

ATILIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE MASTER'S PROGRAMME

**A FOUCAULDIAN READING OF POWER POLITICS IN *ANIMAL FARM*
AND *LORD OF THE FLIES***

Master's Thesis

Mohammed Saleh

Ankara – 2021

ATILIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE MASTER'S PROGRAMME

**A FOUCAULDIAN READING OF POWER POLITICS IN
*ANIMAL FARM AND LORD OF THE FLIES***

Mohammed Saleh

Supervisor

Asst. Prof. Dr. Kuğu Tekin

Ankara – 2021

ACCEPTANCE AND APPROVAL

This is to certify that this thesis titled “A Foucauldian Reading of Power Politics in *Animal Farm* and *Lord of the Flies*” and prepared by Mohammed Saleh meets with the committee’s approval unanimously as Master’s Thesis in the field of English Culture and Literature following the successful defence of the thesis conducted on 20.01.2021.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Kuęu TEKİN (Supervisor)

Assist. Prof. Dr. Gökşen ARAS (Jury Member)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dürrin ALPAKIN MARTINEZ CARO (Jury Member)

Prof. Dr. Dilaver TENGİLİMOęLU (Director)

ETHICS DECLARATION

I hereby declare that;

- I prepared this thesis in accordance with Atilim University Graduate School of Social Sciences Thesis Writing Directive,
- I prepared this thesis within the framework of academic and ethics rules,
- I presented all information, documents, evaluations and findings in accordance with scientific ethical and moral principles,
- I cited all sources to which I made reference in my thesis,
- The work of art in this thesis is original,
- I hereby acknowledge all possible loss of rights in case of a contrary circumstance. (In case of any circumstance contradicting with my declaration)

07/01/2021

Mohammed Saleh

ÖZ

Saleh, Mohammed. Güç Politikalarının Foucault'ya Göre Bir İncelemesi: *Hayvan Çiftliği ve Sineklerin Tanrısı*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara, 2021.

Bu tez George Orwell'in *Animal Farm (Hayvan Çiftliği)* ve Willim Golding'in *Lord of the Flies (Sineklerin Tanrısı)* başlıklı romanlarındaki güç ve politika arasındaki bağıntıyı Michel Foucault'un görüşlerine gönderme yaparak inceler. Her iki romanda da güç, ilgili diğer karakterler karşısında politik fayda sağlama ve üstün olmanın tek yolu olarak gösterilir. Hem Napoleon hem de Jack diğer karakterlerden üstün olma hırslarını baskıcı güce dayandırır. Her iki karakter de kendi farklı toplulukları içinde var olan hiyerarşik düzene itirazı olan her canlıyı/bireyi ezmeye veya yok etmeye çalışır. Kurdukları totaliter düzenin katılımcıları Napoleon ve Jack'e göre birer kukladır. Napoleon ve Jack hakim oldukları düzeni korku duygusu ile yönetirler ve bu korku duygusunu oluşturan da ölüm tehdididir. Foucault ayrıca başka bir üstün güç biçimi olan normalleştirici güçten söz eder ki buna göre yaptırım sadece baskıcı güç aracılığı ile gerçekleştirilmez. Normalleştirici güç etki alanındaki bireyleri sayısız kurallar ve yasalarla yönetir ve bu kuralları bireylerin zihinlerine çocukluktan itibaren yerleştirir. Bireyler bu kurallar ve yasalara uymayı bir an bile sorgulamayıp, tereddüt etmeden kabul ederler. Böylece üstün bir güç yaratılmış olur. Farklı bir sisteme göre işletilen bu güç konumu bakımından altta olanları yasalara uymaya zorlar. Örneğin, polisler bu gücü doğrudan yasaların yaptırım gücüne dayanarak kullanırken, öğretmenler yasaların ve kuralların yaptırım gücünü dolaylı yollarla hedef kitlelerine aktarırlar. Normalleştirici güç bireylerin baş kaldırmayı düşünmeyeceği dengeli bir yönetim biçimi önerir. Bu tezde incelenen iki roman da gösteriyor ki sadece baskıcı gücün kullanıldığı yönetim sistemleri dengesizdir ve bu dengesizlik sonunda isyana yol açmaktadır. Her iki roman da gücü elinde tutanların acımasız davranışlarına maruz kalanların isyanını aktarır. Her iki roman yazarının görüşüne göre uygulanan ister baskıcı güç ister

normalleřtirici g¼¼ olsun, sistem y¼netimi altındakileri mutlak kontrol altında tutmayı hedefler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Politik g¼¼, Foucault, *Hayvan iftlięi*, *Sineklerin Tanrısı*, Diktat¼rl¼k



ABSTRACT

Saleh, Mohammed. A Foucauldian Reading of Power Politics in *Animal Farm* and *Lord of the Flies*. M.A. Thesis, Ankara, 2021.

This thesis explores the relations of power and politics as represented in George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* with reference to the philosophy of Michel Foucault. In both novels, power is an evident source of gaining political advantage over the others. Both Napoleon and Jack rely on "repressive power" to be superior. They either suppress or destroy all the entities in their distinct communities who resist against the hierarchical order. They create a totalitarian system that treats its subjects as puppets. Both Napoleon and Jack rule their communities through fear, and that fear is made up of death threats. On the other hand, Foucault describes another superior form of power, named "normalized power," which suggests that in order to be assertive, one does not have to use power. This form of power puts certain groups under countless rules and laws and implants them into the group members' minds as early as childhood. Individuals accept to obey these rules and laws willingly without judging or questioning them. Thus, a superior form of power is created. This power is governed by different systems that enforce these laws on those who are beneath it. The police, who directly enforce those laws, or teachers who indirectly enforce them by teaching these laws might be given as examples. Normalized power offers a more balanced system that ensures those who are subject to it will not revolt. The two novels that are selected to study in this thesis indicate that the systems that use repression alone are imbalanced and likely to end up in revolt. Both novels convey the reactions of those who are subject to the cruel treatment of power-holders. Indeed, both Orwell and Golding emphasize the fact that by using either normalized or repressive power, the system manages to keep the ruled ones under strict control.

Keywords: Political Power, Foucault, *Animal Farm*, *Lord of Flies*, Dictatorship



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to express my deep and sincere gratitude to many people; without their invaluable support I wouldn't have been able to be here.

Most importantly, to my Advisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Kuğu Tekin laid the ground and the base for this thesis, and without her support, I wouldn't have been able to finish it. Her continuous support in my journey helped me to better understand how to write this thesis.

Secondly, I would like to thank every single Professor in Atılım who guided me with their incredible knowledge at this university. Without a doubt, I can say that they taught me many new things and made me a different man from when I first entered this University.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez-Caro and Asst. Prof. Dr. Gökşen Aras for their invaluable guidance, comments and suggestions in the process of thesis writing.

I would also like to thank my family; without them, I wouldn't even afford to be here. Their support to me was unimaginable, help that I doubt that I can ever pay back in my whole life. I would like to say to them, thank you for loving me and trusting me on this journey.

And to my friends in good and evil, I offer you my sincere thanks.

Lastly, I would like to truly thank Turkey's nation for giving me a place I indeed called home. I would like to say thank you to these beautiful people in heart and soul. It was a long journey, but at least I was at a place that I called "home."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| ÖZ..... | i |
| ABSTRACT..... | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | v |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | vi |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |

CHAPTER ONE

THEROTICAL BACKGROUND

| | |
|---|----|
| 1.1. Dictatorship and Dictators | 7 |
| 1.2. Into the mind of a Dictator “Stalin” | 12 |

CHAPTER TWO

MICHEL FOUCAULT on POWER, SCIENCE and KNOWELDGE

| | |
|---|----|
| 2.1. Normalized Power vs Repressive Power | 21 |
|---|----|

CHAPTER THREE

GEORGE ORWELL’S *ANIMAL FARM*

| | |
|--|----|
| 3.1. Animal farm under John's hand..... | 29 |
| 3.2. Animal Farm after the Rebellion..... | 31 |
| 3.3. Power in <i>Animal Farm</i> | 34 |
| 3.4. Foucault and <i>Animal Farm</i> | 39 |

CHAPTER FOUR

WILIAM GOLDING’S *LORD OF FLIES*

| | |
|--|----|
| 4.1. The Theme of Children as the Main Antagonists and Protagonists in the Novel..... | 43 |
| 4.2. The conflict of power and ideology in <i>Lord of the Flies</i> | 47 |
| 4.3. Foucault’s Normalized and Repressive Power in <i>Lord of the Flies</i> | 51 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 53 |
| REFERENCES..... | 57 |
| CURRICULUM VITAE..... | 63 |

INTRODUCTION

This thesis aims to explore different types of power in the world of politics, and explain their relation to types of the regime they produce with reference to Orwell's *Animal Farm* and Golding's *Lord of Flies*. These two novels exemplify the execution of different types of power in creating different types of regimes, and the effect these regimes produce on those who are under their rule. By using Michel Foucault's theories on types of power, the thesis hopes to draw a close relation between how the ruler's ideology affects the society and how dangerous that power could be if it is left under one ruler.

This thesis intends to display how political power can corrupt those individuals who gain absolute and unchallenged power, and contrasts them with egalitarian systems that use moderate policies and promise equality to everyone under their regimes. Chapter One explains the term "dictatorship" and its relationship with the new systems of ideology that rose in the nineteenth century by comparing the totalitarian system with a democratic system. The chapter dwells on each system's differences and how each regime exercises its power to make those under it submit to its commands. It is observed that both Orwell and Golding use their authorial skills in the fictional worlds of their novels to criticise the tyrannical rules of dictators whose only aim is to establish an absolute rule based on repression. It might be claimed that the two novels, both of which are highly political, exemplify how writers use literature as a form of resistance and as a weapon to criticise oppressive rulers and their regimes. The thesis will then take a look into Joseph Stalin's life, explaining his unexpected rise from being nobody to a well-known figure who used the ideals of Marxism as an ideology to rule the others. Dividing his life into stages from his childhood into adulthood, explaining each phase's effect on his mentality as ruler, and how every stage in his youth and childhood generated his ideology and shaped him into the man, we know as Stalin. Exploring his journey and the ways he used to climb the leadership ladder step by step, marking the tactics he used to overthrow all those who were his rivals. It is important to note that this thesis' main aim is not to glorify or criticise none of the mentioned historical figures. Its only aim is to explain how power corrupts the fictional figures and to uncover the reasons behind their boundless desire to become supreme rulers.

Chapter Two focuses on Michel Foucault's studies on power. The chapter explores Foucault's ideas on repressive power and normalized power and draws a contrast between the two powers. This part of the thesis attempts to reveal how repressive power holds those who are subjected to it by means of fear and unconditional submission. In contrast, "normalized power" does the opposite. Foucault advocates the supremacy of normalized power and states that in order to be considered robust, you do not have to use your power to subjugate others. By subjecting others into various compelling systems of laws and rules, one can embed these rules inside others' minds, so that they will automatically obey these rules by their own will.

Furthermore, Foucault mentions how these systems punish those who break those rules by putting them in prisons or in correcting faculties where their beliefs, ideas and behaviors will be monitored and modified daily to create better citizens who obey the laws and are obliged to its systems. Only then they are allowed to interact with the outside world. Chapter Two also explains how science, knowledge and education are an essential part of this power and how they play a central role in implanting its system of beliefs into every member of the society, including the newborns. Lastly, the chapter discusses Foucault's standing and his views about the current penalty system and how it can be as cruel as the medieval ones.

In Chapter Three, the thesis discusses the discord of power with reference to Napoleon's rise from being an ordinary pig to the farm's ruler in *Animal Farm*. This chapter is divided into three sections. Each section reveals the state of the farm in a certain period, starting from the farm being under John's control. The first section comments on the poor, miserable state of the farm the animals live in, and how the farm is monopolized in an order that would export all that the animals produce for the humans while giving them very little food just enough to keep them alive. The first section proceeds with Old Major's speech that finally gives these animals hope for a better life, a life where they would be free and would eat what they produce without being controlled by humans or any other agency that would exploit them. Old Major's speech gives these animals' seven commandments that will be later turned into Animalism, a code of conduct that these animals would live at. After Old Major's death, these animals finally engage in a revolution that would free them from humans and make themselves their masters.

The second section again takes place in the farm, which is now free from all human control. Firstly, it defines "Animalism" and what it stands for, explaining that these seven commandments shape their newly created society and how it is essential to memorize them to comply with the new set of rules that the new Animal farm has. Then the thesis classifies these animals in order to better understand the function and rule of each animal in the new farm, starting from the pigs who are the most intelligent among all, and to explain how their intelligence make them the top ruling class, and how soon these pigs take charge of every activity in the farm. Then the section mentions the guard Dogs as enforcers of rules in the farm and how Napoleon trains them to be his perfect soldiers, which he uses to climb to the peak of the chain of power and finally manages to throw Snowball out of the farm. There is the rule of the sheep whose only role is to chant simple slogans whenever there is dissension among other animals. Boxer's rule on the farm is explained as the current workforce that helps build the farm while being exploited by Napoleon. Finally, the first section explains the underlying motives of a few individuals who choose to help Napoleon to reach his seat. The second section also explains the phrase "four legs good, two legs bad," which would change by the end of the novel to "four legs good, two legs better." The second section discusses other issues related to religious beliefs, which can be followed in Moses' promise of Sugar Candy Mountain, telling the animals that the good animals go to a better place when they die. Lastly, it discusses the conflicting ideologies of Snowball and Napoleon, explaining why Snowball is the biggest threat to Napoleon, a threat that he cannot defeat through a peaceful, reasonable and convincing argument. Therefore, Napoleon shows his real face. Moreover, he calls for the Dogs that he took to train earlier in the novel. They chase Snowball and force him to run away. This is the beginning of a new era in the farm where Napoleon will use his power to control the farm under his sole will.

