to find the term that often exist in the post-colonialism. Said’s *Orientalism* and Spivak’s *Can the Subaltern Speak?* is always be an intereting book for furthermore studies in post-colonial subject.

To whom is interest to make a research of *Animal Farm*, the researcher wan to suggest that there is some point that has to describe. The whole story in the novel is all about how the ruling class produce the inferior class and its impact in the practice of it. Then, it is clear that the novel is contain some politic, social and economic to analyze in many ways of an approach nor theory as a support of its research.
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