



ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL

Available Online: <https://assajournal.com>

Vol. 04 No. 02. Oct-Dec 2025. Page# 3421-3441

Print ISSN: [3006-2497](#) Online ISSN: [3006-2500](#)Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)

An Analysis of Structural Violence in Animal Farm by George Orwell

Saima Gul

BS English (Graduate) Department of English, FATA University Dara Adam Khel, Kohat

Akbar Ali (Corresponding Author)

Chairperson/Assistant Professor, Department of English FATA University, KP, Kohat

akbar@fu.edu.pk

Surhab u Din

English Linguistics Scholar, Department of English, Kohat University of Science and Technology

(KUST) Kohat, KP, Pakistan

suhrabuddin36@gmail.com**ABSTRACT**

This thesis delves into the intricate issue of structural violence within the context of George Orwell's renowned novel "Animal Farm." The primary objective is to identify how the mechanisms of structural power, embedded within a repressive system, engender structural violence. The study employs a two-fold approach to investigate this phenomenon: identifying the elements of structural power that give rise to structural violence in "Animal Farm," and providing concrete evidence of instances of structural violence within the narrative. The research methodology employed here is primarily literature review-based, drawing from both primary and secondary sources. The main source is "Animal Farm," and the other sources are books and articles that connect with literary theories, especially the sociological approach by Wellek and Warren, and the theory of structural violence by Johan Galtung. This sociological perspective is crucial in establishing the connection between structural power and structural violence within the novel. The findings reveal that structural power manifests in various forms, leading to structural violence through practices such as exploitation, which occurs on four occasions, penetration, observed five times, fragmentation, occurring twice, and marginalization, documented on two occasions. These findings substantiate the presence of structural violence against second-class groups as depicted in the narrative. Notable instances include the execution and psychological manipulation endured by characters like Snowball, Boxer, and other animals, as well as the collective memory loss concerning history and the past experienced by most characters, excluding the pigs. The research also suggests avenues for future scholars interested in exploring George Orwell's novel from different angles, such as the examination of cultural violence.

Keywords: Structural Violence, Structural Power, George Orwell, Animal Farm, Exploitation, Penetration, Fragmentation, Marginalization, Johan Galtung, Sociological Approach, Sociology of Literature

Introduction**Background of The Study**

Eagleton (2008) and Ahmed et al. (2024) argue that the main goal of studying literature is to link it with ideology. He thinks that literature and art can strongly influence our beliefs and ideas. This idea is also supported by Selden in 2005. Within societal contexts, ideologies invariably exist, and the role of literary criticism is to identify and analyze the ideologies embedded within literary works, thus preventing their vulnerability. A fundamental aspect of

literary criticism posits that literature must vividly depict the tangible aspects of human life, avoiding mere abstract descriptions. Consequently, critiquing literary works equals to critiquing reality (Eagleton, 2008). Eagleton further contends that while many literary studies commence with appropriate methodologies, they often overlook their socio-political significance. He asserts that, regrettably, most literary criticism tends to reinforce the existing societal systems rather than catalyzing social change.

The decision to study George Orwell's "*Animal Farm*" was influenced by Eagleton's ideas about how literary analysis connects to the real world. This renowned political satire novella has garnered widespread acclaim for its portrayal of farm animals exhibiting human-like traits such as speech, thought, and the operation of a farm. Orwell's crafted "*Animal Farm*" with the backdrop of the Russian Revolution, infusing it with ample criticism and irony regarding these historical events. Much like other novels, this Orwellian work delves into the societal conditions of human lives. Consequently, analyzing the internal elements within the novella provides us with a fresh perspective to comprehend real-life social issues. It is my hope that through this new viewpoint, readers of this investigation can offer insights and solutions to address prevailing social challenges.

Structural violence, a central theme in Orwell's novels, pertains to actions that inflict physical or mental suffering or serious harm upon individuals, as defined in sociological discussions (Cheal, 2002). Structural violence, explained by Galtung in 1969, focuses on how economic and political systems can hold back people. It shows up as unfair access to things like resources, political influence, education, healthcare, or legal rights. This kind of harm is usually not easily seen, which makes it an interesting topic to study.

In the novel, Johan Galtung (1969) often discusses violence in terms of structural violence, which points to societal issues rooted in the social structure. This type of violence is typically not easily visible, as it becomes ingrained in the everyday fabric of society, governed by established institutions and routine experiences. Structural violence emerges whenever individuals face disadvantages due to longstanding political, legal, economic, or cultural traditions, resulting in persistent inequalities within the social structure (Winter, DD, & Leighton, DC, 2001).

Structural violence, when deeply ingrained within a society's framework, often becomes imperceptible and appears in commonplaces. This is due to the social structure's role as a cohesive and organized system that aligns with the cultural values and social components of a community, serving as a crucial mechanism for its stability. Consequently, each facet of society operates and contributes to the community's well-being over an extended duration (Farmer, 1996; Afaq et al., 2023).

Social structure includes things like religion, beliefs, what's considered right or wrong, and government rules. The values and culture of a society are really important in keeping this hidden harm called structural violence in a society. Various institutions, such as schools, churches, households, hospitals, and governments, contribute to shaping these social structures and disseminating the moral principles upheld by society. As described by Althusser (1971), these institutions are referred to as ideological state apparatuses, and their primary function is to establish intangible norms within civil society through the aforementioned private entities. Their purpose lies in educating civil society to uphold the authority of the state. Social institutions like the government, families, religion, and schools can unintentionally create unfairness and harm in society. This harm usually comes from their intentions. These institutions aren't neutral; they often support those in charge. The government can use force

to stay in control, which limits people's freedom and diversity, harming both personal and public spaces (Arendt, 1959).

Social institutions like the government, families, religions, and schools can keep unfairness going in society. It is important to highlight that this violence is driven by motives. When it comes to disseminating values and ideologies, these institutions are not impartial; instead, they tend to support those in authority. The state employs violence as a means to secure and maintain its power and stability. This form of violence restricts freedom and diversity, ultimately eroding both personal and communal spaces (Arendt, 1959; Akhter et al., 2025).

The chosen novel prominently features structural violence, offering a deep exploration of the experiences of violence victims, particularly among the central characters. According to Galtung's theory (1996), there are four reinforcing elements within these structures that obstruct the ability to resist exploitation: penetration, segmentation, marginalization, and fragmentation. Penetration instills a particular perspective on the vulnerable, analogous to the non-pig livestock population in "*Animal Farm*." Segmentation offers only a limited understanding of ongoing events, akin to Squealer's selective information dissemination among the farm animals in the same novel. Marginalization pushes the less powerful group away from the accepted limits or norms, and fragmentation further isolates the disadvantaged, preventing unity among them.

Problem Statement

The analysis of structural violence depicted in "*Animal Farm*" aims to investigate the underlying social and political systems within the allegorical narrative, identifying how these structures perpetuate inequality, exploitation, and oppression among the animal inhabitants. This study seeks to understand the impact of these systemic injustices on the characters and the broader themes of the narrative, shedding light on the parallels between the farm's totalitarian regime and real-world instances of structural violence. Through a comprehensive examination of the text, this analysis will explore the mechanisms of power and control that lead to the disenfranchisement and suffering of the animals, ultimately providing insights into the broader implications of systemic violence in society.

Research Objectives

1. To investigate the origins of structural violence within Orwell's *Animal Farm*.
2. To identify instances of structural violence endured by the characters in the narrative.

