



## EXPLORING THE INTERCONNECTEDNESS OF INTERNAL COLONIZATION AND MIMICRY IN GEORGE ORWELL'S *ANIMAL FARM*: A POST-COLONIAL ANALYSIS

**Ruly Indra Darmawan\***

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

E-ISSN: 2621-9158

P-ISSN: 2356-0401

\*Correspondence:

[rulyindra@mail.unnes.ac.id](mailto:rulyindra@mail.unnes.ac.id)

Submitted: 8 September 2023

Approved: 1 October 2023

Published: 27 November 2023

Citation:

Darmawan, Ruly, I. (2023). Exploring the interconnectedness of internal colonization and mimicry in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*: A Post-Colonial Analysis. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 10(2), 194-208. Doi: 10.22219/celtic.v10i2.29004

### ABSTRACT

In *Animal Farm*, George Orwell introduces mimicry and internal colonisation. Mimicry, a basic notion in human imitation, is used to study Napoleon and his porcine companions. Homi K. Bhabha's ambivalence and "same but not quite" theory examines mimicry. The pigs' behaviour is explained by these post-colonial theories. This study also shows how internal colonisation underlies narrative mimicry. This study claims that the story's copying indicates colonization's lasting effects and is a strategy for internal colonisation. Old Major's clear speech inspires *Animal Farm* residents to imitate humans, making them feel inadequate. This study reveals how internal or external colonisation divides colonised people. In this approach, people may adopt the conquering entity's cultural norms and values as superior. Another group may be indigenous. Internal colonisation by another party or associated group could result through imitation rivalry. This level requires imitation to demonstrate power. *Animal Farm* exemplifies colonised people imitating colonisers. This detailed analysis of *Animal Farm* by George Orwell shows how imitation and internal colonisation are interconnected.

**Keywords:** *Animal Farm*; George Orwell; hybridity; internal colonization; Mimicry

### ABSTRAK

Di *Animal Farm*, George Orwell memperkenalkan mimikri dan kolonisasi internal. Mimikri, sebuah gagasan dasar dalam meniru manusia, digunakan untuk mempelajari Napoleon dan teman-teman babinnya. Ambivalensi Homi K. Bhabha dan teori "sama tetapi tidak sepenuhnya" mengkaji mimikri. Perilaku babi dijelaskan oleh teori-teori pascakolonial ini. Kajian ini juga menunjukkan bagaimana kolonisasi internal mendasari mimikri naratif. Studi ini mengklaim bahwa penyalinan cerita tersebut menunjukkan dampak jangka panjang penjajahan dan merupakan strategi penjajahan internal. Pidato jelas Mayor Tua menginspirasi penghuni Peternakan untuk meniru manusia, membuat mereka merasa tidak mampu. Kajian ini mengungkap bagaimana penjajahan internal dan eksternal memecah belah masyarakat yang terjajah. Dalam pendekatan ini, masyarakat mungkin menganggap norma-norma dan nilai-nilai budaya pihak penakluk sebagai sesuatu yang lebih unggul. Kelompok lain mungkin adalah penduduk asli. Kolonisasi internal oleh pihak lain atau kelompok terkait dapat terjadi melalui persaingan imitasi. Level ini membutuhkan peniruan untuk menunjukkan kekuatan. *Animal Farm* mencontohkan orang-orang terjajah yang meniru penjajah. Analisis mendetail tentang *Animal Farm*

oleh George Orwell ini menunjukkan bagaimana imitasi dan kolonisasi internal saling berhubungan

**Kata Kunci:** Animal Farm; George Orwell; hibriditas; kolonisasi internal; mimikri

## INTRODUCTION

Colonization has long fascinated researchers. The unequal relationship between the two nations, colonialism's consequences on both sides and colonization's results are essential. Yang, Zhang, and Wang (2016) indicate that colonial discourse can always show the unequal relationship between the colonized and the colonizer and the oppressed and the oppressing. Colonial speech continuously exposes the underlying inequity that characterizes the dynamics between the colonized and the colonizer and between the oppressed and the oppressor parties. This assertion highlights the underlying principles of colonialism, wherein the dominant colonizer exercises authority and dominance over the colonized, establishing a hierarchical and oppressive framework. Morrocks (1973) and Walts (1979) state that colonized societies were subjected to the control of dominating forces through the implementation of oppressive measures.

According to Lois Tyson (2020), colonialism left a cultural residue involving adopting the colonizer's government, education, and practices that disparage the conquered culture. The colonized also adopted the colonizer's appearance. The colonized frequently had a psychological "legacy" of bad self-image from the colonizer. The conquerors also alienated them from their culture, which had been suppressed or ignored for years. Therefore, most pre-colonial or original colonized culture is gone permanently. Craven (2012) states that the colonizers established a hierarchical system where they positioned themselves at the highest level, thus asserting their authority and making decisions on behalf of the conquered population.

