



Power's Manipulation of the Minds and Language's Creation of Knowledge: Foucault's Power/Knowledge as Depicted in George Orwell's Animal Farm

Dr. Abdelnaeim Ibrahim Awad Elaref

Lecturer at Department of English
Faculty of Arts, South Valley university

DOI: 10.21608/qarts.2022.110782.1320

مجلة كلية الآداب بقنا - جامعة جنوب الوادي - العدد ٥٤ (الجزء الأول) يناير ٢٠٢٢

ISSN: 1110-614X الترخيم الدولي الموحد للنسخة المطبوعة

ISSN: 1110-709X الترخيم الدولي الموحد للنسخة الإلكترونية

<https://qarts.journals.ekb.eg> موقع المجلة الإلكتروني:

Power's Manipulation of the Minds and Language's Creation of Knowledge: Foucault's Power/Knowledge as Depicted in George Orwell's Animal Farm

Abstract:

This paper investigates the social and political control strategies of totalitarian societies. Michael Foucault (1926–1984), a philosopher and thinker, proposed the idea of the incorporation of power and knowledge, which suggests that power creates knowledge and knowledge supports power. The study's investigation into how political control is formed depends on approaching the close and polar relationship between power and knowledge. Power creates the truth with the help of discursive practices and in its turn, the truth is to maintain and support the consistency of power. In this paper, the researcher illustrates these hypotheses in George Orwell's Animal Farm. Terrorism, torture, propaganda, and the rewriting of history and language are depicted in the novel as representing just a few strategies used to control and impose hegemony over mankind. Having a look at Orwell's works, we can see that they demonstrate the power of the language of those in power. Language and eloquence are employed throughout the novel to establish power. Language manipulation and verbal commands helped make the farm control system successful.

Keywords: Power- Knowledge- Hegemony- Manipulation- Discourse

Introduction: Power Relations According to Foucault:

Power is a central issue in Michel Foucault's theoretical paradigm. His postmodernism has a tremendous effect on how we think about power, driving us towards the view that in language, knowledge, and truth regimes, power is everywhere and is diffused and embodied. (Foucault, 1991). He was an outspoken opponent of Marxist concepts about power relations, arguing that power is not mainly what organizations acquire and utilize oppressively against individuals and communities. According to Foucault, it is incorrect to think of power as a thing owned by institutions and used to oppress individuals and groups. By examining the everyday interactions between individuals and institutions and how power functions in the daily interactions between people themselves, he aims to broaden the study beyond the simple assumption that the powerful oppress the weak. In his book *The History of Sexuality* (1990), He argues that we must renounce the idea that power equals oppression because oppressive practices, at their most extreme, are not just repressive and censorious but also constructive, fostering the emergence of new behaviors.

As a technique rather than an object, power is seen here as more like something that performs and functions in an orderly fashion. Foucault views it as a constructive force since it leads to desirable ends such as self-making and is coextensive with resistance. In addition, he maintains that power is coincident with resistance since it is a necessary condition for the possibility of all connections. It occurs in all forms of interpersonal interactions amongst members of society. John Gaventa claims that Foucault's concept of power is a radical departure from the norm. It is challenging to integrate with previous ideas because Foucault's power is diffuse rather than concentrated, lived rather than

possessed, discursive rather than purely coercive. It constitutes rather than utilizes the actors involved (Gaventa, 2003, p.1).

In contrast to other Marxist academics, Foucault is more interested in oppressed people's fight. For example, Louis Althusser, a Marxist scholar, focused on how state structures oppress people and develop as individuals through the enigmatical process of ideology (Althusser, 1984). To put it another way; Foucault believes that power relations are distributed across society's relational networks and that humans are not, as Althusser suggests, just passive victims of the ideological and repressive apparatus but are active participants. This enables him to build a model of how power is exerted and disputed daily and regular analysis founded in the active subject rather than the passive object of power.