Research Questions

1. What are the origins of structural violence within Orwell's *Animal Farm*?
2. What are the instances of structural violence endured by the characters in *Animal Farm*?

Significance of the Research

The significance of the research lies in its primary goal, which is to communicate the researcher's objectives to the readers. However, the significance of the study also emerges from the outcomes it yields in both practical and theoretical domains. In essence, whether in theory or practice, research holds significance. This study seeks to enhance the understanding of conflict analysis, particularly within the context of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, with a specific focus on structural violence. Additionally, it aims to contribute to the body of research on *Animal Farm*, offering valuable insights for future researchers interested in conducting conflict analysis studies.

Literature Review

Introduction

This section encompasses the examination of relevant literature and the theoretical framework applied, which is rooted in sociological principles. The research draws upon Johan Galtung's concept of structural violence as its guiding theory.

Sociological Approach

Sociology of literature is a way of looking at books and stories that focuses on how they relate to society and its aspects, according to Damono in Wiyatmi's work from 2013. Essentially, it combines literature with sociology to understand how literature relates to society. This interdisciplinary approach, as Swingewood (in Wiyatmi, 2013) suggests, requires us to grasp the boundaries of sociology as a science and highlight the distinctions and connections between sociology and literature.

Swingewood, in Wiyatmi's work, points out that sociology is a way to scientifically and impartially study how people behave in society, including looking at things like social institutions and how society works. It aims to address inquiries regarding the feasibility, functioning, and resilience of society. Sociology and literature share a common focus on understanding human interactions within society, exploring the resulting societal processes. Santosa and Wahyuningtyas (2011) assert that literary creations blend the author's imagination with the intricate aspects of social life. Literary works often serve as a reflection of a community's social existence, portraying issues that resonate with the author's experiences. This convergence underscores the necessity for interdisciplinary engagement when examining literary works.

Literary critics employ various approaches for text analysis, including the sociological method. This method allows them to examine literature within cultural, economic, and political contexts, going beyond common perceptions. Sociology delves into how society evolves and endures by investigating political, religious, and economic issues within social institutions and structures (Gidden, Duneier, and Applebaum, 2007; Gill et al., 2024).

Laurenson and Swingewood (1972) argue that literature is inseparable from real life and is heavily influenced by societal conditions during its creation. They assert that the chosen subject of literary research reflects social and political contexts. This perspective, known as the sociology of literature, encompasses three main approaches: the sociology of the author, literary works, and readers, as outlined by Wellek and Warren in their book "*Theory of Literature*" (1964). In this study, the researcher utilizes a sociological lens to analyze George Orwell's novel "*Animal Farm*," making literary works the primary source of data.

The sociology of literary works is a branch of sociological analysis that explores how literature relates to societal issues, departing from Plato's idea that literature imitates reality (Wiyatmi, 2013). It focuses on dissecting the content, objectives, and societal implications within literary works, viewing literature as a reflection or reinterpretation of societal realities. This field of study delves into various aspects of literature, emphasizing its role as a mirror reflecting society and a cultural record of a specific time and place.

The sociological method is embraced to enhance public comprehension of literary works tied to society. Moreover, it can illustrate that novels do not contradict reality; literature, in this context, is fiction. Furthermore, literature is not solely a personal experience but also a societal one. Wellek & Warren (1964) mentioned that certain rules and expectations only exist in society. The sociological way of looking at literature sees art and literature as important parts of society. Lucaks (1962) adds that this approach treats literature like a real, observable social thing that is part of our daily lives. Authors use this to create their works, using observation, analysis, interpretation, thinking, imagination, and judgment. The sociological approach shows how sociology and literature connect with each other, with each influencing the other. It is a

perspective that centers on human issues, significantly contributing to our comprehension of social life aspects. Furthermore, it sheds light on the position and challenges faced by different social classes within society.

Literature serves as a mirror reflecting aspects of life, intricately tied to social realities and human experiences (Ahmed et al., 2025). It encapsulates the interplay between society and individuals 'inner thoughts. Consequently, the primary criterion for evaluating literary works is their portrayal of the world and human existence. Nevertheless, as Wellek and Warren (1964) caution, literature serves as a tool to express life, although not in a direct manner. Social phenomena within literary works may emerge unintentionally from the author, or literature 's nature may indirectly unveil aspects even the author might not fully recognize. Literary works possess the ability to shed light on elements of society that sometimes remain obscured.

In this study, the sociological method is deemed appropriate, aiming to demonstrate that Orwell's novel "*Animal Farm*" serving as a reflection of tangible reality. The study will unveil the presence of structural violence subtly affecting individuals within the context of state life.

Structural Power

Galtung views, Power as a fundamental and multifaceted concept in the realm of politics and knowledge, similar to the concept of Energy in physics. This is because power is deeply rooted in social relationships, manifesting in various patterns between individuals, groups, or nations. Galtung distinguishes power relations as those that are exploitative and repressive, emphasizing that not all social relations qualify as power relations. He underscores the importance of discerning between power and authority, with power often relying on sheer strength, while authority represents legitimized power, endorsed by a broader consensus. In summary, Galtung 's perspective on power revolves around unbalanced relationships, emphasizing a nuanced understanding over mere authority.

Power becomes tangible in unbalanced social relationships, where some individuals or groups possess more strength while others are weaker. Power only manifests when such imbalances exist. Galtung 's concept of power is rooted in two fundamental aspects of human life: being (existence) and having (possession). As mentioned earlier, power emerges within relationships that lack equilibrium, and this imbalance arises from disparities in being having, and one 's position within the social structure. The discussion of the third aspect, sources of power, will be explored in greater detail later. Whether it is a nation, a group, or a country, differences in terms of being, having, and position exist within both national and international contexts. It is the combination of these three elements, encompassing both large and small entities, that determines the nature of power dynamics in relationships.

Individuals can possess power through various means, such as having an intriguing personality or high charisma, which enables them to influence others with their ideas. Some individuals may also have physical strength or exceptional intelligence, giving them an advantage. Additionally, those who possess weapons can derive power from their armaments. However, not everyone accumulates resources independently; some people attain power by occupying central positions within bilateral or multilateral networks. This is known as structural power, which can be used for exploitation, penetration, and the expansion of influence. It is important to emphasize that discussions about power are not isolated from the real world but are always connected to the development of nations and the pursuit of global betterment. In essence, power should be viewed within the context of a nation 's development. But how does a nation or group grow? According to Galtung, a community develops when it can achieve values such as personal growth, freedom, socio-economic progress, social justice, equality, autonomy, solidarity, participation, and ecological balance. These ten objectives define the strategy for

community development, whether at the national or global level. Development is not inherently at odds with power; rather, it opposes power imbalances. This implies that development seeks to reduce disparities in power.

Galtung's perspective emphasizes that structural power doesn't solely reside in the most powerful nation but is also embedded within the power dynamics of less powerful nations. It is an abstract concept with significant real-world implications, rooted in the existing structures. For instance, a president derives power from their role within the national structural power framework. Galtung acknowledges that individual factors, like personal charisma, can influence structural power. In the upcoming sections, I will explore four successive aspects of structural power: exploitation, penetration, fragmentation, and marginalization.

