

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

B.1 Theoretical Framework

The researcher intends to analyze the dominance of the ruling class that causes resistance by the lower class. Researchers need theories related to the topic and object of research to analyze existing phenomena. Therefore, based on the researcher's observation, the theory that can be used in this research is Antonio Gramsci's theory of hegemony and Michel Foucault's theory of power and resistance which serves as a guide to understanding the ideological domination exercised by the upper class that provokes resistance from the lower class.

B.1.1 Antonio Gramsci's Hegemony Theory

B.1.1.1 Biography Antonio Gramsci

Antonio Gramsci was born in Ales, Sardinia, Italy on January 23, 1891. He was an intellectual and politician who was also the founder of the Italian Communist Party who managed to make his leadership able to influence Italian communism through his ideas (Martin, 2023). In 1911, he enrolled at the University of Turin, which was the start of his illustrious career, where he was directly associated with the Federation of Socialist Youth and joined the Socialist Party in 1914. He studied Marxist thought in the midst of World War I and became a leading theorist of his time. Gramsci with his vast intellect became a left-wing leader who supported social equality and opposed the hierarchical system of the

right. He led a leftist strike at the Socialist congress held in Livorno in January 1921, where he successfully founded the Italian Communist Party and then spent two years in the Soviet Union. After returning to Italy in April 1924, he became the head of his party and was elected to the country's Chamber of Deputies, but then Antonio Gramsci was arrested and imprisoned in 1926 because his party was banned by the fascist Benito Mussolini.

While in prison, despite the strictures of the censorship, Gramsci conducted extensive historical and theoretical research on Italian society and possible strategies for change. However, due to his failing health while imprisoned by Mussolini's fascists for more than 10 years, in April 1937, Antonio Gramsci died in Rome's Quisisana clinic. Gramsci left behind 33 notebooks that he wrote while in prison. After 80 years of his death, people still read the notes Gramsci left behind to gain greater insight into the contemporary landscape of power.

B.1.1.2 The Nature of Hegemony

Before hegemony was popularized by Gramsci, the word "hegemony" was already used by Lenin as a revolutionary strategy that the working class and its members must carry out to gain majority support (Olsarreti, 2014). While in ancient Greek "hegemony" comes from the word "eugonomia" which refers to domination or leadership, especially the leadership of a state or nation in a confederation. This means that hegemony can be interpreted as a domination

exercised by one party over another, a complex example is the form of government domination over a country.

Hegemony theory is one of the thoughts obtained by Antonio Gramsci when he was in prison which was later recorded under the title "Selection from the Prisons Notebook". The theory of hegemony was put forward by Gramsci in the 20th century around 1937. In his time, hegemony theory was the most important political theory (Saptono, 2010). Antonio Gramsci is seen as the most important political thinker after Marx. His brilliant ideas on hegemony, heavily influenced by Hegel's philosophy of law, are considered the cornerstone of an alternative paradigm to traditional Marxist theory (Gramsci, 1971). Gramsci's theories emerged as a critique and alternative to previous theoretical approaches to social change dominated by the class and economic determinism of traditional Marxism. Gramsci's theory of hegemony is not new to the Marxist tradition. The notion of hegemony has been recognized by Marxists long before Gramsci, such as Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, Sigmund Simmel according to Femia.

Hegemony according to the understanding put forward by Gramsci, namely, in order for the controlled to obey the ruler, the controlled must accept and agree to submit themselves to them, in other words, the controlled must understand the application of the values and norms adopted by the ruler. In this context, Gramsci saw hegemony as a more subtle and effective form of control, where rulers are able to maintain their power by creating compliance with the ruled through

ideology, rather than relying on physical violence. Gramsci divided the type of supremacist leadership of the ruling group or social class into two, namely, domination and oppression with intellectual and moral leadership (Herdanto, 1993).

Gramsci said, when power is achieved by relying on physical violence and coercion, the successful result of force is called “domination”. That is why Gramsci distinguishes hegemony from the concept of domination because the two have quite significant differences. Gramsci emphasized that sustainable and stable power would be better if achieved through hegemony rather than domination. Hegemony involves integration and consent to the values set by the ruler, so the power will last long because it is not vulnerable to resistance. In contrast, domination relies on physical force and coercion, which can pose a threat and eventually lead to resistance.

