

The Architecture of Power in Octavia E. Butler's *Patternmaster*: A Foucauldian Analysis

Jeslin Chellam J¹, Dr. D. Nalina Palin²

1. Reg, No. 22211274012013, Ph.D Research Scholar, Department of English, St. John's College, Palayamkottai, Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli – 627012 Tamilnadu, India.
2. Associate Professor, Department of English, St. John's College, Tirunelveli – 627002. Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli – 627012 Tamilnadu, India.

Abstract

The present paper looks at the way power works in Octavia E. Butler's novel *Patternmaster* (1972) using the ideas from Foucault. It focuses on the complicated way that power controls people in her fictional world. By looking at what Michel Foucault said about power, rules and how society controls people, this research studies how the Patternist class builds and keeps its control in a complicated social system. Architecture's picture is used to show the basic structure of power. This includes physical, social and mental parts. This study digs into the meaning of words in the text and looks at how power is hidden inside society's groups, ranks and discourses. This study also reveals the manner in which the power structure affects the actions, feelings and relationships of people. It also highlights how power changes their lives. Moreover, ways to resist and acts of saying no to the powers are looked at using concepts such as biopower, disciplinary power, and panopticon. By looking at the power structure from Foucault's viewpoint, the paper shows how complicated the act of control of people and fighting back are in Butler's fiction.

Keywords: Power, Foucault, Social Structure, Discipline, and Architecture.

Introduction

Octavia E. Butler changed the way people read science fiction with her deep thinking and caring stories about social issues. Born in 1947, Butler faced many difficulties as a Black woman who was mostly surrounded by white and male areas. Her writing investigated topics like race, power, females, and self-identity. One of her famous books, *Patternmaster*, came out in 1976. The book is about a possible bad future. It is set in a society called Patternist, where people who can read minds are the ones with power. *Patternmaster* is the last book in the Patternist series, but it was written first. By looking at who has power over others and how it is used and tried to fight back

against, the book shows that taking control is not simple. It also shows its effects on people in society.

In Octavia E. Butler's novel *Patternmaster* shows how power works in a society using many different and complex ways. The image of architecture here indicates the structure of authority or control within that group. It includes more than just buildings and groups but also social levels, rules, and ways to rule that influence how people behave together. Using a method called Foucauldian analysis in *Patternmaster* lets one understand how power, control and social rules work in its story. Using Michel Foucault's ideas, such as control systems, watching people, and power's connection with knowledge, is a method that allows one to understand the Patternist society better. It shows how they use their strength there.

Theoretical Framework

Michel Foucault's exploration of power in literary texts is a complex and multi-dimensional concept. Kiliçarslan (2019) discusses how Foucault suggests that power in literature can create new possibilities and produce new ideas, akin to 'empowerment'. Uygur (2013) further elaborates that Foucault sees power in literature as embedded in language, creating "regimes of truth" through discourse, which establishes power through socially accepted forms of knowledge (47-59). Bongie (2002) notes that Foucault's idea of power in literature is rooted in materiality and historical practices, rather than ideology-versus-reality distinctions or signifier-signified distinctions (256-267). According to Ramin and Ghanbari (2018), Foucault's theories suggest that texts can reveal power relations and how power reacts to deviancies, revealing gaps in power structures and potential threats to dominant ideology. Yolcu (2022) highlights that Foucault associates power with discourse, believing that power is relative and that discourse is the monitor of power. Abdulla Almaarof, Hamid, and Abdullah (2022) further elaborate that Foucault views power as a dynamic relationship between discourses and subjects, dominating specific subjects or governing individuals' demands.

Michel Foucault's ideas on power, control and social rules give a deep understanding about how societies handle the balance of power. Foucault says that power isn't just something someone has or holds. Instead, it is a widespread force that works in many ways and plans to control people in different situations. His idea of power is not just about stopping others but also making things. He believes that how you use your power changes social connections and habits in a good way. Sara Mills, in her book *Michael Foucault* (2003) articulates, "he sees power as also at the same time productive, something which brings about forms of behaviour and events rather than simply

curtailing freedom and constraining individuals” (51). Foucault’s idea about discipline studies how power works by watching, making usual or normal and checking. These tools are used to keep a check on people in certain group scenarios. He also looks at the connection between power and knowledge. This includes showing how information is made or used as a helper in getting control over things. Foucault’s ideas question common thoughts about power and give a method for looking at the mixed-up ways of having control in society.

Power

Michel Foucault’s conception of power places a strong emphasis on mechanisms of social control. His theories highlight various forms of power, including disciplinary power, normalizing power, biopower, and the panopticon. Disciplinary power operates through mechanisms of discipline and regulation to shape individual behaviour and maintain social order. Normalizing power establishes and enforces societal norms and standards, encouraging conformity and shaping subjectivities. Biopower involves the regulation and management of populations, including control over bodies, health, and reproduction. The panopticon, a central concept in Foucault’s work, represents a form of power that operates through constant surveillance and the internalization of disciplinary mechanisms. These mechanisms of social control underscore Foucault’s focus on how power operates within societies and influences individuals through various means of control and regulation.