Exploitation

Galtung believes that we should think about exploitation in terms of how people, groups, or countries interact. Exploitation happens when the benefits and drawbacks of economic activities in a trade system are not shared fairly, leading to some groups benefiting more than others. If the gap between those who benefit the most and those who benefit the least continues to widen or remains substantial, Galtung identifies this as exploitation. Furthermore, when there is a disagreement in what people want from a trade, exploitation can also occur.

In the global context, every nation engages in exchanges based on their resources, needs, and positions. These interactions involve the exchange of different values; for example, one nation may possess oil, while another has tractors. The underlying assumption is that each interaction should ideally result in a balanced relationship, but in reality, interactions may not always be equitable. To determine whether an interaction is balanced or not, two factors must be considered: the impact on the interacting parties, referred to as interactor effects, and the effects within each party, known as intra-actor effects.

In essence, there are two fundamental principles underlying the imbalance in connections between groups, particularly among nations: the principle of vertical interaction and the structure of interaction.

Galtung's theory discusses three types or steps of exploitation.

- i. First Type: Developed countries (A) extract raw materials from third world countries (B) without giving them fair profits.
- ii. Second Type: A gives some advantages to B, but the relationship remains imbalanced over time.
- iii. Third Type: A and B achieve a balanced exchange of value, but there's still an imbalance within B due to a processing gap between raw material production in B and goods production in A.

Galtung emphasizes that the success of these steps depends on the interaction between central and peripheral nations, where both have aligned interests.

The first principle suggests that vertical interactions lead to inequality, while feudal structures maintain it. The second principle highlights how central countries monopolize relationships with peripheral countries, leading to fragmentation. In vertical work distribution, there is a division between processing and production, with central nations monopolizing challenges and exploration while leaving routine tasks to the peripheral nations. This power dynamic allows the central nations to shape the culture of the periphery through work distribution.

The problem does not solely revolve around one person being wealthy and another being poor; it extends to the contrast between initiative and apathy, leading to one becoming stronger and others weaker. According to Galtung, these differences, expressed as disparities in there and have, tend to persist and may or may not be associated with structural power. However, when

viewed through the lens of structural power, these differences arise from the underlying structure, especially in the distribution of labor within economic activities and other domains. This is why Galtung suggests that addressing exploitation and redistributing sources of prosperity is not a straightforward task. It requires a struggle to completely transform the underlying structure, particularly the economic activities that give rise to exploitation. In this context, there are two approaches: either reorganizing economic activities to ensure a more equitable sharing of costs and profits or dismantling these activities altogether.

In short, discussions about exploitation can be summarized as follows: Exploitation is identified as the root cause of inequalities in our world. These inequalities are primarily based on the vertical distribution of labor, distinguishing between the processing of raw materials (peripheral) and the production of goods (central). This pattern of vertical interaction is further reinforced by feudal-like relationships within individual countries and between central and peripheral regions.

Penetration

Galtung's concept of penetration involves powerful countries exerting influence over weaker ones. Structural power becomes significant when a nation seeks refuge within another, allowing the powerful nation to establish a presence within the weaker nation.

Galtung distinguishes between two types of penetration: subversion, which involves infiltration from lower or peripheral societies, and superversion, which pertains to infiltration from the top. Let me focus on the latter, superversion penetration, which has two key aspects. Firstly, it starts with a connection between the powerful people in the ruling country and the powerful people in the controlled country. This connection allows the elite of the ruling nation to get new ideas, lifestyle patterns, and economic activities originating from the central country. The link between the powerful groups in the central and controlled areas involves common interests, helping each other, and similar lifestyles. But as time goes on, the powerful group in the central area might not live in the same way anymore, leading to changes in other aspects of this relationship. Secondly, this type of penetration is smoother because it exploits existing inequalities within the structure of both dominating and controlled countries. In particular, the peripheral regions experience much greater inequality compared to the central areas. This second aspect facilitates penetration, allowing the central nation's elite to discreetly infiltrate through the peripheral elite in these countries.

Fragmentation

Fragmentation, an age-old concept dating back to the Roman Empire, is similar to *divide et impera*, which means to break up, divide, and dominate. It encompasses various terms and practices, generally referring to a method employed by one nation or group to dominate others. Governments can achieve dominance over other countries by dividing and splitting those they seek to control. According to Galtung, there are three key strategies for achieving this mastery.

The first approach involves convincing the target countries that they should not have direct horizontal interactions, especially in terms of economy and trade. This can be achieved by stimulating social conflicts or creating geographical barriers. According to this principle, relationships with the outside world should be vertical, primarily through a central authority. Countries should not be allowed to form organizations independently, and communication from the center to the periphery should be direct and controlled.

The second approach involves persuading the countries under control that multilateral interactions should include one dominant country and avoid multiple ruling countries. This implies that controlled groups should have a single central authority, while the ruling country

should treat the controlled country as an independent entity. Disputes between them should be resolved individually, without considering how others are treated by the central authority. The central authority can maintain control because the periphery remains divided, and the central authority only accepts individual agreements with the periphery, not collective ones. The third approach is about the relationship with the outside world. In essence, the central authority limits direct interactions between controlled countries and the outside world. Ideally, all contact between them should go through the central authority, ensuring that relationships with the outside world, whether with the ruled or controlling countries, are channeled through the central authority.

When the second type of connection is established, it can potentially pose a risk to the central authority. This risk arises from its associations with countries under control, which could serve as a foundation for the emergence of a global proletarian organization. Moreover, its ties to dominant countries may perpetuate a stable foundation for altering power dynamics. A third perspective emphasizes the significant impact of fragmentation when it is effectively implemented. These tree-like fragmentation serves the purpose of safeguarding against exploitation by ensuring that those in control cannot be organized or recruited, and it even obscures the clear location of dominance.

Marginalization

Galtung's perspective highlights that marginalization leads to a division between central and peripheral nations, where the former are considered first class and the latter are labeled second class. It is important to note that marginalization should not be confused with fragmentation. The proposed solution involves forming inclusive global assemblies where significant decisions affecting the entire world are made collectively by member associations. On the other hand, there is a group of smaller northwestern European countries that might espouse non-imperialist principles but have aligned themselves with structures that are inherently exploitative towards external, second-class nations.

Galtung referred to the four aspects of structural power as the four mechanisms of imperialism. These mechanisms, namely exploitation, penetration, fragmentation, and marginalization, collectively represent a concept where one nation exerts dominance over others through the influence of a small elite group serving as the foundation for political exploitation. Exploitation is the central and essential element of imperialism, while the other three elements serve to reinforce this dominance.

Structural Violence

Violence, within the realm of sociology, encompasses actions that are deliberately aimed at inflicting physical or psychological suffering or causing severe harm to another individual (Cheal, 2002). According to The Encyclopaedia of Psychology (1994), violence can be defined as the harm inflicted upon individuals, property destruction, violent intentions, and certain specific behaviors. When delving into the understanding of violence, Galtung integrates an actor-centered approach with a structure-centered one (Windhu, 1992). This implies that societal violence doesn't solely arise from individual errors but also from structural flaws. The responsibility for such occurrences lies not only with one person but also with the social framework that shapes that individual. It's essential to recognize that there must be a harmonious interplay between actors and structures since they mutually influence each other (Windhu, 1992).

Johan Galtung, a prominent figure in conflict and peace studies who established the International Research Institute of Oslo (PRIO) in the early 1960s, drew inspiration from Mahatma Gandhi's ideas on violence, as outlined in his book "*Gandhi's Politiske Etikk*" (1988).

