

## Napoleon's Panoptic Surveillance in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*

Indy Nur Hayati, Ni Wayan Sukarini, Ni Made Suwari Antari

Udayana University, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia

Correspondence email: [nur.hayati015@student.unud.ac.id](mailto:nur.hayati015@student.unud.ac.id), [wayan\\_sukarini@unud.ac.id](mailto:wayan_sukarini@unud.ac.id),  
[suwari\\_antari@unud.ac.id](mailto:suwari_antari@unud.ac.id)

### Article Info

Submitted: 11<sup>st</sup> June 2025

Revised: 19<sup>th</sup> July 2025

Accepted: 28<sup>th</sup> July 2025

Publish: 31<sup>st</sup> August 2025

**Keywords:** *panopticism; surveillance; Foucault; panopticon; discourse*

### Corresponding Author:

Indy Nur Hayati

email:

[nur.hayati015@student.unud.ac.id](mailto:nur.hayati015@student.unud.ac.id)

### DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.24843/JH.2025.v29.i03.p04>

### Abstract

*This article aims at examining the Panopticism within the novella Animal Farm during Napoleon's leadership. This is done by applying the theory of Panopticism developed by Foucault as derived from Bentham's Panopticon model. This research utilizes the qualitative method and uses George Orwell's novella Animal Farm (1945) as the data source. Foucault's panoptic schema is characterized by the impression of continuous observation internalized into self-surveillance. The findings suggest that the Animal Farm is considered a panoptic society, with the pigs corresponding to the tower inspectors and the farm animals as the prisoners. Panoptic surveillance comes in various forms and primarily through discourse, to influence the animals to conform to the norm of staying docile and accepting Napoleon's leadership. The Panopticism in Animal Farm shows how discourse can be a powerful device of social control as a surveillance method, especially when it incites fear and the desire for security.*

## INTRODUCTION

Modes of power have experienced major transformations throughout history as society continues to change. In earlier days of history, power was enforced through voyeuristic mechanisms of control. Crimes and offenses against the sovereign body were retaliated through disciplinary punishments, ranging from torture to executions. There is a trend in the distant past in which these punishments were made into a public spectacle to reinstate the sovereignty of the body of power. With the rise of capitalism and the corresponding focus on property crimes, a more efficient system of punishment was needed (Taylor, 2014, p. 75). From this need arose "the birth of the prison". Most notably, Jeremy Bentham's architectural design of the Panopticon that became the basis of Michel Foucault's concept of Panopticism. Changes in society brought on the transformation away from voyeuristic and forceful means of control towards the subtler and less invasive panoptic mechanisms of surveillance.

The Panopticon was originally an architectural design of "the most ideal prison" developed by the British philosopher Jeremy Bentham in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The Panopticon is described as "an annular building; at the centre, a tower; this tower is pierced with wide windows that open onto the inner side of the ring; the peripheric building is divided into cells, each of which extends the whole width of the building;

they have two windows, one on the inside, corresponding to the windows of the tower; [...]” (Foucault, 1995, p. 200). The layout of the Panopticon allows for the prisoners to be put under constant observation and surveillance from the central tower, while the prisoners are unable to see within the tower itself. This mechanism of constant invisible surveillance is the basis of Foucault’s theory of Panopticism, of which the term pays homage to Bentham’s original model. While the Panopticon’s model is one of a prison, this disciplinary system can be deployed in any domain where “one is dealing with a multiplicity of individuals on whom a task or a particular form of behavior must be imposed” (Foucault, 1995, p. 205; Scott, 2017, p. 104).

Throughout history, literature often acts as a reflection of the conditions of the society in which it was created. Similarly, the evolution in the exercise of power is reflected across the literary works of history. As modern society continues to integrate the panoptic system of surveillance, many literary works were created to capture life in a panoptic society. In the novel *1984* (1949) by George Orwell, the Panopticon is realized through the eyes of “Big Brother” who is “always watching” through various modern devices of surveillance. In *Fahrenheit 451* (1953) by Ray Bradbury, modern technology is also similarly used as a device for surveillance, primarily through television to discourage literacy amongst the masses.

Another work of literature which similarly captures a panoptic society is the novella *Animal Farm* (1945) written by George Orwell. *Animal Farm* is a satirical fable about anthropomorphic animals in a farm who incites a rebellion against their human owner, Mr. Jones, and his farm workers, with the hopes that they would be able to create a society where all animals are equal and free from the humans’ exploitation. They lived in relative peace for some time after the rebellion,. However, one of the pigs, Napoleon, in his thirst for power assumes control over the farm as its leader. Gradually, the farm becomes more reminiscent of a panoptic society as Napoleon and the pigs utilizes surveillance to reinforce their position of power within the farm.

This study aims at examining how the theory of Panopticism as developed by Foucault is applied within the novella *Animal Farm*, specifically the farm under Napoleon’s rule. In particular, the study intends to identify the various means of surveillance used within the text and how these modes affect the farm animals as the “prisoners” of the Panopticon. Foucault’s theory of Panopticism is believed to be able to appropriately provide insight on how Panopticism is depicted in literature and the various ways panoptic surveillance can take form as well as contribute to future research on a similar topic.