The last section mainly focuses on the issue of power exerted in the farm, explaining the different tactics that Napoleon uses to command the other animals under his will. This section defines the Dogs' rule as Napoleon's army and how essential they are for maintaining and consolidating his regime in the farm. The transformed farm soon turns back to its former state and becomes even worse than what it was under John's regime. The pigs start to exploit every good thing in the farm, including all the nutritive

food and other essential needs. This part compares and contrasts the farm's condition under John and Napoleon respectively, and explains why it is even worse under Napoleon's regime—furthermore, puts emphasis on how corruption plays a significant role in Napoleon's changing ideals. Napoleon's tyrannical rule of the farm and his ambitious hunger for power and control lead him to a way where he exploited every other animal according to his selfish goals. Being another worth mentioning fictional figure, the thesis also analyses Squealer, without whom Napoleon would not have managed to establish his unquestionable authority. Squealer serves as the second-in-command to Napoleon; he is the farm's minister of propaganda in the novel the thesis explains Squealer's main tactics that he uses in order to subdue all the other animals. Without his tactics, the animals could have revolted and started a new revolution. Squealer's function is described as the effective propagandist that each regime has. Evidently, his discourse influences and directs people's judgment on the current affairs of the animal community. The thesis moves on with Napoleon's command over the farm as the absolute ruler; his abolishment of the seven commandments, and the rise of the pigs as the only rulers of the farm. The pigs' transformation from walking on four legs into two shows their resemblance to humans. Finally, the thesis focuses on Foucault's studies and his theories of normalizing power and repressive power, and its relation to forms of power employed in *Animal Farm*. It is observed that the novel is, in fact, an allegorical representation of many forms of oppressive power exerted in the first half of the twentieth century. In *Animal Farm*, the regimes of the two tyrannical rulers, the first one being John's, and the second being Napoleon's are conveyed. The thesis analyses the period's conditions when the farm is under John's regime; how it passes to Napoleon's absolute control, and makes comments on why Napoleon's use of power falls under repressive power category and Snowball's under normalizing one. Lastly, it is claimed that Napoleon could not gain absolute control had he only used repressive power. Squealer's use of normalizing power completes and consolidates the components of two distinct forms of power and helps Napoleon govern the affairs in the farm under strict control and discipline.

The last chapter investigates William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*, and the chapter starts by explaining why Golding chose kids as his main characters and why they are an

essential part of his novel, and the message the author delivers. Furthermore, the chapter attempts to shed light on the innocent's rule in the novel, and on Golding's apocalyptic world in war. The children's way of establishing a new society with few rules that keep them organized is reflected as well. The chapter portrays Ralph as the new chieftain and his democratic ways of keeping the boys together as much as possible. The psychology and mentality of the main characters in the novel are also explored in detail with particular emphasis on the contrast between Ralph and Jack whose ideals will affect the other kids who are easy to manipulate due to their being younger. Ralph is a sound leader who thinks about all the kids' well-being and tries to establish a society where everyone can voice their independent opinion. However, Jack is the manipulative one who thinks power is the only solution to every trouble and tries to get his way by dominating others with power alone. On the other hand, Piggy represents intelligence, and his practical wise ideas help the other boys settle as comfortable as possible; yet, his poor physique causes him to be bullied by others. As for Simon, he represents everything good in human nature, he is the first one who figures out the true nature of the beast on the island, but the other boys kill him brutally.

The next section focuses on the rule of power, defines the identity of the true leader on the island and shows how good nature alone is not enough to deem someone worthy of being a ruler. Here the emphasis is laid on the importance of the conch and Piggy's glasses as two defining tools of power that set the first rules on the island. The conch gathers all the boys in one place while giving the holder the ability to speak his mind without interruptions. Next, we will take a look at the conflict between Ralph's ideals of civilization and Jack's tribal views; while the first one believes in organization, the latter only believes in power. Nevertheless, it is Jack's ideas based on brutal power finally win but at a high cost that sets the whole island on fire. The thesis also investigates the rule of the beast on the island and its psychological effect that drives the boys to the very edge of savagery. The last discussion is based on

Foucault's repressive and normalized power in the novel and how each represents one leader, similar to *Animal Farm*. Repressive power wins without any normalizing one to control the damage it causes, destroying the nature around the boys, and the island ends up in flames until rescue arrives.



CHAPTER ONE

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1.1. Dictatorship and Dictators

Humans are brilliant beings who managed to rise in the chain of power above all the other animals and started to rule the world and used its resources for their benefit. They domesticated animals as livestock for their survival. Nevertheless, these intelligent beings have a very fragile body. They can die by a simple bullet that is much smaller than their size. However, despite their fragility, some of them manage to rise to power and rule a whole nation and subdue anyone who defies them. They become so emerged in this power that they start to see themselves as gods that can rule everyone with fear. In their seat of power, they become what we call a dictator. The purpose of this study is to shed light on the character of such individuals and to pinpoint the circumstances that lead these individuals to become power-holders either by succession, election, or a coup.

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica defined Dictatorship as:

Dictatorship, form of government in which one person or a small group possesses absolute power without effective constitutional limitations. The term dictatorship comes from the Latin title dictator, which in the Roman Republic designated a temporary magistrate who was granted extraordinary powers in order to deal with state crises. Modern dictators, however, resemble ancient tyrants rather than ancient dictators. Ancient philosophers' descriptions of the tyrannies of Greece and Sicily go far toward characterizing modern dictatorships. Dictators usually resort to force or fraud to gain despotic political power, which they maintain through the use of intimidation, terror, and the suppression of basic civil liberties. (Britannica, Dictatorship, 2020)

The term "totalitarian" is used to describe any regime that has been ruled by one party that uses all its force to enforce the laws on all the citizens under their rule. Mostly these parties are under the command of one leader that uses his absolute power to rule his country under his firm grip without allowing any other parties to interfere in his rule.

The description of dictatorship reads as follows:

A new form of government falling into the general classification of dictatorship, a system in which technologically advanced instrument of political power are wielded without restraint by centralized leadership of an elite movement for the purpose of affecting a total social revolution, including the conditioning of man on the basis of certain arbitrary ideological assumptions, proclaimed by the leadership in an atmosphere of coerced unanimity of the entire population. (Brzezinski, 1962, p. 47)

In Soviet Union totalitarian regime has been constructed from communism as the book titled *Ideas in Conflict: Liberty and Communism* describes:

The word "communism" is derived from the Latin word communist, meaning "belonging to all." The idea of common ownership of all property and the management of all human activities is a concept that has appeared in many ages. It has appealed to idealists speculating on the ideal commonwealth and to reformers seeking to end all human misery and injustice. It has also attracted ambitious revolutionist who saw in communism an opportunity to acquire power over men and women. (*Ideas in Conflict: Liberty and Communism*, (1962), p. 18)

The tendency toward totalitarian regimes emerged especially after the end of the First World War with the rise of new thinking where one man rules the country following the examples of dictators like Hitler in Germany, Stalin in the Soviet Union, and Mussolini in Italy. Although each of these dictators has his own specific system of ruling his country they shared one aspect which is the power to rule their countries by themselves, Stalin, for example, used many tactics to rule Russia as mentioned in the book titled *European Dictatorships*: "The collapse of the Russian Empire allowed the installation of a totalitarian socialism with a new model of single-party dictatorship and totalitarian control of (political) institutions. Mass murder, mass concentration camps and a personality cult of mass proportions around the dictators followed." (Besier, Gerhard, Stokłosa, Katarzyna, 2013, p. 9)

These cruel tactics were the weapon of fear of these dictators who abused their power beyond imagination and stopped looking at the ones they rule as people and more like puppets who are used to achieve their goals of higher command of the world. While they seized all the lands and property that were owned by the rich "socialism questioned some of the most basic tenets of liberalism: ownership, freedom of private property and the market." (Besier, Gerhard, Stokłosa, Katarzyna, 2013) Individualism has died and communism has risen. According to Oatman: "the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is declared to be a federated state, formed on the basis of the voluntary association of republics possessing equal rights. The word "voluntary" is given a particular emphasis by the further provision that to each republic is reserved the right freely to secede from the Union." (Besier, Gerhard, Stokłosa, Katarzyna, 2013, p. 12)

As for living under this regime, a citizen must follow the law and constitution that were set the by the upper state. These laws were like the Bible to the citizens and

violation of them meant severe punishment. Oatman states few of them which are among the duties of citizens; the first one is about internalising the constitution and the laws, maintaining labour discipline, honestly performing public duties, and respecting the rules of the socialist community. Other duties are the safeguarding and strengthening of public socialist property and "defence of the fatherland." There is a universal liability to military service. (OATMAN, 1937) Upholding these laws was a priority of every citizen in the Soviet Union.

Literature is a field where a writer can deliver his/her thoughts to large groups of people through his/her writings. Unlike other media, literature appears to be much more effective in conveying a message for it appeals to the readers' emotional, psychological as well as intellectual states. For example, a novel like *Animal Farm* would make them feel compassion toward the characters and their cause against Napoleon; unlike other media like the news or a documentary, they draw the reader's attention for two reasons: first, they are more fun to read. A reader would pick a novel to kill time and enjoy while news seem more like a mandatory thing that would consequently get the reader bored. Second, it is likely that a novel may leave an enduring impression and may cause the reader's emotional attachment to the fictional characters.

Many novels produced in the first half of the twentieth century employ a dystopian background that revolve around a satirical attack against tyrannical regimes. There was an indirect criticism against dictatorship, tyranny and war that emerged; writers used their genius to deliver novels and articles that moved the reader's emotions and stimulated awareness against this dryness. A more detailed analysis will be presented in the later section of the thesis about two of these books. Although many writers used literature to wage wars against these tyrannical regimes, literature has been used as a way to brainwash the citizens, attract them into nationalism and move their feelings in favour of the cases of these dictators by reminding public love of the country. Furthermore, bravery in battle while feeding on the accomplishment of few soldiers who achieved incredible feats by defending their lands, turning them into champions of the nation, and making other soldiers aspire to reach their glory. These arts have been crafted in a way that described their accomplishment in battle and introduced a mass propaganda that declared their intention as the one and the only righteous one, while others immortalized their leaders and turned them into Gods among men to appeal to

the masses that they were ruled by a divine power that did no wrong and all of their actions were the righteous one. By turning the public into a flock behind the shepherd with their eyes closed, by creating an illusion through movies that champion the Soviet soldier who fought for his country or the labourer who worked for his country in return for minimum wages, these media were used as a medium of mass control.

The media under these regimes were under the strict control of the nation; the newspapers, even the privately owned ones, were not allowed to publish any words that would undermine the political regime under any circumstances. Foisie describes them as a "unique stratagem of allowing privately-owned newspapers to exist, while submitting them to total political control "(Foisie, 1960, p. 56) by keeping a close eye on every media published under these regimes the media has become a weapon to brainwash the citizens. Foisie also mentions another group that "are aimed at the double purpose of teaching the illiterate while, of course, instilling regime propaganda. Toward the same end, there has been an attempt to enlist local "postmen" as activists responsible not only for delivering and displaying the papers but making sure that they are read." (Foisie, 1960, p. 56) These groups' aim was to handout these pamphlets and newspaper to all the citizens in order to educate them on how to become perfect slaves; none of those newspapers were able to freely express their ideals. In brief, only the ideals that were laid out by the central government could be published. Foisie further explains the state of these newspapers by saying: "It was seeking to make newspapers not freer but more effective as a party weapon. There followed a campaign, only partly successful, against monotony, against the press's gray paternalism. Where the press is free, a newspaper that is not read will not survive; in the Communist world, it can survive, but it will not "educate." (Foisie, 1960, p. 57)

Both writers and newspapers were under the tremendous pressure of the central government due to government meddling that abolished any individual idea. Daniloff mentions that: "This situation is the result of a long struggle, going back decades, between two powerful tendencies: the desire of individuals to express themselves freely, and the determination of leaders to use information selectively as a lever of power. (Nicholas Daniloff, 1993, p. 17) Media became another weapon at the hands of these dictators to spread their power and influence among the nation.

In order to understand the type of regime that a country has, we must first have an insight toward the type of dominant ideology each country has in order to classify them as Capitalist or Totalitarian regime. According to Ringen, “All human activity is guided by ideas that make sense of choices and actions. We create ideas to give ourselves meaning and reassurance, and once ideas take hold they work back on us to shape our thinking’s and doings. In collective activities, such as in governance, shared ideas, often referred to as ‘political culture’, condition collaborative action. (Ringen, 2016) These ideas constitute the collective ideology that every ruling party has to shape the country. It is these ideas that are shared by a few power-holder individuals that lead a whole nation and shape its ideology. Ringen also states that: “When we ask of what kind a state is, the first step towards an answer is to explore the ideas that inform its governance.” (Ringen, 2016) In order to understand democracy first we have to have to understand its meaning and its main ideology. Democracy, which derives from the Greek word demos, or people, is defined, basically, as government in which the supreme power is vested in the people. (Joseph, 2014, p. 8) The main characteristics of Democracy are listed as the following:

Democracy is government in which power and civic responsibility are exercised by all adult citizens, directly, or through their freely elected representatives.

- Democracy rests upon the principles of majority rule and individual rights. Democracies guard against all-powerful central governments and decentralize government to regional and local levels, understanding that all levels of government must be as accessible and responsive to the people as possible.
- Democracies understand that one of their prime functions is to protect such basic human rights as freedom of speech and religion; the right to equal protection under law; and the opportunity to organize and participate fully in the political, economic, and cultural life of society.
- Democracies conduct regular free and fair elections open to citizens of voting age.
- Citizens in a democracy have not only rights, but also the responsibility to participate in the political system that, in turn, protects their rights and freedoms.

- Democratic societies are committed to the values of tolerance, cooperation, and compromise. In the words of Mahatma Gandhi, “Intolerance is itself a form of violence and an obstacle to the growth of a true democratic spirit.” (Democracy in Brief, 2008, pp. 5-6)

Unlike totalitarian regime, democracy gives room to the individuals to express their words and ideas in an environment that allows them to grow under certain laws that protects their rights. Democracy, however, also gives room to capitalism allowing few individuals to be rich, while others are suffering under poverty. Capitalism makes the poor alienated to the rules of democracy. Although the poor are free to express their feelings and ideas they suffer under heavy taxes and low wages; consequently, their life centre around two things-work and sleep.