Gandhi's work introduced three forms of nonviolent resistance: 1) The non-violence of strength, characterized by confident and resolute nonviolent resistance; 2) The non-violence of the weak, involving resistance due to a lack of weapons and resources; and 3) The nonviolence of the forward, which takes the form of surrender driven by weakness and fear. Gandhi believed that war encompassed not just fighting against something but also fighting for something. Galtung, influenced by Gandhi's perspective, developed the concept of structural violence, which became the foundation for theories on aggression, imperialism, international communication, diplomatic patterns, and even theories on achieving positive peace. In this structural viewpoint, the focus is on understanding the root causes of violence, which are often not attributed to inherently bad actors.

Galtung originally provided a broad definition of violence, stating that it occurs when human potential is hindered in such a way that their physical and mental well-being falls short of what it could be. This definition highlights violence as a consequence of the gap between what is possible and what actually happens. Violence occurs when this gap widens. For example, in the 18th century, dying from tuberculosis may not be considered violence due to limited treatment options. However, in a modern context where medical resources are abundant, such type of death can be viewed as a kind of violence. Similarly, death from an earthquake today is not violence, but if we reach a point where earthquakes can be predicted and prevented, victims of such events might be considered victims of violence. Essentially, violence arises when potential outcomes (such as preventable deaths or avoidable harm) exceed actual outcomes (such as recovery from disease or protection from threats), and necessary actions to bridge this gap are not taken.

Galtung argues that violence, in a broader context, should be prevented because it acts as an obstacle hindering an individual's ability to fully realize their potential. He suggests that this hindrance can be eliminated, leading to the prevention of violence when the barrier is removed (Holman & Harmon, 1986).

"In simple terms, violence can be physical, emotional, verbal, related to institutions, built into structures, or even connected to our beliefs and actions. It's anything that harms, controls, or ruins us and those around us." (Galtung, 1971).

Direct violence can manifest in various ways, including physical acts like murder, torture, rape, beatings, and verbal aggression like insults, as outlined by Johan Galtung in 1971.

"...things that divert our attention should be things that we don't really need for a good life. These distractions can make our real needs less satisfying than they could be. And remember, just the threat of violence itself is a form of violence" (Galtung, 1990).

Galtung talks about two kinds of violence. One is the obvious kind we see when people harm each other. The other is called "structural violence," which isn't caused by individuals but is built into systems. In these systems, things like unequal access, separation, pushing people to the edges, and breaking things apart, all contribute to harm, particularly through exploitation, work together to hinder the formation and movement of efforts to combat exploitation. Firstly, penetration instills a biased perspective in the weaker group, while segmentation provides only a limited understanding of the situation. Additionally, marginalization keeps these weaker groups isolated, and fragmentation prevents them from uniting. These four components operate within the power dynamics of a totalitarian state.

Galtung highlights the importance of considering a more comprehensive concept beyond just violence and peace, which is power. Power operates across various domains like culture, economy, military, and politics. In culture, it influences people's moral judgments, in the

economy, it involves exchange, in the military, it is about command, and in politics, it is about decision-making.

Research Methodology

Research Design

Qualitative Research

Qualitative research is chosen because it is well-suited for exploring complex and nuanced aspects of a text like "*Animal Farm*." It focuses on understanding the depth of information rather than quantitative measurement. In this case, it enables the researcher to delve deeply into the text's narrative, characters, and themes related to structural violence.

Textual Analysis

Textual analysis is a research method that involves a systematic examination of the content of a text, in this case, George Orwell's "*Animal Farm*." It aims to uncover meaning, patterns, and insights within the text.

The purpose of textual analysis here is to identify instances of structural violence within the narrative. Structural violence means there is hidden violence within political, social, and economic systems, rather than direct physical harm.

The process of textual analysis involves a careful reading of "*Animal Farm*" with a focus on passages, dialogues, or events that reveal or allude to structural violence. The researcher may analyze how power dynamics, inequalities, and injustices are portrayed in the story.

Through textual analysis, the researcher aims to uncover not only the instances of structural violence but also how it manifests within the narrative and the consequences it has on characters, society, and the overall storyline. This involves a careful examination of character interactions, plot developments, and thematic elements.

Overall, this research design utilizes qualitative methods, particularly textual analysis, to gain a deep understanding of how structural violence is depicted in the narrative. It involves a detailed examination of the text's content to identify, analyze, and interpret instances of structural violence, shedding light on its various aspects and implications within the narrative.

Data Collection

The main source of data for this study is a short book called "*Animal Farm*" written by the famous British author George Orwell. It's about 140 pages long and was first published in 1945 by the Penguin Group in New York.

The text has information in the form of words, sentences, and phrases, and the researcher is only interested in finding examples of structural violence in it. Given this textual nature of the data, the most appropriate data collection methods for this research are thorough reading, attentive examination, and in-depth comprehension. These methods provide a thorough way to understand the novella's features and elements related to the research topic. In addition to the main information from the book, the researcher also looked at other sources like textbooks, journals, encyclopedias, and online materials from the internet to support his study. The next section will center on identifying phenomena associated with structural violence, with the researcher emphasizing the essential data. This data will be used when analyzing the data to answer the research questions.

Data Analysis

This stage involves the collection and organization of research materials, allowing the researcher to build upon his existing knowledge and share his own findings. Following Bogdan and Biklen's (1998) framework, this step typically involves data processing, data organization, segmentation of data into manageable components, synthesis, pattern recognition, the discovery of significant insights and learning processes, ultimately leading to the decision to

communicate these findings to others. In this study, the way I analyze the data involves these steps:

- a) Categorize the novel 's data into four distinct sections, unveiling the elements of structural violence, which include penetration, segmentation, marginalization and fragmentation.
- b) Investigate the concept of structural violence through the lens of Galtung 's theory and identifying the similarities between the novel 's content and Galtung 's framework.

Formulate a conclusion and assess its sufficiency in addressing the research problem.

Discussion And Analysis

In this chapter, the discussion revolves around the findings derived from an analysis of primary data obtained from the novel "*Animal Farm*." These findings center on the classification of violence within the novel as structural violence, a concept based on Johan Galtung 's theory. The researcher delves into the novel 's elements to identify the nature of violence portrayed, primarily utilizing Galtung 's Structural Power theory. This process involves identifying four key elements: Exploitation, Penetration, Fragmentation, and Marginalization. The initial step results in the categorization of the novel 's depicted violence, while the subsequent step involves a detailed explanation of how structural violence is manifested, which is elaborated upon in the discussion segment.

Structural Power as the Underlying Cause of Structural Violence

The researcher combines structure-oriented and actor-oriented analysis as recommended by Galtung for studying violence. The analysis focuses on the social structure within a Manor Animal Farm led by a Pig named Napoleon, where Pigs hold the highest status, and other animals are subordinated. Napoleon utilizes indoctrination, propaganda, and fear to maintain control. The analysis explores structural power, following Galtung 's framework, which consists of four aspects: exploitation, penetration, fragmentation, and marginalization. Structural power, as Galtung (1969) explains, is not limited to powerful nations and is embedded within societal structures, leading to indirect and avoidable violence, known as structural violence. This violence is perpetuated through associations, organizations, and unequal opportunities, sustaining oppressive systems, and enforcing specific ideologies and priorities among leaders.

In the following section, the researcher examines the facets of structural power upon which the foundation of structural violence is built, as outlined in George Orwell 's *Animal Farm*.