Colonialism exploits the conquered nation's material and human capital. It also controls and disrupts the afflicted entity's politics and culture. Colonialism can be understood as more than a mere historical period, but rather as a worldwide paradigm characterised by the exercise of economic and military power, which resulted in the transformation of nations and communities on a global scale (Höglund & Burnett, 2019). Memni (1965) says, "The act of colonialism engendered cognitive, linguistic, and behavioural patterns that, as a result, infiltrated the societies and discourses of the colonizing nations." The invaders' victory over the colonized population's territory and culture may cause inferiority complexes. Colonized people's inferiority might cause subconscious behaviour and cultural adaptation. Memmi also states that colonials might obey societal norms willingly or unknowingly. The colonized unwittingly adopt the colonizer's values, creating an inferiority mentality (Sabol, 2017b). They think their culture is inferior

to the colonizers. They adopt its lifestyle when they think their culture is inferior to the colonizer's. Colonized people employ imitation to survive and resist tyranny. Pennycook (2002) argues that the maintenance of colonial practices and beliefs inside the colonizing nations frequently promoted the notion of the inferiority of the colonized peoples. The adoption and acceptance of these practices by colonial powers affected the dehumanization and subordination of the colonized population, exacerbating their sense of inferiority. Pennycook's approach underscores the significance of the colonizers' assimilation of colonial ideals, which directly influenced the colonized population's psychological and social encounters, exacerbating their feelings of inferiority within the colonized framework. Gabbert (2020) states that the ruling class's apathy towards the proletariat is a recurring theme in post-colonial literature, as the labor and sacrifices of regular individuals often go unrecognized and unappreciated. Kohn and Reddy (2023) also agree that colonial officials make arbitrary decisions without seeking input or providing explanations to the colonized population.

Colonization process is not only occurs between foreign groups that exert their power and domestic nation or group. Sometimes, one member of the group attempts to colonize their own race, member, or nation. Calvert (2021) states that internal colonization relates to the continuous process occurring in specific territories that are still under the control of their ruling elites, who exert power over subordinate social groups. The internal colonizers tend to adopt the foreign colonizer's language, culture, and even movement to exert their power. Language, when exploited as a formidable tool of colonialism, not only supported the construction of cultural superiority but also contributed to preserve colonial ideology and maintain control (Clemons & Grieser, 2023) Furthermore, one of the cause of internal colonization is explained by Norma Beatriz Chaloult and Yves Chaloult (1979). They state that internal colonization occurs as a result of the initial colonization by earlier foreign entities, and this pattern is consistently recognized. Williams (1978) also argues that the act of imitating or mimicry characterizes the concept of internal colonialism.

Bhabha in Huddart (2006) describes mimicry as similar but different imitation. Byrne's (2009) argues that mimicry might be used to promote one's uniqueness or deflect unfavorable stereotypes. It may also explore the concept that imitation might be a deliberate or unconscious reaction to the necessity of conforming or being embraced within a specific social circle. The writer studies political imitation academically. To illustrate Soviet politics, the writer used George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. In this case, Literary works also served as platforms for the colonial interpretation of indigenous culture, history, and textual analysis (Reynolds, 2020). Post-colonial thought, notably Bhabha's mimicry theory, would use Napoleon's imitation to symbolize Stalin's in *Animal Farm*. Empire and dictatorship are heavily critiqued in George Orwell's literature. *Animal Farm* and *Shooting an Elephant* show Orwell's opinions on Soviet and Burmese colonialism.

*Shooting an Elephant* (1936) narrates a Burmese police officer who must control a renegade elephant damaging a community. The protagonist disagrees with euthanizing a peaceful elephant before the town, signifying his law enforcement persecution. The elephant is injured but not killed. The hamlet's occupants remove most of the elephant's flesh, leaving it nearly skeleton.

De Lange (2007) indicates that in *Shooting an Elephant*, Orwell balances vulnerability with brilliance. The village's residents loathe the policeman despite his power. Orwell believed Burmese Asians felt inferior to Europeans. *Shooting an Elephant* was inspired by Orwell's condemnation of the British invasion of Burma. This book explores how imperialism may destroy both conquerors and colonized parties. *Animal Farm* stresses imitation and internal colonization without openly showing them. The writer picked *Animal Farm* over *Shooting an Elephant* for some reasons. Academics recognize Orwell's major works, although some critics argue that his intense animosity leads to biased and contradictory writing, rendering his perspective unfit for scientific investigation. Others enjoy Orwell's intriguing writing style. In "The Real George Orwell: Dis-simulation in Homage to Catalonia and Coming Up for Air," Anthony Shuttleworth (2007) claims that Orwell utilized writing to challenge poverty, social inequality, imperialism, and fascism in his current setting. Shuttleworth says that Orwell's writings reflect his period by addressing many subjects to give readers a view into reality. Patricia Rae (2013) interprets George Orwell and his writing differently. She said Orwell's portrayal of British labourers and colonial people in various writings was improper. The relationship is shaky due to Orwell's intense criticism of imperialism. The writer says Orwell's opposition to imperialism displays his regard for humanity. He strongly opposes slavery and mistreatment in his works. The writer's writings are timeless. *Animal Farm* is a Russian Revolution folktale.

