INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION (IJHLT)
VOLUME 1, ISSUE 3, OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2026
RCHUB PUBLISHER
ISSN: 3139-9185
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/IJHLT/1/3/008

CONTROLLING LANGUAGE, CONTROLLING SOCIETY: A SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDY OF POWER AND IDEOLOGY IN GEORGE ORWELL'S *1984*

Nethra J
II MA English
Ethiraj College for Women

Abstract

Language is more than a medium of communication; it is a social practice through which power, ideology, identity, and relationships are constructed and maintained. In George Orwell's dystopian novel *1984*, language becomes one of the most significant instruments employed by the ruling Party to exercise ideological and social control. The Party's systematic manipulation of language demonstrates how linguistic practices can be used to regulate not only communication but also thought, individual identity, and perceptions of reality. This research paper, titled **"Controlling Language, Controlling Society: A Sociolinguistic Study of Power and Ideology in George Orwell's *1984*,"** examines the relationship between language, power, and ideology in the novel from a sociolinguistic perspective.

The study focuses primarily on Orwell's representation of Newspeak, linguistic restriction, political slogans, propaganda, the manipulation of meaning, and the relationship between language and social hierarchy. A qualitative textual analysis is employed to examine selected dialogues, official statements, slogans, descriptions, and linguistic practices presented in the novel. These textual elements are interpreted through sociolinguistic perspectives on language and power, language ideology, linguistic control, and the social functions of discourse. Particular attention is given to the ways in which the Party attempts to control vocabulary and meaning in order to restrict independent thought and eliminate forms of linguistic expression that could facilitate resistance.

The study argues that Orwell presents linguistic control as a central mechanism of ideological domination. The reduction and manipulation of vocabulary through Newspeak represents an attempt to narrow the boundaries of thought, while political slogans and contradictory expressions demonstrate how language can normalize ideological contradictions and encourage social conformity. Furthermore, the study explores how the Party's control over discourse contributes to the construction of obedience, collective identity, and political loyalty. At the

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION (IJHLT)
VOLUME 1, ISSUE 3, OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2026
RCHUB PUBLISHER
ISSN: 3139-9185
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/IJHLT/1/3/008

same time, *1984* illustrates the relationship between language, memory, and individual consciousness, suggesting that the preservation of meaning and independent expression can function as forms of resistance. By examining these linguistic dimensions, the research demonstrates that *1984* offers significant sociolinguistic insights into the relationship between language and social power. The study ultimately highlights the continuing relevance of Orwell's representation of linguistic manipulation to contemporary discussions of political discourse, propaganda, ideological influence, and the social control of language.

Keywords: Sociolinguistics; Language and Power; Language Ideology; Newspeak; Ideological Control

Introduction

Language is one of the most important resources through which human beings understand and organize their social world. It allows individuals to communicate information, express emotions, establish relationships, construct identities, and participate in communities. However, language does not operate independently of society. The way people speak, the words they choose, and the meanings attached to those words are influenced by social institutions, cultural values, political structures, and relationships of power. For this reason, language can be studied not only as a system of communication but also as a social practice.

Sociolinguistics is concerned with the relationship between language and society. It examines how language reflects social structures and how linguistic practices can contribute to the construction of identities, relationships, ideologies, and social hierarchies. One important area of sociolinguistic study is the relationship between language and power. Individuals and institutions with greater social authority often have greater influence over what forms of language are considered legitimate, appropriate, truthful, or acceptable. Political institutions, for example, can use language to influence public opinion, define social groups, justify policies, and establish particular interpretations of events.

George Orwell's *1984* provides a particularly significant fictional representation of these issues. Published in 1949, the novel presents a dystopian society in which the Party exercises extensive control over the lives of citizens. The Party controls political institutions,

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION (IJHLT)
VOLUME 1, ISSUE 3, OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2026
RCHUB PUBLISHER
ISSN: 3139-9185
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/IJHLT/1/3/008

information, education, history, and public communication. More importantly for a sociolinguistic study, it attempts to control language itself.

The fictional language of Newspeak is one of the most important examples of this linguistic control. Newspeak is designed to replace ordinary English and reduce the range of linguistic expression available to the population. Its development is not presented as a neutral linguistic change. Instead, it is directly connected to the Party's political objectives. By reducing vocabulary and eliminating words associated with political opposition, the Party seeks to make certain forms of thought and expression increasingly difficult.