In general, power is defined as an agent's capacity to impose his will on the powerless or coerce them into performing acts they do not like to accomplish. According to this concept, power is viewed as a possession held by individuals in positions of authority. Foucault argues that power is not something that can be possessed but instead acts and emerges in a certain way; it is more like strategy than ownership. As a circulatory force or as a chain, power must be examined in order to understand it. In a network-like structure, power is used and exerted. Power flows through people (Foucault, 1980, p.98).

According to this perspective, rather than a connection between the oppressed and the oppressor, both of them are part of the same system of power (Mills, 2003, p.35). According to G. E. Kelly, Foucault's definition of power in *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison* (1975) includes several characteristics. According to him, power is characterized by its impersonality, or subjectivity, which implies that it is unaffected by the wills of

specific individuals. Furthermore, he contends that power is relational, suggesting that it is always a matter of power relations between individuals rather than a quantum owned by individuals. Additionally, he goes on to assert that power is decentralized, meaning that it is not concentrated in the hands of a single individual or class. Furthermore, its heart is bidirectional, which means it does not flow from the strongest to the weakest but instead begins from below. Eventually, he believes in power's strategic nature, which indicates that it has a deliberate dynamic of its own (Kelly, 2009, pp.37–38).

Additionally, Kelly says that Foucault's *The History of Sexuality* may reveal other characteristics such as the requirement that there be expediency between the two parties to ensure the success of their relation; If a relationship is to succeed, it must be mutually beneficial to both parties, which means that power is a necessary component of every connection between members of society. To rephrase it, if you want to connect with someone, you need to have some control over them (Kelly, 2009).

Accordingly, for Foucault, the state is not a divine agent motivated by human-like motives. To gain a deeper understanding of power relations, we do not need to abandon the concept of the state, but rather to expand it: despite the omnipotence of its apparatuses, the State is far from occupying the entire of realistic power relations. (Foucault, 1980). Power relationships exist between parents and children, lovers and their beloved, and bosses and their staff, among other types of power relationships. Regardless of how adaptable the hierarchy is; each individual has their position within it.

In accordance with Foucault, individuals or organizations cannot exercise their authority through singular acts of dominance or coercion; instead, power is distributed and pervasive. From this

perspective, there is no specific organization or structure for power production (Foucault, 1998, p.63). Meta power, or "the regime of truth," permeates society and is constantly contested. In Foucault's opinion, knowledge and scientific comprehension and the concept of 'truth' are all aspects of power.

To sum it up, when Foucault examines the relationships between individuals and society, he does not assume that the individual is powerless in comparison to institutions, organizations, or the state. There can be no doubt about his opinion that power does not reside in a single man but is diffused throughout society. Each encounter with another human being enables an examination and comprehension of the function of resistance. It must be replaced and maintained regularly to provide stability in a more volatile and contentious component such as power.

Power's Employing of Discursive practices to Create the Truth:

In our world, truth is a short idea that can be created only through various forms of constraint. Additionally, it exhibits the expected power effects. Each community has its own "general politics" that dictates which discourses are acceptable. Further, these politics establish the parameters within which truth is recognized and deception is eliminated. They are to unearth techniques deemed valuable in the pursuit of truth (Foucault, 1991).

Science, education, and the flow of political and economic ideas contribute to the development of 'generic politics' and 'truth regimes' that are continuously reinforced and redefined. In this sense, the term "Battle for Truth" refers to a dispute over the criteria by which 'truth' and 'falsehood' are separated, and particular effects of power are connected to the 'true' (Foucault, 1991).

There are limitations to what people can do and how much power they have, which is why Hayward places such a high value on the ability of individuals to recognize and manage these limitations. For him, power is a collection of these limitations (Hayward, 1998).

In addition, social conformity and discipline might be the outcome of a strong feeling of social authority. Rather than focusing on the "sovereign" and "episodic" means by which feudal states imposed their will on their subjects, Foucault saw a new type of "disciplinary power" at work in the social services and administrative structures established in 18th-century Europe, such as prisons, schools, and mental hospitals. They no longer required the use of force or violence in their monitoring and assessment systems since individuals had developed the ability to be disciplined and behave predictably.