1.2. Into the mind of a Dictator “Stalin”

Joseph Vissarionovich Dzhugashvili, known in history as Joseph Stalin, the man who ruled over 200 million people and killed millions in his quest for absolute power. He killed countless of his friends and colleagues to reach the seat of power, but to understand his character and motives, we must look at the aspects of his life and what led him to become who he was. Blundell’s portrayal of Stalin reads as follows:

Joseph Stalin was a monster. He sacrificed his friends and allies in pursuit of power, murdered thousands with sadistic brutality to maintain it, and callously obliterated millions of his people over a quarter-century of his leadership. However, almost as frightening as the horrendous crimes he committed are idolatry that allowed this ogre to flourish. Just like a fellow monster of the twentieth century Adolf Hitler, Stalin saw himself as a master of destiny, a role that to him excused the vilest atrocities. Furthermore, bafflingly, just like his Nazi counterpart, he was allowed to dominate his nation and overrun others with the enthusiastic support of the majority of the citizens whom he had subjugated. Stalin was lauded as a national saviour until his death, which was marked by mourning crowds so vast that untold numbers perished in the crush. (Blundell, 2017, p. 6)

He was born in Georgia in Gori to his father Vissarion and his mother, Ekaterina. According to him, he lived an everyday life as the fourth child. His other siblings died as infants, which made his mother cherish him as her only child. There is no evidence of whether his father was beaten him or not, although he stated that they did not beat him in one of the interviews, although his father's drunk behaviours suggest otherwise.

Later on, he left Stalin and his mother and ran away with another woman leaving his mother to care for him. Stalin's life in school was a ruthless one as Grey describes it: Joseph spent five years at the Gori Theological school in which he learned to read, His mother no doubt impressed on him the need to work hard, but he was by nature fiercely competitive; he had to excel and to prove himself better than others. He was naturally intelligent and gifted with an exceptional memory. His marks were always high, and he was regarded as the “best student,” (Grey, 2017) Melyan Yaroslavsky stated that at this time, Stalin read Karl Marx and Charles Darwin and became an atheist. When a schoolfellow spoke of God, Joseph cut him short. “You know they deceive us. There is no God. . . . I’ll lend you a book to read; it will show you that the world and all living things are quite different from what you imagined, and all this talk about God is sheer nonsense.” (Grey, 2017)

If this statement is true, then we can already see that Stalin is turning into the Stalin we know. Becoming an atheist is a sign that his pride already makes him refuse even to worship God, which soon will make him even refuse to bow down to any other leader apart from himself. Obviously, his reading of Karl Marx shaped his ideology to a considerable extent. When Joseph moved to Tiflis Theological Seminary a new chapter in his life began away from his mother into a Seminary that was described as prison. Grey describes it as:

Like seminaries in other parts of the Empire, its purpose was not only to educate but also to train students for the religious life. In the second half of the nineteenth century, however, a fever of unrest was sweeping through Europe. In Russia, it erupted with special force in the seminaries. By the time of Joseph’s enrolment, the Tiflis seminary had become a center of opposition to Russian authorities. In 1885, Sylvestr Dzhibladze, a student and later revolutionary leader, was banished to Siberia for assaulting principal Pavel Chudetsky, who had spoken of Georgian as “a language for dogs,” and the following year, Chudetsky was murdered by another student. (Grey, 2017)

Under the heavy regime of Seminar, Stalin grew more and more into a rebel who hated the current system. He grew tired of Seminary rules and started reading many books by Charles Darwin, Henry Thomas Buckle, John Stuart Mill, and Nikolay Chernyshevsky, which shaped his character. During his years in the Seminary, he also wrote poems that were romantic and strongly nationalistic in spirit. Grey mentions:

T. G. Mazaryk had claimed to be a socialist at the age of six. He then asked Stalin what had made him a socialist and when. The reply was: “I cannot assert that I was already drawn to socialism at the age of six. Not even at the age of ten or twelve. I joined the revolutionary movement when fifteen years old, when I became connected with underground groups of Russian Marxists then living in

Transcaucasia. These groups exerted great influence on me and instilled in me a taste for underground Marxist literature. . . . It was a different matter at the Orthodox theological seminary which I was then attending. In protest against the outrageous regime and Jesuitical methods prevalent in the seminary, I was ready to become and actually did become a revolutionary, a believer in Marxism as a truly revolutionary teaching.” (Grey, 2017)

During this time, he was growing increasingly radicalized. He stopped writing verse and developed an ardent interest in politics which according to Khlevniuk. “He longed to get involved in something “real,” a desire that led him to the Social Democrats, an interest in Marxism, and attendance at illegal meetings of railway workers.” (Khlevniuk O. V., 2015, p. 19)

There were different rumours about Stalin’s departure from the seminary in his fourth year. Some say he was expelled while his mother says it was his health. Nevertheless, his four-year study under the seminary would have opened the doors for him to become a teacher at elementary schools, but Stalin had another path in his mind. Stalin’s ideals led him to become a revolutionary. During this period he started to refer to himself as “Koba.” Grey describes the meaning of the revolutionary name “Koba”:

Joseph was attracted by the romantic Georgian heroes. He read Shota Rustaveli’s classic, *Knight in the Panther’s Skin*, but was most impressed by Alexander Kazbegi’s stories of the mountain rebel, Koba (The Implacable). He began to use Koba as a nickname; later it was to be the name he used most frequently until about 1910 when he started calling himself Koba Stalin and then finally Joseph Stalin. (Grey, 2017)

And during this time he stopped calling himself Georgian “Early in his career, he began to think of himself as a Russian and to scorn Georgians, perhaps because they were pleasure-loving, ebullient, romantic people who so easily lost touch with reality.” Koba hated the ordinary dull life of Georgians and became a rebel that has nothing to lose Khlevniuk mention that “Nicolaevsky had spent time in Transcaucasia and had even met with Koba. He de-scribed the future dictator as “exceptionally vicious and vindictive” and capable of applying “the most extreme measures” in his struggle to dominate the party.” (Khlevniuk O. V., 2015, p. 21) it is clear now that the ordinary Georgian boy is long gone and a man who is ready to win this revolution no matter what the cost is. However, it is important to note that his behaviour to dominate others is a clear sign that Stalin’s eagerness to rise above all others knew no bound. Many accounts noted that Stalin liked Lenin. He was ready to shed blood and get offensive in order to win this revolution. It is also essential to take note that his drive in the revolution was not like other young and eager men who rushed into the field with nothing to lose. Koba

was cautious. Indeed, as Khlevniuk noted “When success came, [he] had the best chance of solidifying power. He had just the right balance of decisiveness and caution, obsession and cynicism, to emerge unscathed through the revolution’s countless dangers.” (Khlevniuk O. V., 2015, p. 22) This made Koba, unlike many others, survive the long battle to reach their goal. After avoiding being arrested, he was raised in the ranks of Tiflis Social Democrats, and to avoid further arrests, he escaped to Batum where many workers staged a strike. Koba helped to organize it. The strike ended with many people being killed and Koba being arrested in Batum before the revolution as Khlevniuk described it as follows:

Workers staged a spate of strikes and demonstrations. The government response was severe. On 9 March 1902, when workers stormed a prison where many of their comrades were being held, troops opened fire. At least thirteen people were killed and dozens were wounded. News of violence in Batum spread, and Jughashvili, one of the organizers of the demonstration, was arrested. (Khlevniuk O. V., 2015, p. 23)

During this Strike Koba was arrested on accusations that he was leading these Protests; however, Koba denied these accusations and he said he had nothing to do with what happened in Batum. He claimed he was not there during those strikes. The authorities could not find the evidence that he was involved but by looking at his background they held him in prison for a year and six months. During this time Koba pled to the officers that he should be released so that he could take care of his mother who was on her own but his pleads met no ears during his imprisonment. Koba experienced harsh life, humiliation and oppression that further triggered his hatred toward the current system. After a few months, he was sent to exile in Serbia from where Koba managed to escape and came back to Georgia. He married Ekaterina Svanidze who died at 1910. She died young because of a toilsome life of labour and contempt as she waited her husband Koba to come from his meetings. She wished for herself and for her husband a quiet life. Yet, Koba thought his ambitions were much more significant than his wife’s expectations for a peaceful life.

During his exile, Koba claimed that he received a personal message from Lenin encouraging him to stay healthy. The so-called Lenin letter created doubts: some believed that he pretended so to show that he was the true heir to Lenin; there were also others who thought that such a letter did really exist. Yet, it was not directed toward him personally, rather toward everyone exiled. The material after-effect of this incident was

that Koba started to champion Lenin and saw him above everyone else and called him “The Mountain Eagle” above everyone else.

In 1905 the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks came together under one camp against the Tsar’s regime, and set many riots and movements. These movements were met with heavy resistance, with both parties using violence and bloodshed against one another. Koba used this time to make many armed robberies and kidnapping in order to gain money to support their cause, and during this time, Koba’s task was to organize publications of pamphlets and articles. Khlevniūk describes his role as: “Koba took an active part in these events, traveling across Georgia, helping to organize before the revolution strikes and demonstrations, writing leaflets and articles, and helping set up an underground printing press and militant groups. He gradually reached the forefront of the Bolshevik leadership in Transcaucasia” (Khlevniūk O. V., 2015, p. 25). He wrote many articles that helped the revolution these articles had gain a mass interest and helped the revolution to state its goals. Koba more and more gained the interest of Lenin that helped him to further move in the ranks of revolution. Grey also mentions the significance of Koba’s political activism: “Koba was already becoming known as the stubborn champion of Bolshevism in the region where Bolsheviks were few in number. In fact, this reputation, supported by his writings, probably led to the next major step in his revolutionary career.” (Grey, 2017, p. 7) In 1905 Koba travelled to Finland to take part in Bolshevik conference where he first met Lenin. Koba wrote about this meeting as Grey stated:

I was hoping to see the mountain eagle of our Party, the great man, great not only politically but, if you please, physically, for in my imagination I pictured Lenin as a giant, stately and impressive. What then was my disappointment when I saw a most ordinary man, below average height, in nothing, literally in nothing, distinguishable from ordinary mortals. . . . It is accepted that “a great man” must usually arrive late at a meeting so that the people assembled may await his appearance with fast-beating hearts, and then before “the great man” appears the warning goes round, “Hush! Silence! . . . He’s coming!” This ceremony did not seem unnecessary to me, for it impresses and inspires respect. What then was my disappointment when I learnt that Lenin had arrived at the conference before the delegates and, settled somewhere in a corner, was quite simply carrying on a conversation, a most ordinary conversation, with the most ordinary delegates at the conference. I will not conceal that this seemed to me rather a breach of certain essential rules. . . . Only later I understood that this simplicity and modesty of Lenin, this striving to remain unnoticed or, at least, not to be conspicuous and not to stress his high position - that this characteristic was one of Lenin’s strongest features as the new leader of the new masses, of the simple, ordinary masses of fundamental humanity. (Grey, 2017, p. 7)

Although Stalin swore loyalty to Lenin, Stalin's nature did not allow him to kneel before anyone, not even the Mountain Eagle. During this period, Koba was elected to attend the congress along with other party members. During these congress meetings, Koba first met Trotsky and instantly disliked him. In late 1907, Koba met heavy criticism of the party members and was set on trial within the party on claims for expropriation in Baku. The verdict of the court was that he should be expelled from the party. Koba later commented on this incident, saying, "never in my life was I placed on trial before my party or expelled. This is a vicious libel. . . . This incident might have shaped Stalin's way of handling other party members without any mercy. He often killed his comrades later when he gained the ultimate power and had no regard for who they were.

During his arrest, he was exiled again for two years. However, he returned to Baku after a year to find the party situation in a dire state. He soon started to write to criticize party leaders, including Lenin. In his writings, he often commented on Lenin's words, which drew the attention of the party leaders, including Lenin who saw his enthusiasm and young blood as an essential link that the party needs. Lenin's positive views gave Koba a chance to become central in party committee. Meanwhile, Koba changed his name to Stalin, marking the end of a long journey and starting a new longer one as Stalin.

Stalin wrote many articles. The most famous one is the new Editorial named *Pravda*, or the truth taken from Trotsky's *Pravda*, which the latter contested and ceased his paper's publication. The *Pravda* gained 80000 followers. During this time, Stalin was involved in Duma elections. Grey stated:

In which Thirteen Social Democrat deputies were elected, six Bolsheviks and seven Mensheviks. As in the previous Duma, they began at once to cooperate with each other, forming a united faction and electing Chkheidze, the Georgian Menshevik, as their leader. In doing so, they were reflecting the strong demand among the workers for party unity; furthermore, as a very small minority group in a now reactionary Duma, they needed to stand together. (Grey, 2017, p. 8)

After the elections Lenin called for the party generals to hold a meeting wherein they would discuss the party's involvement with the other party. He told the party members to break. During their stay at Cracow, Stalin stayed behind on-demand of Lenin. There were no records indicating what their meeting was about. Later on, in 1913, Stalin went to Vienna where he wrote

Marxism and National Question and expressed the urge for the rebirth of nationalism under the new laws of Marxism. This gave Stalin a new status as a Marxist theoretician in party rings.

Upon returning to St. Petersburg, Stalin was arrested when he went to attend a fund raiser for the Pravda, but this time his escape would not be easy for he was sent to the hardest part of Siberia, where he would serve his exile and prison. Concerning this time Gray notes: "As a member of the Central Committee and editor of Pravda, he had much to do, but he was being sent far away into exile and impotence. He may have felt resentful toward Lenin, Trotsky, and others who lived in security abroad, but more probably he despised them for removing themselves from the dangers of the real revolutionary struggle" (Grey, 2017, p. 9).