Orwell also presents political slogans and propaganda as important mechanisms of ideological control. Statements such as "WAR IS PEACE," "FREEDOM IS SLAVERY," and "IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH" demonstrate how political discourse can manipulate conventional meanings. Through constant repetition and institutional authority, contradictory statements are presented as accepted truths. The language of politics therefore becomes a mechanism through which citizens are encouraged to accept the Party's interpretation of reality.

The novel further demonstrates that control over language is closely related to control over memory and identity. The Party continually rewrites historical records, changing the official account of the past whenever political circumstances change. Winston Smith, the protagonist, works at the Ministry of Truth, where he alters historical documents. This manipulation of written discourse makes it difficult for individuals to establish an independent understanding of history.

This research examines these linguistic practices from a sociolinguistic perspective. Rather than treating *1984* only as a political or literary dystopia, the study considers how Orwell represents language as a social resource connected to authority, ideology, identity, memory, and resistance.

The central argument of this research is that Orwell presents the control of language as an essential component of the Party's broader system of social control. By regulating vocabulary, political discourse, meanings, and historical records, the Party attempts to influence not only what people say but also how they understand themselves and their society.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION (IJHLT)
VOLUME 1, ISSUE 3, OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2026
RCHUB PUBLISHER
ISSN: 3139-9185
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/IJHLT/1/3/008

Literature Review

The relationship between language and society has been examined extensively within sociolinguistics and related fields. Scholars have demonstrated that language is connected with social identity, institutional authority, ideology, and unequal relationships between individuals and groups. These perspectives provide a useful foundation for examining the linguistic world represented in Orwell's *1984*.

Ronald Wardhaugh and Janet M. Fuller explain sociolinguistics as the study of the relationship between language and society. Their work demonstrates that linguistic behavior is influenced by social factors such as social class, identity, context, relationships, and institutions. Language can therefore provide information about the social organization of a community. This perspective is useful in *1984*, where language reflects the political structure of Oceania and the unequal relationships between the Party and ordinary citizens.

Janet Holmes similarly emphasizes the social dimensions of language. Her work demonstrates that speakers use language differently depending on their social identities, relationships, and communicative situations. Language can signal social distance, solidarity, authority, and group membership. In Orwell's novel, the Party attempts to influence these social dimensions by regulating public language and defining the acceptable forms of political expression.

The relationship between language and power has also been explored by Norman Fairclough. His work on language and power emphasizes that discourse can contribute to the reproduction of social structures and unequal relationships. Institutions with authority can shape discourse in ways that make particular beliefs or social arrangements appear natural and unquestionable. This perspective is especially relevant to *1984*, where the Party uses institutional discourse to establish its political worldview as the only legitimate interpretation of reality.

Pierre Bourdieu's concept of linguistic power also provides an important theoretical perspective. Bourdieu argues that language is connected to social authority and that not all speakers possess equal power to make their words socially legitimate. The value and authority of particular forms of speech depend partly on the social position of the speaker and the institution supporting that speech. In *1984*, Party-controlled discourse possesses enormous authority because it is supported by the political institutions of Oceania.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION (IJHLT)
VOLUME 1, ISSUE 3, OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2026
RCHUB PUBLISHER
ISSN: 3139-9185
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/IJHLT/1/3/008

Michel Foucault's discussions of discourse, knowledge, and power are also relevant. Foucault emphasizes the relationship between systems of knowledge and structures of power. Institutions influence what can be said, who is authorized to speak, and which forms of knowledge are recognized as legitimate. This concept can be applied to the Party's control of historical records and political communication in *1984*.

Previous discussions of Orwell's novel have frequently focused on totalitarianism, surveillance, political oppression, and the relationship between language and thought. However, examining these concerns specifically through sociolinguistic concepts allows greater attention to the social functions of language. Newspeak, propaganda, slogans, and controlled discourse can be understood not simply as literary devices but as representations of the ways institutions may use language to establish authority and shape social beliefs.

This research therefore brings together Orwellian literary analysis and sociolinguistic perspectives to examine how language functions within the social and political structure of Oceania.

Theoretical Framework

This study is based primarily on sociolinguistic approaches to language and power, language ideology, discourse, and linguistic control. The theoretical framework recognizes that language does not exist separately from social structures. Words acquire meaning within particular social contexts, and institutions can influence which meanings become dominant.

The concept of **language and power** is central to this study. Language can reflect existing power relationships, but it can also help reproduce them. Institutions that control communication can influence public discussion and determine which interpretations of social reality receive authority. In *1984*, the Party possesses institutional control over newspapers, historical documents, education, and political communication. This institutional authority gives Party language a privileged position.

