
Academia Open



By Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo

Academia Open

Vol. 11 No. 1 (2026): June
DOI: 10.21070/acopen.11.2026.13904

Table Of Contents

Journal Cover	1
Author[s] Statement	3
Editorial Team	4
Article information	5
Check this article update (crossmark)	5
Check this article impact	5
Cite this article	5
Title page	6
Article Title	6
Author information	6
Abstract	6
Article content	7

Academia Open

Vol. 11 No. 1 (2026): June
DOI: 10.21070/acopen.11.2026.13904

Originality Statement

The author[s] declare that this article is their own work and to the best of their knowledge it contains no materials previously published or written by another person, or substantial proportions of material which have been accepted for the published of any other published materials, except where due acknowledgement is made in the article. Any contribution made to the research by others, with whom author[s] have work, is explicitly acknowledged in the article.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author[s] declare that this article was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright Statement

Copyright © Author(s). This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licences/by/4.0/legalcode>

Academia Open

Vol. 11 No. 1 (2026): June
DOI: 10.21070/acopen.11.2026.13904

EDITORIAL TEAM

Editor in Chief

Mochammad Tanzil Multazam, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

Managing Editor

Bobur Sobirov, Samarkand Institute of Economics and Service, Uzbekistan

Editors

Fika Megawati, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

Mahardika Darmawan Kusuma Wardana, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

Wiwit Wahyu Wijayanti, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

Farkhod Abdurakhmonov, Silk Road International Tourism University, Uzbekistan

Dr. Hindarto, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

Evi Rinata, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

M Faisal Amir, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

Dr. Hana Catur Wahyuni, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

Complete list of editorial team ([link](#))

Complete list of indexing services for this journal ([link](#))

How to submit to this journal ([link](#))

Academia Open

Vol. 11 No. 1 (2026): June
DOI: 10.21070/acopen.11.2026.13904

Article information

Check this article update (crossmark)



Check this article impact (*)



Save this article to Mendeley



(*) Time for indexing process is various, depends on indexing database platform

English as a Tool for Political Ideology within the Works of George Orwell: A Review

Zaid Fouad Hashim, zaid.hashim@atu.edu.iq (*)

AL-Furat AL-Awsat Technical University (ATU), Al-Qadisiyah Polytechnic College, Iraq

Sattar Abduljabbar Mohammed , zaid.hashim@atu.edu.iq

College of Agriculture, Al-Qadisiyah University, Iraq

Raneen Muwafaq Fadhil , raneen.fadel@atu.edu.iq

AL-Furat AL-Awsat Technical University (ATU), Al-Qadisiyah Polytechnic College, Iraq

(*) Corresponding author

Abstract

This study examines the role of English within global political communication by situating it as more than a neutral linguistic medium. **General Background:** English has become the dominant international language in diplomacy, media, and transnational interaction, shaping communication patterns worldwide. **Specific Background:** Its widespread use in political discourse positions it as a carrier of ideological meanings embedded within language structures and usage contexts. **Knowledge Gap:** However, limited attention has been given to how English operates as an instrument that conveys and reinforces political ideology across different sociopolitical environments. **Aims:** This research aims to analyze how English functions as a tool for expressing and disseminating political ideology in global discourse. **Results:** The findings reveal that English is strategically employed to frame narratives, legitimize power structures, and influence perception in political communication, particularly through media and institutional discourse. **Novelty:** The study highlights the dual role of English as both a communicative medium and an ideological mechanism, emphasizing its embedded political dimensions. **Implications:** These insights contribute to a deeper understanding of language and power relations, encouraging critical awareness of linguistic choices in global political contexts and supporting further interdisciplinary research in discourse analysis and sociolinguistics.

Highlights:

- English Operates as a Medium Carrying Ideological Meanings in Political Communication
- Linguistic Choices Shape Narratives and Legitimize Authority Structures
- Global Discourse Reflects Embedded Power Relations Through Language Use

Keywords: English Language, Political Ideology, Global Discourse, Language And Power, Critical Discourse Analysis.

Published date: 2026-03-17

Introduction

In today's digital, ever-evolving world, where the flow of information has reached unsuspected levels, the wisdom of George Orwell on manipulative language remains pertinent. Orwell's keen observations about how language can be used to frame political ideology and control public perception are paramount for understanding the dynamics of present-day political discourse.