Stalin grew soulful toward other party members. He isolated himself from other exiles, and his manners grew aggressive after four years of exile. In 1917, the revolution broke out, which ended the Tsar's regime and the provisional government's establishment. The Bolsheviks took this chance and started a revolution that would end this new government and bring the Bolsheviks into power with Lenin in command. Lenin's next movement was to end any resistance against his regime. He formed the USSR secret police that would execute over a hundred thousand people in the upcoming months ranging from people of the middle class to intellectuals or any supports of the Tsar's regime. Later on, he focuses his attention on the ongoing war against Germany. Knowing that his new government cannot carry out this war, he would sign a peace treaty that would end this war. During this time, a new resistance against Lenin's newly formed government emerged. The country was divided into two fronts. However, Trotsky managed to gather over a million soldiers that would support the new regime known as the red army. This war, known as the civil war, would continue until 1920, where finally, the red army would have the upper hand over the white army and its forgoer supporters. During this time, Stalin also participated in the war by providing food, and his tactics in this war would prove his cruelty and the harsh methods he used against the white army, which were criticized within the party itself. As the war proceeded, the country fell into famine and starvation, which prompted Lenin to take immediate measures. His measures came after many of those who lived in rural areas started to head into cities, which threatened the party's position because most of its

supports were from the city. Lenin then announced the farmlands and crops of the farmers to feed the red army. Lenin's call resulted in the death of millions of these farmers from starvation. Lenin announced Stalin as the new government's new secretary, which gave Stalin power within the country. This was one of the significant rules that made Stalin so influential within the new government and made him grow more powerful and gain new information about the party members. While on duty, he managed to draft a plan to establish himself within the party.

As General Secretary, Stalin gained a lot of allies and managed to centre himself in the party. He strengthened his position in the party along with Lenin's ill health in 1922 and later, with his death in 1924. Before his death, Lenin wrote a letter saying that Stalin is too cruel and should not be trusted, but this letter never saw the light of day as Stalin and his allies managed to take hold of it and destroy it. With Lenin's death, Stalin has finally had a chance to become the leader, but in order to do so, he had to finish his last rivals, mainly Trotsky, who gained much fame during his battle against the white army. Trotsky started to move the public in favour of his rule as the leader, and since many members of the party recognized him as the true successor, his rule as the leader was in sight. However, Stalin was too cunning because he secured the votes of a lot of significant party members who were then supporting him to guarantee their status. They soon started to support Stalin and his rule as the Successor of Lenin; consequently, they ostracised Trotsky, and after a short while, he lost his seat in the party, which gave a chance to one of history's greatest dictators to rise to power.

With Stalin's rise to power as the leader, he started enacting his first plans for the industrialization of the Soviet Union, which prompted the establishment of hundreds of factories and mines. His orders to realise his plans took the lives of thousands of pheasants. Next, he focused on the farmers and started to apply Lenin's act of giving the farmers control over their workers, known as Kulaks. The farmers who were given the license to control the pheasants, captured and killed the kulaks, caused the death of around three million Kulaks. By eliminating this class, Stalin opened state-controlled farms and farmers who worked under the state to get wages. State-controlled faculties soon started to spread, and every city in the union was filled with state control of schools, newspapers, and other facilities.

All churches were closed and burned down, and the state gained absolute control over every aspect of the people's lives under the Soviet Union. By eliminating individualism, Stalin managed to spread his control over every citizen under the regime.

The distribution of food was utterly unfair due to the regime's control over every farmland because the food was mainly sent to central regions. This meant the rural areas had a serious food shortage, which resulted in the death of millions of people.

In the following years, Stalin managed to keep his leading position as the absolute power. He started to assassinate anyone who would pose any threat toward him, including many of his fellow Bolsheviks. Anyone who would be a threat to him would be eliminated. He became fiercer towards his opponents and he initiated, what could be called "a mass slaughter," destroying innocent people mercilessly. With the rise of Hitler and the Nazi party, Stalin knew soon he would invade the Soviet Union. Before this, he ordered the execution of thousands of the red army officers, which weakened the red army. Knowing his regime could not stand against the Nazi invasion, Stalin supported the Nazis by providing them with food and ration to help France's invasion. After the fall of France, Hitler's eyes were soon directed towards Russia and Stalin.

CHAPTER TWO

MICHEL FOUCAULT on POWER, SCIENCE and KNOWLEDGE

2.1. Normalized Power vs Repressive Power

Foucault described repressive power as forcing people to submit to some individuals by using force, either physically or mentally. Using this kind of power, the abuser manages to dominate the other into doing his bidding or agree to a topic, disregarding what the abused wants. As Dahl summarizes it by asserting, “A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do.” (Dahl, 1957, p. 203). Traces of this kind of power is found in the nineteenth-century dictatorial regimes that mainly dominated its people into accepting any rule or regulation without voicing any complaint in fear of the outcome that it may produce. By using fear as a means of control, those regimes managed to deject the citizens and insert them into their regimes to produce citizens ruled by the absolute power of control. People who live under such repressive regimes cannot protest even if they are exposed to regime-committed violence, or else condemned to starvation.

Nevertheless, this kind of fear is not inserted automatically into the souls of those under control. Exemplary tortures and executions were used to frighten and subjugate opponents so that they would never dare to voice their complaints or protesting ideas. The best example of this is the Kulaks, whom Stalin punished for abusing their rights, he killed millions of people and made an example of them.

As for normalized power or what Foucault believed to be the actual power and a more robust form of using the power to control. Foucault believed that this form transforms repressive power and normalize it, meaning that it makes the tactics used by repressive power seeming awful. To Foucault, you do not have to show your power in order to be powerful. Normalized power can be seen daily by watching the citizens comply with the rules set by society. The system prohibits actions that are classified as crimes, for example, murder, theft or harassment fall into this classification. The system automatically classifies those who commit these crimes as criminals, and the authorities, whose job is to enforce the rules, punish them. It is a form of power that has been instilled into the minds of the citizens by means of many different institutions or systems, such as school, family, or television commercials or shows that present

characters living their lives in a normalized way and degrading those who go out of the norms by expressing their disappointment in that character and his behavior. Take children shows, for example, or songs that can be found on social media which instruct children in doing what is right; child songs simply function as systems, making it easier for the child to understand and comprehend the norms and rules. When the child starts to memorize those lyrics, the systems and rules of normalized power are instilled into the child's mind as early as childhood.

Different authorities apply these rules to their other citizens, either directly or indirectly. A direct authority could be the police, whose job requires them to monitor other citizens to ensure that they comply with the government's laws and rules to ensure others' safety. Those citizens strive to be upright citizens who comply with the laws and rules and manage to keep a clean record while avoiding any trouble in order to secure their position in the society and manage to live on the benefits that those societies offer while avoiding any behaviors that are prohibited by-laws; few behaviors are not punished by law but frowned, upon. It is not that these individuals are submitted by fear into avoiding these actions. However, they refuse to do them because they feel guilty in their conscious. It is their inner desire to comply with these rules without any outside factor compelling them to do so. Obviously, this is the most important distinguishing quality between normalized and submissive power. Individuals want to lead their lives away from anything that would prove hassle to them, or make them feel bad. One simple example could be that when we yell at our parents, we soon start to feel bad for what we did because we know parents want only the best for us. Another authority figure is the judge, whose task is to evaluate a case about a person who committed an act that is prohibited by law and judge based on why that person committed this crime. If found guilty, the person will be punished accordingly. If we monitor those in charge, we always see guilt about what they did, and they only have themselves to blame for what they did. Only in rare cases, we see those who charged feel proud about what they did. Such behaviors are deeply rooted in their character, which comply them to ignore the law. It is observed that the underlying reasons of criminal behavior go back to childhood and they are closely related to upbringing. John Landy's comment on the normalizing power suggests that:

First of all, Foucault rejects the standard picture according to which power is always about the strong oppressing the weak, the rich oppressing the poor, the monarchy oppressing its subjects. Instead he suggests that in the modern world, power is spread throughout society. You and I are just as much conduits of power as a CEO or a member of congress: we internalize the norms of our society, and we end up policing ourselves and other people, whether we realize it or not. We all act as unwitting enforcers of the power structure. (Landy, 2018)

Indirect authority is defined by those whose job is to engrave those systems into citizens' minds. A teacher is a person whose job is to teach those systems and pass their knowledge into different generations. "In order for power to gain access to the lives of men, it allied itself with the knowledge to administer life necessitated the knowledge of life's processes and capacities" (Leslie Paul Thiele 247). Scaled from kindergarten to the university, the knowledge transmitted into the learner's mind is different. It is simplified in the kindergarten. Simultaneously, it is more advanced in the university, where professors' job is to create people who are ready to graduate and take a job and become a part of the cog in this system while continuing to teach what they learned to the generations to come.

If we look closely at the teacher's job, we can classify his authority as an authority present in the class. He or she is a person who is expected to be respected by the students during practicing his/her job while maintaining authority as the central figure whom the students avoid to challenge. There are two kinds of power and authority in the class that the teacher tries to maintain. Both of them have their wrong and right sides. The first authority is a teacher who uses a friendly approach to teach the students, and who creates a positive learning atmosphere where student feel safe and loved. Such an attitude will definitely make students more eager to learn what the teacher has to teach; which makes his task easier to teach the students. Although this system is the most suitable to teach the students, sometimes complaints arise. Few students may start to challenge the teacher's authority because they feel unthreatened by his behavior.

This challenge can cause trouble in the class that can disturb the perfect learning environment. Under such a circumstance the teacher will have to use his authority either by threatening those students or by sending them to a more feared authority, which is the principal of that school. The principal has more authority to punish those students and force them to comply with the school's disciplinary codes.

The second authority uses fear and power to make the students comply with the teacher's authority. In some countries, the use physical force to punish the students is allowed. Although this figure of power makes the students submit entirely to the teacher's authority in the class, in many cases, it creates an environment where the students feel forced to learn what the teacher is teaching. Naturally, such a forceful teaching method causes students to resist against the process of learning. It is seen that the process of learning based on fear can never be healthy and fruitful. Authority itself is also a form of power as Dahl describes:

What is the intuitive idea we are trying to capture? Suppose I stand on a street corner and say to myself, "I command all automobile drivers on this street to drive on the right side of the road"; suppose further that all the drivers actually do as I "command" them to do; still, most people will regard me as mentally ill if I insist that I have enough power over automobile drivers to compel them to use the right side of the road. On the other hand, suppose a policeman is standing in the middle of an intersection at which most traffic ordinarily moves ahead; he orders all traffic to turn right or left; the traffic moves as he orders it to do. Then it accords with what I conceive to be the bedrock idea of power to say that the policeman acting in this particular role evidently has the power to make automobile drivers turn right or left rather than go ahead. (Dahl, 1957, p. 202)

The power to compel others to do what we want varies although the policeman himself has the authority and power to do people what he wants, yet he falls under the same jurisdiction that the normalized power does not exempt any people from its authority. As Paul Thiele states:

Power, formerly a weapon of the sovereign with which he could threaten the lives of his subjects, became a tool to extort and fashion life itself. The King's power of death gave way to the State's power over life. Both the nature of power and of the sovereign changed. Today power must be seen as coming from "below." Power forms an omnipresent web of relations, and the individuals who support this web are as much the producers and transmitters of power as they are its objects. (Thiele, 1986, p. 248)

Although those who have the authority and power to oblige others to do what they are told, they are not allowed to abuse this authority that is given to them. Each society has invited a system where a citizen can complain if he/she feels disturbed by a figure of authority to do what that authority wants. But what differentiates the normalized power from the repressive power?

One may attribute the King's long life in political analysis to his symbiotic relation with the law. This is the heritage of Western society, which has, since the Middle Ages, conceived of and exercised power in terms of law and sovereignty (whether that of a monarch or of "the people"). Accompanying the concepts of law and

sovereignty are those of prohibition and liberty. Their relation to power is straightforward. Law, as power's form of expression, is the articulation of prohibition. Power, as held by the sovereign, is a pure limit set upon man's fundamental liberty. Power prohibits by restricting the freedom of its objects. (Thiele, 1986, p. 247)

Foucault argued about the difference between the kings' power in the medieval era and the governments' power at present. The king had the absolute authority and power to give his commands; yet he only used it to force the lords of his nation to pay taxes and tribute; he used his power to force others to kneel and bow to his figure as the king, while maintaining his authority in check. While some kings exerted their power justly, some acted in the exact opposite way; they forced their power into others and forced them to do things they would not normally do. At the same time, they exercised their brutal power within the castle. They did not care about the living conditions of those under their rule. Subjects were only taken into consideration if they challenged the absolute power of the kings. Similarly, modern society and laws try to control people's behavior and their actions. The Repressive Power exercises its control by forcing their propaganda onto them. By monitoring citizens' thoughts and gaining control in the state matters, authorities ensure public submission and prevent any resistance from those individuals and thus, they maintain absolute control over the lives of those under their regime. Leslie Paul Thiele describes this form of power as:

A form of power comes into being that begins to exercise itself through social production and social service. It becomes a matter of obtaining productive service from individuals in their concrete lives. And in consequence, a real and effective "incorporation" of power was necessary, in the sense that power had to be able to gain access to the bodies of individuals, to their acts, attitudes and modes of everyday behaviour. (Thiele, 1986, p. 247)

While the Normalized power uses a more passive way and tries to normalize authorities' control over citizens by using television, books, and other means to ensure the laws and control those individuals' thoughts. Thiele describes the current system and contrasts it with the old one by stating:

Michel Foucault coined the term "biopower" to refer to what he viewed as the dominant system of social control in modern Western society. He argued that over the past few centuries, Europe has witnessed a decrease in coercive mechanisms of control such as military force, and an increase in social control through individual self-discipline. His conception of modern power was novel in that it contrasted with existing models that conceptualized power as "domination", that is, as a centralized and repressive force exerted by one group over another--a "possession" which could be acquired and imposed on others through physical coercion. Rather, he described power as dispersed throughout society, inherent in social relationships, embedded in a network of practices,

institutions, and technologies--operating on all of the "micro levels" of everyday life. (Thiele, 1986, p. 247)

Authority and power are present everywhere starting from the family, the parents have the power to force the children what they are asked to do, controlling and monitoring their behaviors to a certain age because children do not have the right set of knowledge to make the right choices in their life. In school, the teachers have higher authority over the students. Even between the students, some of them force others to do as they are told, by force or fear or blackmail. Although the current system frowns upon such behavior and calls it bullying, it is still present in our lives and it is sometimes used to such an extent that the person who is bullied may commit suicide. The principal has absolute authority in the school and can punish every student, even teachers. Also outside school, companies' operative, administrative branches are generally designed according to a hierarchical system and classifies both individuals and positions; each position has a higher authority than the one below it; the structural ladder of any company is classified into many branches. The system promises those who work harder a promotion, which prompts them to upgrade their life into a new higher category. This hierarchical chain allows higher positions to compel the one below to do what they are told. Those in the administrative positions simply disregard the fact that once they were occupying the same position. Although this system may sometimes be unfair when promoting an employee, it is generally stable. The highest position belongs to the company president, who controls everyone below his status. Nevertheless, the highest authority remains under the control of the state itself, who controls the system by enforcing certain rules and laws into citizens' daily lives. As Pylypa states:

According to Foucault, political order is maintained by producing "docile bodies"--passive, subjugated, and productive individuals. Through its many institutions--schools, hospitals, prisons, the family--the state brings all aspects of life under its controlling gaze. The institutional disciplining, surveillance, and punishment of the body create bodies that are habituated to external regulation, working "to discipline the body, optimize its capabilities, extort its forces, increase its usefulness and docility, integrate it into systems of efficient and economic controls. (Pylypa, 1998, p. 22)

Presently, it is easy to find normalizing power around us. For example, while browsing social media, you are subjected too much normalizing power; the social media site has many rules and laws that those who use it should follow. For example, you are prohibited from bullying or making a racial comment on anyone else who uses those sites; these sites give everyone the power to report any oppressive person who does not

follow the community standards. We sometimes see a video that is posted showing a person who is ever doing something frowned upon, or making racist comments on another person, while the law itself sometimes does not punish those individuals. However, if we look at the comment section, we see many people tagging those individuals as bullies or racists; when we read those comments we start to think in the same vein and start to imagine ourselves in similar situations and how we would never do such things; thus, we change our views on such improper behaviors.