The second concept is **language ideology**. Language ideology refers to beliefs about language and its relationship with social values, identities, and power. In Orwell's fictional society, Party-approved language is associated with loyalty and political correctness, while alternative

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION (IJHLT)
VOLUME 1, ISSUE 3, OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2026
RCHUB PUBLISHER
ISSN: 3139-9185
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/IJHLT/1/3/008

forms of expression are treated as dangerous. The Party therefore creates an ideology surrounding language itself.

The third concept is **discourse control**. Discourse includes socially organized ways of speaking and writing about particular subjects. Control over discourse allows institutions to influence how issues are described and understood. In *1984*, the Party controls political discourse by deciding what can be publicly discussed and how political events should be represented.

Finally, this study considers **linguistic restriction**. Language provides individuals with resources for describing experiences and communicating ideas. When linguistic resources are deliberately reduced or restricted, the possibilities for public expression can also be narrowed. Newspeak represents Orwell's fictional extreme of such restriction.

These theoretical concepts provide the basis for interpreting the linguistic practices of Oceania as sociolinguistic representations of political power.

Methodology

This research employs a **qualitative textual analysis** of George Orwell's *1984*. The novel is treated as the primary textual source for examining the relationship between language, society, ideology, and political power.

The analysis focuses on selected linguistic features that are particularly relevant to the research questions. These include Newspeak, political slogans, propaganda, and manipulation of meaning, controlled historical records, and examples of private and public language.

The selected passages are interpreted using sociolinguistic concepts related to language and power, language ideology, discourse, social hierarchy, identity, and resistance. The research does not attempt to measure linguistic patterns statistically. Instead, it examines how linguistic practices function within the fictional society represented by Orwell.

The methodology is interpretive because the research seeks to understand the social and ideological meanings attached to language in the novel. The study also draws on relevant academic works in sociolinguistics and language studies to establish its theoretical foundation.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION (IJHLT)
VOLUME 1, ISSUE 3, OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2026
RCHUB PUBLISHER
ISSN: 3139-9185
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/IJHLT/1/3/008

Language and Power in *1984*

Language and political power are closely connected throughout *1984*. The Party recognizes that controlling citizens requires more than physical surveillance and punishment. It also requires control over communication and the production of meaning.

The Party possesses enormous authority over public discourse. Newspapers, official announcements, political speeches, historical documents, and educational materials are controlled by Party institutions. Consequently, citizens are exposed primarily to information that supports the Party's ideological position.

This situation demonstrates an important sociolinguistic principle: communication is influenced by the social institutions through which it takes place. The Party controls not only individual speakers but also the institutions responsible for producing and distributing language.

Winston's employment at the Ministry of Truth provides a clear example. His task is to rewrite historical documents so that the past corresponds with the Party's current claims.
Language is therefore used to construct an official version of reality.

The political significance of this practice is considerable. If the Party controls the language through which historical events are recorded, citizens have limited access to alternative accounts of the past. The control of written language consequently becomes a form of control over collective memory.

The Party also uses language to establish social conformity. Citizens are expected to use approved expressions and demonstrate loyalty to Party ideology. Linguistic behavior therefore becomes a visible indicator of political identity.

Language in *1984* is consequently not neutral. It is embedded within the social structure of Oceania and functions as one of the mechanisms through which political authority is maintained.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION (IJHLT)
VOLUME 1, ISSUE 3, OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2026
RCHUB PUBLISHER
ISSN: 3139-9185
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/IJHLT/1/3/008

Newspeak and Linguistic Control

Newspeak is the most direct example of linguistic control in *1984*. It is presented as the official language of Oceania and is intended to replace Standard English. However, the purpose of Newspeak goes beyond simplifying communication. Its ultimate political function is to reduce the possibility of independent expression.

The development of Newspeak demonstrates how language planning can become a political activity. The Party decides which words should remain available and which should disappear. Words considered politically dangerous are removed or transformed.

This linguistic restriction is important because vocabulary provides people with resources for discussing experiences and ideas. A person needs words to describe political conditions, social relationships, emotions, and forms of opposition. If these resources are reduced, public discussion becomes more limited.

The Party therefore attempts to create a linguistic environment in which politically unacceptable ideas cannot easily be expressed. Newspeak represents the extreme form of this process.

One important feature of Newspeak is the removal of distinctions between related concepts. By reducing the number of available words, the language also reduces the number of distinctions speakers can make in ordinary communication. The Party hopes that this will make political dissent increasingly difficult.