Disciplinary Control:

Disciplinary power, as conceptualized by Michel Foucault, operates through mechanisms of punishment and control, specifically targeting the body. It involves the exercise of power to regulate and discipline individuals by subjecting them to various forms of punishment and surveillance. The aim of disciplinary power is not only to suppress or repress but also to mold and shape individuals’ behaviors, identities, and subjectivities. Disciplinary power focuses on the punishment of the body as a means of social control. It operates through techniques that regulate and discipline individual bodies, marking deviations from established norms and imposing corrective measures. These techniques include practices such as imprisonment, corporal punishment, physical training, and other forms of bodily discipline.

By subjecting the body to punishment, disciplinary power seeks to instill discipline and docility, shaping individuals to conform to societal norms and expectations. The disciplined body becomes a site of control, repression, and normalization, reinforcing social hierarchies and maintaining social order. Foucault argues that disciplinary power operates not only within

institutions like prisons, schools, and hospitals but also extends into various aspects of everyday life. Through a web of surveillance, examination, and regulation, disciplinary power influences individuals' behaviors, self-perceptions, and interactions within society.

Royal exerts his disciplinary power over Jansee through various means. Firstly, he reminds her of the deaths of his own siblings, emphasizing the ruthless actions he had to take to attain power. In the conversation Royal articulates, “‘Didn’t I have to kill two brothers and a sister to get where I am? . . . ‘Two brothers and a sister,’ . . . ‘And it could easily have been two sisters if my strongest sister had not been wise enough to ally herself with me and become my lead wife’ (5). By referencing these deaths, Royal instills fear and implies that disobedience or opposition could result in similar consequences for Jansee. This reminder serves as a form of punishment and control, as it threatens her with the potential loss of loved ones.

Furthermore, when Jansee questions Royal about whether he would have killed her if she had opposed him, Royal admits that he would have done so. This admission reinforces his dominance and communicates the severity of his disciplinary power. Jansee is confronted with the realization that her life could be at stake if she were to challenge or resist Royal’s authority. The conversation between Royal and Jansee unveils a power dynamic that underlies their relationship. Jansee, seeking to understand the extent of Royal’s control, asks him a crucial question: “‘Would you really have tried to kill me if I had opposed you or refused you?’” Royal’s response is unequivocal: “‘Of course. On your own, you might have become a threat to me’” (5). The exchange exposes the inherent disciplinary power that Royal wields over Jansee, highlighting the potential consequences she would face if she were to challenge his authority or act against his wishes.

Moreover, Royal employs a telepathic slap, an act of punishment, by abruptly jerking the Pattern, causing Jansee to gasp in surprise. This physical sensation, although painless, serves as a reminder of his control and his ability to impose consequences on her. The narrator explains the punishment given to Jansee by Royal thus: “‘Royal jerked the Pattern sharply, and Jansee jumped, gasping at the sudden disturbance. It was comparable physically to a painless but startling slap in the face’” (6). Through these actions and interactions, Royal demonstrates his use of disciplinary power over Jansee. By reminding her of past punishments, admitting his willingness to kill, and employing a telepathic slap, he establishes his authority and instils fear to control her actions and ensure her compliance.

Coransee uses disciplinary power and punishment to control Teray and maintain his dominance within society. Coransee breaks through Teray’s psychic defences and inflicts physical

pain on him through a beating. This physical punishment is used as a means of enforcing discipline and asserting control over Teray's defiance. The intense pain that Teray experiences leaves him unable to think clearly, illustrating the power that Coransee wields through his ability to administer physical suffering. The narrator mentions, "The Housemaster broke through what was left of Teray's shield and began beating Teray in earnest. Now Teray was the naked man. Pain. Teray could not think. He was ablaze with agony" (215). By subjecting Teray to such punishment, Coransee demonstrates his authority and his willingness to use force to ensure obedience. This aligns with the concept of disciplinary power, where those in positions of authority utilize techniques of surveillance, punishment, and control to maintain order and conformity within the society.

Rain's clear resentment toward Teray exemplifies the tensions that can arise when individuals are compelled to obey and accept new leadership, even when they may have preferred a different outcome. Society's norms dictate that they acknowledge Teray as the rightful successor to Coransee, and they follow this established order even if they don't fully agree or are sceptical of Teray's leadership capabilities. This act of compliance underscores the normalizing power that operates through the collective understanding of roles, hierarchy, and expected behaviour within society. Teray uses disciplinary power to assert control and maintain order within the group. Teray's actions demonstrate his willingness to use his psychic abilities to subdue any challenges to his authority, even if it means resorting to forceful measures. When Rain openly challenges Teray's authority and questions his abilities, Teray recognizes the potential threat to his leadership and decides to take action. He employs his psychic abilities to push Rain into unconsciousness, effectively neutralizing her resistance. This action serves as a form of discipline, showing his willingness to assert dominance over dissenting voices. The lines, "Very carefully, he pushed her into unconsciousness—that to prevent her from wasting her strength fighting him. He formed a link with her. The unity was not pleasant even while she was unconscious, but he would get used to it" (45) illustrate how Teray uses his powers to impose his will on Rain. By forcefully connecting with her, he not only silences her but also establishes a level of control over her. Furthermore, Teray's declaration that he will take a more forceful approach with others who refuse to cooperate reinforces his intention to exert his authority and discipline. The line "Those of you who refuse to open, I will force—not necessarily as gently as I forced Rain" (45) highlights his readiness to use his abilities to compel compliance and obedience, thereby exercising disciplinary power to ensure the group's cohesion under his leadership.