Literature is a representation of human society (Rachmayanti & Andini, 2014) (Handika & Hartiningsih, 2017). Allegorically, *Animal Farm* can be seen as a representation of society, especially during the Soviet Rebellion and Stalin's time. Morse (2012) asserts that *Animal Farm* is a literary work that explores the extraordinary concept of metamorphosis and the irreversible transition from pig to human. The writer examines imitation concerning Napoleon in the story. Napoleon reflects the symbolic depiction of the decline of moral values and excessive indulgence that is occasionally linked to authoritarian rule (Schlumberger, 2017). Through imitation and metaphor in the narrative, the writer suggests that Napoleon's mimicry might reveal Stalin's more widespread mimicking. *Animal Farm's* prominence as a global classic was the main reason for studying it. There has not been any post-colonial interpretation of this book by academics or researchers. Many studies discuss *Animal Farm*, concentrating on its allegorical components, George Orwell's satirical utopia, or character depictions. *Animal Farm's* relevance to real-life events, notably the 1917 Soviet Union political atmosphere and Stalin's rule, is another crucial factor. Napoleon's imitation

illustrates how allegory or character representation in the novel aids research by delivering a more realistic image. Darmawan (2020) states that Napoleon's mimicking processes are the same but not quite. Napoleon's copying may have a deeper meaning than other literary works since *Animal Farm*, despite its surface appearance as a fable, is a metaphor for the Soviet Rebellion's political context.

This research explores imitation in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, specifically Napoleon's experiences. This research also argues that imitation can result in internal colonization and colonialism. Napoleon and his fellow animals' imitation can be understood as George Orwell's Post-Colonial studies contribution.

## **METHOD**

This research is qualitative. Data is collected entirely from textual sources, and analytical-qualitative methods extract and understand unique content (Creswell, 2009, 2016). Postcolonialism frames the material by emphasizing the dynamic relationship between the colonizer and the colonized and how these interactions shape internal colonization. This research seeks to understand how the colonized party is broken down into two sides, one colonizing another through a systematic sequence of analytical processes.

## **FINDINGS**

### ***Animal Farm* as an Illustration of Internal Colonization**

George Orwell's literary work, "*Animal Farm*," effectively portrays the notion of internal colonisation by employing an allegorical tale that depicts the farm animals' uprising against human subjugation. The animals' initial endeavour for emancipation and parity symbolises a process of decolonization, wherein they successfully overthrow their human oppressors. Nevertheless, as the narrative progresses, the appearance of a privileged ruling faction comprised of pigs who exhibit human-like conduct and subjugate their fellow animals reflects the dynamics of internal colonisation. The aforementioned depiction highlights the intricate and frequently covert characteristics of colonisation, wherein the subjugated individuals have the potential to transform into oppressors in their own right. Within the framework of post-colonial research, the portrayal found in *Animal Farm* elicits significant inquiries on the enduring consequences of colonisation, the possibility of internalising colonial ideology, and the obstacles encountered in attaining authentic emancipation. This statement encourages scholars to investigate the complex power dynamics and hierarchies that emerge in post-colonial cultures, and how these dynamics can impede the achievement of genuine autonomy and equality. Consequently, it serves as a compelling allegory for the wider discourse on post-colonialism.

*Animal Farm* colonization occurs in Manor Farm. It also happens in the Soviet Union's border as an analogy. Thus, the realm is colonization inside one country. Letemendia (1992) states that Lenin forced Tsarist despotism in the USSR

as Internal Colonization. The period Mr. Jones led as a representative of Tsar Nicholas II is also considered internal colonization. The Rebellion pigs declare equality for all animals, yet their behaviours show that internal colonialism on the farm continues.

Napoleon's entire power after defeating Snowball allows him to favour pigs above other animals. The *Animal Farm* political party bans Snowball because Napoleon gets the most votes from the animals. Napoleon, the new farm leader, applies his first voice restriction edict to all animals save pigs and dogs.