In concept, hegemony is power that is acquired and maintained through the consent of the people by emphasizing ideological aspects by influencing and shaping their worldview through culture.

B.1.1.3 Types of Hegemony

There are three levels of hegemony proposed by Antonio Gramsci, namely total hegemony (integral), decadent hegemony, and minimum hegemony (Herdanto, 1993). In this context, hegemony can be formulated as an understanding of the socio-political situation.

First, integral hegemony is characterized by the ruler gaining almost all the support of the masses (Herdanto, 1993). The support is not only large but also very strong and comprehensive. People show a solid level of moral and intellectual unity by agreeing with the ideology set by the ruler. This is evident in the organic relationship between the ruler and the ruled as there is no coercion or domination. The relationship is not riddled with contradictions and antagonism either socially or ethically because the ruled do not feel under pressure from the ruler. This creates strong social stability and harmony.

Second, decadent hegemony is characterized by the potential for disintegration or conflict hidden beneath the surface of society, even though the system appears to be running well and achieving the desired goals (Herdanto, 1993). This suggests that although basic needs are being met, there is dissatisfaction or tension that could trigger conflict. Although the system has achieved its set needs and goals, this is not enough to ensure long-term stability. There is a misalignment between the material needs being met and the declining ideological support of the society. People who may have their material needs met, do not fully support and align with the thinking set by the rulers. As the rulers begin to lose their ability to fully control the views of the people, the previously strong support begins to weaken and the ruled's trust in the ruler's ideology begins to wane.

Third, minimum hegemony, this form of hegemony is the lowest form compared to the two forms above (Herdanto, 1993). Minimum hegemony relies on ideological unity between economic, political and intellectual elites, accompanied by a rejection of interference in the affairs of government (rulers). They refuse to accommodate the interests and aspirations of other classes in society, instead maintaining control through the incorporation of cultural, political, social and economic leaders who may be at odds with the vision of the “new State” desired by the hegemonic group. They try to maintain the status quo by combining forces from various fields to control the political and social direction according to their interests, even if it means opposing changes desired by other groups or the general public.

B.1.1.4 The Socio-Political Concepts that Gave Rise to the Theory of Hegemony

Not only did Gramsci come up with theories from mere contemplation, but he also made many observations, experiences, and interpretations of socio-political life and social phenomena that took place around his life. During his lifetime when Gramsci was studying in Turin, he was in an industrialized city that reveled in luxury, in stark contrast to his life in a farming village (Gramsci, 1971). Gramsci saw unequal socio-political relations between the working class in the city and the peasants in the village. This sharp difference perpetuated the conflict between the industrialized 'North' and the rural 'South'. The poverty and injustice Gramsci experienced as a child in the South shaped him into a revolutionary, who

was active in political struggle in Turin. Gramsci not only expressed intellectual ideas, but was also involved with militant mass organizations. Gramsci wrote about every aspect of Turin society and its socio-political conditions, while analyzing a number of strikes and labor demonstrations in Turin, as well as other political events in Italy and internationally (Gramsci, 1971). Gramsci was a socialist, so the ideas of Marx and Engels influenced Gramsci's political thought to some extent. The classical Marxist thought developed by Marx and Engels, which tends to view political institutions as a reflection of economic structures, became a point of concern for Gramsci. This view, called economism, is considered to hinder the understanding of the nature of capitalist domination and the strategies needed to end domination and move towards socialism. Lenin offered a sharp critique of classical Marxism, but it was Gramsci's thought that refined the weaknesses of Lenin's critique of economism.

Lenin had laid the foundations of the concept of hegemony before Gramsci. According to Lenin, hegemony was an important strategy for the working class to win the support of the majority in their struggle, especially through alliances with other classes such as the peasants. In the Russian Revolution, for example, the working class, though a minority, allied with the majority peasant population to act as the hegemonic force (Kristianto, 2024). However, Gramsci expanded Lenin's understanding of hegemony by incorporating the role of the capitalist class, emphasizing that hegemony is not just a strategy of class alliances but also involves maintaining control through cultural and ideological means. Gramsci critiqued

Lenin's more class-centric approach by adding a national-populist dimension to hegemony, arguing that a class cannot become hegemonic if it only focuses on its own interests, but must also consider the broader social and national struggles. Furthermore, if for Lenin hegemony was primarily understood in terms of alliances between classes or class groups, then Gramsci added a populist national dimension to the concept of hegemony. Gramsci states that a class cannot achieve national leadership and become hegemonic, if it only pays attention to its own interests, so it must also pay attention to the demands and struggles of people who do not have a pure class character, namely interests that do not arise directly from production relations (Gramsci, 1971). Hence, hegemony has both a class dimension and a popular national dimension.