Foucault is significantly influenced by his concern in the mechanics of jail, school discipline, population control, and propagating sexual norms. These branches of research, which he explored, define psychological, medical, and criminological criteria. A microcosm of the greater population's social control is accomplished through what he referred to as "bio-power," or the capacity to affect one's physical body's behavior. However, it is an ever-shifting discursive practice resulting from disciplinary and bio-power dynamics that sets what is considered normal, acceptable, or deviant. (Foucault, 1991).

There is no one-size-fits-all solution to political speech. Not only does discourse function as a weapon of power, but it may also act as a burden, an impediment to resistance, and a springboard for developing an alternative approach if we are not too serious about it. Discourse facilitates the transmission and development of power;

it enhances and threatens it and permits it to be resisted (Foucault, 1998, pp.100-1). Power creates the truth through utilizing the discursive practices and the smooth institutional weapons to condition the individuals to submit to it.

According to Foucault's theoretical assumptions, knowledge and power revolve around one another: one influences the other while also being impacted by it. In the interplay between power and knowledge, power generates knowledge, while knowledge perpetually initiates the repercussions of power. A significant theme in Clark's book is Foucault's idea that power creates knowledge, or at least the apparatuses of that knowledge, and that knowledge itself becomes power (Clark, 2006, p.104). Wherever power exists, knowledge is present. The relationship between knowledge and power is closely connected. Additionally, while power exists everywhere, resistance does as well. Resistance is a power-related internal phenomenon.

Foucault explores exhaustively in his work *Power and Knowledge* (1980) as a confluence of power relations. According to his article "Prison Talk" in his book *Power and Knowledge*, power cannot exist without knowledge, and knowledge cannot alone give rise to power in the first place (Foucault, 1980, p.52). The power relations that exist at all levels of society are represented in interpersonal interactions through the use of dominant scientific knowledge; this knowledge is primarily produced by power through the promotion of specific discourse, and knowledge is used to reinforce power.

Foucault's study of bio-power shows how modern forms of power and knowledge interact in a complex way. It's a two-way road: power exercises create knowledge, and knowledge, in turn, creates power. It is impossible to distinguish between knowledge

and power. If one thinks of knowledge or power as a single entity, they're wrong. According to Foucault, a description of the nexus between power and knowledge is, therefore, necessary to understand what determines the acceptability of any system, whether it be the mental health system or the prison system, delinquency, sexuality, or any other topic (Foucault, 1984, p.25).

Both power and knowledge coexist inextricably; this is what Foucault refers to as the power/knowledge nexus. It is unwise to create a distinction between power and knowledge. According to Foucault, power cannot be wielded without knowledge. Knowledge cannot exist without generating power. (Foucault, 1980, 52). In this context, Sara Mill maintains that knowledge is a necessary component of power. It cannot exist in the absence of power. It is not politically neutral, but rather a necessary component in the battle for power. (Mills,2003, p.69).

It is vital to study both power and truth to grasp the power/knowledge connection. Truth, for Foucault, is not an ethereal concept akin to knowledge. He maintains that truth is a product of this reality. (Foucault 1980, p13). It indicates that truth can be discovered only in the hands of the powerful. Even each society, according to Foucault, has its private system of truth. (Foucault, 1980, p.131). What is confirmed in a particular society are the discourses accepted by it and are capable of creating the truth. In a nutshell, truth is the world's discourse. Additionally, for a statement to be regarded as true, it must be accepted by the entire society.

From Foucault's perspective, it is clear that the production of truth cannot be divorced from the tools of power. How one can tell the difference between truth and untruth in society is crucial. However, according to Foucault, this can be accomplished by approaching the mechanism and procedures affiliated to condition

the community to approve the unspoken truth and processes employed or values granted to create its reliability.