Foucault links science with power stating that science is also a form of power that determines our lives. Science determines when a person's behavior is normal enough for him to stay within society while categorizing a few abnormal as insane and unfit to be among other people. It decides that those who are considered to be abnormal could cause danger to others and be monitored for their abnormal behavior and tries to reform them by putting them in asylum while trying to correct their behavior. They are kept in institutions until they are ready to be among the others in society. It is science which determines when people are fit for a job and at what age they are no longer fit; it also decides what subjects they should study to pursue their dream job. It even determines what type of history we should study. As Pylypa describes science by stating:

The scientific discourse of medicine, the criminal justice system, psychiatry, and the social sciences produce new forms of knowledge. This knowledge is not neutral or objective; it represents particular perspectives, conventions, and motivations. The type of knowledge produced influences our behavior and has a controlling effect on our bodies, such that knowledge is inseparable from power. (Pylypa, 1998, p. 23)

Lastly, Foucault compared the old justice system to the new one by commenting on the old times. In the past the authority used brutal powers to dominate those who broke the law, either by torture or by execution. The current one, Foucault says, appears to be much more merciful in its ways, in that the current system locks the convicted ones in prison or in correction institute, and monitor their behavior in a systematic fashion; the convicts are subject to all kind of misconduct and stripped from all their values and beliefs, humiliated to some extent and kept under constant surveillance. They feel being watched continuously and can no longer express themselves. They stay locked for an extended period until the state finds their behavior correct and decides to release them. Those released individuals have great difficulties in adapting themselves to their former lives. After being locked away for a long time, they no longer feel any

connection to the outside world and have a hard time functioning in the new society that they are thrown into.



CHAPTER THREE

GEORGE ORWELL'S *ANIMAL FARM*

3.1. Animal farm under John's hand

Animal Farm starts by introducing us to the current state of the farm under John's dictatorship. We soon learn that all the animals are not satisfied with the current events and are unhealthy. Their food rations are meager, and soon we learn that John was a heavy drinker; therefore, his rule over the farm has become inefficient and that he sometimes forgets to feed the animals. He starts to slack his duties in and around the farm. His neglect makes the animals unhappy but they are still satisfied with their miserable condition until the old Major gives his speech. Since the animals do not know any better life, they are adapted to the current circumstances because this is the only way of living they know. The animals do not know the meaning of freedom; therefore, they cannot complain about any of the unfairness occurring around them. O'Neill suggests that Orwell had a very "dark message to the world; however, it would not have been acceptable if he wrote it as an article. By simply converting it into a light-hearted fairy tale, he managed to convey his message in a manner that would reach every reader because people have already had turmoil after the world war and were ready to move on to newer happier life" (O'Neill, 1998). Welch commented on this by stating that Orwell:

By turning the novel into a fable, Orwell managed to escape the average novel's norms. It simplified human nature by converting the complex human behavior into an easier one of an animal, a carefree cat, for example, or a sheep that follows every command, with an exemption of few notable characters who go outside the normal animal behavior and adopt a more complex nature of a human as Edward M. Thomas has pointed. The simplification and humor are dependent upon one another. The animals in the story are funny because of the obviousness of their motives. How in which what they are up to is always quite apparent contrasts comically with the complicated way human beings decide on a similar course of action (Welch, 1994, p. 55)

While reading the novel, these animal characters immediately attract the reader's attention and the reader sympathizes with them. The reader becomes sensitive towards the merciless treatment the animals are exposed to, and the troubles they encounter. The reader starts to see the incidents from the perspective of the animal characters.

Old Major the oldest pig in the farm has a dream of a world where the farm animals are free from all shackles and restraints that are put on them by their human masters. He shares his dream with his fellow animals. One day he calls for a meeting in the barn; after all the animals gather, the meeting starts with all the animals seating in their place: pigs, sheep, horses, dogs, hens, docks all alike without any separation, gather under one roof and under one banner that unite them as animals with no one being above the other. Until this day these animals never knew the word freedom and never knew it existed all they knew was that they were farm animals enslaved by humans for their flesh, milk, eggs and they work hard for a small portion of food just to keep them alive. They know nothing about freedom until old major starts chanting words of freedom and the vital importance of being free from their human masters who enslaved them for many years. Old major's words touch every ear and install faith in them; his words start a fire in their hearts, a fire that tells them there is another way to live not as slaves but as free animals, as comrades with each animal doing his task in order to keep everyone alive and with sharing all the food as equals. Old major speaks of a world which might seem far now but it can be reached, but to accomplish this dream, they must unite and become one. They must fight with the humans together. Old Major's speech rings the bells of justice in their ears, the bells of liberation setting the animals free of all the shackles they have, He finishes his speech and conveys his wisdom before his life faded away, leaving only an idea behind, an idea that can never be destroyed. That idea lives in every animal after each one leaves for sleeping. However, this time they sleep with fire burning in their heart, knowing that there is better world that they can live in, a world where there are no humans to order or slaughter them. Thus the flames of rebellion are born. Ensaft mentions that:

Animals are described. It is evident that old Major is a respected animal and, as a prize-winning boar, he has physical prowess over other animals. The same could be said for Napoleon, who is described as 'fierce-looking' and whom Jones is breeding for sale, suggesting his superior physical attributes. Aside from this, it is evident that the pigs and dogs enjoy a higher status than the other animals as they sit directly in front of the platform upon which old Major is ensconced in Chapter 1. By Chapter 2, we are told explicitly that the pigs are 'generally recognized as being the cleverest of the animals,' so Orwell sets the stage for their assumption of power. ((Ensaft, 2011, p. 53)

3.2. Animal Farm after the Rebellion

Although Old Major has passed away, his words and dreams have passed on to the other animals. John starts to show weak leadership on the farm, forgetting to feed and watch the animals. The animals soon start to plot to overthrow the usurper from the farm. One day, as they cannot bear maltreatment anymore, they all rise and start to wreak havoc in the farm.

After the death of Old Major, the intelligent animals manage to gather all of the farm animals around Old major's doctrine as he conveyed in his speech and turn it into a new system called "Animalism." Animalism contains all the necessary ideals and ideologies that would be put into the soul of rebellion. Each word in this system is like a code of conduct that would direct animals following Animalism willingly. It is supposed to operate as a system that would advocate the rights all the animals in the farm. Concerning "Animalism" Mahoney states that: "It is a mistake to consider *Animal Farm* as just a satire on communism. Animalism is interchangeable with the range of isms: Fascism. Socialism. Conservatism. Thus, that is not so much the doctrine that is corrupt or faulty, as much as the individual in power" (Mahoney, 1994, p. 22)

The demand for equality is one of the main reasons for rebellion. Yet, soon afterwards a certain species of animals become the masters of the farm. Consequently, the animals start to be divided into classes. The pigs establish themselves as the high class and take over the leadership of the farm. There are Snowball and Napoleon on top of them. They start to dominate the others, Snowball with his creative ideas and intelligence, and Napoleon, although he is not on par with Snowball. However, Napoleon soon makes himself as the true leader due to his manipulative ideas, controlling others' demands and expectations. There are also other animals with certain privileges. Although their status is lower than that of the pigs in the chain of command. They at least secure themselves on the higher seat than the others. For example, Boxer, the cart-horse, frequently repeats the two mottos "Napoleon is always right" and "I must work Harder" as justification of the sacrifices he makes for the other animals. He labors himself to death while carrying the weight of other animals on his shoulder. He represents the working class in any regime that works hard in return for small wages and is easily disposed of when he is no longer needed or capable of carrying out his work. In contrast, the sheep and dogs represent the blind followers and soldiers who carry out their daily life unaware of what

is going on around them. The sheep are the meek followers of the leadership. They represent the masses that champion their corrupt leaders while being exploited by life's problems and the leaders' incompetence. They happily chant praising slogans for their leaders. The dogs could easily make everyone's life easy by getting rid of tyranny. They are the soldiers who are trained and nursed to follow the wills of their leaders. Ensaff's description of animal classes reads as follows:

From the start of the novel, we are aware of existing power structures among the animals. Orwell makes this clear in the way in which the animals are described. It is evident that old Major is a respected animal and, as a prize-winning boar, he has physical prowess over other animals. The same could be said for Napoleon, who is described as 'fierce-looking' and whom Jones is breeding for sale, suggesting his superior physical attributes. Aside from this, it is evident that the pigs and dogs enjoy a higher status than the other animals as they sit directly in front of the platform upon which old Major is ensconced in Chapter 1. By Chapter 2, we are told explicitly that the pigs are 'generally recognized as being the cleverest of the animals,' so Orwell sets the stage for their assumption of power. (Ensaff, 2011, p. 21)

Apart from these classes, few animals remain neutral and look the other way during the happenings. One of them is the cat, which minds her own business and never participates in what is ongoing in the farm. The other is Mollie, who only cares about ribbons and beautiful stuff ignoring her duties and then wandering off on her own to another farm. It is not safe to criticize these two characters, but their ideals play a role in what came to the farm after John's defeat. Ensaff's comment on Mollie is as follows:

As winter draws on, it becomes apparent that Mollie has become more and more difficult. She arrives late for work, accepts treats from men linked with nearby farms, and generally behaves in a way contrary to Animalism's principles. Eventually, she disappears, and the pigeon is later reported that she has been lured away by a fat, red-faced man who strokes her coat and feeds her sugar and that she now pulls his carriage. None of the other animals ever mentions Mollie again. (Ensaff, 2011, p. 22)

Same with Benjamin is the Donkey who holds a positive attitude from the start and keeps a passive stance during all the happenings around him. Kingsley Martin "draws a parallel between Benjamin's character and Orwell's own cynicism and disillusionment. Indeed, the Donkey is certain that the more things change, the more they stay the same, His low, foreboding voice chimes in stark contrast to unquestioning work of the horses" (Bloom, 2006, p. 24)

After the animal's take over, they soon establish a system and law that the animals must obey and follow so as to live in peace and harmony. These laws are the seven commandments. Whatever walks upon four legs or has wings is a friend. No

animal shall wear clothes. No animal shall sleep in a bed. No animal shall drink alcohol. No animal shall kill any other animal. All animals are equal. The first thing clear about these commandments is they are antihuman and are against everything humans do; the way they walk, how they sleep, and even drink. The commandments are the Bible, and it is written on the wall of a barn where all animals could see. However, not all of them could read or memorize it; those who are capable are the only smart ones. The rest never learn all of them. Although the seven commandments are clear enough, they are changed according to the needs of the ruling class. Although some notice these changes, they do not attempt to question the reasons for these changes. In a short time, they even forget that there occurred a change in the commandments.

Four legs good two legs bad this phrase is taken from the seven commandments. Since the sheep cannot memorize it, the others simplify the slogan for them so that they can chant these words wherever and whenever they go. The impact of this simple can be traced on other animals as well in that when there is an argument on an issue the animals start to chant the slogan to the extent that they forget the subject of the argument. The chanting of the slogan is often initiated when the animals feel the need to boast about Napoleon and Squealer.

Although these chants move the other animals, they appeal to the pigs most because they are able to restore order in the farm, and they also put an end to all possible oppositions of other animals. The sheep's voice overpowers the others because of their crowded number and their collaboration with each other make them an annoyance to the other animals. Thus, they succeed in proving other animals' dissenting voices futile. In fact the pigs' uncaring attitude towards the sheep reveals how pleasing they find the sheep's chant pleasing.

By the end of the novel this phrase will become "four legs good, two legs better" to make the pigs who start walking on two legs resembling men, seem normal, and superior to other animals.

Although equality is one of the primary rules in the farm, two animals are on the top of the chain of command; the first one is Snowball for being the clever one; and the second one is Napoleon who is united with Squealer to secure his influence on the other animals through rhetoric and charisma. Indeed, they are smart, but not as smart as Snowball, who has many farm plans. These two rulers are always in a conflict because

Napoleon wants to be the sole ruler, and Snowball is on his way to be the commander. Snowball opposes Napoleon with his ideas and defends his cause against him.

Snowball is a swift learner. He consumes knowledge from books of all kinds and comes up with creative ideas to make the farm a prosperous place. One of these ideas is the windmill, which would require much effort to build, but once it is built, it would make the work and life of all the animals much easier; yet, it takes much time to come up with plans and blueprints to build it. Nevertheless, he finally finishes the plans and shows them to all animals in the farm.