B.2.1 Michel Foucault's Theory Power

B.2.1.1 Michel Foucault's Biography

Michel Foucault (1926-1984) was a French philosopher, historian, and social critic who was highly influential in 20th century thought. He is known for his critical analysis of concepts such as power, knowledge, and subjectivity. Foucault was born in Poitiers, France in 1926. He studied at the École Normale Supérieure in Paris and obtained his doctorate in 1961. During his lifetime, Foucault taught at leading universities in France and the United States, including the Collège de France (Foucault, 2006).

Foucault's most influential works include "Madness and Civilization" (1961), "The Birth of the Clinic" (1963), "The Order of Things" (1966), "Discipline and Punish" (1975), and "The History of Sexuality" (1976-1984). His thought is heavily influenced by Nietzsche and Heidegger, and intersects with Marxism. Foucault is known for his "archaeological" and "genealogical" approach in analyzing discourse and power (Foucault, 2007). He emphasized the importance of understanding the historical and socio-political context in studying social phenomena (Dixon, 2007).

In addition, Foucault also paid attention to issues of ethics and "technologies of the self" in relation to the formation of subjectivity. His thinking influenced many disciplines, including sociology, criminology, and gender studies. Foucault died in 1984 in Paris due to complications from AIDS. He left a legacy of highly influential thought that continues to be studied today (Elden, 2018).

B.2.1.2 The Concept of Power in Michel Foucault's Thought

Michel Foucault views power as diffuse and productive, rather than merely repressive. Power, according to Foucault, is not only possessed by certain institutions or actors, but is ubiquitous, shaping individuals and social structures themselves (Foucault, 2007). In this perspective, power operates at every level of life, from everyday interactions to larger social structures. As such, power not only serves to oppress or control, but also creates and shapes individuals and the existing social order.

One of the key concepts Foucault developed to explain how power works is the panopticon. In Foucault's theory of power, the concept of the panopticon plays a very important role. The panopticon, first introduced by Jeremy Bentham in prison design, has come to symbolize the workings of modern power. Foucault developed this concept in his work *Discipline and Punish*, where he explains how constant and hidden surveillance can affect individuals without having to resort to direct violence. In the panopticon system, individuals do not know when they are being watched, yet they must always behave according to the prevailing norms due to the constant possibility of surveillance.

Thus, power does not only operate through violence or visible threats, but also through regulating individual behavior with subtle and systematic social control. This concept of the panopticon illustrates how surveillance and power can infiltrate every aspect of life, shaping behavior and knowledge without direct intervention. It is closely related to the four main concepts in Foucault's theory of power: Disciplinary Power, Governance, Power and Knowledge, and Dispersed Power Relations.

1. Disciplinary Power

Foucault explains that power does not only operate through visible violence or law, but also through more subtle means, such as surveillance and normalization of individual behavior. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault describes how modern society regulates and disciplines individuals through social institutions such as

schools, prisons and hospitals. In this view, power works through the control of the individual's body, which is internalized as part of the normalization of behavior. This creates compliant individuals without the need for direct supervision, a concept known as panopticism (Gautam, 2024).

2. Governmentality

Foucault also developed the concept of governmentality, which refers to the ways in which governments organize and control populations through a wider range of techniques, not only by direct domination or violence, but by more subtle and rational means (Arnold & Hess, 2017). In this context, power focuses not only on individuals, but on entire populations, which are organized through economic, social, and political policies. Governmentality describes how power operates in broader forms of social control, organizing lives and policies through the regulation of resources and populations (Foucault, 1991). Foucault considers governmentality as the rationalization of how power is legitimately exercised by the state.