Manipulation of Minds and various ways of imposing Hegemony:

Through the use of power and knowledge, totalitarian governments impose their will on society. The saying "knowledge is power" is accurate; it is not a mere slogan. This notion evolved into an essential paradigm in the writings of Friedrich Nietzsche and Michel Foucault. Their works maintained an inextricable relationship between knowledge and power. Both believed that knowledge was the way to power. As a consequence, control is built through knowledge, which rises in proportion to power. As a result, control cannot be achieved in the absence of knowledge.

Knowledge is a distinct ideology that embodies every society's symbolic violent function, whereas power enables reality to be changed, organized, and given the perfect shape. Foucault's conception of power and knowledge dissects the complicated power structure and how power regulates individuals. Foucault's knowledge of the perplexing notions and mechanisms that characterize our time grew further. He prefers to look at things from a specialized angle rather than a broad one. The governor/governed, state/people, dominates/dominated are the main targets of his efforts to dismantle the existing opposition. In his writings, he avoids the word "control," preferring instead to use terms like "discipline," "surveillance," and "obedience" instead. Thoughts like these are more powerful and productive (Beaulieu & Gabbard, p. ix).

According to Foucault, power does not entail individual or communal oppression. Powerful individuals do not possess it, but Power must be understood as a circulatory force or, more precisely, as a force that exists solely in the form of a chain (Foucault, 1998).

Moreover, authority does not emanate from a governing elite but rather from the grassroots. We are instruments of power because they are ingrained in the rhetoric and values that underpin our everyday practices, abilities, and communication. According to Foucault, power is "omnipresent."

However, manipulation of the mind is distinct from convincing someone to do something they dislike. As Teuna Vandijk implies, in order to interpret and analyze manipulative language, it is essential first to assess the context in which it is being employed. According to Vandijk, manipulation, in contrast to persuasion, is defined by its use of power and dominance. Examining this aspect of power entails describing how particular social actors or organizations exert influence over others. As a result, the first step toward mind control is to influence someone's beliefs, followed by their conduct based on those beliefs (Vandijk, 2006, pp.361-362).

The concept of 'manipulation' in Critical Discourse Analysis requires considerable theoretical investigation. Controlling someone's thoughts and behavior through manipulation is a type of social power abuse. Illegitimate dominance in the context of social inequality is described as manipulation. Manipulation as a kind of mind control entails interfering with cognitive processes, creating skewed mental models, and using social representations like facts and ideologies to influence behavior. It is common to use standard ideological discourse patterns and styles to manipulate certain people discursively, such as stressing our positive attributes while downplaying their negative attributes.

Antonio Gramsci has actually suggested similar notions although they have been mentioned and applied in a completely different context. Gramsci is most recognized, however, for his argument on cultural hegemony. An important part of this theory is

how governments and ruling capitalist classes, such as the bourgeoisie, use cultural institutions to keep their political dominance in capitalist countries. Hegemonic culture is not created by violence, economics, or coercion, but by ideology, according to Gramsci. To maintain the existing power, the hegemonic culture propagates its values and norms; these values and norms become universal "common sense" standards. Due to this, cultural hegemony is used instead of force to keep the capitalist system in power. These institutions are used by the ruling class to maintain their hold on cultural hegemony.

Reacting against the dominance of the bourgeois, the working class resorted to building its own culture to challenge the idea that bourgeois values were the standard in society. However, Gramsci argued that the first step to power was establishing cultural supremacy, which Lenin viewed as an afterthought. A class cannot rule in contemporary times by only furthering its limited economic interests, nor can it rule by force and coercion. As a result, it must take the lead in various alliances and compromises with a wide range of groups. Gramsci borrows the phrase "historic bloc" from Georges Sorel to describe this coalition of social forces. Consent to specific social order is built on this bloc, a nexus of institutions, social interactions, and beliefs that creates and re-produces the ruling class's power. Thus, the political and ideological superstructure plays an essential role in preserving and shattering the economic basis of Gramsci's theory (Sassoon, 1991). Accordingly, language as one of the main constituents and the essential means of ideology is quite attendant in our consideration concerning achieving hegemony. Language, as being one of the constituents of the ideology, is the primary weapon to manipulate minds.