These elements are detailed below.

Exploitation

Galtung 's concept of exploitation is rooted in the idea of imbalanced exchanges between individuals, groups, or nations, where some gain more benefits than others. In "*Animal Farm*," Napoleon exemplifies this exploitation as he subjects the second group of animals to various forms of oppression. The initial instance of exploitation occurs when Napoleon mandates work on Sunday nights, despite the animals already working sixty hours a week throughout spring and summer. While this extra work is technically voluntary, those who do not comply face a harsh consequence a reduction of their food rations by half, effectively coercing them into submission to Napoleon 's authority. This dynamic of unequal exchange can be illustrated below:

"During the spring and summer, they had to work very long hours, about sixty hours a week. Then in August, Napoleon said they also had to work on Sunday afternoons. It was supposed to be optional, but if an animal did not show up, their food would be cut in half." (p.73)

After the expulsion of Snowball, Napoleon assumed absolute control over Animal Farm, bolstered by loyal guard dogs and the persuasive pig, Squealer, who acted as both

spokesperson and propagandist. Under Napoleon 's rule, the hens were subjected to exploitation, compelled to increase their egg production for sale at the Willingdon market. This marked a shift in policy, as Napoleon sought collaboration with neighboring farms to secure essential resources, a theme recurring in subsequent events on the farm.

"Napoleon told the hens that they should be happy about this extra work because it was their way of helping to build the windmill." (p.76)

In this passage, Orwell describes the animals 'unease as they confront unfamiliar territory, having never interacted with humans, engaged in commerce, or used money before. Though they vaguely recall making resolutions, doubt lingers. Amidst a minor disturbance, Napoleon seizes control, claiming to have struck deals, relieving animals from direct contact with humans an unwelcome prospect. He shoulders the burden entirely. The subsequent task involves second-tier animals rebuilding the fallen windmill, marking a year of unprecedented toil.

"Reconstructing the windmill with thicker walls and meeting the deadline, alongside their usual farm chores, was extremely tough. At times, the animals felt like the worked even longer hours and did not have better food than they did when Mr. Jones was in charge." (p.99)

The description of the story suggests that over time, the animals 'labor becomes increasingly challenging, resembling the conditions prior to the revolt when Mr. Jones was in charge. In fact, it appears to have become even more burdensome. Previously balanced interactions are now revealing clear inequalities. While all animals, except the pigs, toil daily and receive only meager rations, the pigs only issue commands and create fear. This represents a form of structural violence on Animal Farm. These changes occur subtly, escaping the notice of many animals who still believe their hard work benefits themselves rather than humans. The pigs, as leaders, continue to nurture this perception, ensuring their profits steadily grow throughout the year.

The second windmill on Animal Farm, built with twice the strength, tragically collapsed due to sabotage by neighboring ranchers who planted explosives beneath it. The animals, who had dedicated two years of relentless effort to its construction, were left dismayed and furious. Their hard work had been in vain. As they examined the wreckage, Squealer, who had strangely been absent during the confrontation, suddenly appeared with an air of satisfaction. In the background, the ominous sound of a gun echoed from the farm building, encapsulating the tense and volatile atmosphere on the farm. Orwell 's statement in the dialogue can be summarized as follows:

"What is that gun firing for?" said Boxer. "To celebrate our victory!" cried Squealer.

"What victory?" said Boxer. His knees were bleeding, he had lost a shoe and split his hoof, and a dozen pellets had lodged themselves in his hind leg.

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

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

"What matter? We will build another windmill. We will build six windmills if we feel like it. You do not appreciate, comrade, the mighty thing that we have done. The enemy was in occupation of this very ground that we stand upon. And now – thanks to the leadership of Comrade Napoleon – we have won every inch of it back again!" (p.110)

The extended above dialogue highlights Napoleon 's extensive exploitation of the animals on Animal Farm, primarily through the manipulation of Squealer. Their directive to reconstruct the collapsed windmill reflects a significant act of structural violence in the form of exploitation. This underscores the increasingly authoritarian nature of Napoleon and Squealer 's leadership,

as they disregard the emotions and concerns of the subordinate animals. To sum it up, the discourse on exploitation can be succinctly summarized as exploitation emerges as the primary cause of inequality within *Animal Farm*.

Penetration

Galtung talks about "penetration," which means a powerful group influences a weaker one. When one country seeks shelter in another, it is like they are becoming part of the host nation. Galtung sees two types of penetration: subversion, where influence comes from lower classes, and super-version, where the ruling elite is involved. At first, both groups share interests, living conditions, and are willing to face good and bad times together. However, over time, disparities emerge, particularly in the standard of living, leading to changes in various aspects of this relationship. Notably, penetration from the ruling group appears smoother, but a fundamental structural dissimilarity exists between the two groups, resulting in greater inequality within the controlled group compared to the ruling one.

In "Animal Farm," the ruling group, led by the cunning pig Napoleon, engages in manipulative practices primarily executed through their eloquent spokesperson, Squealer. Squealer's talent lies in his ability to distort truth and turn black into white, regardless of the circumstances. His first major task is to announce the cancellation of the Sunday morning meetings, replacing them with a secretive committee of pigs chaired by Napoleon, which will make decisions concerning the farm's work. This decision is conveyed without debate to the other animals, who can still gather on Sundays for rituals like honoring the flag and singing Beasts of England but with no opportunity for discussion. Squealer is then tasked with touring the farm to disseminate and explain these new arrangements to the rest of the animals as illustrated below:

"Comrades," Napoleon said, "I hope you all understand that Napoleon has taken on this extra work for the good of the group. Leading isn't easy; it's a big and serious responsibility, not a pleasure." (p. 69)

Squealer's statements aim to justify Napoleon's decision to abolish the Sunday morning meetings by portraying it as a selfless sacrifice and emphasizing Napoleon's assumed heavy responsibilities. However, this move actually consolidates power in Napoleon's hands, contradicting the initial ideals of equality on Animal Farm. Napoleon's new policy includes cooperation with neighboring farms to prioritize the construction of the windmill, leading to the sale of hay, wheat, and even eggs if necessary. This shift reduces direct contact between animals and humans, with Napoleon assuming full control. Mr. Whymper, a lawyer from Willingdon, serves as a liaison with the outside world, solidifying Napoleon's power and deviating from the farm's original principles of equality. Look at the following passage:

"Later, Squealer went around the farm and reassured the animals. He told them that there was never any rule against trading and using money. It was all just made up, probably started by lies spread by Snowball. Some animals still had doubts, but Squealer cleverly asked if they had any proof or record of such a rule in writing. Since there wasn't any written proof, the animals believed they had been mistaken." (p.77)

In the above passage, Orwell describes Squealer's visit to the farm, where he skillfully persuades the animals that Napoleon's policies are not in opposition to their ideals. Squealer's tour of the ranch instills a sense of progress and encourages the animals to interact with the outside world, a long-held aspiration. However, it becomes evident that Napoleon's actions, which involve transactions with humans, violate the first of the Seven Commandments from the initial animal revolution, stating that anything on two legs is the enemy. This paradox puts Napoleon in close contact with the enemy, even engaging in transactional relationships, leaving

the non-pig animals feeling powerless and manipulated by Squealer 's persuasive tactics, which can be categorized as a form of penetration to ensure compliance with the ruling group 's decisions.