3. Power and Knowledge

One of the central concepts in Foucault's theory is the relationship between power and knowledge. Foucault argues that power is not only oppressive, but also productive, creating knowledge and structures that underlie social norms (Foucault, 1976). Knowledge and power are inseparable, and knowledge is used to organize and discipline individuals. For example, in *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault explains how knowledge about the body, behavior, and sexuality is

controlled by powerful institutions, and how this knowledge is used to control individuals.

4. Dispersed Power Relations

According to Foucault (1990), power is not centralized in one particular individual or institution, but is dispersed and exists in every social relation. Power operates in every social interaction, both at the micro (individual) and macro (population) levels. This means that power does not belong to anyone, but is a set of relationships spread throughout society. Therefore, the analysis of power must focus on how power operates in social relations and everyday practices.

Michel Foucault's theory of power provides a more complex and dynamic understanding of how power works in society. Power not only operates through visible mechanisms of domination, but also through subtle mechanisms that organize individuals and populations. By highlighting the relationship between power and knowledge, as well as how power is diffused in social relations, Foucault's theory offers important insights into social control and subject formation in modern society.

B.3.1 Foucault's Resistance to Power

Foucault viewed resistance as an integral part of power relations that are always interrelated (Saunders & Al-Om, 2022). According to him, where there is power, there is also resistance, because resistance is not just a reaction to power, but is a productive force that has the potential to challenge and change existing

power structures (Davids & Waghid, 2018). For Foucault, resistance is not only seen in the form of open rebellion, but also in more subtle forms of subversion that take place in everyday life.

Foucault identified various forms of resistance, including overt rebellion, subtle subversion, and the creation of alternative subjectivities (Foucault, 2007). In this context, resistance can also take the form of creating alternative subjectivities that challenge conventional ways of understanding the self and society. For example, in his study of the asylum system, Foucault sees resistance in the form of “slow violence” and “slow resistance” by asylum seekers to the disciplinary power of the state, which constantly tries to control and stigmatize them.

One form of resistance that Foucault strongly emphasizes is the practice of “care of the self” as a way for individuals to transform and challenge the ways in which power shapes their subjectivity. By engaging in autonomous practices of self-making, individuals can begin to challenge the norms produced by power and change the way they see themselves and their place in society (Ucnik, 2018). This suggests that resistance can come from within individuals themselves, and not just through collective action.

However, although Foucault sees resistance as a productive force, he also recognizes that resistance is not always effective or transformative. Sometimes, it can be co-opted by the dominant power and twisted to maintain existing

structures (Lilja & Vinthagen, 2014). Foucault warns against over-romanticizing resistance, noting that resistance must always be understood within the context and dynamics of specific power relations, and often faces significant constraints and limitations.

Overall, Foucault's concept of resistance highlights the productive and transformative potential of power relations, but also recognizes that resistance does not always run smoothly or end in major changes. As such, resistance remains a complex, non-linear phenomenon, and must be understood contextually according to the social forces and dynamics present at any given time and place. Foucault identifies form of resistance into several parts, as follows:

1. Overt Rebellion

Resistance can also take the form of open rebellion, where individuals or groups directly confront and challenge existing power structures through protests, uprisings, or other visible forms of resistance. This more explicit form of resistance aims to disrupt the course of power through direct action and confrontation, often at the risk of retaliation or repression. Foucault recognizes that such overt actions can be powerful triggers of change, but also cautions that this type of resistance remains limited by larger powers that can control and respond in unpredictable ways.

2. Subtle subversion

Foucault also identified “slow resistance” and “slow violence” as ways for marginalized groups to resist the disciplinary power exercised by institutions over time, through more gradual and subtle means. This resistance happens slowly, in an attempt to shake up and undermine existing power structures without being immediately visible, which creates a more subtle but still significant change (Spaaij, 2013).

3. Creation of alternative subjectivities

Foucault sees resistance as a way to form alternatives to subjectivities that have been shaped by power. Subjects trapped in oppressive social frameworks can resist by forming identities and values that are different from the dominant ones. This resistance occurs when individuals or groups create subjectivities that go against the social norms and expectations determined by power. This process involves freeing individuals from restrictive social constructs and giving them space to define who they really are, by changing their view of themselves and the world around them (Duschinsky & Adey, 2014).