## **METHOD AND THEORY**

### **Literature Review**

This section provides an overview of previous studies on the topic of this research. Various research has been previously conducted on the theory of the Panopticon and surveillance as developed by Foucault. This section covers two previous studies on the same topic on Panopticism as well as another study conducted on the same object of research.

The first study was conducted by Baral (2022) in the article entitled “A Panopticon Revelation of the Power and Self-Discipline in Orwell's *1984*”. The study explores Foucault’s concept of Panopticism in George Orwell’s *1984*, which is realized through the use of CCTV and other means of distant surveillance and control systems, such as television, telephone, and public posters stating that “BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING

YOU". Although the study was conducted on another one of Orwell's works using the same theory of Panopticism, *1984* focuses on the realization of the Panopticon through the use of modern instruments, of which lacks presence in Orwell's *Animal Farm*. Therefore, the Panopticism in *Animal Farm* is realized through other means, primarily through discourse and fear mongering. However, the article supports the current study through its analysis of how invisible surveillance and the use of certain discourse are used to spread fear and contribute to the Panoptic self-surveillance.

Another study by Cantaş and Can (2022) in the article titled "Justification of panopticon in superhero movies: The Batman Movie" examines how Foucault's concept of Panopticism is normalized in society through superhero movies, particularly *The Batman Movie*. The study finds that the superhero Batman acts as the panoptic inspector who becomes the citizens' invisible saviour from the invisible crimes of Gotham City, justifying and normalizing the idea that observation is necessary for safety. Both Cantaş and Can's (2022) article and the current study employs the same concept of panoptic surveillance, although the difference in research objects yields difference in findings and sheds light on how Panopticism is depicted across the different forms of media. The article supports the current study by highlighting the different ways that panoptic surveillance can take form, including invisible threats to one's safety and invisible agents keeping the order and the safety of a panoptic society.

The last study is an undergraduate thesis entitled "'Eat—or Get Eaten Up": A Study of Power in George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and Aravind Adiga's *The White Tiger*" written by Pombo (2020). The thesis expounds on how power is expressed through the repressive and ideological state structures in George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and Aravind Adiga's *The White Tiger*. The findings suggest that ideological institutions have a bigger role in the maintaining of a state power, although there is some overlap between both structures. Although Pombo's (2020) study provides a broader overview of power, it briefly discusses Foucault's Panopticism and surveillance in both data sources, categorizing them as closer to an ideological structure than repressive. The study provides a foundational basis for the current research, which expands upon the panoptic surveillance in *Animal Farm* in greater focus and detail.

## Research Method

This article utilizes the qualitative method, which is described as an approach for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem, with the data typically presented as non-numerical data, such as text or image, and is more open-ended (Creswell & Creswell, 2018, p. 51). The primary data source used in this article is George Orwell's novella entitled *Animal Farm*, with secondary data sources taken from previous research and related literature on a similar topic to the current research. The data taken from the primary data source are in the form of excerpts from the novella, including narrations and dialogues.

The data was collected through the documentation method by using the recording and note-taking techniques. First, the data source was observed by reading through the novella. In the current research, the text is measured by the usage of the invisible panoptic surveillance within narration and/or dialogue to be classified as relevant data. Next, the data was recorded and taken note of in the form of narrations and dialogues according to Foucault's theory of Panopticism. The collected data were then analyzed using the theory of Panopticism as stated by Foucault to highlight the various forms of surveillance used to contribute to the farm's Panopticism. The analysis is done through Creswell and Creswell's (2018) qualitative descriptive method, that is, through

descriptions of the conversations, actions, and thought processes of the characters. The data was then cross-checked multiple times through the triangulation method, defined as [the usage of] multiple methods or data sources in qualitative research to develop a comprehensive understanding of phenomena (Patton, 1999). After the analysis had been completed, conclusions were drawn to provide a comprehensive discussion of the results. The analysis was then presented through the informal method of descriptive technique, with Sudaryanto (2015) defined as a method of research that incorporates no change of data in the analysis, but rather, done by describing and explaining the data itself.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

The novella *Animal Farm* focuses on the story of the animals in the Manor Farm owned by Mr. Jones. An old well-respected boar named Old Major dreamt of a life where all animals live in equality and freedom from the humans' exploitations. He shares this dream with the other farm animals, calling for an uprising against the humans just before his passing. Three pigs named Snowball, Napoleon, and Squealer carried on his teachings in the form of a philosophy called Animalism.

The rebellion called by Old Major came much sooner than expected, as the animals defeated and drove away Mr. Jones and his workers from the farm. Manor Farm rebranded into Animal Farm, and the animals lived in relative prosperity under their self-established equality. The pigs, with their superior intelligence, watched over the farm in replacement of the humans. However, things take a turn for the worse when Napoleon, in his lust for power, drove away his rival Snowball and took indiscriminate charge of the farm. Bit by bit, the principles of Animalism were skewed to serve his and the pigs' interests until it no longer resembled Old Major's past vision for a better world.

The results and discussion is divided into three parts. The first part discusses the parallelism between Animal Farm and Bentham's model of the Panopticon. The second part discusses the various systems of surveillance utilized by Napoleon and the pigs to enforce the panoptic hierarchy within Animal Farm. Finally, in the last section, the reception and impact of these panoptic systems by the farm animals is discussed.