Normative Control

Normalizing power, as conceptualized by Michel Foucault, refers to the ways in which power operates through the establishment and enforcement of societal norms, standards, and ideologies. It involves the shaping of individual behaviour, beliefs, and identities to conform to prevailing social norms and expectations. Normalizing power influences individuals through the internalization of cultural, moral, and ideological frameworks, which are regarded as normal within a specific society or historical context. Gary Gutting, in his book, *Foucault: A Very Short Introduction* (2005), explains normative power thus: “Norms define certain modes of behaviour as ‘abnormal’, which puts them beyond the pale of what is socially (or even humanly) acceptable, even if they are far from the blatant transgressions that called for the excessive violence of premodern power. The threat of being judged abnormal constrains us moderns at every turn” (103).

Michel Foucault's concept of normalizing power is a key aspect of his analysis of social structures and institutions. This concept involves the use of information technologies to normalize our lives, replacing efficiency with truth and often glossing over concerns about civil liberties (McCoy). Foucault emphasizes understanding the development of norms, normativity, and normalization as crucial to comprehending disciplinary power as part of a biopolitical project (Campesi). Rooted in the Vitalism of his mentor, Georges Canguilhem, Foucault's normalizing power acts on life and imitates its operation (Vázquez García). This concept is also related to the historical construction of deafness as a deficiency and pathology by modern medical and psychological knowledge (Siisiäinen). Foucault discusses the construction of discourses on women in televised products, emphasizing the symbolic emptiness and silences of the feminine (Fischer 589). Additionally, the relationship between knowledge and power plays a key role in neoliberal public policies and adult education, as per Foucault's concept of normalizing power (Kopecký). In education, this concept involves uncovering power relations, especially those impacting the subjectivity of the young, and challenging the authority of the teacher (Marshall 417). Foucault's concept of normalizing power is derived from the totality of disciplinary practices structuring European society, with marginal anthropology as a way of constructing genealogical reality (Ryazanov). This concept has been influential in various fields, offering a critical lens to examine the intricate relations between power, knowledge, and societal norms.

Normalizing power works by creating a sense of what is considered socially acceptable or deviant. It operates through various mechanisms, including educational systems, social institutions, media, and cultural practices. These mechanisms play a crucial role in disseminating and

reinforcing dominant ideologies, values, and modes of behaviour. Through normalizing power, certain behaviours, identities, and ways of being are privileged and deemed desirable, while others are stigmatized or marginalized. By establishing and maintaining a normative framework, power structures perpetuate social hierarchies, reinforcing dominant ideologies and shaping individuals' thoughts, desires, and actions.

The control exerted through normalizing power is not always explicit or coercive but often operates subtly through social pressure, peer influence, and internalized beliefs. Individuals are encouraged to conform to societal expectations, conforming to the prescribed norms, roles, and identities associated with their gender, race, class, or other social categories. Foucault's analysis of normalizing power underscores the ways in which power is exerted through the shaping of subjectivities and the internalization of cultural norms. It reveals how ideologies and discourses contribute to the control and regulation of individuals, influencing their beliefs, desires, and self-perceptions.

Teray's assumption of leadership and the subjects' obedience to him illustrate the broader societal pattern of normalizing power, where individuals follow established rules and hierarchies despite their personal opinions. After the death of Coransee, Teray steps into the role of the new Housemaster and assumes a position of authority over the group of outsiders and women. Despite potential dissent or personal reservations, the subjects conform to Teray's leadership in accordance with established norms and expectations. The concept of obedience to authority, even when faced with personal opinions or doubts, reflects the normalizing power at play within society. The narrator mentions the obedience of the subjects thus: "They obeyed silently. Some of them, Rain in particular, clearly resented him, but they had seen him kill their Housemaster in a fair fight. Custom said they should lower their heads and accept him as their new Housemaster unless one of them wanted to challenge" (221). Thus the normalising power makes them obey Teray.

The societal structure of the Patternist society is oppressive and manipulative, controlling individuals through its norms and laws. The different categories of individuals within this structure, outsiders, mutes, mute herds, apprentices, and housemasters are subjected to varying degrees of control and restriction, reflecting the exercise of normative power by the society's ruling class. The hierarchical structure and the associated norms impose strict control over outsiders. The narrator articulates: "Outsiders were not free to father children as they wished, and of course they had little or no say in where they lived or how long they lived there. They were property . . . outsiders could not marry . . ." (35). The societal structure enforces a strict hierarchy that limits the autonomy and

agency of its members. The narrator, further elaborates, “The laws were old, made in harsher times” (35). The historical context indicates that the current oppressive system is deeply ingrained and perpetuated to maintain power. The mention of “harsher times” implies that the society’s founders established these norms as a means of asserting control and subjugation over different groups of individuals (35). Society’s control over outsiders’ reproductive rights exemplifies normalizing power by regulating a fundamental aspect of human life. By not allowing outsiders to father children as they wish, society dictates the terms on which individuals can form families.