In the next event, the pigs unexpectedly took up residence in the farmhouse, despite a prior resolution opposing this move. Once more, the animals appeared to recall the passed resolution, but Squealer managed to persuade them otherwise, displaying his characteristic behavior as depicted in the following passage:

"Squealer told the animals that the pigs are now sleeping in the farmhouse beds. He argued that there was never a rule against beds themselves, only against sheets, which are a human invention. The pigs removed the sheets and sleep with blankets, which are comfortable. Squealer said the pigs need good rest because they have important work to do and asked if the animals wanted them to be too tired to carry out their duties and risk as none of you wants Mr. Jones' returning." (p.80)

Following Squealer 's skillful manipulation of the animals 'perceptions, they quickly accepted the pigs 'privileges without protest, such as sleeping in beds and waking up later. Squealer 's persuasive tactics effectively maintained the pigs 'higher standard of living, perpetuating an invisible but impactful inequality similar to structural violence. As Squealer continued his role as a propaganda tool for the ruling pigs, he faced the challenge of addressing allegations of Snowball 's nighttime infiltration, where he supposedly committed various destructive acts like stealing corn, spilling milk, damaging seedbeds, and harming fruit trees as illustrated below:

"The real reason is that Snowball was secretly working with one of Mr. Jones's spies all along. We found documents that prove this, and it all makes sense now. Remember how he tried, but thankfully failed, to get us defeated and destroyed in the Battle of the Cowshed." (p.89)

Squealer 's influence, as depicted above, induced profound fear among the animals, making them perceive Snowball as an ominous, invisible threat looming over them. Squealer effectively manipulated them into unquestioningly believing any information coming from the pigs. It 's likely that the pigs fabricated and disseminated stories about Snowball 's wrongdoing to shift blame onto him whenever trouble arose on the Animal Farm. Allegations of Snowball aligning with Frederick Ranch or conspiring with Mr. Jones lacked concrete proof, despite Squealer 's assertions of having evidence, which he never presented to the animals.

The animals fell into a stunned silence upon hearing the accusation that Snowball had destroyed the windmill, initially finding it incomprehensibly cruel. Memories of Snowball 's past bravery during the battle against Mr. Jones flooded their minds, making it challenging to reconcile with the idea that he was now aligned with their former oppressor. When skepticism arose among the animals about Squealer 's news, he swiftly responded, always providing an explanation and subtly manipulating their perceptions a typical tactic of a propaganda tool for those in power, turning falsehoods into truths to maintain their control. All these actions served the purpose of consolidating the pigs 'authority on the farm.

In subsequent events, Squealer continued to run errands for Napoleon. This began when Napoleon declared the sale of a woodpile to Frederick, the neighboring farm owner. Despite appearing friendly with Pilkington, the owner of Foxwood farm during that time, he ultimately sold their timber to different breeders as illustrated below:

"Animal Farm had cut off all ties with Foxwood and sent rude messages to Pilkington. They told the pigeons to avoid Pinchfield farm and changed their slogan from "death to Frederick" to "death to Pilkington." Meanwhile, Napoleon said the rumors of an attack on Animal Farm weren't true, and the stories about Frederick being cruel to his animals were exaggerated. These rumors probably started with Snowball and his supporters. Surprisingly, Snowball wasn't

hiding at Pinchfield Farm as they thought; he was actually living in comfort at Foxwood and had been getting money from Pilkington for years.” (p.105)

The Pigs found Napoleon’s cleverness in his dealings with both Pilkington and Frederick to be a source of satisfaction. Despite seemingly befriending Pilkington, he managed to pressure Frederick into raising the price by twelve pounds, demonstrating a lack of trust even towards Frederick. Squealer, consistently reliable, always turned potentially damaging information into an advantage for the ruler. He adeptly provided defenses and explanations for the ruler’s actions, even when they appeared to violate established rules. This exercise of structural power was evident when one nation concealed itself within another, a concept referred to as penetration.

Fragmentation

Fragmentation encompasses various facets and, in practice, offers numerous approaches. Broadly, it can be described as a strategy employed by a single national group to exert control over several other groups by creating divisions among them. As articulated by Windhu in 1992, the primary purpose of fragmentation is to safeguard exploitation by preventing those under control from organizing or uniting; it even obscures the precise location of the dominant authority.

In “*Animal Farm*,” the leading pigs use different tactics to create division among the other animals. The first case of division happens when Napoleon feels threatened by a small rebellion led by three young black roosters. The hens, encouraged by them, try to challenge Napoleon’s authority by laying their eggs in high places, so the eggs break when they fall to the ground.

“Napoleon acted quickly and harshly. He stopped giving food to the hens and said that any animal who shared even a bit of corn with a hen would be punished with death.” (p.87)

The above statement highlights Napoleon’s determined actions aimed at discouraging other animals from siding with the hens, despite the clear injustice they faced under his rule. This underscores the fact that the controlled group must contend with a single central authority. Napoleon’s canine enforcers ensured compliance, and the hens endured for five days before capitulating and returning to their nests, although at the cost of nine hens losing their lives, attributed to coccidiosis. Whymper remained uninformed of the situation, and egg deliveries continued smoothly, with a weekly wholesale pickup. Ultimately, the controlled groups found themselves increasingly powerless, gradually losing sight of the inequality they endured as this practice persisted.

The subsequent instance of fragmentation arose when Squealer conveyed that numerous agents supposedly linked to Snowball were mingling among the animals on Animal Farm. This revelation followed the chickens’ rebellion against Napoleon’s directives, as described in George Orwell’s narrative snippet below:

“I’m telling all the animals here to be very cautious because we suspect that some of Snowball’s spies might be hiding among us right now.” (p.87)

Four days later, following a brief night, Napoleon summoned all the animals to assemble in the courtyard. They gathered in ominous silence, taking their designated spots as if expecting impending trouble. Napoleon, with an imposing presence, scrutinized the assembly, then emitted a sharp signal. Napoleon’s dogs surged forward, seizing the four protesting pigs by their ears, leaving them bloodied. These four pigs had opposed Napoleon’s decision to abolish Sunday meetings. Uncoerced, they admitted to clandestine dealings with Snowball since his expulsion, conspiring to sabotage the windmill and planning to surrender Animal Farm to Mr. Frederick. They further claimed that Snowball had privately confessed to being a covert agent for Mr. Jones for an extended period.

Napoleon asked if any other animals had something to confess. Three hens, who had been leaders in the egg rebellion, came forward and said that Snowball had appeared to them in a dream, telling them to obey Napoleon. They were immediately killed. A goose admitted to eating six corn cobs from the previous year 's harvest. A sheep confessed to peeing in a drinking pool, blaming Snowball for the influence, while two other sheep admitted to killing an old goat who supported Napoleon. This pattern of confessions and killings continued, resulting in a pile of dead bodies at Napoleon 's feet, and the air smelled of blood, reminding them of the days when Mr. Jones was in charge.

The massacre orchestrated by Napoleon served as a fragmentation tactic, strategically planned in response to the perceived threat posed by the chicken rebellion. Napoleon executed it so discreetly that the other animals remained oblivious to its deliberate nature. However, a discerning researcher may find certain aspects peculiar, casting doubt on the confessions made by the animals who claimed to have conspired with Snowball. The absence of concrete evidence regarding Snowball 's presence on Animal Farm since his expulsion weakens the case against him. Furthermore, the simultaneous confessions of numerous slaughtered animals raise questions about their willingness to accept their fate after admitting to their alleged mistakes, 'appearing rather unusual.