### **Reflecting the Panopticon Model and Panopticism**

It has been previously mentioned that Foucault's conceptualization of Panopticism is rooted in Bentham's architectural model of the Panopticon. The Panopticon consists of a central watchtower surrounded by stacked, concentric rings of individually partitioned cells, where, "[b]y the effect of backlighting," the one who observes from the tower remains hidden while those in their cells remain perpetually on display, "perfectly individualized and constantly visible" (Foucault, 1995, p. 200; Scott, 2017, p. 103). It is important to distinguish Bentham's model and Foucault's theory to avoid the possibility of confusion. Therefore, from henceforth, the term "Panopticon" shall refer to Bentham's architectural model of the ideal prison, while the theory developed by Foucault from the model is referred to in the words "Panopticism" and "panoptic".

There are four major components of the panoptic scheme as derived from Bentham's architectural design: permanent visibility, central inspection, isolation and ceaseless punishment (Brunon-Ernst, 2012, p. 31). The cells have windows facing the central tower, ensuring the "inspectors" within are always able to observe the individuals in the cells. The partitioning between prisoners leads to a sense of isolation,

and the constant observation without being able to see who is watching becomes a covert form of punishment or discipline.

However, this panoptic system is broadly applicable outside the prison system, with the only requirements being the presence of those four key components. The central watchtower does not need to physically exist so long as there is an “invisible” inspector keeping watch over the subjects of surveillance. Similarly, the cell blocks need not to exist so long as a form of enclosure and/or partitioning is present. Discipline sometimes requires enclosure, the specification of a place heterogeneous to all others and closed in upon itself” (Foucault, 1995, p. 141) but can also operate in open spaces through spatial partitioning. Aside from the use of spatial arrangements, non-physical means can also be used such as the distribution of different tasks and activities (Scott, 2017, p. 99). Ultimately, the goal is denumeralization, which is a mode of social division to “into manageable units where their energy can be deployed most effectively and obediently for productive and conformist ends” (Downing, 2008, p. 84).

*There would be no need for any of the animals to come in contact with human beings, which would clearly be most undesirable. [...] A Mr. Whymper, a solicitor living in Willingdon, had agreed to act as intermediary between Animal Farm and the outside world, [...].* (Foucault, 1995, p. 177).

While the panoptic system's flexibility removes the requirement of this type of isolated physical space, the farm itself is a reflection of Bentham's Panopticon prison model. *Animal Farm* is a form of physical enclosure. Enclosure is described as “confinement in [a space], for example, prisons or barracks” (Downing, 2008, p. 79). The perimeters of the farm are closed off by fences and gates, separating the farm from the “outside world” where the humans are. The animals were prohibited to be in contact with humans, except for certain circumstances under Napoleon's orders. All business was done through Mr. Whymper, who was only permitted to interact with a select few. From this, it can be inferred that the animals never ventured outside the perimeters of the farm nor came into contact with humans. Instead, the animals live isolated in their enclosure, within which the panoptic system is applied.

*All that year the animals worked like slaves. [...] Throughout the spring and summer they worked a sixty-hour week, and in August Napoleon announced that there would be work on Sunday afternoons as well.* (Foucault, 1995, p. 50).

The Panopticon effects its control over bodies in part through its efficient organization of space [...] (Dreyfus et al., 1983, pp. 189–190). The “observed prisoners” are divided into distinctions, whether through physical or non-physical means. Each individual has his own place; and each place its individual (Foucault, 1995, p. 143; Scott, 2017, p. 99). The farm animals are divided through temporal rather than spatial means, that is, through the control of activity (Downing, 2008, p. 80). While the control of activity is divided into five aspects, two out of five is particularly prominent in the division of tasks in the novella. They are the timetable, which is “an agenda designed to ‘establish rhythms, impose particular occupations, regulate the cycles of repetition’ and the temporal elaboration of the act, which is “the regulatory rhythm and timespan of each given activity in the timetable; the pace imposed upon an activity” (Downing, 2008, p. 80; Foucault, 1995, p. 149). The animals are assigned various tasks, including the responsibilities of the farm and the building of the windmill. Certain animals are also given certain specialized tasks, such as the pigs who are given the task of supervising the others and create policies for the farm, the hens who are given the task of producing eggs, the cows who are given the task of producing milk, the dogs who are given the task to guard Napoleon and keep watch of the other animals, and the sheep who are given the task to be Napoleon's supporters by continuously bleating

“FOUR LEGS GOOD, TWO LEGS BAD” and eventually “FOUR LEGS GOOD, TWO LEGS BETTER”. The animals are given sixty hours of work per week to do these assigned tasks within their schedule. This division of tasks eases the task of surveillance from the “watchtower”, as the animals are distinctly divided within their assigned activities.

*The pigs did not actually work, but directed and supervised the others. With their superior knowledge it was natural that they should assume the leadership.* (Orwell, 1945, p. 24)

The watchtower structure initially does not exist physically in *Animal Farm*. The closest equivalent to this structure is the role taken on by the pigs since the very start of *Animal Farm*'s standing post-Jones' expulsion. Predating even Napoleon's singular leadership over the farm, the pigs had always been entrusted to replace the role previously occupied by the humans. They became the farm's supervisors and managers. This creates a hierarchy within *Animal Farm* in which the pigs take on the role of the panoptic “inspectors”, while the other farm animals become the subjects of their surveillance. According to Foucault, hierarchy itself is also a form of partitioning. One of the means of spatial partitioning is the assignment of ranks, which is the “arrangement into classes, groups, hierarchies of subjects within a system; a process of classification arranged spatially” (Downing, 2008, p. 79).