4. Care of self

Foucault emphasizes the importance of “taking care of the self” as a form of resistance to the normalizing processes implemented by disciplinary societies. This concept highlights how individuals, by engaging in practices that transform their subjectivity, can resist the homogenizing forces of social expectations. It involves

the active construction of one's identity and values, where individuals critically assess and shape their own lives instead of following the demands of external powers. Self-transformation thus becomes an act of personal liberation as well as a subversion of normalizing processes that limit individuality (Markula, 2003).

B.2 Review of Related Researches

There are several studies relevant to this research, including the topic, theory, object, and aspects. The first research is from article written by Daniel Ahmad Fajri & Romel Noverino (2018) entitled *Critique of Ideology Bin George Orwell's Novel 1984: A Hans-George Gadamer's Hermeneutics Reaing* in *Journal of Language and Literature*, volume 7, number 3, pages 113-125. This study aims to analyze critiques of the ideology concept within the context of the novel *1984* using the philosophical hermeneutics approach of Hans-Georg Gadamer and the critical theory of Jurgen Habermas. Through three stages of analysis involving text understanding, historical consciousness, and historical effects, this research reveals that despite the ideological background differences between the novel's author, George Orwell, and interpreters in the late capitalist era, both articulate critiques of the total domination of systems and efforts to resist totalitarian systems by advocating processes of rationalization and emancipatory communication within society. Furthermore, the study underscores the relevance of these critiques in contemporary contexts, particularly in addressing the

pervasive influence of advanced technology and propaganda in shaping societal power dynamics.

The second research is from the article written by Andika Aliansyah Putra (2021) entitled *Social Class and Rebellion in George Orwell's 1984* in *Litera Kultura: Journal of Literary and Cultural Studies*, volume 9, number 2, pages 66-71. This research analyzes the depiction of social class in George Orwell's novel 1984. The discussion focuses on how social class is portrayed and social class as a trigger for rebellion by Winston Smith as the main character in the novel. Winston Smith as a party member working for Big Brother wants to rebel secretly. Winston is not alone, he meets Julia who has the same desire as Winston. Referring to this problem, this thesis outlines two issues regarding the depiction of social class in the novel 1984 and social class triggers Winston's rebellion. This article uses the supporting theories of Marxism by Karl Marx and rebellion.

The third research is from an article written by Mutjaba Mohammedali Yahya Al-hilo (2023) entitled *The Discourse of Historicity in George Orwell's 1984* in *European Journal of Language and Culture Studies*, volume 2, number 3, pages 15-20. This study explores the ways in which the Party manipulates historical records, the importance of comprehending historicity, and the ways in which language and memory are shaped and controlled within the novel's totalitarian society by drawing on the theories of New Historicism, including authors like Michel Foucault, Stephen Greenblatt, Catherine Gallagher, Hayden White, and Louis Montrose. By

carefully examining these ideas, this analysis illuminates the complex relationship between language, memory, power, and historical interpretation, underscoring the perils of authoritarianism and the necessity of keeping a range of viewpoints and critical thinking.

The fourth research from article written by Mozaffor Hossain (2017) entitled *Language as the device for psychological manipulation in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: A Psycholinguistic Analysis* in *European Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, volume 5, number 8, pages 25-31. The article explores the influential role of language in shaping human thoughts and actions, drawing inspiration from George Orwell's novel, "Nineteen Eighty-Four." It emphasizes how language, when unrestrained, expands understanding, while constraints hinder ideas. Orwell's novel vividly illustrates language's power to manipulate psychological functions, especially through the engineered language 'Newspeak.' The paper conducts a concise psycholinguistic analysis to understand the profound impact of language on mental processes in the context of "Nineteen Eighty-Four."

The fifth research conducted by Mohammad Nusr Al-Subaihi & Hanita Hanim Ismail (2020) entitled *Orwell's 1984 and the Concept of Powerlessness* in *International Journal of English, Literature and Social Sciences*, volume 5, number 1, pages 289-295. This article examines social-psychological alienation in Orwell's *1984* by focusing on Winston as a character, using Seeman's conceptualization of

alienation as the theoretical framework. It specifically addresses the concept of 'powerlessness' as it is dominant in the novel. The paper first presents the reasons behind Winston's feeling of alienation, aligning with Seeman's framework on the process, circumstances, and results of alienation. Although the term 'alienation' is not explicitly used in the novel, it is clearly depicted through Winston's experiences. A thematic analysis combined with Seeman's concept reveals that Winston's alienation stems from totalitarianism, fear, and the Party's control of power and information. The findings benefit scholars and readers by highlighting the circumstances and factors that lead to a sense of powerlessness and subsequent social-psychological alienation.