Napoleon and Snowball's rivalry continued, and once Snowball presents his blueprints for the windmill, Napoleon stands against it entirely and makes it clear that he does not want it to be built. He even tries to sabotage it by voting against it; he asks for votes from other animals. Once he sees that the winner is Snowball, it seems clear to him that Snowball is a threat to his seat as the sole ruler. As a result, Napoleon commands the dogs to attack and chase Snowball out of the farm, and they went on a wild hunt chase after him but he outruns them. Now snowball is no longer in the picture and Napoleon is the only ruler that is left; thus, Napoleon begins his long reign over the animal farm.

Sugar Candy Mountain is a fiction believed by many animals. The first mention of Sugar Candy Mountain is via Moses, the raven. He describes a place where all the good animals would go to after their death; they would eat and drink as they like, where mountains of sugar lies and Milk Rivers would pour. Like heaven, this myth is a double-edged sword that would give the animals hope while also making them tolerate and endure every cruel treatment they go through. It pacifies them and makes them keep on living under these cruel circumstances. Although Napoleon never agrees with this rumor he does not try to prove it wrong because it is beneficial to his cause. It keeps the animals in check.

3.3. Power in *Animal Farm*

The real reason behind Napoleon's rise to power is his control over the dogs that he initially trains. An army at his will and command is used in ingenious ways to throw Snowball and anyone who stands in his way. The dogs are similar to the army and other

supporters that Stalin had when he rises above Trotsky and manage to overthrow him. It is observed that Napoleon is as merciless as Stalin while executing his plans.

Another theme of the novel is greed and the corrupting influence of power. The pigs are the natural leaders and they quickly become a privileged class of the farm society. They immediately take advantage of this elitism, reserving the milk and apples, and later the barley, for themselves. Napoleon can use the other pigs and dogs' greed to further his ends in building up his power base. The subsequent changing of the Seven Commandments gives a more luxurious lifestyle to the pigs as well as reinforcing Napoleon's control, and the dogs' rations are never decreased ('readjusted,' to use Squealer's word). Coercion leads rebellion stray from its path and leadership becomes corrupt with power and greed for more control and a more luxurious life at the other animals' expense. The farm gradually turns back to how originally it was in farmer John's hand and even worse in condition than before. John chained and whipped the animals. Napoleon does not use John's methods; yet he uses psychological pressures to maintain discipline and obedience by installing fear through execution and displaying the dog's brutality. His cruel tactics are much more effective than those of John. Thus, Napoleon dominates every aspect of the farm without hearing any opposing voice.

The mood of the farm soon shifts from equality to oppression parallel to the shift in Napoleon's nature. Even his physical shape at the end of the novel starts to resemble that of a human. Mahoney states:

Note instances of corruption as they occur in the story and trace how corruption gradually affects every animal, both those who suffer because of it and those who gain from it. Look, for example, at how clothing creates identity and influences personality. The clothes of choice exemplify the vanity and superficiality of Mollie and Napoleon's favorite sow. Their wardrobe links Mr. Jones and Napoleon. Napoleon's vanity is illustrated in his black coat. Alcoholic drink is a symbol of corruption, and when the pigs drink it. It shows their moral squalor. (Mahoney, 1994, p. 32)

Orwell's irony at the end of the novel shows how things get even worse and how the old ruler of the farm is replaced by a new one and even worse than the old one. Other animals' individualism soon disappears and returns to its former state when John was in command. Mahoney mentions that "The world is divided into two sections exploiters and the exploited and the exploited has to rise to the exploiters in order to seize what they have taken in a constant drifting cycle of control over the power to rule" (Mahoney, 1994, p. 57). This cycle of command shows that every ruler may become a victim to the temptation of power. Radford states:

Although the old Major's dream ideas had been discussed frequently by the animals, the actual Rebellion was unplanned and unexpected. The violence level was relatively low – one stunned farm boy, a wounded Snowball, and one dead Sheep (not even named). This contrasts sharply with the extreme violence later in the novel, especially the false confessions and mass executions, which have their parallels in Russian history with the actual Russian Revolution (1917) and Stalin's show trials – the years of the 'Great Purge' in the 1930s (Radford, 2016, p. 52)

Taller adds that "ideology counts for nothing, at the end provided one has power, and if there is power, there will inevitably be inequalities, corruption, and betrayal of original ideas" (Tailler, 2016, p. 12)

Throughout the novel, we start to feel hatred toward Napoleons and his actions, yet Orwell gives no justification as to why Napoleon is that much cruel. His main role in the novel is to become the embodiment of a power-hungry dictator who sees everyone beneath him lower, and every cruel method is meant for him to reach his goal. Unjustified hunger for power drives Napoleon to become what he is, and every character in the farm is a means for him to reach the status he desires. He is easily tempted towards the pleasures of drinking alcohol or sleeping in humans' bed as if he envies humans and strives to become like them by any necessary means.

Perhaps one of the most compelling characters in the novel is Squealer, who walks in the shadow of Napoleon alongside him. He manages to subdue all the other animals and keep them under Napoleon's command. Whenever a situation would arise, that makes other animals uncomfortable. Squealer manages to pacify the animals by using his cunning and smoothly turns the situation in their favor. For example, in the animals' question during the distribution of food, he manages to tell them that the pigs need the apples to keep a clear mind and manage to rule the farm to prevent the humans from returning. Similar to the media used by any dictatorship that would twists words and news in favor of the current regime and calm the citizens and brainwash them to make them support every choice that the government makes. "Minimis's inclusion indicates the way that Communist Russia used art and literature to promote its values. The rewriting of history begins in this chapter, with Squealer stating that Napoleon is never against the windmill." (Ensaff, 2011, p. 54)

Squealer, without a doubt, plays a significant role in Napoleon's command over the farm. He has eyes and ears around every corner of the farm and manages to carry out Napoleon's order. Mahoney describes Squealer as:

Squealer is presented as a small fat pig. Nimble in mind and body, He thrives with the new society's growth and achieves high status in it. He enjoys his work, which is essential to Napoleon's success. At the very first mention of him, it is said that he could turn the black into white". Furthermore, this is his job as Napoleon's propaganda machine. Similar to the vast media machine that presented the government's version of events in the USSR as in all dictatorship. (Mahoney, 1994, p. 9)

Squealer's propaganda of controlling the other animals' thinking is devised by a few techniques that he exploits to reach the best results—starting from using literacy on the farm. Many animals on the farm do not know how to read Animalism's main rules, so he makes use of this weakness by changing the rules slowly to what best suits the pigs and Napoleon. Although few animals know how to read, he reads the rules to the other animals. However, he is only reading what is written, without memorizing it or taking notes about what they mean. So this creates an advantage for Napoleon to make use of this weakness in order to abuse the rules in his favor.

When Squealer explains something to the animals, he uses terms unknown to the other animals to confuse them and thus makes them agree with whatever said without realizing what these terms mean. Furthermore, he changes the meaning of the seven commandments to what suits him best. He forbids animals sleeping in bed by arguing that the pigs do not use sheets, so they should not violate that rule. While managing to change the outcome of events to what suits them best by declaring that Snowball is a traitor, Napoleon and his loyal comrades change the animals' perspective in this matter without receiving any protest. In so doing, Snowball is kept away from the farm animals. Lastly, the use of terror in certain cases helps to make the animals submit unconditionally; bearing witness to a few terrifying examples, no animal dares to make any objection fearing for its life.

Napoleon's control over the animal farm is gradual, starting from gaining the dogs' support and training them to become soldiers that would head his command without questioning. He gains the power that he would use to control the farm, but that is not the only thing. He needs to control the farm through Squealer's cunning plans of bending any situation that would arise to challenge his tyranny. As Siahaan states, "But at the end of the novel, there is the betrayal, especially at the changes of the seven commands representing ideological and legal pillars. With propaganda and Squealer rhetoric, Napoleon was able to gradually change Animalism's orders to suit what he did like drinking alcohol, sleeping in bed, and dealing with humans." (Siahaan, 2018, p. 48)

Other factors also help them in his way; the Sheep's blind loyalty to follow and chant whatever Napoleon would command to subjugate any opposing ideas or rebellion. McGregor comments on the sheep's' chants and compares them to Hitler's saying that "Hitler's Nazi party began as a small nationalist group that finally ruled all of Germany. One of its strongest weapons was the use of chanting at huge crowd rallies. A dictator does not get into power by relying on his followers and his secret police alone. The people must be trained to believe what he tells them" (McGregor, Lm, Buzan, T, 1999, p. 25). While majority of animals choose to stay silent like Benjamin and Muriel, who ignore what Napoleon is planning; they prefer to look the other way, instead of taking action to stop Napoleon's tyranny. Some argue that Benjamin is a coward, and some say he is clever enough to know that he cannot change anything. McGregor states, "The 'isms' that Orwell saw came to power in the 1930s - Fascism in Spain and Italy, Stalinism in Russia, Nazism in Germany - all made great use of processions wise. These movements didn't use strength against numbers because their propaganda convinced so many people, and the rest ignored the danger until it was too late to resist" (McGregor, Lm, Buzan, T, 1999, p. 26).

By the end of the novel, Napoleon became the supreme ruler of the farm. After getting rid of any complication in his path, he finally manages to seize the absolute control on the farm.

Of course this control is not a steady one, he disposes of any pig or any animal that might pose any danger. Even the commandments are changed from seven to only one and is made "all animals are equal, but some are more equal than the others". The last change in the farm occurs when the pigs start to walk on two legs, which represents absolute change in their physical and mental behavior turning from animals to beings mimicking humans. This change represents a major step in the evolution of the pigs' sovereignty. They begin to see themselves as superior beings who no longer share the same goals with the other animals. Soon they ignore all the rules of Animalism, and start abusing the other animals even more, until there remains no difference between John's management of the farm in the past and its present condition. The sheep start chanting "four legs good two legs better" to salute the new ruling class, that of the pigs. The pigs behave like humans, drink like them; in brief, the pigs resemble human beings. Gulbin makes a comparison between *Lord of the Flies* and *Animal Farm*:

Lord of the Flies shows the transformation of man to pig. *Animal Farm* shows the opposite process—pig to man. Yet, both authors seem to feel these terms synonymous. Golding says that every man is part savage and that that savagery is disguised or concealed only by the "wall" of civilization built by our ancestors. Orwell shows the pigs be the very thing they had revolted against—the "soft" human who drinks, sleeps, eats, and grows. (Gulbin, 1966, p. 87)

Both novels share the same vision of comparison by comparing a man to pig and a pig to man. Although the semblance between them creates uncanny, this transformation serves as visual representation of change in ideals and nature... Napoleon's power urges him projecting his ideals into the other animals, and makes them comply with it as Crothers claims:

There is a "third face" of power which Orwell does not explicitly address, but which concerned him. "Third face" power is the power to convince a group or individual that what that group or individual wants is actually what the powerful want. As such, "third face" power can be the most effective power of all: if the powerful can shape what the powerless want in the first place, challenges to power are unlikely (Crothers, 1996, p. 77)

Perhaps this power is the most dangerous of all because it submits the other side to comply with it regardless of what that person believes in, making him totally under his control physically, emotionally and mentally. Those who are subject to this kind of power no longer have the will to fight the system because it is transmitted to them fully. Like a totalitarian regime that changes every subject in the school to what suits it best, making those who read, unable to comprehend truth by lies, and completely brainwash them to create a tyrannical order where citizens comply with the wills of the state without questioning. The condition of the dogs and the sheep in *Animal Farm* holds a mirror to that of unfortunate individuals who try to survive in a totalitarian regime.

3.4. Foucault and *Animal Farm*

We get a better understanding of this novel's discord of power by comparing Foucault's theories of power with the established power regimes that we see in *Animal Farm*. Two forms of power are evident in the novel, one being Normalized and the other is Repressive, with the Repressive being the more dominating one. Normalized Power is seen in three forms in the course of the novel. First, normalized power is noticed in Animalism itself. We can find Normalization in the seven commandments. At first, before Squealer's interference in and manipulation of the commandments, all animals are aware of these rules, and they oblige to them and carefully avoid breaking these

rules. All animals in the farm do their best to follow these rules without anyone forcing them to do so. Snowball, acting as an enforcer of these laws, in this period tries to show the animals alternative ways to coexist together and teach them how to read these commandments in this period.

Secondly, Squealer's role as Napoleon's main hand is making propaganda that would ease Napoleon's rule over the farm. This propaganda varies from explaining why the Pigs need apples more than other animals, convincing them that the pigs need them to stay healthy and in the right mind to govern over the farm and to ensure the humans never return. Changing the commandments of Animalism serves to normalize the pigs' abuse of power in the farm without any animal revolting against them. Squealer convinces all the animals that those new changes are normal and that all the farm population should accept them.

Lastly, although the farm is under John's command at the beginning, and although John is the absolute ruler and no one dares to oppose him at the start, it is seen that the animals accept these circumstances submissively because they regard them as the established norms, defining the ways and rules of how they should be treated. They accepted the shackles and chains that John has put around them; they learn to live with them because they do not know any other better way. They are unaware of their helpless miserable situation until Old Major awakens them to their pathetic condition and shows them the way to break free from slavery.

The second form of power that Napoleon mainly uses to control the farm is the Repressive Power. Napoleon only believes in submitting others to his will. By maintaining the dogs' loyalty, he gains the power to do so; first, by driving the only pig, Snowball, that may prove a challenge out of the farm, and second, by executing other pigs and animals whom he marks as traitors for opposing his authority. He manages to eliminate any rivalry in the farm. Napoleon's Repressive Power grows gradually. It grows more oppressive as the conflict reaches its peak towards the end, where he establishes himself as the divine being that rules the farm. Repressive power helps him to strengthen his status in the farm. This power is manifested as Napoleon employs the Dogs to force his commands onto the others, while using the sheep to silence the other animals and subdue them completely.

However, Napoleon does not rely on Repressive Power alone. By only using Repressive Power alone, he would have created another chaos in the farm and have urged other animals to revolt against him... By relying on Squealer's tactics to use Normalized Power, he manages to create a solid regime.