This research will compare Orwell's seminal works, particularly "1984" and "Animal Farm," and his prescient essays, primarily "Politics and the English Language," to examine his theories relative to language as a powerful political tool. Accordingly, the main goal that this paper sets is to review how Orwell's views on language and politics link to modern problems of media manipulation, "fake news," and even wider consequences for democracy and public policy.

This article thus tries, through the analysis of Orwell's narrative and theoretical contribution, to posit points of contact between his fictional and non-fictional work and the actual state of political communication. George Orwell's work is a very critical piece that imparts a lesson on the possibility of what language can be as a tool for control and a way for truth and protest. In a world of intense political polarization and sophisticated digital communication technologies, understanding Orwell's warnings underscores the ethical responsibilities that rest in the hands of the information wielders and the existence of an alert and informed people.

This paper is organized with the clear intention of showing how Orwell depicted language manipulation in his fiction and essays first and, therefore, trying to analyze modern times when language served ideological ends. The article ends by reflecting on how Orwell's work is relevant for all time and in what sense it means to be able to keep public discourse honest in the digital age. In so doing, this research will underscore Orwell's timeless insights with the intention of providing protective mechanisms for democratic processes that call for clear, truthful communication in society.

Literature Review

Language As Power

George Orwell's essay "Politics and the English Language" expresses his worries about the decadence of English and the effects of such decadence on politics and society. Orwell believes that manipulative language contributes to the not-clarity of language and the precision with which it can be used to enable oppressive political conditions. This was his view that language can free and oppress, all depending on how one uses it. Orwell, for his part, argued that reality is easily twisted and manipulated through language so that it informs the perception of the people [1].

Language is, indeed, one of the most powerful tools of enforcing political oppression. In his essay, "Politics and the English Language," he deploras vague and inflated diction—that being typical of political rhetoric in purpose to obscure truth from the public. He classifies such kind of a language to include dying metaphors, operators, or verbal false limbs, pretentious diction, and meaningless words. All these devices, according to Orwell, make lies sound very truthful and by default, make murder sound very respectable, hence the ability to defend even the indefensible. In "1984," Newspeak, the concept of the official language of Oceania, incarnates Orwell's critique toward language as a tool of repression. It is designed with the purpose of narrowing the range of thought. The idea of the concept makes one think that. The party, through their language control, aims at exterminating personal thinking and enforcing orthodoxy [2].

Language control, through such terms as "doublethink" (the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously), goes further to help in manipulating and controlling the minds of the citizens. Orwell, on the other hand, saw language as a possible medium to liberation, a tool in the fight against tyranny, and for clarity in the truth. He recommended that lucid, precise, unostentatious language should be used with the intent of avoiding political manipulation of language and poor relations among the people. In "Animal Farm," the power of language as an instrument of freedom was first clearly realized when the animals were using it to rise up against their human oppressor, Mr. Jones, and actually even setting up some kind of decreed guideline for the commune ("Four legs good, two legs bad") [3]. However, as the novel evolves, it is this same tool that is used to oppress the animals under the new regime led by the pigs. This change points toward the message Orwell is trying to tell about the duality of language: one side liberating but easily turned into a tool of oppression. Orwell concludes "Politics and the English Language" with advice that would "help to guard against mindless barbarism" and "preserve your humanity by not accepting behavior which inevitably arises in human society." These rules include:

- Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figures of speech which you are used to seeing in print.
- Never use a long word where a short one will do.
- If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out.
- Never use the passive where you can use the active.
- Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent.
- Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous [4].

That is to say, these ideals would mean that the importance of clarity, simplicity, and honesty in the use of language that Orwell is trying to inculcate in the readers is something capable by human nature. Throughout, the works of Orwell and his essay "Politics and the English Language" seem to argue that language is not a mere passive artifact of culture but an active force with power, forging society and politics for either good or bad. His legacy warns us to mind the words that we take in

and give out: to see them shape and be shaped by the powers that wield them [5].