The sixth research is from article written by Elsadig Hussein Fadlallah Ali (2023) entitled *The Dystopian Elements of Government in Orwell's Novel 1984* in *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, volume 4, number 2, pages 160-166. The paper focuses on the dystopian elements of government as depicted in Orwell's novel *1984*. Generally, dystopia appears in the abuse of power, manipulation, exploitation, and injustice in man's attempt to achieve a perfect society. This paper deals with how dystopian literature depicts the flaws of those seemingly utopian societies in Orwell's *1984*. It shows how people fall victim to the dystopian government policy and its games, exposing peoples' lives to danger and even death. In brief, it shows the slow decay of life and self as reflected in dystopian literature which portrays a frightening vision of a revolutionary world, generally controlled by knowledge and a dictatorial ruling

government that uses any possible means to utilize iron-handed power over its people; this is done through the discussion of how Orwell depicted the elements of dystopian government like family and sex, repression, religion, control of information, society, psychological manipulation, and technology in his novel.

The seventh research written by Xuan Qin (2018) entitled *Ethical Consciousness under Totalitarianism-Review on George Orwell's 1984* in *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, volume 9, number 4, pages 731-737. The article explores the resurgence of George Orwell's novel *1984* in the context of doubts and concerns arising from the political situation under President Trump. It questions whether Orwell's anti-totalitarian warnings are relevant today. The novel portrays ethical disorder, revolting principles, and ideological deformation in a totalitarian regime led by "Big Brother." The article specifically analyzes the traumatic impact of the totalitarian government on ethical consciousness, focusing on how individuals face ethical dilemmas, adopt irrational thoughts, and surrender to the control of irrationality. The central theme revolves around the applicability of Orwell's warnings to the contemporary political landscape, particularly post-Trump.

The eighth research is from article written by Dewi Saklina Lasiana & Mamik Tri Wedawati (2021) entitled *The Potrayal of Hegemony as Seen in Snowpierce* in *Journal of Language and Literature*, volume 9, number 1, pages 26-40. The study employs a sociological approach to literature to reveal the operation of hegemony

in *Snowpiercer*. This study uses Antonio Gramsci's concept of Hegemony as the main theory and Max Weber's theory about power as supporting theory. In analyzing the data, this study uses a narrative and non-narrative approach. This study aims to describe hegemony through five stages of hegemony operation in *Snowpiercer*. Secondly, revealing the impact of hegemony on the subaltern class in *Snowpiercer*. Moreover, as the result shows that In *Snowpiercer*, hegemony is a process of gaining power through Indoctrinating ideology in which the role of coercive elements is necessary to maintain the power and authority obtained by the dominant class when the hegemony has weakened.

The ninth research is from article written by Jelita Dewanty Hendarsyah & Abdul Hannan EF et al. (2021) entitled *Hegemony by Antonio Gramsci in the Lion King Film* in *Journal of Critical Theory, Art, Language, and Literature*, volume3, number 2, pages 178-188. This research is based on the model proposed by Antonio Gramsci's hegemony of power, this theory covers the causes of the normal practice of overthrowing power and the relationship of consent using the power structure. The purpose of this research is to find out and understand the relationship between the conflict between the main characters causing the coup d'etat represented in film literature; especially in examining the similarities in the causes of the coup d'etat from the perspective of the Hegemony of Power.

The tenth research is from Anna Anganita Theresia Latumeten & Ulum Janah (2022) entitled *Hegemony and Resistance in George Orwell's Animal Farm* in

English Language Studies and Applied Linguistics Journal, volume 3, number 1, pages 31-40. This paper aims to investigate how hegemony and resistance are displayed in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. The literary piece is approached outside of its actual historical context and is treated as a timeless piece, to see the text being a model of how a hegemonic process occurs and how it is challenged by resistance. Gramsci's theory of hegemony is used as a perspective in the reading. The main source of the data is Orwell's *Animal Farm*, and other studies investigating the book are also considered to add some perspectives about the novel. Orwell's *Animal Farm* shows how hegemony works through the spread of the world views of the ruling class with the consent of the working class.