A committee of pigs chaired by him would resolve any Manor Farm issues in the future. These would meet privately and then share their decisions. The animals would still salute the flag, sing Beasts of England, and receive their weekly instructions on Sunday mornings, but no more disputes. (Orwell, 1979, p. 21)

The passage from George Orwell's *Animal Farm* needs to be analyzed through the lens of post-colonial theory. It highlights power dynamics, control, and manipulation comparable to colonial regimes. A committee of porcine members, with one pig serving as chairwoman, takes jurisdiction and oversight over Manor Farm concerns. This part shows how colonial powers built a hierarchical structure and placed themselves at the top, thereby exercising sovereignty and making choices for the colonized populace (Craven, 2012). The pigs are symbols of the colonists, who assert control and power over the other animals. That part is consistent with the historical trend of colonial troops imposing power over subjugated people. Animals' constant behaviour in saluting the flag, singing the hymn "Beasts of England," and participating in weekly instructions on Sunday mornings implies establishing a cultural control and manipulation system. Colonization often involves imposing colonists' cultural norms and values on the colonized population. It is resulting in the subjection of indigenous traditions and beliefs. In the given environment, the pigs use these rituals to preserve a sense of dominance and compliance among the animal community.

In this passage, Napoleon's actions and the way he communicates with the other animals highlight his rule's authoritarian and manipulative aspects, drawing parallels to the power dynamics and lack of transparency often observed in colonial contexts. The text, when viewed through a post-colonial lens, critiques oppressive systems of governance and the consequences of unchecked authority.

Napoleon's announcement that the windmill will be completed on the third Sunday after Snowball's exile shocked the animals. He told the animals that this added chore would be hard work and may require reducing their food without explaining why he had changed his mind. The plans were meticulously designed. A special pig committee had been working on them for three weeks. The windmill and other modifications were estimated to take two years to complete. (Orwell, 1979, p.22)

Napoleon does not explain how he wants a windmill built. Napoleon begins to analyze the benefits of using man culture and animal life knowledge and gradually discards animal culture as less desirable. Napoleon is abandoning animal culture, which he has always known, for man's culture, which he finds more profitable.

Bhabha (1994) claimed imitation alienates its language (or culture) liberty and creates another standard of knowledge. The phrase closes by asserting that imitation “establishes an additional set of standards for knowledge.” According to Bhabha’s theory, it may be inferred that imitation and its consequent sense of alienation give rise to developing a novel kind of knowledge or identity. The information above does not solely align with the perspective of the colonizer or the colonized but instead occupies the liminal area that lies between these two entities. Bhabha conceptualizes this phenomenon as the “third space” or the “hybridity” of post-colonial identity.

Napoleon's nepotism strategy, which involved granting government jobs to his relatives, is a notable illustration of power consolidation within a particular group. This practice resembles the post-colonial phenomena when the governing class frequently sustains its authority by displaying preferential treatment towards family members and close allies. According to Calvert (2021), internal colonization refers to an ongoing process within certain regions still subject to colonization by their ruling elites, who exercise authority over subordinate social strata. Following a year under Napoleon’s governance, the animals residing on *Animal Farm*, despite their early ambitions for emancipation, experience a sense of being unwittingly subjugated. The individuals happily participate in their task, abstaining from criticizing Napoleon and the pigs. This behaviour reflects the notion of internal colonization, wherein the subordinate class or race may not immediately perceive their subordination as a kind of repression, especially when group members perpetrate it. The cultivation of solidarity also intensifies this perspective during their initial uprising against humanity, instilling a collective belief in a familiar opponent, specifically humans. Consequently, the animals maintain a belief that the activities of the pigs are congruent with the tenets of Animalism and are ultimately advantageous for the collective welfare of all animals.

The animals observed his movements with terror and avoided him. However, on all fours, Napoleon gave commands to whimper, on two legs, raised their pride and somewhat reconciled them to the new arrangement. Their relationship with humans had changed. (Orwell, 1979, 26)

In this section, the animals’ apprehension towards Napoleon’s actions results from their avoidance of him. It can be interpreted as indicative of an internal colonization dynamic. Their language had become human as well. Language, when utilised as a potent tool of colonisation, not only assisted the establishment of cultural supremacy but also served to sustain colonial ideology and maintain control (Clemons & Grieser, 2023). As a representative of a novel governing faction within the animal society, Napoleon exercises dominion by instilling fear and employing intimidation tactics. This phenomenon reflects the historical pattern observed in colonial contexts, where dominant forces exerted control over colonized communities by employing oppressive tactics (Morrock, 1973), including violence and coercion. The anxiety among the animals highlights the

underlying power disparity that arises from internal colonization as they experience a novel sort of subjugation within their society.

In essence, the denouement of *Animal Farm*, wherein Napoleon prioritizes profit to the detriment of the animals' aspirations for advancement, aligns with the concept that post-colonial nations may prioritize economic prosperity over the well-being of their populace, thereby perpetuating a cycle of exploitation and unmet commitments. The colonizer pigs later become more resemble humans. They reflect the perpetuation of a status quo resembling the pre-revolutionary conditions, highlighting how power dynamics and oppression often persist even after a change in leadership or governance.