Teray’s use of the term “Lord” to address Coransee reflects the ingrained hierarchy and power dynamics of the Patternist society (30). The act of addressing someone as “Lord” implies a subservient attitude and reinforces the authority of the individual being addressed. Teray’s use of this term showcases how individuals are conditioned from a young age to respect and submit to those in higher positions of power. Teray says, “Only your determination to make me your outsider, Lord . . . Slavery has never appealed to me, Lord.” (30). This behaviour is indicative of normalizing power at work, where societal norms and practices are internalized by individuals and become second nature. Furthermore, Teray’s willingness to become an outsider, a category associated with servitude and subservience, underscores the extent to which he is subject to the normalizing power of society. Despite being someone with considerable psychic abilities and potential, he willingly considers becoming an outsider to avoid confronting Coransee’s dominance.

The normalizing power in the Patternist society extends to every individual, regardless of their position or potential sympathies. Even Michael, who is a journeyman of Rayal and might have some understanding of the oppressive nature of the society, is constrained by the established norms and laws. Teray wishes to speak privately to Michael, which indicates that he sees him as a potential ally or someone who might share his perspective. However, the realization that even Michael’s sympathies cannot change the fact that the law is on Coransee’s side underscores the omnipresence of normalizing power. The law is not just a set of rules; it is a tool of control that reinforces the existing power structure and ensures compliance from all members of society. The narrator mentions, “He found himself wishing he could speak privately to Michael, but he knew it would do no good. Even if the journeyman sympathized with him, the law really was on Coransee’s side. Michael could not change that” (104). Michael’s adherence to the law despite any personal sympathies he might have showcases the extent to which the normalizing power is internalized by individuals. Even if someone recognizes the injustices or inequalities within the system, they may still feel compelled to abide by the rules due to fear of consequences or the belief that challenging

the system is futile. This dynamic perpetuates the status quo and maintains the oppressive societal structure.

Normalizing power operates within the Patternist society by controlling and restricting communication channels, even among members of the same community. The ability to contact Rayal, the ultimate authority, is carefully regulated, limiting who can initiate communication and for what purposes. The Pattern, which inherently connects all Patternists, theoretically enables any individual, regardless of their status, to communicate with Rayal. However, in practice, this ability is tightly controlled and limited to specific groups of individuals: Housemasters, Schoolmasters, Rayal's journeymen, and Rayal himself. This hierarchical restriction reflects the normalizing power at play, as those with higher positions are granted the privilege of direct communication, while those in lower positions are excluded from such access. The narrator explains the norm thus:

Since the Pattern connected each individual Patternist with Rayal, in theory, any Patternist, however lowly, could use it to contact Rayal. In fact, though, the use of the Pattern for communication was restricted to Housemasters, Schoolmasters, Rayal's journeymen, and Rayal himself. Rayal, of course, could use it whenever he chose, but Housemasters, Schoolmasters, and journeymen were permitted to use it only to report a Clayark emergency. Lately Rayal had chosen to ignore their emergencies. It was possible that he would also ignore Teray's. He might even punish Teray for misusing the Pattern. (198)

Furthermore, the passage highlights that even within the permitted group, communication through the Pattern is restricted to specific circumstances, specifically emergencies involving Clayarks. Rayal's recent decision to ignore these emergencies signals a shift in his response, potentially leading to further control over those who rely on this communication channel. This also exemplifies the normalising power in the Patternist society exerted through laws.

The conversation between Rayal and Jansee in *Patternmaster* provides insight into the power dynamics and the role of normalizing power. Jansee brings up the group of mutes outside the house, emphasizing their perception of Rayal as a god. Rayal acknowledges their beliefs but maintains his stance, asserting that he provides them with health, protection, and freedom from abuse, which has led them to form a religion around their gratitude. Jansee, however, challenges Rayal by questioning his enjoyment of the power bestowed upon him. She connects the idea of power with worship, questioning whether she should worship him as well. In a moment of contemplation, Jansee challenges Rayal's god-like status, and the narrator highlights the power

dynamics and beliefs surrounding Rayal through the conversation in the following manner: ““They’ve come here because they think you’re a god . . . ‘They get exactly what they expect from me, Jansee. The assurance of good health, long life, and protection from abuse by their Masters. Making a religion of their gratitude was their own idea’ . . . Power. In fact? since you hold the Pattern, you’re even a kind of god to the Patternists, aren’t you? Shall I worship you, too, husband?”” (7). Thus the conversation reflects Rayal’s power over others, particularly the mutes who see him as a god. This reveals how the normalizing power makes the mutes think Rayal as god.