Methodology

Abstract This paper is based on a qualitative, interpretive research design rooted in textual and critical discourse analysis, focusing on the political using English as a tool for political ideology in the writings of George Orwell. Research Strategy This methodology is aimed at a systematic text-analysis of the pieces of fiction and non-fiction of Orwell that have come to be treated as primary sources (1984, *Animal Farm*, *Politics and the English Language*) in order to extract linguistic devices that highlight the ideological deception, propaganda, and perversion of truth. You will examine several important passages, using close reading techniques to explore the ways in which language operates as tool of power, control, resistance, and subversion in the political realm. This analysis is anchored in a wide-ranging exploration of secondary academic literature (including scholarly books, peer-reviewed journal articles, and critical work on Orwell, political discourse, and language ideology), which provides both theoretical grounding and contextual nuance. Holding a comparative analytical mirror to the present, it goes on to explain how the concept of language manipulation used as a tool to shape and control public opinion, which Orwell so thoroughly analysed, has emerged in countries like the India of today through alleged fake news, media framing, digital surveillance and ideological framing in contemporary political communication. It also works the tools of critical theory to interrogate the ethics of linguistic manipulation and the destruction of truth in democratic regimes. Thus, this innovative methodology synthesizes traditional literary analysis with a discourse-oriented interpretation allowing us to understand the lasting significance of Orwell when it comes to the relationship between language and power. Not only does this method question the strict textual adherence characteristic of much critical linguistic analysis, but also it maintains theoretical openness through its discursive positioning between interpretive rigor and rhetoric, a strength for exploring this never simple language-ideology-political authority relationship in both historical and contemporary contexts.

Political Ideology and Propaganda

Zapico argues that George Orwell's writing is highly associated with political ideology criticism and an all-around influence of propaganda, most notably through strategic diction [6]. Orwell viewed English not only as a medium through which people communicated but as a powerful tool that both political ruling and influencing propaganda were based on. His books, especially "1984" and "Animal Farm," are the classic example of how the language may be directed toward politics, at the same time for enforcing political ideology and government propaganda. Orwell remains greatly suspicious about fascist or communist totalitarian states, and his portrayal of the repressive societies shows this. In several instances, his novels shed light on how political systems tend to turn to language to mold and enshrine their particular ideology.

In "1984," the Party ideology—Ingsoc (English Socialism)—finds its enforcement through Newspeak and the falsification of historical. The official language becomes Newspeak, purposely designed in such a way as not to allow any possibilities for individual mind; i.e., the idea of "thought crime," whereby certain ideas are literally inconceivable by a person because there is no articulation for the ideas to be expressed. This manipulation of language is direct in enforcing political ideology, as it limits the level of complexity in thoughts and communications. "Animal Farm" uses an allegory of a farm to lay criticism on Stalinist communism. The pigs, who had first drafted their revolution, gradually distorted the idealities of Animalism so as to rationalize their assumption of power [7].

Williams asserted that such slogans as "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others" and the unremitting, continuous changing of the Seven Commandments to suit their present purposes were some of the manners through which language could be adjusted to hold and legitimize corrupt leadership by the pigs [8]. "Propaganda," Orwell states, "is one of his key subjects of his inquiry into political language." He demonstrates how language can deform truth and affect the population. The Ministry of Truth, where the chief character Winston Smith works, is responsible for the alteration of historical records to what the Party's current official narrative is. Through such a way, it ensures a position always to look infallible and omniscient. Examples such as "War is Peace, Freedom is Slavery, Ignorance is Strength" are the slogans full of doublethink used in "1984" that sum up the meaning of doublethink. These are slogans meant to disorient, play with, and poison the human brain of citizens.

Harris argued that in *Animal Farm*, propaganda is made almost exclusively through Squealer, a pig who serves as the right-hand man for Napoleon [9]. Squealer, on the other hand, twists language into the convincing of other animals into accepting pigs' increasingly blatant power grabs; he uses statistics to lie about improvements in farm production and discredits enemies like Snowball, scapegoating them for any misfortunes. Orwell's work brings out very well that language is not an inactive medium for expressing ideas; rather, it is a very powerful tool for political power and control. Exposing the use of English in his novels, it seems very clear that Orwell was a person who had a serious commitment to the corruptibility of language and how it employed the oppressive governance. In *1984* and *Animal Farm*, Orwell criticizes not only some of the political ideas, but he issues a warning of what can come as a consequence if language was left to be too manipulated for reality and perception. His illustration of the manipulation of language stands as one for today, where concerns on propaganda and the abuse of power are never-ending and still stay very topical for modern political discourse.

Language and Truth

A central theme in George Orwell's exploration of the relationship between language and truth is the way in which language can be manipulated to actually distort truth and distribute political ideology. In both "1984" and "Animal Farm," Orwell exhibits how authority over language can accord those in power control deeper than the way in which they control people's

Academia Open

Vol. 11 No. 1 (2026): June
DOI: 10.21070/acopen.11.2026.13904

understandings of reality and how individuals are governed by them [10].