*It was about this time that the pigs suddenly moved into the farmhouse and took up their residence there. [...] It was absolutely necessary, he said, that the pigs, who were the brains of the farm, should have a quiet place to work in. It was also more suited to the dignity of the Leader (for of late he had taken to speaking of Napoleon under the title of “Leader”) to live in a house than in a mere sty.* (Orwell, 1945, p. 54)

The pigs' standing as the watchtower inspectors only becomes exacerbated throughout the novel. The pigs taking their residence within the farmhouse that had once been the Joneses' home only serves to reinforce this role. The “watchtower”, which did not initially exist in *Animal Farm*, suddenly took the form of the farmhouse. From this, a clear division of “the see/being seen dyad” (Foucault, 1995, p. 202) is created. The pigs are able to keep watch over the farm animals from within the farmhouse, while the animals are unable to look into the farmhouse in return. This is a direct reflection of the relationship between the tower inspectors and the prisoners as detailed by Foucault in his conceptualization of Panopticism.

*Even in the farmhouse, it was said, Napoleon inhabited separate apartments from the others. He took his meals alone, with two dogs to wait upon him, [...].* (Orwell, 1945, p. 73)

Even within the metaphorical central tower, this dichotomy of the watcher and the watched also exists on a smaller scale. Napoleon, who is placed at the top of the hierarchy in *Animal Farm*, becomes the “highest eye” who watches the watchtower inspectors. He occupies a different, singular room by himself guarded by his watchdogs. This creates a metaphorical tower within the metaphorical tower, in which he is able to watch the other pigs. However, the other pigs are not privy to seeing Napoleon's activities or whether he is watching or not. The existence of this smaller panoptic structure is evidence of the flexible applicability of this power system, which Foucault states may be used “[w]henver one is dealing with a multiplicity of individuals on whom a task or a particular form of behavior must be imposed” (Foucault, 1995, p. 205).

### **Panoptic Surveillance in *Animal Farm***

Surveillance is defined as a “focused, systematic and routine attention to personal details for purposes of influence, management, protection or direction” (Lyon, 2018, p. 19). It is not only a form of watching, but it also has the capacity to modify human

behaviors. This is expanded in the Foucauldian theoretical framework as “an invisible power exercised directly and continuously over a visible collection of individual subjects” (Scott, 2017, p. 102). This is a central part of Panopticism. No matter the medium, panoptic surveillance is characterized by its continuity and its inability to be verified by its subjects of surveillance. It allows the “disciplinary power [to become] an 'integrated' system, [...], [that is] both absolutely indiscreet, since it is everywhere and always alert, [...] and absolutely 'discreet', for it functions permanently and largely in silence” (Foucault, 1995, pp. 176–177) and allows the exercise of power “[...] without [excess] recourse [...], force or violence” (Foucault, 1995, p. 177).

In *Animal Farm*, there are various means by which Napoleon keeps surveillance over the farm animals. In place of modern systems of surveillance, a lot of the means of surveillance in *Animal Farm* involve the use of discourse. Much of the discourse regulation in the novella is done through one of the pigs, Squealer, whose persuasiveness is known to the animals. Perhaps, it is for that reason that Napoleon had entrusted him with the work of modulating the farm's discourse.

*[...]; they [the Seven Commandments of Animalism] would form an unalterable law by which all the animals on Animal Farm must live for ever after. [...]. The Seven Commandments themselves are as such:*

1. *Whatever goes upon two legs is an enemy.*
2. *Whatever goes upon four legs, or has wings, is a friend.*
3. *No animal shall wear clothes.*
4. *No animal shall sleep in a bed.*
5. *No animal shall drink alcohol.*
6. *No animal shall kill any other animal.*
7. *All animals are equal.* (Orwell, 1945, p. 21)

It is imperative to first discuss the Seven Commandments of Animalism. These seven commandments are the heart of Old Major's teachings, and after the rebellion, became the policy that regulated the way the farm animals live in *Animal Farm*. By its very essence, it is discourse meant to regulate the behaviours of farm animals. The Seven Commandments are law, a set of regulations to communicate to the farm animals that “the following are what is expected of the animals”. There is a strong link between Panopticon, language, and control – discourse is a means to fix specific ideas, especially written discourse, to control what ideas, behaviors, and actions are acceptable within the limitations (Bozzo-Rey, 2012, pp. 171–172). In this sense, the seven commandments are the very first of the systems of surveillance implemented within *Animal Farm*.

However, the seven commandments do not stay unchanged forever. In fact, the commandments go through various alterations, majority of the time to serve the interests of the pigs. For example, the fourth commandment was modified to be “No animal shall sleep in a bed with sheets” after the other animals found out that the pigs are sleeping in the farmhouse beds. The fifth commandment was changed to “No animal shall drink alcohol to excess” after the pigs had found Jones' old stash of alcohol in the cellar and drank without restraint. Similarly, the rest of the commandments undergo alterations throughout the novella.