CHAPTER FOUR

WILIAM GOLDING'S *LORD OF FLIES*

4.1. The Theme of Children as the Main Antagonists and Protagonists in the Novel

In *Lord of the Flies*, Golding introduces us with a group of British school children trying to survive on a tropical island. The children are the passengers of a plane that is intended to evacuate them from the horrors of the ongoing war; yet, the plane is shot down on a desolate island. At first, the boys are happy with this new start away from grownups, away from the traditions of their society; they embark on an adventure to establish a new community out of nothing. However, a few known human behaviors have already been integrated into these boys personality.

The first establishment of the new society starts from necessity after the boys spent their time playing in the water and participating in a world with no adult jurisdiction. They soon realize that they must think of a new way to organize, and, with Ralph and Piggy finding the shell, they blow on it to gather the boys. The first step in building a society is stated by appointing a new leader of the group. Piggy suggests that they should appoint Ralph because he stands out from the rest for being calm and steady and much older than a few of them. Xiaofang Li & Weihua Wu state:

Driven by his instinct of civilization and democracy, Ralph wants to set up a civilized utopia for all the boys on the island. He blows the conch and summons the deserted children together. He suggests the boys making a chief by voting, which shows his thought of law, order and democracy. After he is elected as the chief, he makes rules of speaking; Ralph tries to have the boys preserve the civilized living principles. (Xiaofang Li & Weihua Wu, 2009)

After some discussion, the others agree with Ralph. When Jack protests stating that he is the head boy, the first clash on power starts a new rivalry between the two sets of ideas presented by Ralph and Jack. Although Ralph is the new leader, he appoints Jack as the leader of another group of kids, the hunters. Each group is informed about their tasks. The law created now becomes an intrinsic element for survival. Thapliyal, R., & Kunwar, S. add that “The conch becomes a symbol of order (giving the right to speak). However, the establishment of rules, from the very beginning, becomes a sort of obligation.” (Thapliyal, R., & Kunwar, S, 2011, p. 87)

Two objects set the rules of this newly established society. The first one is the shell, which is used to gather the boys at one spot, at the same time allowing the holder

the opportunity to state his mind and speak without interruption. The second object is Piggy's glasses which become a tool for making fire. The fire represents an advancement in technology for the boys because by means of fire, and they can stay warm and cook food and most importantly, light the signal fire that is used to call upon any passing ship or plane for help and rescue which becomes a sign of hope for escaping the island.

Golding's child characters in this novel are closely related to a reality in human nature. Violence is one of the primal characteristics of human nature. From the beginning, we understand that the world is at war, and within an environment of deprivation, we see a number of helpless children who are left alone, devoid of parental care and affection. As the novel unfolds, it is observed that all those negative, even horrific, circumstances foreground violence embedded in human nature. By the time Jack becomes the new chieftain of the hunters' tribe, he surrenders to all of his primitive desires for fun and hunt, and his group follows his example heartily. At the end, when they are rescued, the officer refuses to believe in what the children did. Even without any contact from the outside world where there is real war, this small group of children embraces their violent nature as the adults do. Chougule's comment on Golding reads as follows:

Golding presents the boys as the new generation of the coming society who are going to colonize the island. Golding has reasons for such boys of certain age to be scattered on that island. These boys have no corrupt minds like those adults who might have been affected by their experience of wars etc. Golding shows that this theory does not make any difference in terms of how different the boys' behavior would be on this island. The story details the behavior of some boys who find themselves in an island with no control of adults (Chougule, 2020, p. 48)

There is particular emphasis on the three characters represented in the novel. The first one is Jack who is violent and ready to use power and fear to dominate others from the start. Ralph, on the other hand, is a sound leader that has good nature and ready to help others but who also falls into the cycle of chaos and starts to enjoy what Jack and others do. He joins them in their feast and participates in their evil deeds. Yet, when the group murders Simon, he realizes his fatal error. There is Simon who has good nature: he remains faithful to his way until his death at the hands of the others.

Written within one decade of a span, William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* (1954) and George Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1945) have a special treat of portraying fake

revolution for power. *Animal Farm* is a novel that depicts the transformation from utopia into dystopia. It presents the unattainable dream of the revolutionary animals and how systematically their revolution is manipulated for the sake of the intelligent pigs. As far as leadership is concerned, Napoleon and Snowball use their power to influence the farm animals. “The difference between two leaders was visible from their first descriptions; Napoleon was a strong character while Snowball was more educated” (, 2015, p12). Similarly, Ralph and Jack are two different characters seeking for leadership. Ralph resembles Snowball while Jack resembles Napoleon. Jack has his adventures and fierce character to try to attain leadership. Under his influence, he leads his team against Ralph. The common factor in both novels is the way that these characters are thinking (Chougule, 2020, p. 51)

Although Napoleon and Jack are very different in how they rule and command others, Napoleon uses tactics and Squealer to brainwash others. Jack, on the other hand, embraces chaos in order to kill Ralph alone. He burns the whole island to lure him out, and he does not think twice about his actions. Frankly childish, it shows the emotional gap between the two characters. Nevertheless, in the end, they both rule and believe in power and power alone. The similarity of Snowball’s and Ralph's fate is noteworthy in that they both want the greater good for everyone and pay the price in the end.

Another interesting character in the novel is Piggy, who is the only one who has adult-like features and ideas but he is not like adults entirely. He mentions the adults a lot and always thinks about what they will do without them. Although his ideas are wise, practical and helpful to others, they are not appreciated by some of the children; and instead, the others often bully him due to his physical appearance. The novel shows that only the strong ones survive on this island, and characters like Piggy have a slight chance of surviving a wild world where it is hard to experience the actual survival of the fittest. Mazhar’s description of Piggy reads as follows:

Piggy is distinct from others not only in his accent, but also in his aversion for physical toil. His fatness and asthma illustrate how the civilized thinking of superego is ill-matched for this environment and is excluded as useless. Besides, his physical description not only makes him different from other boys, but also brings to the readers’ mind an image of the old man having extraordinary human wisdom (Mazhar, 2019, p. 3)

Piggy's wisdom plays a great part in helping the other boys at surviving the island especially Ralph whom Piggy stands by his side until he is killed by the other boys and Xiaofang Li & Weihua Wu also describe him as:

The embodiment of intellect and rationalism. He firstly senses the seriousness of their life on the island and he reminds Ralph of their serious situation by using three words of death in succession when Ralph takes it for granted that they will be rescued soon. In addition, he firstly suggests that they should do something such as collecting the scattered boys. And he gives the information of conch and teaches Ralph the ways of blowing. Piggy, too, is the first to recognize that life entails making certain choices and establishing certain priorities. (Xiaofang Li & Weihua Wu, 2009, p. 15)

In the end, Piggy thinks about a way to leave this Island and senses the impending doom that the Island might have. He is the one who finds the conch and recognizes its use, and gives it to Ralph. His glasses serve as a power source that makes fire helping the others stay warm. However, in the end, he is picked on for being a fat unappreciated character. Alaa Alnajm mentions that

Golding does not share the romantic ideas that portray children the status of innocent angels. According to him, children possess both good qualities and bad ones as do grown-ups. And in both cases only a few possess good qualities like love, fellow feeling, sympathy, and pity. In this novel, Simon alone is called innocent. (Alnajm, 2015)

From the start, Golding's idea of using the children as the subject of his novel is to portray the weakness of humanity at that time, a doctrine that reveals the sickness of the human heart and how even the innocent is tempted by power, corruption and evil. As Alnajm mentions "Another important aspect of evil shown in the novel is that it does not exist outside; only Simon can feel the truth of evil when he says that the beast might be within us." (Alnajm, 2015)

4.2. The conflict of power and ideology in *Lord of the Flies*

The shell is one of the main symbols of power in the novel in that possession of it gives the holder the ability to speak. The conch not only gathers the boys in order without chaos but also represents the civilized democracy as Alnajm states:

Very quickly, the conch has come to symbolize the values of their previous existence. The boys cannot talk at meetings unless they are holding the conch. They must treat whoever is speaking with respect. This means that Piggy, despite being in many ways a natural victim, is able to air intelligent thoughts that lead to improvements in the boys' lives, for example moving the toilets away from the shelters and keeping a fire going. (Alnajm, 2015)

Furthermore, it will establish rules where the boys came from. It gives everyone a chance to speak his ideas without any intervention. Within a society of underage kids, it is a vital device used to help them understand each other better while keeping democracy as the main rule in society. Björn states that "This rule is made by Ralph, through Piggy (Golding 33) and shows that the conch stands for law and order, the main trait of democracy since everyone has the right to free speech with the conch. The shell becomes "a symbol of parliamentary order" as Piggy, together with Ralph" (Bruns, 2008, p. 1). It represents the ingrained rules that the humans uphold and what they deem right and wrong. At the beginning, the boys respect these newly established rules and the conch's power as a symbol of cooperation between them. The conch is given a symbolic power that the boys need in order to survive on this Island. Golding uses a normal conch that can be found easily with no value as a symbol of power and civilization.

Nevertheless, the conch is essentially needed to live as a cooperating group on the island. At the beginning of the novel, we see order; thanks to the conch; however, soon, these established rules are demolished when Jack and the other boys start to accept the reality that they are not leaving the Island. This society's final destruction happens when they throw a bolder on Piggy and kill him while breaking the conch, which marks the start of total anarchy and the hunt for Ralph.

As mentioned before, the second object is Piggy's glasses; they are regular glasses of no value to others but of great importance to Piggy, who needs them to see clearly. However, its function to build fire raises its importance in the group. By making fire, the boys manage to advance in technology. By keeping the fire, Ralph and his group hold the hunters' group in an orderly fashion because the other group always asks them

to lend them fire when theirs run out. After stealing Piggy's glasses, the hunters' group monopolizes Ralph and his group's assets, which starts the upcoming events of increasing savagery. The fire is also used as a signal for possible ships and airplanes, providing the kids with the hope of escaping the island. This hope first shatters when a ship passes by unnoticed by the children; in the meantime the hunters, who are supposed to keep the fire alive, are busy with hunting. The first conflict between Ralph and Jack occurs when Ralph confronts Jack, who is satisfied with his first hunt. The signal fire represents the kids' connection with the outside world. The extinguished fire on the Island symbolizes the children's loss of hope in returning home, to civilization.

Two central ruling systems start to clash on the Island. Ralph's idea of keeping a democratic civil system where everyone can speak his mind and help each other is to maintain a system that connects them through brotherhood and friendship. The conch becomes the indispensable tool of Ralph's idealistic democracy. The two groups help each other; the hunters hunt while the other group maintains certain necessities. With goodwill, Ralph tries to keep their life together; whereas, Jack has dark intentions. Spitz mentions: "when it was suggested that there ought to be a chief, he immediately and arrogantly demanded that position for himself. Defeated in an election, he took command of the hunters, the forces of naked power." (Spitz, 1970, p. 27) Jack develops hatred toward the current system of work distribution and having no fun. He begins to enjoy the thrill of the hunt. In order to celebrate his achievement of killing an animal, Jack performs a wild dance around the fire with the other hunters accompanying him. "Parliaments of this kind have always been key elements of successful civilizations. It is Jack who challenges this structure. His leadership is more like that of a dictator." (Foster, 2014, p. 12)

After Jack starts wearing a mask, he accepts his new identity as a chieftain. Following the rules of primitive tribes, Jack's group members begin to use the pig's head as a sacrifice to the monster they create. The new group soon wear identical clothes and hats and start hunting as a group while indulging in dancing around the fire, abandoning all of their old beliefs of the society they actually belong to. The hunters display laity toward Jack and accept him as their leader. As Jack further inclines towards more savage ways, the others accept them as their new norms without questioning what they are doing or how they are doing. The more they hunt, the more savage they become.

One day while they are dancing around the fire, Simon approaches them in order to inform them about the identity of the beast. They kill Simon without hesitation and remorse, thinking that Simon himself is the beast. Even Ralph and Piggy enjoy the horrible act until they understand that the killed one is not the beast but Simon. Afterwards Ralph and Piggy reflect upon the outcomes of their actions while Jack and his group become much wilder.

They enjoy their newly developed savage nature to the full. The more they get farther away from civilization, the more primitive they become. Thapliyal, R., & Kunwar, S suggest that “Jack in his desire for malignant power soon breaks away from the order of Ralph and becomes the chief of his own tribe, which completes the conversion into evil. The killing of the sow symbolizes the terror human is going to bring to nature” (Thapliyal, R., & Kunwar, S, 2011, p. 86). According to Foster:

Jack is the natural antithesis to Ralph. He is used to power, and exerts perfect - cum- regiments authority over the choir. He is self-confident and fluent, arrogant and inconsiderate of others. His salient characteristic is aggression, and he has an overmastering urge to lead; later this urge is wedded to a need to kill. He asserts the superiority of the British, and he is an example of the type of very limited Englishman, the type who doesn't wish to think, and whose standards have been fashioned for him by the limited society in which he lives. In a way he is like the naval officer who leads the rescue, so far his horizons are limited, his responses conditioned (FOSTER, LORD OF THE FLIES WILLIAM GOLDING, p. 52)

The two contrasting leaderships in the novel are worth examining. For instance, Ralph is always ready to listen to others, hear them out, and comes out with a civilized solution in every situation. On the other hand, Jack is a fearless leader who believes only in brute power and he dominates the other boys and exerts his power to yield them in place by using fear as a tactic. He listens to no one other than himself, takes no advice; he is just like a dictator who uses his power to suppress everyone. Even when confronted by Ralph in the end, he dominates Ralph and tells him that solution can only be achieved when one of them is defeated. If he beats Ralph, he could establish himself as the most powerful among them, like a chieftain who accepts any duel in order to settle things. Xiaofang Li & Weihua Wu note saying:

Golding has made this exposition of cruelty in his novel probably to make his readers aware of what he deemed the real nature of the human mind. He might have believed that World War II did not present us with issues such as fighting—, nationalism, politics, and freedom; it corrupted the nature of human beings. Perhaps Golding also believed that the earth is mangled by men and can be saved only if men become aware of his nature and changes (Xiaofang Li & Weihua Wu, 2009)

Golding probes into the weakness of humanity by writing this novel. He even goes into extremes by ultimately making his characters unrecognizable as humans anymore. The difference between the children from the beginning of the novel to the end, is displayed how truly the children have changed and to what extent humans are ready to accept savagery in their nature and get consumed by it. Toma mentions an important point about the violence of these children:

The moment that probably marks best the complete separation between the two tribes is in my view Piggy's death. Of course, Simon's death is an important episode as well, but Simon was murdered in a kind of unconscious manner, whereas Piggy was killed deliberately. This is the point where the violence of the children reaches its peak, mostly because they are not afraid to act violently anymore (TOMA, 2017, p. 186)

After Simon's death, Jack and his tribe completely change their tactics and reach the point of no return soon after they steal Piggy's eyeglasses. They kill Piggy and chase Ralph in order to kill him too. Obviously, the desire to kill indicates their willing acceptance of savagery.