The others' lives were as they remembered them. They were hungry, slept on straw, drank from the pool, and worked in the fields. In winter, they were chilly, and in summer, flies. Sometimes, the older ones drew on their vague recollections to see if things were better or worse in the early Rebellion when Jones's banishment was still recent. (Orwell, 1979, p. 50)

The passage describes the animals' lives mirroring the conditions they faced under Mr. Jones' reign. It implies that a new type of oppression has formed despite the initial uprising and removal of the human tyrant. In a post-colonial setting, this might be read as a criticism of how, in many post-colonial states, the colonized people may have hoped for better conditions and emancipation after independence, only to find themselves subject to new forms of exploitation and oppression (Calvert, 2001). The cyclical pattern of the animals' existence, in which they go through hunger, discomfort, and effort, underscores the concept that oppressive regimes may remain and reoccur even after a revolutionary shift in leadership.

### ***Animal Farm* as a Convergence of Mimicry and Internal Colonization**

The animal characters in George Orwell's *Animal Farm* eloquently illustrate mimicry as a complex reaction to internal colonisation. At the outset, the animals exhibit a propensity to imitate human behaviours and establishments, exemplified by their act of designing a flag and engaging in the recitation of slogans. This behaviour is driven by their revolutionary zeal and their yearning for a society characterised by greater fairness and justice. The act of mimicking serves as a representation of their early fervour towards decolonization and the incorporation of aspects from the colonizer's culture as a strategy to establish their autonomy (Sabol, 2017a). Nevertheless, as the narrative unfolds, the dominant swine, particularly Napoleon, partake in the act of imitating the exact humans from whom they had revolted, by adopting their tyrannical strategies and embracing human vices. This shift underscores the notion that imitation can serve as a mode of resistance in its earliest stages, yet thereafter be appropriated by dominant entities to sustain the process of internal colonisation. Internal colonisation employed diverse forms and visual representations to depict both external groups and one's own characteristics (Sabol, 2017c). From a post-colonial standpoint, this



examination of mimicry highlights the intricacies of resistance and adjustment within post-colonial communities, prompting a critical examination of how the colonised may imitate certain elements of the colonizer's culture as a means of asserting their own agency. However, it is crucial for them to remain vigilant in order to avoid reproducing oppressive systems.

The change in Napoleon's bodily position, transitioning from a quadrupedal stance to an upright bipedal posture, is a metaphorical representation of a shift in power dynamics resembling the post-colonial era. The decision by Napoleon to adopt a posture resembling that of a human being can be interpreted as an attempt to imitate the same individuals who were originally the target of the animals' Rebellion. According to Byrne (2009), mimicry responds to stereotyping. Throughout the narrative, the pigs, notably Napoleon and his close associates, tend to imitate the conduct and customs of the humans they had previously held in contempt. The inhabitants transition to residing within the farmhouse, engaging in behaviours like humans and walking on two legs. This phenomenon provides empirical evidence that aligns with Huddart's (2006) interpretation of Bhabha's concept of mimicry, which posits that this act can be understood as a type of mockery. Napoleon progressively assimilates anthropomorphic tendencies, including adopting bipedal locomotion, donning attire, and participating in farmhouse dining table meals. The activities above can be interpreted as imitating human behaviour, which the animals previously perceived as repressive and morally compromised.

A revolt occurred for the first time since three young Black Minorca pullets exercised Jones' exile and led the chickens in their attempt to defy Napoleon. They climbed the rafters and laid their eggs, which shattered on the floor. Napoleon responded immediately and brutally. His command was to cease the chickens' rations (Orwell, 1979, 30).

Domination may be understood as a sort of authority that is generally stable and institutionalized. Resistance may be seen as a form of organized opposition to authority that is institutionalized in a particular manner (Ortner, 1995). The uprising orchestrated by the trio of juvenile Black Minorca pullets can be seen as a manifestation of resistance against the repressive governance of Napoleon, akin to the resistance frequently observed among colonized communities against their colonial overlords. The activities showed manifest resistance against the prevailing hierarchical structure and a deliberate endeavour to regain personal autonomy. The fast and violent response of Napoleon, in this particular instance, which involved the cessation of the hens' meals, bears resemblance to the techniques utilized by colonial rulers in order to quell the Rebellion. The statement above underscores the autocratic characteristics of his governance, wherein any manifestation of organized dissent is dealt with severe retribution. This phenomenon resembles the historical pattern observed among colonial rulers, who frequently employed violent and punishing tactics to suppress rebellions. This sample elucidates the intricate interplay between resistance and oppression in the framework of internal colonization on *Animal Farm*. Consequently, it provides

valuable perspectives on the overarching themes of power, control, and subversion frequently observed in tales about colonialism and its aftermath.