The modifications of these commandments all serve the same purpose: that is, to justify the decisions made by the pigs when the other animals start to question them. Very often, the modification of these commandments were some in secrecy and with Squealer convincing the others that their memory had been at fault all along. The other animals, who are less intelligent than the pigs are unable to verify the legitimacy of his claims. All they understand is that the commandments apparently had always been there

in writing, even though the reality is that the writings were modified to suit the pigs' needs. As the commandments change, the expectation of behaviors and accepted actions change with them. The surveillance throughout the novella follows these regulations along with their alterations.

*"We pigs are brainworkers. The whole management and organisation of this farm depend on us. [...] Do you know what would happen if we pigs failed in our duty? Jones would come back! [...] surely there is no one among you who wants to see Jones come back?"* (Orwell, 1945, pp. 29–30)

Another usage of discourse in the panoptic surveillance of *Animal Farm* is through the fabrication of various "invisible threats" that pose a major danger to the farm's safety. The earliest form of this occurrence that precedes even Napoleon's singular leadership over the farm is the threat of their previous master, Mr. Jones, coming back to the farm. If this were to happen, the animals would once again live the same life of misery prior to the Rebellion. They are afraid of being once again enslaved and exploited by the humans, no longer free. Jones becomes one of the "invisible eyes" in the farm's panoptic surveillance. This threat is used multiple times throughout the novel, such as to justify the abolishment of their weekly Meetings where the animals can vote on policies to pass as well as to justify the pigs' use of human beds. These situations do not have any apparent logical connection towards Jones' return. By the end of the novella, Jones died without having ever returned to the farm after his failed attempt in the Battle of the Cowshed. Regardless, it encourages the animals to stay docile, unquestioning of and unresisting against the pigs' decisions.

*"Snowball! He has been here! I can smell him distinctly!" and at the word "Snowball" all the dogs let out blood-curdling growls and showed their side teeth. The animals were thoroughly frightened. It seemed to them as though Snowball were some kind of invisible influence, pervading the air about them and menacing them with all kinds of dangers.* (Orwell, 1945, p. 63)

Another one of these invisible enemies is the threat of Snowball. Snowball was previously another influential figure among the animals and Napoleon's political rival. To ensure his rise to leadership, Napoleon drove Snowball away from the farm. After his expulsion, Snowball was continually defamed and eventually made out to be an evil character. His plans for a windmill was said to be stolen from Napoleon, and when the built windmill was destroyed from the strong winds, Snowball was accused of having destroyed the windmill in revenge. He is made out to be a traitor aligned with Foxwood or Pinchfield Farm, whichever one is considered to be Napoleon's enemy at the time, and even said to have always been working with Jones since the very beginning. Not only that, but he also has agents of his own within the farm working alongside him and in his interests. Similar to Jones, by the end of the novella, Snowball had never once again set foot within the farm after his forced expulsion. Nevertheless, he poses an invisible danger towards the farm throughout the novella, never actually seen but seemingly always causing mischief and chaos.

One of the key characteristics of the panoptic system is the invisibility of the "watcher" Both Mr. Jones and Snowball act as one of these "watchers" in the metaphorical central watchtower, although only in their conceptualization as a threat fabricated by Squealer. In fact, neither the actual Mr. Jones and the actual Snowball were a threat to the farm, if at all. However, it is not the actual Mr. Jones or Snowball that is needed to act as an agent of surveillance. Only the invisible and vague idea of their danger is needed to modulate the actions of the farm animals to fit the expected behaviors by law.

*In fact, it was [Snowball] who had actually been the leader of the human forces, and had charged into battle with the words "Long live Humanity!" on his lips. The wounds on Snowball's back, which*

*a few of the animals still remembered to have seen, had been inflicted by Napoleon's teeth.* (Orwell, 1945, p. 89)

This invisible form of surveillance does not only come in the form of obscure dangers, but it also takes the form of the “invisible hero”, Napoleon. He is painted as the selfless saviour of Animal Farm throughout the novella. His assumption of leadership after Snowball's expulsion was said to be a burden he was willing to bear for the farm. Stories were told that, in the Battle of the Cowshed during Jones' attempted return to the farm, he was the one to deliver a blow against Jones when Snowball had fled. The stories of this battle eventually reaches to a point where Snowball was said to have been on Jones' front lines, while Napoleon heroically retaliated against the traitor in the name of the farm. These retellings of the events are far from true. In truth, Snowball had played a significant part as the tactician and front-liner in the Battle of the Cowshed as detailed within the novella.

*Napoleon himself was not seen in public as often as once in a fortnight. [...] Even in the farmhouse, it was said, Napoleon inhabited separate apartments from the others.*

[...]

*In his speeches, Squealer would talk with the tears rolling down his cheeks of Napoleon's wisdom the goodness of his heart, and the deep love he bore to all animals everywhere, even and especially the unhappy animals who still lived in ignorance and slavery on other farms.* (Orwell, 1945, p. 73)

However, Snowball had eventually been painted to be a criminal and a traitor, and Napoleon is made out to be a hero as his foil. He is described to be a generous and selfless leader who keeps the best interests of the farm in mind. Grandiose stories of his good deeds and intentions were spread by Squealer, but it is never clear whether these stories told of Napoleon were really true or not. Meanwhile, Napoleon himself remained in relative seclusion within the farmhouse where the pigs reside, his metaphorical watchtower, and is seldom seen by the other animals. Many see the panopticon as an acceptable measure because there are clear benefits to sacrificing their right to privacy in the interest of greater personal security, and the disadvantages are generally far less tangible (Sheridan, 2016, p. 49). This is particularly evident in the way the farm animals treat Napoleon as opposed to Snowball. In the same vein as Snowball being only a concept of danger to the farm, Napoleon thus far has been only a concept of a hero or saviour. Regardless, both are concepts that have already been internalized by the farm animals. It is the reason why the farm animals choose to abide by the expectations of behavior from the pigs, one of which is to follow Napoleon unquestioningly.