Biopolitical Control

Michel Foucault's concept of bio-power is a critical element in his exploration of the relationship between power, knowledge, and the body. Foucault's bio-power is based on the paradigm of economic theology, aiming to subjugate, control, and govern the soul of every human being (Agamben and Matiashvili). This concept emphasizes that power is a product of bodily forces, and 'somatic enactment' can open up bio-power to localized concerns of service users (Tucker). Foucault also focuses on the contemporary articulation of biology, power, control, and the construction of subjectivities (Cueille). His analysis extends to how life abilities and extra-work qualities (bios or 'life itself') are key objects of exploitation, especially under neoliberalism (Fleming 877). Furthermore, Foucault's bio-power extends the power of patriarchy and consumerism through gender prescriptions in modern sexuality discourses (Arnold). His concept is a duality between force and knowledge, forming under the principle of force (Fujita). In the context of biopolitics, Foucault introduces a new concept of power that operates on populations, which has issued out into neoliberalism (May 53). This multifaceted concept of bio-power, as proposed by Foucault, has been influential in various fields, including sociology, political science, and philosophy, offering a critical lens to examine the intricate relations between power, the body, and societal structures.

Michel Foucault’s concept of biopower focuses on the ways in which power operates at a broader societal level, governing and managing populations. Biopower involves the regulation and control of life processes, including aspects such as health, reproduction, and welfare. It encompasses both disciplinary and regulatory techniques that shape and manage the biological aspects of individuals and populations. Biopower functions by exerting control over the biological aspects of life, not just at the level of individual bodies but also in terms of population health and well-being. It operates through various techniques, institutions, and practices that aim to govern and

optimize the biological existence of individuals and groups. As Paul Patton puts it in his essay, “Power and Biopower in Foucault”, “biopolitical technology operated by different means, on a different scale. It sought to regulate birth and death rates, the prevalence and spread of illness, levels of nourishment, and the physical environments in which people lived” (310).

Foucault argues that biopower is exercised through a combination of positive and negative strategies. Positive biopower seeks to promote and enhance life, focusing on the well-being, improvement, and productivity of populations. It includes practices such as public health measures, vaccination campaigns, social welfare programs, and other forms of population management. Negative biopower, on the other hand, involves strategies of regulation, control, and exclusion. It targets aspects such as disease prevention, demographic control, and measures to manage or suppress perceived threats to the population. Examples of negative biopower include policies related to quarantine, surveillance, and eugenics.

The conversation between Rayal and Jansee in *Patternmaster* illustrates Rayal’s control over Jansee’s reproductive choices, even when she expresses a desire to have children by an outsider. Rayal exerts his power by redirecting her preference and suggesting she should have children by a journeyman or apprentice from within their community. This decision-making authority reflects Rayal’s dominance in shaping Jansee’s reproductive decisions and reinforces his control over her choices. The narrator captures this power dynamic as Jansee questions Rayal’s suggestion thus: ““You want me to have children by one of your outsiders?” she asked . . . Have them by a journeyman, or at least an apprentice. Not an outsider”” (3). The conversation highlights Rayal’s influence over her reproductive autonomy and further underscoring the exertion of biopower in their relationship.

Rayal’s assertion that he can awaken thousands of Patternists through his psychic ability serves as a compelling example of biopolitical control. This concept of biopower is evident in the way Rayal manipulates and influences the minds of a vast number of individuals, exerting control over their actions and consciousness. Rayal’s statement, “I’ve just awakened several thousand Patternists by exerting no more effort than another person might use to snap his fingers” (6), emphasizes the ease with which he can activate the latent potential of numerous Patternists. By using his psychic ability to awaken them, Rayal showcases his capacity to shape and mobilize a considerable collective force. This action aligns with the biopolitical idea of controlling masses of individuals through their inherent characteristics, in this case, their psychic abilities.

The Patternists' ability to access and control the memories of mutes underscores their capacity to exercise power over the biophysical and cognitive aspects of the mutes' lives, thus illustrating the concept of biopolitical control. The conversation between Jansee and Rayal sheds light on the Patternists' capacity to access mute memories thus: "Why bother?" he said. "You're linked with them. If there was anything wrong with them, you would be the first to realize it. Why send a mute to find out what you already know?" "Because I'll be able to see them through the mute's memory when he comes back. I haven't seen either of them for over two years" (3). The exchange between Jansee and Rayal revolves around the idea of accessing the memories of mutes. Rayal's rationale for sending a mute to find out about certain individuals is rooted in the fact that he will be able to see their experiences and memories through the mute's recollection. The ability to tap into the mutes' memories is significant because it grants the Patternists the power to know intimate details about the mutes' lives, thoughts, and experiences, effectively penetrating their private realm.

The character Jochim's situation serves as an example of biopolitical control. Jochim is controlled by Coransee, a powerful Patternist Housemaster, through psychic manipulation and dominance. Coransee exercises authority over Jochim's mind, illustrating the dynamics of biopower in the narrative. Jochim's predicament is a manifestation of the Patternists' ability to exert control over individuals' thoughts and actions. Coransee's dominance over Jochim is evident in how he uses his psychic abilities to manipulate and influence Jochim's decisions. This control extends to Jochim's emotions, beliefs, and even his physical actions. Joachim's revelations about his lack of autonomy and the extent of Coransee's control over him is exemplified in the conversation between Teray and Jochim thus: "I'm conditioned ... controlled! That special horse of mine has more freedom than I have when it comes to dealing with Coransee . . . 'Controlled? Like a mute? Like an animal?'. . . As strong as he is, even he couldn't have done it if I had resisted. So I didn't resist" (40). Coransee's ability to exert control over Joachim's thoughts and actions demonstrates the biopolitical control present in the society depicted in the novel.