A four-day gap existed between the chicken rebellion and the night of slaughter, providing ample time for Napoleon and his associates to meticulously plan their actions. It 's highly probable that this was the case. During those four days, all animals under the ruler 's authority were effectively coerced into obedience, preventing any chance of them organizing. They were coerced into making confessions that seemingly implicated them in a conspiracy with Snowball, thus creating a division between the controlled group and Snowball 's image. Regardless of whether Snowball was involved or not, the ruling group was determined to thwart the emergence of any grassroots proletarian organization, resorting to drastic measures like massacre if necessary.

Marginalization

Galtung 's theory distinguishes between marginalization and fragmentation, where the former creates a division between central (first class) and lower (second class) groups within society, as noted in his work from 1997. In the context of *Animal Farm*, marginalization happened twice. The first instance was initiated by Napoleon when he made an announcement, as described below:

"From now on, any farm-related questions will be handled by a group of pigs, led by Napoleon. They will have private meetings and then tell everyone else their decisions." (p.68).

The announcement marks Napoleon 's practice of marginalization, revealing his desire for absolute power within animal husbandry despite already holding considerable authority. He seeks the pinnacle of power to fulfill his personal wishes, even at the expense of the group. This became evident when four young pigs expressed dissent over one of his policies, resulting in their tragic demise on the day of the slaughter, as depicted in the narrative below:

"Four pigs were nervous and looked guilty. Napoleon asked them to admit what they had done wrong. These were the same four pigs who had complained when Napoleon stopped the Sunday Meetings." (p.92)

"When they had finished their confession, the dogs promptly tore their throats out." (p.93)

As indicated in the above statements, Napoleon 's act of marginalization serves the purpose of creating divisions within the pig community, intentionally allowing him to identify loyal supporters who reinforce his absolute authority.

Overall, in *Animal Farm*, the utilization of four key components of structural power gives rise to structural violence. These elements are distinctly referred to as Exploitation Practices, Penetration Practices, Fragmentation Practices, and Marginalization Practices.

Instances of Structural Violence Endured by the Citizens of Animal Farm

The study of structural violence involves examining it through individual experiences, with its objectivity emerging from the resulting effects. It is crucial to emphasize that structural violence should be comprehended primarily from an individual viewpoint, as noted by Windhu in 1992. To answer the second question in the problem statement, I used the idea of structural violence to study both what structural violence is and the social systems that support it.

Execution and Brainwashing

The Animal Farm 's governance is under the control of Napoleon, a pig, who commands nine formidable dogs and a pig named Squealer. These two forces serve as instruments of Napoleon 's power, consistently instilling fear and guilt within the society. Any dissident challenging Napoleon 's authority would invariably confront the menacing dogs, resulting in the demise of most dissidents. The dogs 'primary role was to carry out the execution of those who confessed to their wrongdoing, illustrating how Napoleon dealt with dissenters, as exemplified in the following passage:

"At that moment, Napoleon, the leader, gave a strange look to Snowball and made an unusual high-pitched sound. Right after, there was loud barking outside, and nine big dogs with tough collars rushed into the barn. They went straight for Snowball, who barely escaped their biting mouths by jumping away in the nick of time. It seemed like they almost caught him, with one of them almost grabbing his tail, but Snowball managed to free himself. Then, he ran as fast as he could and, with just a bit of space to spare, got through a hole in the hedge and disappeared." (p.68)

In the above statement, the researcher observes that Snowball 's expulsion from Animal Farm was never a lasting concern, as evidenced by the lack of him being branded a traitor. Following his departure, rumors circulated that Snowball had joined another farm, leaving the animals in the dark about the truth. An example highlighting the structural violence inflicted upon the animal population involves four protesting pigs who opposed Napoleon 's decision to abolish the Sunday Meeting. Without coercion, they admitted to clandestine connections with Snowball since his exile, alleging a conspiracy to sabotage the windmill. Following their confessions, the dogs swiftly executed them by slitting their throats, denying them the chance for a fair trial. Their confessions remained unproven, yet they met a tragic end.

Napoleon employed a strategy of eliminating any animals who opposed the regime 's principles, utilizing terror as a means to eradicate even those considered objective enemies who showed no disloyalty but were viewed as having unfavorable inclinations. This is exemplified by Boxer, the mighty horse of Animal Farm, who, when faced with complex situations, would simply assert, "*If Napoleon said something, it was considered true.*" After they stopped having Sunday meetings, he started saying "*Napoleon is always right,*" and he also had his own motto, which was "*I'll work harder.*" illustrating how unquestioning loyalty and conformity were instilled through the regime 's tactics.

The execution and indoctrination of dissidents represent clear acts of violence. These characteristics align with the classification of structural violence due to their vertical nature, exerted from those in power to the weaker, and involving forms of repression such as domination and exploitation. In *Animal Farm*, there is a kind of violence that happens on a big scale. It usually involves powerful groups like governments, security forces, and organizations. In this story, Napoleon, with his tough dogs and Squealer as a propaganda tool, is the one

causing this kind of violence. This type of violence leads to things like him getting more power, taking control of resources in different ways, and making everyone believe his ideas are perfect while saying anything different is wrong (Galtung, 1969). It is a kind of like brainwashing and punishing anyone who disagrees, which harms not only their bodies but also their minds.

The Erasing of Values and Memory of the Past

Napoleon and his pig group in Animal Farm control all the information and carefully change history to benefit themselves. The other animals can't keep their own records, so their memories get fuzzy and they start believing whatever Napoleon and Squealer tell them. By controlling what's happening now, Napoleon can make up stories about the past to make his actions seem perfect. To maintain control, Napoleon ensured the eradication of any evidence opposing his will and falsified records. This manipulation extended to instances like the pigs moving into the farmhouse, despite a previous resolution against it, stated in one of the Seven Commandments. Squealer 's persuasion once again convinced the animals otherwise, but a horse named Muriel recited the altered Commandment: "*no animal should sleep in a bed with sheets*," illustrating the distortion of their history and ideals.

A similar situation had occurred before when Napoleon introduced a new policy of cooperation with neighboring farms on Animal Farm. This decision stirred a faint unease among the animals as they recalled their earlier resolutions after overthrowing Jones never dealing with humans, avoiding commerce, and refraining from using money. These resolutions seemed to be part of their collective memory. However, Squealer reassured them that there had been no resolution against trade or money usage, not even a proposal to that effect. He pointed out that the Seven Commandments only stated whatever goes on two feet is the enemy. Nevertheless, Squealer reminded them that old Major, before his passing, had elaborated on this matter:

"Whatever goes upon two legs is an enemy. Whatever goes upon four legs, or has wings, is a friend. And when we fight against humans, we can't become like them. Even if we beat them, we can't start doing the bad things they do. Animals can't live in houses, sleep in beds, wear clothes, drink alcohol, smoke, use money, or trade. All those human habits are bad. Most importantly, animals can't boss each other around. We're all like brothers, whether strong or weak, smart or not. No animal can harm or kill another animal. All animals are supposed to be equal." (p.31)

After the first revolution, Napoleon started changing the values the animals used to believe in. When the fear from executing animals accused of conspiring with Snowball faded, some animals remembered that the sixth rule had originally said, "*No animal can kill another animal.*" But when Muriel read the Seven Commandments on the wall, they now said, "*No animal can kill another animal without a reason.*" This shows how Napoleon keeps changing history to match what he wants at the moment.