*Silent and terrified, the animals crept back into the barn. [...] they were the puppies whom Napoleon had taken away from their mothers and reared privately. Though not yet full-grown, they were huge dogs, and as fierce-looking as wolves. They kept close to Napoleon. It was noticed that they wagged their tails to him in the same way as the other dogs had been used to do to Mr. Jones.* (Orwell, 1945, p. 44)

One of the major ways surveillance in Animal Farm is kept by Napoleon is through watchdogs. They were dogs Napoleon had personally educated since their youth to become his loyal guard and watchdogs. These dogs act as an extension to the pigs' role of surveillance, particularly to fulfill the goal of modeling certain behaviors encouraged by the system. The dogs are described to be large, fierce, and intimidating figures. Napoleon's introduction of them towards the animals had been to have the dogs chase Snowball off the farm. It is only because they could not keep up with Snowball that he had very narrowly avoided being harmed.

*Four young porkers in the front row uttered shrill squeals of disapproval, and all four of them sprang to their feet and began speaking at once. But suddenly the dogs sitting round Napoleon let out deep, menacing growls, and the pigs fell silent and sat down again.* (Orwell, 1945, p. 44)

The dogs are used as tools of intimidation various times throughout the novel. They pose the threat of violence towards the animals, instilling fear within them that most end up internalizing. In such cases where they fail to do so, they are given a warning sign through the dogs' growling. The fear and insecurity experienced by the animals are enough to reinstate the behavior of docility as encouraged by Napoleon through the dogs.

In this way, Napoleon's watchdogs symbolizes the guards at the watchtower. Unlike the inspectors, they are visible, but they are still carrying out the duties of surveillance in extension to the inspectors. A fitting parallel to these guards within the modern society would be the role of a police institution within the complex apparatus of a state. Foucault describes the police as a state apparatus "whose major, if not exclusive, function is to assure that discipline reigns over society as a whole" (Foucault, 1995, p. 214). They act as an extension to the inspector's eyes and a physical reminder that the prisoners are, indeed, being watched.

*He [Napoleon] was especially successful with the sheep [at canvassing support for himself]. [...] It was noticed that they [the sheep] were especially liable to break into "Four legs good, two legs bad" at crucial moments in Snowball's speeches. (Orwell, 1945, p. 40)*

Among the very first to internalize the panoptic system, even predating Napoleon's leadership over the farm, was the sheep. They are considered to be one of the "stupider animals" in *Animal Farm*. They are shown to do as they are told without much thought for themselves. Although the proposition of the maxim "FOUR LEGS GOOD, TWO LEGS BAD" had been Snowball, Napoleon had taken advantage of their easiness to influence to make the sheep his supporters. The bleating of the sheep is shown to be disruptive. They serve as a distraction from critical moments of disagreement, especially during Napoleon's leadership over the farm. Their distracting bleating is meant to shut down thoughts of doubt and words of protests from the other animals.

*[...]— they might have uttered some word of protest. But just at that moment, as though at a signal, all the sheep burst out into a tremendous bleating of — "Four legs good, two legs BETTER! Four legs good, two legs BETTER! Four legs good, two legs BETTER!" (Orwell, 1945, p. 102)*

By the end of the novel, the pigs have started to stand on their hind legs on two feet. They are effectively indistinguishable to the humans, which creates confusion in the other animals. However, just before they were able to protest, the sheep once again started to bleat loudly and drown out all other voices. Their bleating has changed from "FOUR LEGS GOOD, TWO LEGS BAD" to "FOUR LEGS GOOD, TWO LEGS BETTER", reflecting the change within the pigs. The effects of their bleating is immediate in shutting down any potential words of protest, coaxing the other animals to once again conform to the norms that had been placed in the farm to remain unquestioning and unresisting. These changes in the pigs and the sheep signify the ever-widening wedge between the animals, symbolizing the prisoners in the cell, and the pigs, symbolizing the tower inspectors, within the panoptic hierarchy of *Animal Farm*.

The prisoners of the watchtower are subjected to the observation from the central watchtower. The internalization of that "invisible gaze" can result in these self surveillance and self disciplines of the objects of surveillance. the details on the topic of self-discipline as discussed within the next section. However, once the prisoners have already internalized the norm as dictated by the system, they can also become the subject or the agents of the panoptic surveillance themselves.

*"[...] This morning I saw you looking over the hedge that divides Animal Farm from Foxwood. One of Mr. Pilkington's men was standing on the other side of the hedge. And [...] he was talking to you and you were allowing him to stroke your nose. What does that mean, Mollie?" (Orwell, 1945, p. 39)*

Mollie, a mare in the farm, is described to be vain and continually favors humans. There are several reasons for this. She enjoys being dressed up in ribbons, although ribbons are considered human clothing, which is not allowed in the farm. She also enjoys consuming sugar, which is an item that is only produced by humans and not animals. However, the farm's rigidity in the belief that humans are evil prevents her from being able to access neither ribbons nor sugars. Yet, she still desires them and sought them out in secret from one of the workers in Foxwood.