Teray's act of forcefully accessing Jackman's memories to acquire knowledge about mute-herding exemplifies a manifestation of biopolitical control within the Patternist society. By tapping into Jackman's private experiences and thoughts, Teray exercises a form of power that goes beyond mere individual interaction. The narrator explains Teray's act of reading the memories of Jackman in the following manner: "he tapped and absorbed the man's memories of the previous five years. He wasn't doing to Jackman quite what Coransee wanted to do to him, but he was invading

Jackman's mental privacy . . . When Teray let Jackman go, he knew everything the older man did about keeping mutes" (60). This interaction underscores how knowledge acquisition and manipulation of individuals' experiences serve as mechanisms of control and surveillance within the Patternist society, aligning with the principles of biopower and biopolitics.

Panoptic Control

Michel Foucault's concept of the panopticon is a seminal idea in his exploration of surveillance and power structures. He conceptualized panoptism as a principle of political anatomy, focusing on control, discipline, surveillance, and centralization (Mallamaci). The panopticon, originally a prison design, features a central observation core where guards can always see prisoners, but the prisoners cannot see themselves, leading to internalized surveillance and self-policing (Godbey 42). This surveillance-based method of control spreads throughout the social body, fostering compliant behavior (Harris-Birtill 55). Foucault's focus on surveillance highlights a shift from social and theatrical arrangements to modern surveillance activities where the few see the many (Mathiesen 226). Panopticism, as developed by Foucault, analyzes control mechanisms through the ages, focusing on discipline, training, and hierarchical surveillance (Batko). It is also seen as a coercive mechanism of control that normalizes individuals' identities and determines political and interpersonal relationships (Rojas). Furthermore, Foucault's concept of panopticism involves subtle exercises in knowledge and power, using tools like questions and questionnaires for investigation and control (Kaplan 90). This concept has been influential in various fields, including sociology, political science, and philosophy, offering a critical lens to examine the intricate relations between surveillance, power, and societal structures.

Panoptic control, as conceptualized by Michel Foucault, revolves around the idea of constant surveillance and the perception of being watched. It draws on the architectural design of the panopticon, a circular prison structure with a central observation tower that allows for the surveillance of all prisoners without their knowledge of whether they are being observed at any given time. Panoptic control operates through the internalization of the possibility of being watched, resulting in self-regulation and conformity. The mere presence of the panoptic gaze creates a state of perpetual surveillance, which leads individuals to modify their behaviour and conform to societal norms and expectations. Barry Smart, in his book, *Michael Foucault* (2002) elucidates the panoptic control thus: "Observation induces effects of power and that a means of coercion makes those subject to it potentially visible . . . If it were possible to construct the perfect disciplinary apparatus then a single gaze, 'the eye of authority', would be able to constantly observe everything" (97). As Smart points out, observation makes the subjects disciplined. This form of

control is not reliant on physical coercion or constant supervision but rather on the perception of being potentially under scrutiny.

Panoptic control is not limited to physical structures like prisons but extends into various aspects of society, including schools, workplaces, and public spaces. The panoptic mechanism influences behaviour, shapes social interactions, and reinforces social norms by instilling a sense of constant observation and the fear of potential repercussions. Foucault's analysis of panoptic control serves as a powerful metaphor for understanding how power operates through surveillance and self-discipline. It highlights the ways in which individuals internalize control mechanisms, conform to societal norms, and regulate their behaviour in response to the ever-present panoptic gaze.

Teray establishes a psychic link with Jackman, creating a means of constant surveillance. By doing so, Teray gains access to Jackman's thoughts, actions, and experiences. This connection allows Teray to monitor Jackman's activities and sense any potential threat or conflict. While Teray claims that the link is merely an "alarm," it still functions as a form of control and surveillance over Jackman's behaviour. Teray warns the Jackman, "I've linked us," said Teray. "If you get into trouble, I'll know. If I find that you caused the trouble to make trouble for me, I'll let you be torn apart. But if you didn't cause it, and you want my help, I'll help you. Nothing else. The link isn't a control or a snoop. Just an alarm." (62). Teray's ability to know if Jackman is in trouble or has caused trouble highlights the asymmetry of power in their relationship.

Teray's threat to let Jackman be torn apart if he caused trouble shows how Teray wields his psychic abilities to exert dominance and enforce compliance. By maintaining this link, Teray can ensure that Jackman's actions align with his own interests, effectively limiting Jackman's autonomy. The concept of biopolitical control is evident in this situation as Teray uses his psychic powers to maintain oversight and regulate Jackman's actions. The surveillance and control that Teray exerts through their psychic link mirrors the dynamics of biopower, where individuals' bodies and minds are subjected to monitoring and manipulation by those with greater power.