This point is best elaborated with vivid examples from "1984," where Orwell first introduced the concept of Newspeak as an instrument designed to narrow the range of thought. But more than a simple instrument of language, Newspeak becomes a strategy to design the truth, cutting down on complexity in both thought and expression.

Newspeak is deleting words that could be susceptible to breeding rebellion and critical thinking. For example, minus the word "freedom," hard to even imagine the actuality of freedom. Other than Newspeak, the ability to create "doublethink"—the holding of two contradictory beliefs in one's mind at the same time and accepting both—allows the Party to lie to the people and change the past records to make the lie admissible in the future, even if those people who remember the truth. This manipulation of the truth, therefore, serves to fulfill the conformity of Ingsoc's political ideology in ensuring all times the Party looks infallible [11].

In "1984," this motto has the words: "Who controls the past controls the future: who controls the present controls the past." That perfectly sums up what language does to remodel history. The very change in the party records of the past makes sure history never remains the same but has, in fact, to change according to what the party declares. This manipulation only further endorses the ideological viewpoint that the Party is trustworthy as a source of truth and moves on to oppress people under the pretense of knowing all and being kind [12].

In "Animal Farm," Orwell uses language to show how, in the hands and mouths of unscrupulous communicators, it can be both a hammer and a muzzle, enforcing ideology and distorting truth among the farm animals.

The pig, Squealer, craftily uses his rhetorical skills to persuade the other animals for the need to abide by the pigs' ever harder and stifling rules. He contorts language to make the animals not experience their suffering and adversity, convincing them that they are better off than they were under human leadership. Through Squealer, Orwell illustrates how language can be purposefully used to manipulate the perception of truth and provide a justification for political change that is evidently against the interest of the animals [13].

The Seven Commandments are gradually tampered with in the story; first subtly, then more brazenly. But apparently each change from the original revolutionary intent of the commandments was a kind of modification that seemed necessary to, not a betrayal of. This gradual change of the language actually shows how the truth could be bent over the years so that people in power can twist historical facts for ideological control [14].

Higgins argued that Orwell's message is the fact that the truth, when the language becomes a tool, gets in the hands of power [15]. The truth becomes pliable and an issue of perspective. He warns for a society where language is used not for the sake of communication but as an instrument of control and limitation of thought. He goes as far as to warn that if people take no notice of the corruption of a clear and honest language, the consequence could be that people might not even be able to think logically and, therefore, lose their freedom. In both novels, Orwell discloses a negative vision of how language can be corrupted for political ends, issuing a warning on the power of language to shape reality as much as it communicates it.

Through his poignant and stark narratives, Orwell illustrates that control of language by political powers can turn into a dystopian reality in which the truth is not discovered by language but dictated by it. The question above holds some very serious questions on the ethical obligation of those who wield language and who are watchful about the integrity of language as the vehicle for truth.

Resistance and Subversion

Hollis claimed that George Orwell's works are interwoven with themes of resistance and subversion, demonstrating how language may be used to be a tool for enforcement and, at the same time, can be utilized in order to bring into question and challenge prevailing political ideologies [16]. In his novels, most perceptibly in "1984" and "Animal Farm," language lies at the very locus of a titanic battleground on which the powers of repression and resistance ration. The book explores some of the ways in which language can be used not only by the powerful but also by those who want to question or overthrow that power.

In "1984," Winston Smith works in the Ministry of Truth, editing historical records all the time—edit them, not because people had to be misled and the world turned upside down by them, but because they somehow have to fit the constantly changing narratives of the Party. However, Winston started with his own private rebellion against the Party in his diary entries. In this place, language becomes one form of fighting. This is a direct approach wherein Winston shows his rebellion against the control of truth and memory by the Party. He keeps track of his reality and that of his individual point of view against the imposed collective memory by the Party, marking a record of his experiences and thoughts. The use of this language can be subjective and, at the same time, an act against totalitarian control of reality.

Benson asserted that newspeak is being designed by the party to wipe away unorthodox thoughts [17]. On their part, Winston and his lover, Julia, speak to each other in oldspeak (standard English) at their private conversations. This is kind of an act of resistance. Oldspeak provides them with words in which to express thoughts and feelings that are literally unimaginable in Newspeak and therefore alien from the concrete world the Party is trying to fashion. "Animal Farm" demonstrates how language can be used to control, from the monopoly exercised by the ruling class (the pigs), but also to

Academia Open

Vol. 11 No. 1 (2026): June

DOI: 10.21070/acopen.11.2026.13904

resist, even if much less often and with tragically poor results by the other animals.