Manipulation of Minds and Imposing Hegemony in *Animal Farm*:

The novel *Animal Farm* features a prominent issue of linguistic manipulation. Using language to propagate a false ideology is a powerful technique for the elite to employ against lower-class people, as demonstrated by pigs (elites) in the novel. Elites are constantly attempting to tell a story through their use of words. The work features a discussion on power and language. Elites employ vague, rhetorical, and figurative language to deceive the populace, according to the novel.

Within the *Animal Farm* community, there are characters who pursue the authority. To maintain their influence, the rulers are allowed to do whatever they desire. Jones, Napoleon, and Snowball are among the farm's most renowned leaders. The animals were subjected to societal control through the use of power and knowledge. The majority of them are dissatisfied as a result of their desire for power. Animals on the farm are denied pleasures and liberties. Additionally, the fact is that an animal's life, as depicted in the novel, is miserable and enslaved. (Orwell, 1989). In a society where the majority of people are downtrodden, the minority exploits its position of power to its advantage.

Jones was the first animal ruler. The treatment with them was mainly characterized by the dictatorship. Animals without mercy may go days without food. Mr. Jones, according to Abadi, exploits, and abuses other animals for his own advantage. (2012, p.13). As a result, one may claim that Jones is restrained by traditional power. He always physically and psychologically abuses his detainees. Mr. Jones and his supporters would whip animals, which was more difficult for them to bear than "the hunger that animals could bear" (Orwell, 1989, p.38). Jones' use of violence drove animals into surrender.

Foucault views power as being realized and practiced through unusual techniques; namely "disciplinary coercion". Disciplinary coercion is a technique employed by the government to compel people to obey without resorting to violence. It converts them into mindless automatons capable of completing any task assigned to them. According to Foucault, discipline enhances one's physical talents. Distancing body and power is the objective of this strategy; on the one hand, it emphasizes the body's capability; on the other hand, it attempts to convert that capability into a rigid surrender to force (Foucault, 1986, p.138). In light of this, Foucault views authority as an unorthodox type of power. Each individual is thus subject to government policy in accordance with the government's disciplinary plan.

In *Animal Farm*, traditional authority was employed to seize control. The other animals rejected Jones' rule as a result of his administration. They formed a ring and resisted him at that point. A call for unity will resonate with the animals when they decide to begin their rebellion against Mr. Jones in an environment of all for one and one for all as Vantieghem suggests (2008, p.36). Because of their unity, they can stand up to Jones and his unbridled power and create a republic where they can fully appreciate their freedom. They have the ability to defy authority. After Jones was expelled as a result of their rebellion, the Manor Farm became theirs, and they took it over. (Orwell, 1989, p.39).

However, power, according to Foucault, cannot be acquired, taken, or distributed. The ability to maintain one's power or to allow it to ebb and flow is a choice (Foucault, 1990, p.94). Knowledge is a potent force that can be used for either good or evil. Encroachment on a person's authority via force generates feelings of resistance and rejection. Not from the top-down, but from the bottom up (Foucault, 1986, p.99).

To show that power and knowledge may be used in constructive ways, Orwell uses the character of Old Major to illustrate this point. Foucault maintains that truth may be liberated from any framework of power, but that it must be disconnected from the frameworks of authority, social, and financial within which it currently operates (Foucault,1986, p.133).

In *Animal Farm*, there are two kinds of power: conventional and unconventional. A significant distinction between conventional and pig powers is that animals submit to authority without resorting to force or violence. They were driven by a strong sense of purpose and held high regard for authority. While they may have performed the functions of slaves and blindly obeyed commands, they were content in their labor and felt no resentment toward the effort or sacrifice they made on behalf of others of their kind who would follow in their footsteps, rather than for the benefit of a lazy, thieving human race (Orwell, 1989, p.69). To rephrase it, animals surrender voluntarily to their rulers' dominance.