Clover, one of the cart-horses, just so happens to witness one of the interactions between Mollie and the Foxwood worker. Although not intentionally, she had inevitably watched one of her own defy the regulations that had been put in place in the farm. She had witnessed someone's defiance from the norm. To correct this wrong, she seeks Mollie out alone and confronts her, demanding an explanation. In doing so, she becomes another one of the agents of surveillance within the farm making sure that the others conform to the norms of the Animal Farm. Clover's behavior in confronting Mollie for her transgression is evidence of her internalization of the panoptic gaze, which causes her to also become an agent of surveillance and ensure others' conformity to the expected discipline.

### **Internalization of the Panoptic Eyes: Self-surveillance and Self-discipline**

A key feature of the Panopticon is the prisoners' constant visibility from the central tower. Consequently, in Panopticism, the "prisoners" feel "a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power" (Foucault, 1995, p. 201) without being able to see their inspectors. They soon behave as if they are being watched, without knowing for certain whether or not [they are being watched] (Downing, 2008, p. 82). This prevents them from acting on "undesirable behaviors". The internalization of these panoptic "eyes" transforms the act of surveillance "from a matter of external overseeing to a rigorous self-policing" (Downing, 2008, p. 84). This rigorous self-policing is referred to as self-surveillance or self-discipline.

*Clover warned him sometimes to be careful not to overstrain himself, but Boxer would never listen to her. His two slogans, "I will work harder" and "Napoleon is always right," seemed to him a sufficient answer to all problems. (Orwell, 1945, p. 51)*

The panoptic schema was so successfully integrated into their lives that the animals had internalized Animal Farm's Panopticism within themselves. One of the testaments of this success is shown in the character named Boxer, who is one of the cart-horses in Animal Farm. He is characterized as hardworking, even to the point of overstrain, as a show of his pride to be part of Animal Farm. He thoroughly internalizes Napoleon's role as the "invisible saviour" of Animal Farm, whose good deeds may or may not be true, that will protect them from the "invisible threats" of Jones and Snowball, who may or may not truly be real dangers to the farm. He adopts two maxims that continue to define his life, one of them being that "Napoleon is always right". Because Napoleon is always right, he holds the belief that he should carry out any duties Napoleon places upon him. To do so, he "will work harder" to yield the best results, as he believes that those duties will bring good towards the farm. Boxer and the other animals believe that Napoleon protects the farm from.

*Instead — she did not know why — they had come to a time when no one dared speak his mind, when fierce, growling dogs roamed everywhere, and when you had to watch your comrades torn to pieces after confessing to shocking crimes. There was no thought of rebellion or disobedience in her mind. [...]. Whatever happened she would remain faithful, work hard, carry out the orders that were given to her, and accept the leadership of Napoleon. (Orwell, 1945, p. 69)*

Not only Boxer, but a vast majority of the animals have similarly internalized the panoptic surveillance in Animal Farm. From these various systems, they have identified the kind of behavior that was being encouraged by Napoleon and the pigs. Similar to Boxer, the other animals accepted Napoleon's leadership and decisions without question, even when they personally did not agree with those decisions. They carry out the orders given to them without a word of protest, all for the good of the farm, as Napoleon is believed to know best for them. They remain docile as the pigs had intended. Their self-discipline only continues to fortify the running of Animal Farm's panoptic system by becoming agents of their own surveillance.

*Then there came a moment when the first shock had worn off and when, in spite of everything—in spite of their terror of the dogs, and of the habit, developed through long years, of never complaining, never criticising, no matter what happened — they might have uttered some word of protest. (Orwell, 1945, p. 102)*

It is said that the animals conformed to these norms and expected behaviors even years into Napoleon's leadership over the farm. It is explicitly written within the text that throughout the years, the animals have developed a habit of never showing any form of protest of resistance against Napoleon and the pigs, no matter what happened. The formation of this habit is from the successful internalization of the panoptic system. It is the continuation of their self-surveillance and self-discipline.

After years of becoming their own subjects of surveillance, the first time they have gained the clarity to question the pigs again is when the pigs have started to stand and walk upright, mimicking the humans. However, even the thought to protest is forced to remain as thoughts. Immediately after the thought crosses their minds, the sheep broke out in loud bleating of "FOUR LEGS GOOD, TWO LEGS BETTER".

*After that it did not seem strange when next day the pigs who were supervising the work of the farm all carried whips in their trotters. It did not seem strange to learn that the pigs had bought themselves a wireless set, were arranging to install a telephone, and had taken out subscriptions to 'John Bull', 'Tit-Bits', and the 'Daily Mirror'. It did not seem strange when Napoleon was seen strolling in the farmhouse garden with a pipe in his mouth — no, not even when the pigs took Mr. Jones's clothes out of the wardrobes and put them on. (Orwell, 1945, p. 103)*

After the reveal of the pigs standing and walking upright, life for the animals in the farm continues on as "normal". At the very least, it is the norm that has been their norm for years. The pigs standing up and walking upright on their hind legs had been a massive shock to the farm animals, and yet, the following abnormalities did not strike them as strange anymore. The pigs continue to increasingly resemble humans, by carrying weapons with them, using human technology, and wearing their clothes. All of these actions have always been against the teachings of Animalism they had derived from Old Major. However, the degree of their internalization to be docile and unquestioning leads them to wholly believe that these actions from the pigs were in no way strange or abnormal. In that sense, the Panopticism within Animal Farm had gone beyond simply applying the panoptic schema as a method for control and discipline, but had fully turned Animal Farm into a panoptic society.