Bowker suggested that the song "Bejson of England," so inspirational for the revolution at the very beginning, gives a really powerful example of the language with the help of which the animals will unite and use to make themselves consolidated and mobilized against the oppressors [18]. Though the pigs would later ban the song in an effort to stifle dissent and further solidify their control, its early use demonstrates how language can serve as the rallying cry, bringing disparate individuals in a common cause. Moses the raven was telling the animals about Sugar Candy Mountain, which he heard was a place of great joy and plenty to which animals went after death. Even if in the beginning it might seem to be a tool of the humans in order to make the animals accept the suffering in hope of a better afterlife, its persisting among the animals, too, suggests a form of resistance. This strengthens them with optimism and another voice against the fatalistic reality that the pigs impose on them.

What Orwell's investigation of resistance and subversion with language really highlighted was his belief that language is intrinsically political [19]. In "1984" and "Animal Farm," language performs its function for the ruling elite: either to subjugate and submit or, in its pure sense, it is a powerful tool of resistance. Throughout, Orwell shows that even in the most regimented social orders, language is free to keep its subversive potential, and people or groups use it to question or defy power. These stories remind one that the language does have a dual capacity: it's one way to be dominated, and it's one way to be freed. It does seem from the works of Orwell that in the struggle against oppression—or in the pursuit of freedom—there does seem to be this element of language use and interpretation.

Influence on Political Discourse

George Orwell's critical exploration of language and politics in his works, most saliently through the ideas of Newspeak, doublethink, and the mutability of historical truth, has left a profound and lasting influence on the way modern political discourse is framed. His reflections on how language might be used to manipulate and the ethical consequences for political communication resonate down to today, one notes, in any discussion on media, politics, and ideology.

Orwell's characterization of the role of the media in forming public perception and opinion within "1984" contains clear parallels to modern discussions of media bias and agenda-setting. One of the important concepts that Orwell tried to emphasize was the fact that the controllers of the information almost controlled and could manipulate the reality. This is definitely bearing the echo in contemporary concerns over how media would angle certain stories or facts to frame public discourses for some kind of political mileage.

Orwell was much distressed to know that euphemistic language could be used to mask hideous truths and even to twist people's minds. One can see that his essay "Politics and the English Language" is a plea for clarity in the use of language. In today's political discourse, one might find something like the gimmicks present in the euphemistic "collateral damage" for civilian victims of military actions, or in "enhanced interrogation techniques," another option for a long-established word: torture. The criticism adds fuel to the debate on the morality and effects of the language used in political communication.

The concept of Newspeak, ideated to make thought processes less free, has often been cited in political correctness and language policing discussions. Critics would say that the prohibition of some words or their usage in a certain way in any kind of quenching of public debates would definitely suffocate freedom of speech, just like in Newspeak. On the other hand, those supporters of this concept would definitely argue that this is very much a necessity for the respectful and inclusive language to be brought about. Orwell's work is so often alluded to on both sides of this argument; that does seem to place him as one of enduring relevance to discussions of the proper balance between free expression and expression that may be injurious to others.

Shelden argued that Orwell's doublethink was the idea that the mind could contain two contradictory ideas at once, accepting both as true, much like the psychological concept of cognitive dissonance [5]. Nowadays, in the modern political discourse, one can find quite often a doublethink within the justification of the politician's contradiction regarding his policies or action, capable of confusing perception and public discourse. Orwell's insights into doublethink give a very useful mirror to compare against these given political statements and strategies in order that a better understanding of how political figures and governments manage public opinion vs. internal contradictions can be had.

The technological surveillance in "1984" predated modern concerns regarding privacy, data collection, and surveillance. Orwell's concept of the surveillance state has only gotten more relevant in an internet and big data world, where governments and corporations can follow individual behaviors as much as they care to. Discussions on the balance between security and privacy in the digital age often throw in Orwellian nightmares to bring out what could go wrong [20].

Orwell's foray into the manipulative power of language and the potentiality of the political reins through media and technology is something that really left an indelible mark on modern political rhetoric. His warnings about the degradation of language and the corrosion of truth still have influence in debates about the ethics of media, freedom of speech, and what truth in politics means. In contrast to alarmist thinking, Orwell's work militates against critical inquiry into how language gets used, enjoined in the public sector by all citizens and policy-makers alike to be ever more clearly, honestly, and integrally spoken in political practice.