They are in close proximity to Old Major, the world's largest pig, who was once considered as their principal source of wisdom. Additionally, they were more intelligent than the remainder of the group. They will be able to lead the farm following the revolution as a result of all of this. As a result of their experience and education, they were able to advance in the community. Consequently, they are incapable of wielding power in the absence of information. Due to this, the power that Snowball and Napoleon possess is a generational thing. Political leaders are not in power due to their ability. They retain control, though, because they are descended from the prior regime's rulers. Alternatively, they might share a similar socioeconomic level. As a result, when Old Major dies, Napoleon and Snowball will assume authority. Napoleon and

Snowball's strength and wisdom are an extension of the Old Major's knowledge.

Establishing control in the Pigs' class necessitated the development of a new philosophy. Humanity, their primary adversary, was shown as having two legs in an attempt to split the two. Snowball is able to unite all of the animals and enjoys their unwavering support. To encompass all animals with two legs, he added a new concept to the revolution's principles: that anyone with two wings and legs is a revolutionary friend (Orwell, 1989, p.42). Pigs are successful in their attempt to take over the minds and bodies of animals in this manner. They gained power by imposing their will through coercive and oppressive ways. According to Gramsci, "Hegemony" occurs as a result of a particular ideology that embodies power. When prevailing beliefs on social media are recognized for the difficulties they impose, one can see that they are a source of power. A social group's transformation of these relationships into "common sense" constitutes the establishment of a hegemonic order (Steve,2006, p.4). Hegemony can be established and maintained in this circumstance without resorting to violence. The government's institutes can assist you in achieving your objectives.

Animals' ideal dream diminishes over time, while their use of hostile language increases. The new regime's leaders resorted to violence in order to maintain their hold on power. According to Foucault, these strategies can be used in a variety of ways to establish power relations through the manipulation of diverse apparatuses. These are useful in a "complex strategic situation in a specific society," When we consider the difficulties associated with producing new information, we can understand the connection between knowledge and power.

The totalitarian regime uses the media to manipulate its citizens' minds. This can be accomplished by seizing complete control of the media and maintaining the appearance of normalcy. As a result, no one is capable of detecting when errors have been made. Squealer accomplishes this task because he is stronger and more intelligent than the others; he was introduced to us as having extremely round cheeks, flashing eyes, agile movements, and a strident voice. He is an excellent speaker, and he had a knack for skipping from side to side when debating a difficult subject. Squealer is an agent of the ruling party's propaganda institute. He makes an attempt to persuade the other that life has more notable nobility now than it did earlier (Orwell, 1989, p.110). It is preferable to human rule. There is sufficient food for all animals, and there is also freedom. His remarks resulted in an increase in animal enthusiasm. As a result, animals labor longer hours out of pride and excitement, even though they "didn't feel better than they did on Jones Day" (Orwell, 1989, p.98). There are few educated animals in Animal Farm. In contrast to other animals, pigs like Squealer can read and write. As a result, they have the freedom to run the farm however they see fit. Because the majority of the population is educated, it can be difficult to sway people with incorrect information.

Memories are not erased at the animal farm, but they are scattered throughout. Pigs are the most intelligent animals on the farm. As a result, pigs were responsible for the failure to remember information. As proven by the seven commandments devised by the animals upon taking over the property. As long as animals have no recollection of the original commandments, they have no difficulty accepting the new ones. To paraphrase Snowball, "Four legs good, two legs bad" can be simplified to the Seven Commandments (Orwell, 1989, p.49). Animals lack the ability to memorize

commands. So that, they are unaware of the changes. "An animal shall not slaughter another animal without justification," for instance" (Orwell, 1989, p.92). The animals' recollections of the final two words had been wiped clean by a casual slip of the tongue.