## CONCLUSION

Foucault's concept of Panopticism is reflected within *Animal Farm*, particularly through the "invisible" systems of surveillance that serves as a manifestation of the central tower inspector derived from Bentham's model of the Panopticon. These systems of surveillance are not a monolith, but instead, can take a variety of forms. Many of these systems in *Animal Farm* involve the use of discourse to instill the normalization of certain behaviors in the farm, whether through the overt regulation of

behaviours, intimidation tactics, or subtler forms of influence such as distraction. Some of them may even appear contradictory at first glance. For example, the role of Jones and Snowball as the “invisible enemies” of the farm and Napoleon’s role as the “unseen hero” are direct foils to each other, but they ultimately occupy the very same seat as the “inspectors” in the watchtower.

Regardless, the goal of these systems of surveillance are one, that is, to encourage the “prisoners” to conform with the norm. In *Animal Farm*, what is considered the “norm” is to be quiet and keep on with their work as they are tasked to, for it should not be doubted that Napoleon knows what is best for the farm. The lack of need to challenge Napoleon’s policies is normalized within the farm. The animals of *Animal Farm* successfully internalized this idea, to the point that they themselves have become the agents of their own surveillance and even other animals within the farm. The Panopticism in *Animal Farm* shows how easily and subtly panoptic surveillance can be integrated into society and permeate all facets of life without being noticed. The panoptic systems in *Animal Farm* also show that fear and the desire for safety are incredibly powerful motivators, and their overwhelming presence could very easily lead to the justification of what may not necessarily be normal. While it may not be a possible feat to escape from the panoptic gaze, especially in the current surveillance society, it is important to regard the world with a critical mind and awareness to avoid blind and mindless conformity.

## REFERENCES

- Barker, P. (1998). *Michel Foucault: An introduction*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Bentham, J. (2018). The Panopticon. In T. Monahan & D. M. Wood (Eds.), *Surveillance studies: A reader* (pp. 31–35). Oxford university press.
- Bozzo-Rey, M. (2012). Social Control and the Legal Panoptic Paradigm. In A. Brunon-Ernst (Ed.), *Beyond Foucault: New perspectives on Bentham's Panopticon* (pp. 161–184). Ashgate.
- Bradbury, R. (2021). Fahrenheit 451. In J. R. Eller (Ed.), *Novels & story cycles: The Martian chronicles, Fahrenheit 451, Dandelion wine, Something wicked this way comes* (pp. 231–362). Library of America.
- Brunon-Ernst, A. (2012). Deconstructing Panopticism into the Plural Panopticons. In A. Brunon-Ernst (Ed.), *Beyond Foucault: New perspectives on Bentham's Panopticon* (pp. 17–42). Ashgate.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*.
- Downing, L. (2008). *The Cambridge Introduction to Michel Foucault*.
- Dreyfus, H. L., Rabinow, P., & Foucault, M. (1983). *Michel Foucault, beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (2nd ed). University of Chicago Press.
- Elmer, G. (2012). Panopticon—Discipline—Control. In D. Lyon, K. D. Haggerty, & K. Ball (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of surveillance studies* (pp. 21–29). Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (2nd Vintage Books ed). Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (2018). Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. In T. Monahan & D. M. Wood (Eds.), *Surveillance studies: A reader* (pp. 36–41). Oxford university press.
- Laval, C. (2012). From Discipline and Punish to The Birth of Biopolitics. In A. Brunon-Ernst (Ed.), *Beyond Foucault: New perspectives on Bentham's Panopticon* (pp. 43–62). Ashgate.

- Lyon, D. (2018). Surveillance Studies: An Overview. In T. Monahan & D. M. Wood (Eds.), *Surveillance studies: A reader* (pp. 18–21). Oxford university press.
- Orwell, G. (1945). *Animal Farm*. The University of Adelaide Library; Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/AnimalFarmByGeorgeOrwell>
- Orwell, G. (2001). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Project Gutenberg Australia. <https://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks01/0100021.txt>
- P. Hier, S., Walby, K., & Greenberg, J. (2006). Supplementing the panoptic paradigm: Surveillance, moral governance, and CCTV. In D. Lyon (Ed.), *Theorizing Surveillance: The panopticon and beyond* (pp. 230–244). Willan Publishing.
- Pombo, D. L. (2020). “Eat—Or Get Eaten Up”: A Study of Power in George Orwell’s *Animal Farm* and Aravind Adiga’s *The White Tiger* [Undergraduate Thesis]. University of A Coruña.
- Scott, D. (Ed.). (2017). *Understanding Foucault, understanding modernism*. Bloomsbury Academic, an imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Inc.
- Sheridan, C. (2016). *Foucault, Power and the Modern Panopticon* [Senior Thesis, Trinity College]. <http://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/theses/548>
- Taylor, D. (Ed.). (2014). *Michel Foucault: Key concepts*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315711478>