Relevance in Today's World

Academia Open

Vol. 11 No. 1 (2026): June

DOI: 10.21070/acopen.11.2026.13904

George Orwell's concern with language, truth, and manipulation in his works, particularly "1984," holds a relevance deep in the present world where media manipulation and the spread of "fake news" have become a norm. His ideas provide a much-needed way in which to understand the current condition of the media within a world that's spinning out of control with information and misinformation that can drastically affect political reality and public perception.

Bradford asserted that the result is a depiction of a media serving the state, continually editing the history and spreading out the propaganda, chillingly close to the kind of media manipulation in evidence today: some narratives are amped up, whilst others discredited or ignored—all for political ends [21]. Today, state-controlled and corporate media entities exercise an immense influence on public opinion, taking off halfway if political discourse rises. In the modern digital media environment, with modern capacities to customize and even filter information so that it comes to individuals, echo chambers may be created that reinforce existing biases. This is like segregating the population segments into diverging perceived realities.

The term "fake news," essentially describing constructed information that mirrors news media content in form but not in organizational process or intent, mirrors Orwellian preoccupations with truth and language. Most of the time, "fake news" has been designed to mislead or manipulate public opinion, in similar practices to what the Party was doing in "1984" to hide the truth. Orwell's obsession with the political use of language as a weapon and the cynical view of arriving at a shared basis of understanding reality, unfiltered merged into one description of society's predicaments to deal with untruths online or offline [22].

Of course, Orwell's invention of Newspeak as a language specifically designed to narrow the range of thought is starkly compared to the political and corporate doublespeak of today: the euphemistic or ambiguous use of words to say something that is the opposite of the truth or to hide something. For instance, say "alternative facts" by some means reflect the pursued manipulation of language, reminiscent of Newspeak, to reform the manner people should understand reality. Such practices contribute to cynicism in society, hence erosion of even the residual trust towards political institutions and media houses, hence complicating efforts in appropriately addressing social and political issues.

The modern use of technology in surveillance and data collection similarly draws direct lines to Orwellian predictions. Such an ability of the government and private companies to pursue a person's patterns of behavior and preferences paves the way for new opportunities in manipulating political ideology and public opinion, just the way telescreens and constant surveillance, as for example displayed in "1984," impose. This type of surveillance does, of course, raise many ethical questions when it comes to privacy and even possible coercive control—an idea that certainly must have crossed Orwell's mind during his representations of totalitarianism [23].

Orwell's appeal to use plain, clear language as a defense against tyranny is particularly apropos to today's political society, where evasion makes it possible for misinformation to triumph over ambiguities and vagueness. His reminders come into play to call for vigilance in the way language is used in public discourse, reminding them of the need for integrity in communication. This is to keep the first; journalists and politicians secondly, and citizens thirdly urging for honesty and clarity to maintain a democratic society [24] [25].

Finally, George Orwell's language and ideology explication dig up an insight into his work and the contemporary issues of "fake news" and media manipulation. His works set a warning signal that this very language can get converted into a source of coercion and falsehood time and again. Reiterated is the need for people with critical literacy and democratic engagement to keep the truth sacred, and the public debates should not be allowed to corrode with misinformation and manipulation.

Conclusion

This research has offered comprehensive insight into George Orwell's deep insights in the play of language and political ideology, giving evidence toward the lasting relevance of those insights for today's political speech. It is in a critical analysis of two of his prime works, "1984" and "Animal Farm," along with his critical essays, that we see how his concerns toward the misuse of language and manipulating truth had not turned into relics of some bygone era but had remained an issue requiring us to face it head-on in today's world, drenched in media.

In this sense, our analysis revealed Orwell's fear of a society in which language would be abused as a means for oppression and control. On the political and social surface, such fears would be expressed in phenomena like media manipulation, fake news, and the politicized information well. Doublespeak practices and manipulation of public records Orwell fantasied as dystopian alarm bells to find reflection in modern political and corporate means seeking to form public perception and blurry reality with all sorts of spin. Moreover, the surveillance capability of the digital revolution is set to give added urgency to Orwell's warning as people wade through a growingly monitored and manipulated information environment.