Regardless of how well they understand the regulations, they have no way of demonstrating the change that occurred, as the bulk of them are illiterate. Squealer, on the other hand, lets animals know when they have a poor memory. It's easy for the pigs to persuade Snowball that he's a traitor thanks to the animals' short memories. To prove Snowball's innocence, Boxer repeats "Napoleon is always right" over and over. For him, Napoleon's words must be true because of his famous motto: "I will work harder," (Orwell, 1989, p.66). Napoleon is a cold-blooded pig that has taken over the Farm. They followed in Boxer's footsteps due to his tenacity on the farm. Additionally, he never asks Napoleon a single question. As a result, he developed a reputation as a role model for other creatures. Napoleon's reputation among animals is bolstered due to Napoleon's own beliefs. One could conclude that animals' poor recall aided Napoleon in gaining control of them and establishing them as a dependable source of information.

The majority of the animals in *Animal Farm* lack the appropriate learning. Additionally, some of them look opposed to developing their skills. On the other hand, animals are incapable of learning from their environment. In actuality, the ruling class seeks to trap the middle class through education, believing that teaching the working class will develop critical thinking. If this occurs, those in Farm, for example, will come to distrust the authority's motives. For instance, despite the vibrations generated by Snowball's disappearance, the animals in *Animal Farm* were astonished to learn of this news. Numerous individuals would have objected if

they had the ammunition to do so. Even Boxer appeared apprehensive. With his ears pinned back and his forelock trembling, he struggled to compose the words that would escape him, but nothing did.

The Farm's leaders have their work cut out for them with enemies and traitors. Fear of traitors is instilled in the population by them. It's impossible to predict what an enemy will do to complicate your life. Hence, leaders need traitors to point the finger at someone else when they make an error. To instill fear in a person, the government employs a tactic of "regime fear." As a result, the play necessitates using a live actor to fill this job. Therefore, leaders must carefully select the traitor, and no random person will do so. To have a more significant impact on the rest of the community, the traitors must occupy a prominent position inside it.

Snowball, a member of the leadership, is the traitor in Animal Farm. Because he plays a vital role in his community, he gets selected. He is a traitor who must be put to death. "This afternoon's execution of the traitors was the climax." Adversaries both external and internal will be eliminated by the exclusion of the traitor, resulting in a society that is free of enemies " (Orwell, 1989, p.90). By portraying him as a criminal, he becomes a serious threat to the public. Because he knows everything, there is to know about the farm and has a good grasp of what's going on there. Allegedly, the Pigs disseminated rumors regarding Traitor's whereabouts, warning all livestock that a traitor was lurking among them.

Conclusion:

Power and Knowledge are two interrelated concepts utilized by the dominating class or the totalitarian regimes to maintain political and social control. In other words, it is feasible that Orwell's work foretells our collective fate. The bulk of totalitarian regimes relies on these concepts to maintain control over society.

While Foucault and Orwell were critical of authoritarian government, they disagreed on how power works. According to Foucault, the phrases "control" and "dominance" are rarely utilized; instead, concepts such as "discipline" and "surveillance" are used. Orwell frequently uses the terms "control" and "dominance." Dictatorships have emerged in society due to persons who possess both authority and expertise.

Approaching Orwell's work, it is pretty apparent that it highlights how language can be a potent weapon in the hands of the minority in power. Throughout the novel, language and eloquence are used to establish dominance. The farm control was effective because it was founded on verbal command and language manipulation. Following the revolution, the most crucial cause in the demise of the animal utopian society is an evident inequality in language distribution to distinct classes of animals. When it comes to imposing hegemony over other species, the most powerful animals or species are those that can communicate fluently, understand all facets of the farm, and possess an in-depth understanding of all facets of dominance.