Coransee, as a Housemaster, embodies the panoptic figure. His presence and authority are felt throughout the House, creating an atmosphere of constant surveillance. The House members are aware that they are being watched and controlled, which affects their behaviour and choices. This power dynamic is rooted in the fear of potential punishment or retribution for any deviations from Coransee's expectations. The fear of his punitive actions creates a sense of self-regulation among the subjects, as they adjust their behavior to align with his wishes. This aligns with Foucault's notion of panopticism, where the subjects regulate themselves due to the constant threat of

surveillance. there is an outsider who indulges in torturing mutes and another who derives sadistic pleasure from harming them, among other disturbing behaviours. Coransee's knowledge of these violent and harmful actions reflects his capability to monitor and control the actions of his subjects. Amber explains Teray, "He knows. I've told him often enough myself. He won't let me do anything about it unless I give up my independence and settle here" (79). Furthermore, Coransee often snoops through the thoughts of Amber. As Amber puts it, "But it made a difference. I didn't tell him. He found out by snooping through my thoughts just a few weeks ago" (121).

Moreover, Coransee's surveillance and mental intrusion is detectable even when he is not physically present. Coransee is able to extend his influence and presence into the mental link between Teray and Amber. Despite the fact that Coransee cannot directly access Teray's thoughts without Teray's consent, his mere presence within the link makes Teray uncomfortable and unsettled. This intrusion showcases Coransee's ability to exert a form of panoptic power by being able to indirectly influence and monitor the thoughts and emotions of those linked within the Pattern. As the narrator articulates, "Teray became aware of Coransee as a part of the link. The Housemaster was an intruder, unwelcome, bringing discomfort to the link for the first time. Teray tried to rid himself of the sensation of being mentally invaded. He knew that Coransee could not reach his thoughts unless he opened. Yet the feeling would not go away" (173). Even though he may not be physically present, his surveillance reaches beyond the physical realm and extends into the mental connections that bind the Patternists together. This highlights the way in which Coransee's power extends beyond mere physical control, allowing him to exert influence and surveillance over the thoughts and emotions of those connected to the Pattern.

Royal, on the other hand, exercises a different kind of panoptic power through his mental abilities and connection to the Patternist society. As the central authority figure, he is capable of observing the thoughts, actions, and intentions of the individuals linked to the pattern. This creates a sense of constant scrutiny, where individuals are aware that their every move is potentially monitored by Royal. This surveillance is not only external but internal as well, as individuals might censor their thoughts and actions based on the perceived gaze of Royal. This aligns with the panoptic power structure, where the constant possibility of being observed leads to self-discipline and conformity. From the beginning, Royal seems to possess a deep understanding of the dynamics between Coransee and Teray, as well as their individual motivations. The line "It seemed to Teray that Royal examined his thoughts longer than necessary, but there was nothing he could do about it" (220) indicates that Royal has the ability to delve into Teray's thoughts and likely has a heightened

awareness of his internal processes.

Furthermore, Royal's surveillance extends to not only understanding Teray's thoughts but also predicting the intentions of both Coransee and Teray. The lines "No. Not unless I fought him. He had already made up his mind about you—and from his point of view, he was right. You were definitely a danger to him even though at first you didn't want to be" (227) showcase Royal's ability to discern Coransee's thoughts and intentions. Royal's omniscient insight into the minds of both characters highlights his panoptic power of surveillance, allowing him to understand the dynamics and motivations of those around him. This further establishes Royal as a character with a profound understanding of the minds of others and the ability to manipulate events based on his knowledge.

In both cases, whether under Coransee's rule or connected to Royal through the pattern, the characters' behaviours are influenced by the awareness of surveillance and the potential consequences of deviating from established norms. This surveillance mechanism reinforces the power dynamics within the society and maintains the control of the central authority figures.

Conclusion

Thus the research paper, "The Architecture of Power in Octavia E. Butler's *Patternmaster*: A Foucauldian Analysis", shows the complicated pattern of power in the book by looking at how power is built up, kept strong and used. Drawing from Foucault's conceptual framework, the study delves into four distinct manifestations of power: discipline force, common sense control, bio power and constant watch. The paper shows how these types of control work together to create the society in the book. It does this by carefully looking at different scenes, talking with people and holding conversations. The study shows that people like Coransee and Royal keep control, set rules for society, use normal ways to make them seem right. It also explains the power over bodies and lives using biopower. Also, it talks about a panoptic watch being used to see behaviour in a regulated way but gives one an idea of what something is going on. After the research paper studied these power relations, it showed us how complicated *Patternmaster*'s control is. It shows how much it affects characters, personal connections and wider society. In the end, this study gives key clues about how power is shown in the novel and its results. It helps us understand Octavia E. Butler's work better and larger talks on power within books and society, too.