Galtung (1969) explains that violence can harm people in two ways: physically and mentally. In the story, the violence described, like changing the past values and memories, hurts the animals mentally. This makes them believe things that are not true. Physical violence, on the other hand, hurts their bodies and can even kill them, whereas psychological violence exerts mental pressure to diminish cognitive abilities. Both forms are equally perilous for individuals. Within Napoleon 's structural power dynamic, facilitated by Squealer and the Dogs, to uphold dominance, these acts of violence fall under the category of structural violence.

Conclusion

Research Findings

In the last chapter, I took a close look at how structural violence is shown in "Animal Farm." I focused on answering the main question: Where does the structural violence in *Animal Farm* come from? Here 's what I found to help explain this.

Exploitation is the first aspect of structural power leading to structural violence. In "Animal Farm," the exploitation is exemplified by the pigs 'oppressive control over the other animals. They take advantage of the animals 'labor, production, and loyalty for their own benefit, while the rest of the animals receive minimal rewards and suffer. The second part is about the act of penetration. This involves ensuring that the controlled group (in this case, the other animals) remains tightly under control. The pigs use manipulation, propaganda, and even force to maintain their dominance, ensuring that they maintain their grip on power and that information flows only in their favor. The third part is about fragmentation, with the goal of dividing and gaining control. The pigs deliberately create divisions among the animals, fostering mistrust and conflict. This fragmentation ensures that the animals cannot unite effectively against their oppressors, as they are too busy fighting amongst themselves. Lastly, there is the aspect of marginalization. In Animal Farm, certain animals are marginalized and excluded from decision-making processes. They are treated as lesser beings and denied the same rights and privileges as the ruling pigs. This marginalization further reinforces the hierarchical structure and justifies the exploitation of these marginalized groups. In essence, the analysis of structural violence in "Animal Farm" reveals how power is wielded and abused by the ruling class (the pigs) through these four aspects. These practices lead to the structural violence that ultimately oppresses the majority of the animals on the farm. The story serves as a powerful allegory for the real-world dynamics of oppression and exploitation within societies where those in power manipulate structures to their advantage at the expense of the marginalized and disenfranchised.

The second problem we're looking at is finding times when characters in *Animal Farm* go through structural violence. This includes things like kicking out Snowball, killing animals who were thought to be working with Snowball, and Boxer believing in Napoleon. Snowball 's expulsion from Animal Farm reflects structural violence as it is a way to eliminate dissent and opposition within the community. The violent killing of animals who were believed to be working with Snowball demonstrates how those who deviate from the established authority are violently suppressed. Boxer 's unwavering loyalty to Napoleon, despite his actions, is a form of brainwashing. His unquestioning obedience to Napoleon 's authority perpetuates the structural violence by preventing any challenge to the ruling class. Additionally, the alteration of the commandments, specifically the sixth commandment, illustrates the erasure of past values and memory. Initially, it stated that "*No animal may kill another animal*," reflecting a fundamental principle of equality. However, it is later changed to "*No animal may kill another animal without cause*," allowing for justifications and exceptions. This manipulation of the commandments serves as a tool for those in power to justify their violent actions, eroding the moral foundation of the farm.

Overall, these examples highlight how structural violence operates in *Animal Farm*. It involves the use of force, manipulation, and the suppression of dissent to maintain control and uphold the authority of those in power, ultimately leading to the exploitation and suffering of the animals on the farm.

Suggestion

The study focuses on George Orwell 's novel, where the researcher effectively conveys universal themes related to power and violence. In this novel, Orwell 's exploration primarily centers on identifying facets of structural power, its implementation, and instances of

structural violence within the context of animal husbandry. The researcher wants to propose that future researchers delving into this novel should consider examining and analyzing cultural violence within "Animal Farm." This suggestion is significant, as cultural violence, as defined by Galtung (1993), is seen as the fundamental source of all forms of violence.

References

Afaq, M., Shah, M., & Gul, N. (2023). The Role of Henchard's Character in Loss and Profit of His Business in the Novel the Mayor of Casterbridge. *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review*, 7(2), 318-327.

Ahmed, S., Jamal, K., & Gul, N. (2025). Stylistic Analysis of The Poem 'Dreams' by Langston Hughes. *Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review*, 3(2), 401-411.

Ahmed, S., Waqar, A., Habib, S., & Gul, N. (2024). The Reflection of Mystical Elements in the Poetry of William Butler Yeats. *International Journal of Social Science Archives (IJSSA)*, 7(3).

Akhtar, A., Hoorain, Y., & Gul, N. (2025). Exploration of War Trauma in Modernist Literature: A Study of Ernest Hemingway's Selected Works through the Lens of Ecological Discourse Analysis. *ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences*, 4(3), 3381-3387.

Althusser, L. (1971). *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. Lenin and philosophy, and other essays. (B. Brewster, Trans.). London: New Left Books. (Original Work Published 1970).

Arendt H. (1959). General And Theoretical: *The Human Condition*. Volume 61, Issue 4 <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1959.61.4.02a00190>

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative Research for Education: An introduction to theories and methods*. Creative Education, Vol.2 No.3

Cheal D. (2002). *Sociology of Family Life*. Macmillan Education UK, 2002. ISBN, 0333665783, 9780333665787.

Eagleton, T. (2008). *Literary theory: An Introduction*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.

Farmer, P. (1996). *On suffering and structural violence: A view from bellow*. Journal Daedalus. vol 125 No 1. p.261. Cambrigde MA: The MIT Press.

Galtung, J. (1969). *Violence, Peace and peace research*. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6 (3), p.167-191

Gidden M, Duneier R, & Applebaum (2007). *Introduction to Sociology* (6th, 07). Norton & Company, Paperback (2007). ASIN B008CM9YXC.

Gill, A., Ishtiaq, M., & Gul, N. (2024). Love and spirituality in The Forty Rules of Love by Elif Shafak: A textual analysis through the lens of Sufi philosophy. *International Journal of Politics & Social Sciences Review (IJPSSR)*, 3(III), 492-506.

Holman, C. H. & Harmon, W. (1986). *A Handbook to Literature* (4th ed.) New York: Macmillan.

Laurenson and Swingwood A (1972). *The Sociology of Literature*. Schocken Books, 1972. University of Michigan. ISBN, 0261632558, 9780261632554.

Lucaks G. (1962). *Reflections on the Cult of Stalin*. Nuovi Argomenti, Nos. Orwell, G. (1945). *Animal Farm*. England: Penguin Book.

Orwell, G. (1945). *Animal Farm* translated by Bakdi Soemanto. Yogyakarta. Bentang Pustaka.

Santosa H. & Wahyuningtyas (2011). *Sastra : teori dan implementasi*. Yuma Pustaka, Surakarta, 2011

Selden R. (2005) *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literature*. 5th Edition. Universitat de Valencia

Wellek, R. & Warren, a. (1964). *Theory of Literature*. New York: Mariner Books.

Windhu, I. M. (1992). *Kekuasaan dan Kekerasan Menurut Johan Galtung*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

Winter, D. D., & Leighton, D. C. (2001). *Structural Violence*. New York: PrenticeHall. Wiyatmi W. (2013) *Sosiologi Sastra*. Kanwa Publisher, 2013ISBN: 978-979-153-830-5