References:

- Abadi H. (2012). "Rhetoric and the manipulation of language in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*", *Journal of Comparative Literature and Culture* (JCLC).
- Althusser, Cf. L. (1984). *Essays on Ideology*. London, Verso.
- Beaulieu Alain and Gabbard David. (eds.) (2006). *Michel Foucault and Power Today: International Multidisciplinary Studies in the History of the Present*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Clark, Simon. (2006). *From Enlightenment to Risk: Social Theory and Contemporary Society*. Macmillan Palgrave
- Foucault, M. (1980). Truth and power. In C. Gordon, *Power and Knowledge: Selected Interviews and other writing 1972-1977*. Brighton: Harvester.
- Foucault, M. (1986). Disciplinary Power and Subjection. in Steven Lukes, *Power (Readings in Social and Political Theory)*. New York: University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1991). *Discipline and Punish: the birth of a prison*. London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power and Knowledge: Selected Interviews and other writing 1972- 1977*. (C. Gordon, Ed.) New York: Pantheon Book.
- Foucault, Michel. (1984). *The Foucault Reader*. (Paul Rainbow, Ed.) New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The History of Sexuality Volume I An Introduction*. (R. Hurley, Trans.) New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, Michel. (1994). *Power*. (James D. Faubion, Ed) New York: The New Press
- Foucault, Michel. (1998). *The History of Sexuality: The Will to Knowledge*. London: Penguin.

- Gaventa, John. (2003). *Power after Lukes: a review of the literature*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Hayward, Clarissa Rile. (1998). 'De-Facing Power', *Polity* 31(1).
- Kelly, Mark G. E. *The Political Philosophy of Michel Foucault*. London: Routledge.
- Kelly, G.E. (2009). *The Political Philosophy of Michel Foucault*. New York and London: Routledge
- Mills, Sara. (2003). *Michel Foucault*. London and New York: Rutledge
- Rabinow, Paul. (1991). *The Foucault Reader: An introduction to Foucault's thought*. London: Penguin.
- Sassoon, A. S. (1991). Hegemony. In T. Bottomore, L. Harris, V. Kiernan, & R. Miliband, *The Dictionary of Marxist Thought (Second ed.)* (pp. 229-231). Blackwell Publisher Ltd.
- Steve, Jones. (2006). *Antonio Gramsci*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Teuna, Vandijk. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*. Vol 17(3), 359–383
- Vantieghem, Griet. (2008). Ideology in the works of George Orwell: a socio-cultural approach in the wake of Raymond Williams' cultural materialism. [Unpublished thesis Master Degree]. The University of Ghent.

تلاعب القوة بالعقول وخلق اللغة للمعرفة: مفهوم القوة والمعرفة عند فوكو كما تم تصويره في مزرعة الحيوانات لجورج أرويل

الملخص:

تتناول هذه الورقة البحثية استراتيجيات السيطرة الاجتماعية والسياسية على المجتمعات الشمولية. فقد اقترح الفيلسوف والمفكر ميشيل فوكو (١٩٢٦-١٩٨٤) فكرة دمج السلطة والمعرفة، مما يشير إلى أن القوة تخلق المعرفة والمعرفة بدورها تدعم القوة. يسعى الباحث إلى دراسة كيفية تشكيل السيطرة السياسية على الاقتراب النقدي من العلاقة الوثيقة والقطبية بين السلطة والمعرفة. فالقوة تخلق الحقيقة بمساعدة الممارسات الخطابية، والحقيقة بدورها هي التي تحافظ على اتساق السلطة ودعمها. يقوم البحث في هذه الدراسة حول رواية مزرعة الحيوانات لجورج أرويل بتوضيح هذه الفرضيات. فقد تم تصوير الإرهاب والتعذيب والدعاية وإعادة كتابة التاريخ واللغة في الرواية على أنها تمثل فقط بعض الاستراتيجيات المستخدمة للسيطرة على البشرية وفرض الهيمنة عليها. بإلقاء نظرة على أعمال أرويل، يمكننا أن نرى أنها تُظهر قوة اللغة وتأثيرها عند استخدامها كأداة في يد من هم في السلطة، حيث يتم استخدام اللغة والبلاغة في جميع أنحاء الرواية لتأسيس القوة وعلاقتها بالتلاعب اللغوي والأمر اللفظي في جعل نظام التحكم في المزرعة ناجحًا.

الكلمات المفتاحية: القوة، المعرفة، الهيمنة، التلاعب، الخطاب