The sociolinguistic significance of Newspeak lies in its connection between linguistic structure and social power. The Party is not simply creating a new vocabulary; it is attempting to control the linguistic resources available to an entire population.

However, Orwell's representation should not be interpreted as proving that language mechanically determines thought. Rather, the novel illustrates how restricting linguistic resources can influence communication and make some forms of political discussion more difficult.

Newspeak therefore functions as an imagined model of extreme linguistic regulation.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION (IJHLT)
VOLUME 1, ISSUE 3, OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2026
RCHUB PUBLISHER
ISSN: 3139-9185
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/IJHLT/1/3/008

Political Discourse, Propaganda, and Ideology

Political discourse is one of the most important forms of language in *1984*. The Party constantly communicates political messages through slogans, announcements, posters, speeches, and other forms of propaganda.

The slogans displayed throughout Oceania are particularly significant:

“WAR IS PEACE”
“FREEDOM IS SLAVERY”
“IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH”

These expressions deliberately contradict ordinary expectations about meaning. Their purpose is not to encourage logical debate but to establish the Party’s authority over interpretation.

The slogan “WAR IS PEACE,” for example, reverses the conventional relationship between war and peace. Instead of presenting war as the opposite of peace, the slogan suggests that permanent conflict is necessary for political stability.

Similarly, “FREEDOM IS SLAVERY” transforms the meaning of freedom. In the Party’s discourse, individual independence is represented as dangerous, while obedience is presented as a form of security.

The final slogan, “IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH,” directly reflects the Party’s interest in limiting independent knowledge. If citizens do not question official information, the Party can maintain greater control over society.

These slogans demonstrate how political discourse can influence social attitudes through repetition. Because citizens encounter the same expressions repeatedly, the slogans become part of the linguistic environment of everyday life.

Propaganda in the novel also demonstrates the relationship between language and institutional authority. The Party does not need every citizen to independently verify its claims. Instead, the constant repetition of official discourse creates a social environment in which Party statements become familiar and authoritative.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION (IJHLT)
VOLUME 1, ISSUE 3, OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2026
RCHUB PUBLISHER
ISSN: 3139-9185
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/IJHLT/1/3/008

From a sociolinguistic perspective, propaganda therefore functions as a mechanism for reproducing ideology. It does not simply communicate political information; it constructs a particular worldview and encourages citizens to accept that worldview as normal.

Language, Identity, Memory, and Resistance

Language in *1984* is closely connected with individual identity. Winston's private thoughts reveal his struggle to preserve a sense of self in a society where public language is controlled.

His diary is particularly important because it creates a private space for linguistic expression. By writing his thoughts, Winston attempts to record experiences that cannot safely be expressed in public.

The contrast between Winston's private language and the Party's public language reveals the importance of linguistic freedom to individual identity. Public discourse requires conformity, while private writing allows Winston to question official claims and express personal emotions.

Language is also connected with memory. The Party continuously changes historical records, making it difficult for citizens to establish an independent account of the past. Winston's uncertainty about his own memories is partly a consequence of this environment.

The rewriting of historical documents illustrates how language can influence collective memory. If records are repeatedly changed, later generations may have difficulty distinguishing historical events from political inventions.

This creates a powerful relationship between discourse and truth. The Party seeks to become the primary authority responsible for determining what counts as a fact.

However, the novel also shows that language can become a form of resistance. Winston's diary, his memories, and his attempts to preserve personal meanings demonstrate that independent expression can challenge ideological control.

Resistance therefore exists not only through physical or political action but also through the preservation of alternative meanings. Remembering an event differently from the official

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION (IJHLT)
VOLUME 1, ISSUE 3, OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2026
RCHUB PUBLISHER
ISSN: 3139-9185
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/IJHLT/1/3/008

account, questioning a political slogan, or writing an independent thought can all represent challenges to the Party's authority.

This aspect of the novel is particularly important from a sociolinguistic perspective. It demonstrates that language can reproduce power, but it can also provide individuals with resources for questioning power.

Analysis and Interpretation

The analysis of *1984* demonstrates that Orwell presents language as a central component of social organization and political authority. The Party's linguistic practices operate at several interconnected levels.

At the institutional level, the Party controls the production and distribution of public discourse. Through newspapers, political announcements, historical records, and official terminology, it determines which interpretations of events receive public legitimacy.

At the linguistic level, Newspeak attempts to restrict vocabulary and reduce the possibilities for politically unacceptable expression. This demonstrates the relationship between language planning and ideological control.