The three hens that led the egg uprising said that Snowball had appeared to them in a dream and incited them to resist Napoleon. They were also killed. ... They were all killed instantly. (Orwell, 1979, 33)

The three hens who spearheaded the egg rebellion might be seen as a disenfranchised faction within the animal community, comparable to a conquered populace. In their attempt to counteract the harsh governance of Napoleon, individuals conjure the persona of Snowball, who symbolizes a previous leader and gives an alternative to Napoleon's dominion. Nevertheless, the prompt and ruthless reaction of being "instantly killed" highlights the terrible internal subjugation in the animal society, whereby any manifestation of opposition is met with violent retribution (Ypi, 2013). The observation above highlights how the governing elite (Napoleon and his faithful followers) employ violence and oppression to uphold their authority, exhibiting resemblances to internal colonization features.

## DISCUSSION

This study argues that the process of pig colonization shown in *Animal Farm* may be understood as a form of internal colonization. Drawing upon the conceptual framework proposed by Williams (1978), the phenomenon of mimicking characterizes internal colonialism. The novel elucidates how pigs assimilate human cognition and philosophical principles after assuming the responsibility of civilizing their fellow non-human creatures. Williams claims that the internal colonial model was initially established to illustrate that colonialism was not just an external occurrence but also manifested within certain nations.

The termination of Mr. Jones in George Orwell's *Animal Farm* marks the conclusion of overt human colonialism, although, as a result, it reveals the persistence of animal hierarchy and control. According to Norma Beatriz Chalout and Yves Chalout (1979), internal colonization is consistently observed due to the initial colonization by previous foreign parties. Mr. Jones symbolizes the external colonizer that governed the Manor Farm, reflecting the historical backdrop of colonial forces asserting control in unfamiliar regions. The exile of Mr. Jones serves as the first milestone in the emancipation of the animals. Nonetheless, the later rise of Napoleon's tyrannical governance and the internal subjugation of the animals by their fellow creatures resembles the process elucidated by Chalout.

Napoleon's unilateral choice to publicize the windmill's completion date, which coincides with Snowball's banishment, reflects autocratic authority. This authority might be regarded as a post-colonial analogue to how colonial authorities made arbitrary choices without consulting or explaining themselves to the colonized populace (Kohn and Reddy, 2023). Napoleon's lack of openness and

reluctance to present an apparent reason mirrored the acts of colonial rulers, who frequently acted without consideration for the interests or well-being of the colonized.

Napoleon's acknowledgement that the windmill project would be complex and may need lower food rations without appropriate cause matches the colonial practice of imposing difficulties on the colonized populace without justification. This choice assists in maintaining control over the animals by making them unsure and reliant on the leadership. Establishing a "special pig committee" that has been working on windmill plans for three weeks indicates the existence of an elite group inside the animal hierarchy. This issue is analogous to the colonial elite working with colonial rulers to advance their interests and maintain control over the colonized populace in a post-colonial context. The secrecy surrounding this committee's functioning reflects the lack of openness and representation in colonial rule. The estimate that the windmill and other changes would take two years to complete demonstrates the project's long-term character.

Despite his eagerness to develop man's culture on the land, Napoleon first resists it because the subject rejects the colonizer's culture. They mimic first. Napoleon initially rejects man's civilization given to the farm by Snowball. He confronts Snowball because he appreciates Old Major and his opinion that all men's traditions and practices are wrong. However, Napoleon gradually embraces the cultures he first hates, believing that by mimicking them, he will achieve total control over the farm. Thus, mimicking can gain power. According to Bhabha (1994), imitation represents a distinction that is disavowal. Bhabha posits that the act of imitation functions as a mechanism for establishing a discernible separation or divergence between the individual who imitates and the entity being imitated.

The differentiation between imitation and originality is not a simple matter but encompasses a disavowal process. This process suggests that copying recognizes and rejects the impact of mimicking the source. Imitation can be understood as a multifaceted process wherein individuals or civilizations incorporate features from other sources while also attempting to establish a sense of differentiation from the original inspiration. Bhabha's analysis highlights the complex interplay of mimicry in post-colonial settings when colonized entities imitate colonial powers while simultaneously striving to maintain their distinct identity by rejecting complete integration.

Napoleon's shrewd deceit becomes evident as he directs the animals to decrease their provisions, ostensibly to generate additional funds for the windmill initiative. This action resembles the exploitation frequently observed within internal colonization dynamics. Simultaneously, the protagonist forms a committee dedicated to constructing a windmill, which pigs predominantly lead. This event mirrors the historical pattern observed in colonial contexts, when governing organizations and committees were established by colonial authorities, primarily consisting of individuals from their nation, to exert control and influence the

conquered inhabitants (Waltz, 1979). This approach exemplifies the concept of internal colonization when individuals from within the same group are utilized to exert authority.

Napoleon's dictatorship forefronts the subject of power and authority. The animals' invocation of Snowball may be understood as an attempt to contest the prevailing discourse and oppose the subjugation imposed by the ruling class, akin to post-colonial nations striving to recover their narratives and combat the dominance of their former conquerors. Nonetheless, the expeditious and forceful reaction exemplifies the complexities of contesting the prevailing power hierarchies as the dominant social group attempts to uphold its control by all means necessary (Ypi, 2013).