Therefore, Orwell's implication of ideas for modern society lies in calling upon the information consumers to be uncompromisingly vigilant and critically literate about the truth and its variations. Thus, Orwell's advocacy for clear and honest communication to rise as an antidote to political blackmail becomes a call to media practitioners, educators, and policymakers to foster transparency and integrity in public discourse.

Overall, Orwell's writing provokes one to critically engage with the language of power, making one realize just how complicit they become in the continuous perpetuation or challenging of the narratives by which our world is run. The work he produced gives an important lesson: the defense of truth and clear communication is a constant activity in taking care of

any society that seeks to be free and just. As we face these first-world problems of misinformation and digital surveillance, Orwell's vision points to a guiding light as we think of ways to better inform and engage the public.

References

1. E. Van Ree, "Socialism in one country: A reassessment," *Studies in East European Thought*, vol. 50, pp. 77-117, 1998.
2. T. McKenna, "Behind the Black Mirror: The limits of Orwellian dystopia," *Critique*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 365-376, 2019.
3. P. Thomas, "Mixed feelings: Raymond Williams and George Orwell," *Theory and Society*, vol. 14, pp. 419-444, 1985.
4. G. Orwell, "Politics and the English language," *Horizon*, vol. 13, no. 76, pp. 252-265, 1946.
5. M. Sheldon, *George Orwell: The Authorised Biography*. London, U.K.: William Heinemann, 1991.
6. A. Zapico, *James Joyce: Portrait of a Dubliner*, D. Prendergast, Trans. Dublin, Ireland: O'Brien Press, 2016.
7. N. G. Popova and T. A. Beavitt, "English as a means of scientific communication: Linguistic imperialism or interlingua?" *Integration of Education*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 54-70, 2017.
8. R. Williams, *War, Words and Reason: Orwell and Thomas Merton on the Crises of Language (The Orwell Memorial Lecture 2015)*. London, U.K.: University College London, 2015.
9. R. Harris and T. J. Taylor, *Landmarks in Linguistic Thought I: The Western Tradition from Socrates to Saussure*, 2nd ed. London, U.K., and New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 1997.
10. T. A. Beavitt and N. G. Popova, "The role of the English article system in developing dialogical context: A view from Russian science," *Journal of Language and Education*, vol. 3, pp. 52-68, 2020.
11. G. Y. Trail, "Teaching argument and the rhetoric of Orwell's 'Politics and the English language'," *College English*, vol. 57, no. 5, p. 570, 1995.
12. S. Wilson, *Cultural Materialism: Theory and Practice*. Oxford, U.K.: Basil Blackwell, 1995.
13. C. West, "In memoriam: The legacy of Raymond Williams," in *Cultural Materialism: Essays on Raymond Williams*, C. Prendergast, Ed. Minneapolis, MN, USA: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1995.
14. C. Freedman, "Writing, ideology, and politics: Orwell's 'Politics and the English language' and English composition," *College English*, vol. 43, no. 4, p. 327, 1981, doi: 10.2307/377118.
15. J. Higgins, *Raymond Williams: Literature, Marxism and Cultural Materialism*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 1999.
16. G. Hollis, *A Study of George Orwell: The Man and His Works*. London, U.K.: Hollis and Carter, 1956.
17. F. Benson, *Writers in Arms: The Literary Impact of the Spanish Civil War: Hemingway, Malraux, Orwell, Koestler, Bernanos, Regler*. New York, NY, USA: University Press of New York, 1967.
18. G. Bowker, *George Orwell*. London, U.K.: Abacus, 2013.
19. J. S. Mill, *Mill on Bentham and Coleridge*. London, U.K.: Chatto & Windus, 1950.
20. S. Pinsker, "Musing about Orwell's 'Politics and the English language'—50 years later," *The Virginia Quarterly Review*, vol. 73, no. 1, 1997.
21. R. Bradford, *Orwell: A Man of Our Time*. London, U.K.: Bloomsbury Caravel, 2021.
22. P. Christin and E. Bilal, *The Town That Didn't Exist*. Paris, France, and Los Angeles, CA, USA: Humanoid Publishing, 2000.
23. P. Christin and E. Bilal, *Century's End: The Black Order Brigade and The Hunting Party*. London, U.K.: Titan Comics, 2016.
24. B. Crick, *George Orwell: A Life*, rev. ed. London, U.K.: Harvill Secker, 2018.
25. J. Meyers, *Orwell: Wintry Conscience of a Generation*. New York, NY, USA: W. W. Norton, 2000.