For the children on the Island, the imaginary beast symbolizes the primal instinct of savagery that exists in human psyche. The boys acknowledge its material existence by offering the pig's head as a sacrifice. . Although they always search for it and try to hunt it, they never go extra miles to hunt it. This imaginary being seems to them to be real; therefore, they are profoundly scared of it. They think that the stranded pilot's parachute is the beast, imagining it has wings; they also envision the beast like a gorilla. Only Simon manages to go to the cave where they believe it is there. What Simon finds out is not a beast but the dead pilot. Simon rushes to warn the others about his findings. In the meantime, the others are celebrating their hunt, dancing a savage ritual around the fire. Being in a wild ecstatic state, Simon's shadow makes the children think that the beast is coming for them. As a result, they kill Simon accidentally. According to Gulbin, "Golding seems to feel that the success or failure of any government depends on the relative leadership, strength or weakness of the individual or individuals who head it. (Gulbin, 1966, p. 86)

4.3. Foucault's Normalized and Repressive Power in *Lord of the Flies*

Like *Animal Farm*, we see both forms of power in the novel; both powers manifest themselves in Ralph and Jack, the two leaders. Ralph tries to use Normalized power by deciding the chief with elections and establishing the rule that the conch gives the holder the absolute power to speak his mind. He tries to listen to everyone's opinion and hear what they say. Ralph manages to create two teams and peacefully organizes the boys without any protest of his rule. He convinces the boys that the signal fire is an essential part of their life and must be kept lit all the time. Ralph also manages to create an organized system on the Island, except one problem: Jack's ideals are based on the use of Repressive power to establish his rule on the Island. Gradually, Jack manages to gain more and more support from the other boys by undermining Ralph's rule as the current Chief; slowly, he pulls the strings of power from Ralph to himself. Jack only believes in power, which means submitting the others to his command, and if they do not submit, he would resort to force to get rid of them. By killing Piggy first, then chasing Ralph all around the Island, he almost manages to get rid of the last problem that stands on his way. Jack's belief in Repressive power alone creates chaos; this is evident from the sight of nature; the moment the boys arrive at the Island, the nature has an untouched, peaceful beauty, but before their departure, the boys set the whole Island into fire.



CONCLUSION

This dissertation aims to provide evidence that power and politics are two inseparable concepts. Each gives the other the means that is needed to hold those subjected ones under tight control. Either this power is applied forcefully or in systems of chains established in a controlled fashion designed to systematically apply it to control the minds of those under its domination. By applying Foucault's ideas, we can interpret power in two categories as Normalized and Repressive. Although Repressive power is more direct and more visible than Normalized power, it may fail to create the expected effect because it gives those subjected ones a feeling that they are being controlled against their will. Submission and fear can make people do what they want against their will. Normalized power, however, normalizes these commands and impose those who are subjected to it a sense that they are not in control.

Furthermore, they want to fulfill the requirements of Normalized power without realizing that they are already part of the system itself. Dictatorship offers the ruler the right to command and rule those who are under him; yet, this privileged authority gives dictators a false image of power. Such boundless power corrupts undoubtedly. Totalitarian leaders think they are invincible. That kind of power strips dictators of their humanity as well as their former ideals, making them see those under them as pawns that they can use whenever they want. Fear appears to be the medium commonly used by dictators. They force their people to abide self-made laws, which generally lack reason and are unjust. Such dictators become absorbed in their own image; for instance, they are pleased to see their giant statues, representing them as divine beings. Sculptors and/or painters often portray them in poses showing their glories to the citizens. Nevertheless, history has shown that repressive power alone can only bring about chaos at the end. This power has to be used alongside the Normalized one so as to promise better effects and convince those who are subjected to it. In *Animal Farm*, Napoleon gradually turns into abovementioned kind of dictators. He only believes in Repressive power while Squealer uses the Normalized one. Together they create the perfect regime that would hold all those act according to their will. In *Lord of the Flies*, however, we see the opposite of this kind of system. Although Jack resembles Napoleon and uses some similar tactics to control the others, these tactics lead to chaos. The end of the

novel shows the residue of his reign of chaos by the image of the island on fire. His blind belief in using repression alone drifts him from being a sound character.

Orwell drew a satire filled with irony to create *Animal Farm*, and the irony is that the animals in the novel are becoming the same beings they hated. The reader can see the irony as we see the pigs change the commandments, but only we are aware while the animals do not recognize the difference. In many of his novels Orwell attacked every oppressive system in the world that tries to manipulate its power in favor of ruler's will. In *Animal Farm*, every one of his characters represents one of human characteristic. Napoleon represents those who become corrupt to the extreme on seizing power. Moreover, Napoleon represents those who can do anything inhuman to reach their goals. Such characters see others as a means to their end. Their brutal punishment methods extend from imprisonment, torture or to killing. Those who become narcissistic in their image, regarding themselves as the only ones who are truly worthy of living and anyone else, are just side characters in their stories.

Squealer represents the media that impose its propaganda on people's lives, making people view those corrupt leaders as the ideal beings who are the only ones worthy of ruling them. Characters like Squealer collect the minimal benefits those leaders grant them. Snowball, on the other hand, represents the ones that are ready to offer a modest living to those around them in a democratic way without forcing the others. Boxer represents the worker who works hard in return for a minimum wage. Orwell views them as disposable for when they are old and incapable, they would no longer be needed. Finally, some choose to be passive observers, even though they could change things. Orwell compares Benjamin, who has the capacity to read and understand things, to those would-be intellectuals who only read the news and comment on them without making any change.

Animals' hatred toward humans does not free them; instead animals transform to human beings whom they harshly criticize; since animals hate the idea of being under human control again, Squealer convinces them that Snowball is with the humans. So they believe what Squealer says; he tells them that the pigs need to eat the apples in order to stay smart and drive the humans away. In brief, they unquestioningly believe whatever he says. Their hatred blinds the animals and make them being exploited once again.

Foucault's ideas can be traced in both novels, and we come to understand that although Repressive power is more effective than Normalized power, it is also destructive. It destroys human emotions, and the values that shape human lives, ideals that humans spent centuries developing, for the benefit of few parties. Normalized power has the same effect on those who are shaped by it; nevertheless, Normalized power makes use of rather humane ways compared to Repressive power. Those who are exposed to it still feel their humanity intact. They are capable of changing the malfunctioning order when they vote for their next president. Indeed, they are governed by laws and rules, but most of them are made to protect them. For instance, although law forbids stealing, it does not mean that law itself stops us; we do not want to steal because we see robbing another person's property as a wrong act. We understand these rules and accept them because they protect us. This makes the Normalized power superior than the effectiveness the Repressive power offers. If we look at the structure of Normalized power, we find it as a very complicated system of the chain of commands. Every factory is divided into different seats of power. Each seat is higher than the other, starting from the bottom as an intern, raising one level with every promotion until reaching the highest seat, the CEO. Every hospital, every school has different seats of power. They are all combined to create the present system that we live in.

In *Lord of the Flies*, Repressive power alone is the dominant one. Furthermore, it creates chaos on the whole Island, as the whole island is engulfed by fire. We see nature being punished for what the boys do. Moreover, as the fire keeps going, the other boys chasing Ralph only care about one thing, that is finding and killing Ralph. Being unaware of what they are doing and why they are doing it, they abandon all reason. It is revealed that the beast in *Lord of the Flies* becomes every single one of them. Obviously, repression alone cannot bring a balanced system of power. Without Normalizing power, the whole system will collapse.



REFERENCES

- Alnajm, A. (2015). *The main themes in Lord of the Flies*. Iraq-Alnjaf-Alghadee Q, Iraq: University of Kufa.
- Besier, Gerhard, Stokłosa, Katarzyna. (2013). *European Dictatorships : A Comparative History of the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Bloom, H. (2006). *George Orwell's Animal Farm Bloom's guide*. Chelsea House.
- Blundell, N. (2017). *Joseph Stalin*. Pen & Sword Military.
- Bruns, B. (2008). *The Symbolism of Power in William Golding's Lord of the Flies*. Karlstads universite.
- Britannica, T. E. (2020). *Dictatorship*. Encyclopædia Britannica: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/dictatorship>
- Brzezinski, Z. (1962). *Ideology and Power in Soviet Politics*.
- CELKAN, G. (1999). *William Golding's Lord of the Flies a Critical Analysis*. Near East University .
- Chougule, R. B. (2020). *Scarce Life between Leadership and Nature of Savagery in William Golding's Lord of the Flies*. Literary Endeavour.
- Crothers, L. (1996). *George Orwell and the Failure of Democratic Socialism: The Problem of Political Power*. *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 389-407. Retrieved January 2, . <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41178898> adresinden alındı
- Dahl, R. A. (1957). *The concept of power*. *Syst. Res.*, 2: 201-215. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830020303>, 203.
- Democracy in Brief*. (2008). Project Gutenberg.
- Ensaif, N. (2011). *Animal Farm, George Orwell*. Hodder Education.
- Foisie, P. M. (1960). *Dictatorship and the press*. *Problems of Communism*.
- Foster, S. W. (2014). *Lord of Flies*. New York Press .
- Grey, I. (2017). *Stalin*. New Word City, Inc.
- Gulbin, S. (1966). *Parallels and Contrasts in "Lord of the Flies" and "Animal Farm"*. *The English Journal*, 86-92.
- Hasan, M. B. (2007). *Tranlatng law*. Londo: Bloom house.

- Ideas in Conflict: Liberty and Communism.* ((1962)). Washington: not identified.
- Joseph, J. J. (2014). *Democracy's Hypocrisies: Revelations of Society's Incremental Erosions on Democracy.* Xlibris.
- Khlevniūk, O. V. (2015). *Stalin : New Biography of a Dictator.* Yale University Press.
- Khlevniūk, O. V. (2015). *Stalin : New Biography of a Dictator.* Yale University Press.
- Landy, J. (2018). *philosophy talk.* philosophy talk:
<https://www.philosophytalk.org/blog/foucault-power> adresinden alındı
- Mahoney, J. (1994). *Animal Farm, George Orwell : guide.* London: Letts Educationa.
- Mazhar, S. M. (2019). *The Portrayal of Piggy's Mind in Lord of the Flies in the Light of Ghazalian Theory of Soul and Freudian Psychoanalysis.*
[https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2019\(IV-I\).01](https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2019(IV-I).01) adresinden alındı
- McGregor, Lm, Buzan, T. (1999). *George Orwell's Animal farm.* Hauppauge: Barron's.
- Nicholas Daniloff. (1993). *Will Russia's Free Press Survive.* Fletcher Forum of World Affairs.
- OATMAN, M. E. (1937). *The New Constitutions of the Soviet Union.* Washington, D.C.: The Digest Press.
- Olsen, K. (2000). *Understanding Lord of the Flies: A Student Casebook to Issues, Sources, and Historical Documents.* Westport: Greenwood Press.
- O'Neill, T. (1998). *Readings on Animal farm.* San Diego, CA : Greenhaven Press.
- Pylypa, J. (1998). *Power and Bodily Practice: Applying the Work of Foucault to an Anthropology of the Body.* Radford, K. (2016). *Animal Farm by George Orwell.* Hodder Education Group.
- Ringin, S. (2016). *The Perfect Dictatorship : China in the 21st Century.* Hong Kong University press.
- Siahaan, S. (2018). *Marxist's Ideology and Revolution Analysis of George Orwell's Novel "Animal Farm".* University of Riau Kepulauan.
- Spitz, D. (1970). *Power and Authority: An Interpretation of Golding's "Lord of the Flies".* The Antioch Review.

Tailler, M. (2016). *Animal Farm by George Orwell (Book analysis): Summary, Analysis and Reading*. Bright Summaries.

Thapliyal, R., & Kunwar, S. (2011). *Ecocritical Reading of William Golding's Lord of the Flies*. IUP Journal of English Studies.

Thiele, L. P. (1986). *Foucault's Triple Murder and the Modern Development of Power*. Canadian Journal of Political Science.

TOMA, A. (2017). *Tribal organisation in Lord of the Flies. An anthropological perspective*. Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov, Series IV: Philology & Cultural Studies.

Welch, R. (1994). *Animal farm : George Orwell*. . Essex : Longman.

Xiaofang Li & Weihua Wu. (2009). *on Symbolic Significance of Characters in Lord of the Flies*. Yan'an University.



saleh.mohammedsalah

ORIJINALLIK RAPORU

% **17**

BENZERLIK ENDEKSİ

% **15**

İNTERNET
KAYNAKLARI

% **6**

YAYINLAR

% **14**

ÖĞRENCİ ÖDEVLERİ

BİRİNCİL KAYNAKLAR

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| 1 | docplayer.net İnternet Kaynağı | %2 |
| 2 | Submitted to Atılım University Öğrenci Ödevi | %1 |
| 3 | Submitted to Ramapo College Öğrenci Ödevi | %1 |
| 4 | citeseerx.ist.psu.edu İnternet Kaynağı | %1 |
| 5 | Submitted to University of Durham Öğrenci Ödevi | %1 |
| 6 | www.tracesofevil.com İnternet Kaynağı | %1 |
| 7 | www.barnesandnoble.com İnternet Kaynağı | %1 |
| 8 | docs.neu.edu.tr İnternet Kaynağı | <%1 |
| 9 | Submitted to Technological Institute of the | <%1 |