Napoleon and the pig family are modifying more Commandment of Animalism material. Later in chapter VIII, they change another aspect of this edict: the farm rule. The pigs are amending "No animal shall drink alcohol" to "No animal shall drink alcohol to excess". That regulation modification is due to Napoleon's alcoholism. Napoleon is studying wine growing. Clover saw Napoleon order his subordinates to seize distilling and brewing literature from Mr. Jones' collection before modifying the regulation. He also prepares farm grounds for barley planting. The modification of the law, changing it from "No animal shall consume alcohol" to "No animal shall consume alcohol excessively," indicates a notable transformation in the power dynamics observed within the animal society. This statement highlights the ability of individuals in positions of power, namely Napoleon in this context, to manipulate and misinterpret regulations that align with their own goals; also, it parallels the historical pattern observed among colonists, who frequently imposed and adjusted legal frameworks to uphold their dominance (Ypi, 2013). Furthermore, Napoleon's drunkenness, which serves as the impetus for this proposed modification, might be seen as a symbolic representation of the moral decay and debauchery sometimes associated with authoritarian governance (Schlumberger, 2017). This perspective is consistent with the post-colonial discourse, which critically analyzes how authoritarian regimes sustain their power by manipulating and reinterpreting regulations, even if these modifications have negative consequences for the welfare of the populace.

The progressive decline of the farm depicted in each chapter emphasizes the maintenance of power disparities, a prevalent consequence observed in post-colonial contexts. The failure of Squealer to effectively elucidate the unequal distribution of animal rations in Chapter IX manifests the absence of openness and responsibility within post-colonial governance systems. In such contexts, the privileged ruling class frequently reaps disproportionate advantages from available resources while most people grapple with scarcity and adversity. The allegorical representation of memory manipulation, exemplified by the animals' collective forgetting of Mr. Jones' transgressions, resembles the deliberate erasure of historical injustices within post-colonial narratives. In these narratives, the

newly established leadership attempts to portray itself as a superior alternative to the previous colonial oppressors despite potential disparities between this idealized image and the actuality of the situation. Calvert (2001) defines this process as internal colonization, in which their elites still colonize a part of a system, ruling over inferior classes.

The act of Napoleon colonizing the farm, mirroring the oppressive behaviours previously demonstrated by Mr. Jones, is a prime illustration of how internal colonization may exhibit comparable brutality to exterior colonization. The perplexity experienced by farm animals regarding their apprehension towards both humans and pigs underscores the intricate power relations observed in post-colonial settings, when the newly established authorities may adopt similar strategies as their previous oppressors.

The differences in the allocation of food resources and the excessive pampering of the pigs, particularly Napoleon, exhibit resemblances to the economic inequalities and corruption sometimes witnessed in post-colonial societies, as the ruling class accumulates money at the detriment of the underprivileged population (Schlumberger, 2017). The idea that the animals hold that their lives are enhanced and characterized by more dignity under Napoleon's governance exemplifies the utilization of propaganda to sustain the illusion of advancement and amelioration despite contradictory evidence.

The formation of a Republic *Animal Farm* by Napoleon and his unchallenged authority illustrates how post-colonial states may embrace democratic institutions in form while retaining authoritarian power in substance. The animals' heightened labour demands and poverty levels under this novel government framework resemble the patterns of exploitation and marginalization frequently observed in post-colonial nations when the aspirations for freedom and equality remain unrealized. The untimely demise of Boxer as a result of excessive labour serves as a poignant reminder of the indifference exhibited by the ruling class towards the proletariat, a repeating motif throughout post-colonial literary works whereby the toil and sacrifices of the ordinary people frequently remain unacknowledged and undervalued (Gabbert, 2020).

## **CONCLUSION**

George Orwell's portrayal of Napoleon in *Animal Farm* unequivocally depicts how the character uses imitation as a powerful instrument of internal colonization. Napoleon's purposeful copying of human behaviours and practices demonstrates his desire to imitate the same system that the animals fought against in the first place. Morse (2012) states that *Animal Farm* is a book about the fantastic convention of transformation and the irreversible process from pig to man. On the other hand, this phenomenon also provides empirical evidence that aligns with Huddart's (2006) interpretation of Bhabha's concept of imitation as a manifestation of mockery. He consolidates his authority and domination through

these mimicking actions and fosters a subtle type of cultural imperialism inside the farm. Napoleon effectively colonizes the brains and actions of his fellow animals by copying the colonizer, in this case, humans, strengthening his power over them.