At the ideological level, slogans and propaganda establish a particular worldview. Contradictory statements are repeated until citizens are expected to accept them without questioning their logical consistency. Language therefore becomes a mechanism for normalizing political ideology.

At the individual level, the Party's linguistic control affects identity and consciousness. Winston's private writing demonstrates his need for an independent linguistic space in which he can formulate thoughts outside official discourse.

The analysis also reveals that Orwell does not present language as an isolated form of power. Linguistic control operates together with surveillance, punishment, historical revision, and political authority. Language is powerful partly because it is supported by these other institutions.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION (IJHLT)
VOLUME 1, ISSUE 3, OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2026
RCHUB PUBLISHER
ISSN: 3139-9185
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/IJHLT/1/3/008

This is significant from a sociolinguistic perspective because it demonstrates that language gains social power within particular institutional contexts. A political slogan would not have the same authority if it were spoken by an ordinary individual. In Oceania, Party-controlled institutions give official language extraordinary authority.

The novel also highlights the importance of repetition. Political expressions become powerful because citizens encounter them constantly. Repetition makes particular forms of discourse familiar and socially recognizable. In this way, propaganda becomes part of everyday linguistic experience.

Another important finding is the relationship between language and social conformity. Citizens are not only expected to obey political laws; they are expected to participate linguistically in the Party's worldview. Language becomes one of the ways through which political loyalty is performed.

At the same time, Orwell suggests that complete linguistic control is difficult to achieve. Winston continues to remember, question, and write. His private language represents the possibility of an alternative consciousness.

The sociolinguistic interpretation of *1984* therefore reveals a complex relationship between language and power. Language can be used to restrict expression, normalize ideology, construct social identities, and control collective memory. Yet the same capacity of language to create meanings also makes it possible for individuals to challenge dominant interpretations.

Conclusion

George Orwell's *1984* presents one of the most influential fictional representations of the relationship between language and political power. Through Newspeak, propaganda, political slogans, historical revision, and controlled discourse, the Party attempts to make language serve the interests of ideological domination.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, the importance of the novel lies in its representation of language as a social practice connected with institutions, identity, ideology, and power.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION (IJHLT)
VOLUME 1, ISSUE 3, OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2026
RCHUB PUBLISHER
ISSN: 3139-9185
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/IJHLT/1/3/008

Language in Oceania is not simply a means of exchanging information. It is part of the political structure of society.

Newspeak represents the Party's attempt to restrict linguistic resources and reduce the possibilities for independent political expression. Political slogans demonstrate how meanings can be manipulated through repetition and institutional authority. Propaganda illustrates how discourse can construct a particular version of social reality, while the rewriting of historical records demonstrates the connection between language, memory, and truth.

The novel also reveals that linguistic control affects individual identity. Winston's private writing represents his attempt to preserve an independent voice in a society dominated by official discourse. His struggle demonstrates the importance of language for maintaining personal memory and consciousness.

At the same time, *1984* shows that language is not exclusively a tool of oppression. The ability to preserve words, memories, experiences, and alternative meanings can also function as resistance. This dual role makes language particularly significant in the novel.

The study therefore concludes that Orwell presents linguistic control as an important mechanism of social and ideological domination. By controlling what people can say, how political events are described, and which meanings are treated as legitimate, the Party attempts to influence how individuals understand their society and themselves.

The sociolinguistic relevance of *1984* extends beyond its fictional setting. The novel encourages readers to consider how political discourse, propaganda, institutional language, and ideological communication can influence public understanding. Orwell's work therefore remains valuable for examining the relationship between **language, power, ideology, identity, and social control**.

Ultimately, *1984* demonstrates that the struggle over language is also a struggle over meaning. When powerful institutions attempt to control language, they are also attempting to influence the ways in which society understands reality. Conversely, the preservation of independent language can provide individuals with a means of questioning dominant power.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION (IJHLT)
VOLUME 1, ISSUE 3, OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2026
RCHUB PUBLISHER
ISSN: 3139-9185
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/IJHLT/1/3/008

References

[1.] Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Edited by John B. Thompson, translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson, Harvard University Press, 1991.

[2.] Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power*. 2nd ed., Longman, 2001.

[3.] Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith, Pantheon Books, 1972.

[4.] Holmes, Janet. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 4th ed., Pearson, 2013.

[5.] Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Secker & Warburg, 1949.

[6.] Wardhaugh, Ronald, and Janet M. Fuller. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 7th ed., WileyBlackwell, 2015.