Works Cited

- AbdullaAlmaarof, Ansam R., Layla Nazhan Hamid, and Ethar Riyadh Abdullah. "Applying Michel Foucault's power theory in Shakespeare's King Lear." *International journal of health sciences*, 2022.
- Agamben, Giorgio, and Lasha Matiashvili. "II. 4. THE KINGDOM AND THE GLORY: For a Theological Genealogy of Economy and Government." *The Omnibus Homo Sacer*, 2020.
- Arnold, Alyson Chace. "Supporting Patriarchy and Consumerism Through Sex Rhetoric: Power, Foucault and Sex and the City." 2003.
- Batko, Roman. "Panopticon – Cybercontrol in Liquid Modernity." *Censorship, Surveillance, and Privacy*, 2019.
- Bongie, Chris. "What's Literature Got to Do with It?" *Comparative Literature*, vol. 54, 2002, pp. 256-267.
- Butler, Octavia E. *Patternmaster*. Headline Book Publishing, 2021.
- Campesi, G. "Norma, Normatività, Normalizzazione. Un Itinerario Teorico tra Canguilhem e Foucault." 2008.
- Cueille, Julien. "Bio-Art et Transhumanisme: Une Anthropologie des Limites." *Philosophical Readings*, vol. 11, 2019.
- Fischer, R. "Mídia e Educação da Mulher: Uma Discussão Teórica sobre Modos de Enunciar o Feminino na TV." *Revista Estudos Feministas*, vol. 9, 2001, pp. 586-599.
- Fleming, P. "Review Article: When 'Life Itself' Goes to Work: Reviewing Shifts in Organizational Life through the Lens of Biopower." *Human Relations*, vol. 67, 2014, pp. 875-901.
- Fujita, K. "Force and Knowledge: Foucault's Reading of Nietzsche." *Foucault Studies*, 2013.
- Godbey, E. "Picture Me Sane: Photography and the Magic Lantern in a Nineteenth-Century Asylum." *American Studies*, vol. 41, no. 1, 2000, pp. 31-69.
- Gutting, Garry. *Michel Foucault*. Reaktion Books, 2002.
- Harris-Birtill, Rose. "'A Row of Screaming Russian Dolls': Escaping the Panopticon in David Mitchell's Number9dream." *SubStance*, vol. 44, 2015, pp. 55-70.
- Kaplan, Martha. "Panopticon in Poon: An Essay on Foucault and Colonialism." *Cultural Anthropology*, vol. 10, 1995, pp. 85-98.
- Kiliçarslan, Zehra Güven. "ÇAĞDAŞ TÜRK EDEBİYATINDA ÖZGÜR BİR KADIN

- BEDENİ İNŞA ETMEK." *Avrasya Uluslararası Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2019.
- Kopecký, M. "Foucault, Governmentality, Neoliberalism and Adult Education - Perspective on the Normalization of Social Risks." 2011.
- Mallamaci, Marco Germán. "The Three Panopticons. Analysis of Modulations of Power and Visual Forms of Control between Modernity and the 21st Century." *Digitum*, 2018.
- Marshall, J. "Michel Foucault: Liberation, Freedom, Education1." *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, vol. 34, 2002, pp. 413-418.
- Mathiesen, T. "The Viewer Society." *Theoretical Criminology*, vol. 1, 1997, pp. 215-234.
- May, Todd. "Power in Neoliberal Governmentality." *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology*, vol. 43, 2012, pp. 45-58.
- McCoy, T. "Surveillance, Privacy and Power: Information Trumps Knowledge." 1991.
- Mills, Sara. *Michel Foucault*. Routledge, 2003.
- Patton, Paul. "Power and Biopower in Foucault." *Biopower: Foucault and Beyond*, edited by Vernon W. Cisney and Nicolae Morar, University of Chicago Press, 2016, pp. 308-322.
- Ramin, Z., and Sajjad Ghanbari. "UNHEARD VOICES AND COUNTER DISCOURSE, A STUDY OF THE MARCH BY E.L. DOCTOROW; WITH SPECIAL REGARDS TO ALAN SINFIELD'S THEORIES OF DISSIDENCE." *Folia linguistica et litteraria*, 2018.
- Rojas, D. "El Panóptico Como Modelo de Poder en la Novela El Señor Presidente de Miguel Ángel Asturias." *Revista de Filosofía*, vol. 68, 2012.
- Ryazanov, I. V. "POWER AND PUNISHMENT IN M. FOUCAULT'S GENEALOGICAL PROJECT." *Вестник Пермского университета. Философия. Психология. Социология*, 2019.
- Siisiäinen, Lauri. "Foucault and Deaf Education in Finland." *Nordic Journal of Social Research*, vol. 7, 2016.
- Smart, Barry. *Michel Foucault: An Introduction*. Routledge, 2008.
- Tucker, I. "Bio-Somatic-Power." *Outlines. Critical Practice Studies*, 2011.
- Uygur, Mahinur Akşehir. "QUEER VAMPIRES AND THE IDEOLOGY OF GOTHIC." *Journal of Yaşar University*, vol. 8, 2013, pp. 47-59.
- Vázquez García, Francisco. "Canguilhem, Foucault y la Ontología Política del Vitalismo." 2015.

Yolcu, Ece. "Foucault ve söylem dinamiklerine ilişkin bir derleme." *Kayseri Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 202