Furthermore, Napoleon's mimicry goes beyond merely copying human routines to manipulating language and propaganda, reflecting the conquerors' imposition of their values and ideologies on colonial populations. In this way, Napoleon imposes a type of internal colonialism that subjugates the animals and highlights how unrestrained power can become an instrument of tyranny, even within the very populace that wanted independence. Finally, Napoleon in *Animal Farm* serves as a moving indictment of the pernicious nature of internal colonialism through imitation, bringing insight into the complexity of power relations and manipulation in post-colonial situations.

## REFERENCES

- Bhabha, H. K. (1994) *Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Byrne, E. (2009) *Homi K. Bhabha*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Calvert, P. (2021) "Internal Colonization, Development, and Environment." New York: Third World Quarterly.
- Chaloult, N. B, and Yves. (1979) "The Internal Colonialism Concept: Methodological Considerations." *Social and Economic Studies* 28.4
- Clemons, A. M., & Grieser, J. A. (2023). Black Womanhood. *Daedalus*, 152(Summer 23), 115–129.
- Craven, M. (2012) *Colonialism and Domination*. Oxford Scholarly Authorities on International Law. London
- Darmawan, R. I. (2020). "Revisiting Bhabha's Mimicry in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. *Pioneer: Journal of Language and Literature*", [S.l.], v. 12, n. 2, p. 141-156
- De Lange, Ad. (2007) *Autobiography: An Analysis of 'Shooting an Elephant' in Harold Bloom*. Bloom's Modern Critical Views: George Orwell. New York: Chelsea Huse Publishers.
- Gabbert, W. (2020). *Human Sacrifice, Ritualised Violence and the Colonial Encounter in the Americas*. In R. Antony, S. Carroll, & C. Pennock (Eds.), *The Cambridge World History of Violence (The Cambridge World History of Violence*, pp. 96-116). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781316340592.006
- Handika, M., & Hartiningsih, S. (2017). An Analysis of Feminism Idea that represented by Queen Elizabeth I in the Shekhar Kapur's Film Entitled "Elizabeth: The Golden Age." In *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics* (Vol. 1, Issue 2, pp. 75–82). <https://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/celtic/article/view/4669>
- Huddart, D. (2006). *Homi K. Bhabha*. London. Routledge.
- Höglund, J., & Burnett, L. A. (2019). Introduction: Nordic Colonialisms and Scandinavian Studies. *Scandinavian Studies*, 91(1–2), 10–27.

- Kohn, M., & Reddy, K. (2023). *Colonialism*. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2023 Edition). <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2023/entries/colonialism/>
- Morrock, R. (1973). "Heritage of Strife: The Effects of Colonialist "Divide and Rule" Strategy upon the Colonized Peoples". *Science & Society* Vol. 37, No. 2. New York: Guilford Press. pp. 129-151
- Morse, D. E. (2012). "A Blatancy of Untruth": George Orwell's Uses of the Fantastic in *Animal Farm*." *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies* 1. p. 89
- Ortner, S., (1995). "Resistance and the problem of ethnographic refusal". *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 37 (1), 173–193. doi:10.1017/S0010417500019587
- Pennycook, A. (2002). *English and the Discourse of Colonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Rae, P. (2009) "Orwell, World War I modernism and the Spanish Civil War", *Journal of War & Culture Studies*, 2:3, 245-258, DOI: 10.1386/jwcs.2.3.245/1
- Rachmayanti, E., & Andini, T. M. (2014). An analysis of Japanese rituals of a new geisha in Arthur Golden's novel *Memoirs of Geisha*. In *A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature, and Linguistics* (Vol. 1, pp. 83–90).
- Reynolds, A. R. (2020). Introduction: Colonization, Modernity, and the Editorialization of the Americas. *Textual Cultures*, 13(2), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.14434/textual.v13i2.31591>
- Sabol, S. (2017). Assimilation and Identity. In *"The Touch of Civilization."* <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1mtz7g6.10>
- Sabol, S. (2017). Internal Colonization. In *"The Touch of Civilization."* <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1mtz7g6.9>
- Sabol, S. (2017). Through the Colonial Looking-Glass. In *"The Touch of Civilization."* <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1mtz7g6.8>
- Schlumberger, O. (2017). *Authoritarian Regimes*. 1093/oxfordhb/9780199935307.013.18.
- Tyson, L. (2020). *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. New York: Routledge.
- Wagner, F. (2016). *Colonial Internationalism: How Cooperation Among Experts Reshaped Colonialism (1830s-1950s)*.
- Waltz, K. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*, Addison-Wesley, Reading.
- Williams, C.W. Mitchell and Stephen Wyn. (1978). "Internal Colonialism." *Area* 10.
- Yang, G., Qixue Zhang and Qi Wang. (2016) "The Essence, Characteristics, and Limitation of Postcolonialism: From Karl Marx's Point of View." *Frontiers of Philosophy in China* 1.
- Ypi, L. (2013). "What is Wrong with Colonialism," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 41, no. 2, 158-191.