

Power Discourse and Social Control in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

Hilmy Qaais Widaad

English Literature, Faculty of Humanities, UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.

hilmyqaais@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18860/lilics.v3i1.6770>

Copyright © Hilmy Qaais Widaad



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

How to Cite: APA Style 7th edition

Submission

Track:

Received:

05-01-2024

Available online:

30-04-2024

Corresponding

Author:

Hilmy Qaais Widaad

hilmyqaais@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

*In the contemporary era, literary studies play a crucial role in understanding power dynamics within social contexts. This research analyzed the impact of power discourse on social practices portrayed in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Employing the discourse theory of power, the study revealed an intricate power system, showcasing its enduring nature, which made overthrowing it challenging. Adopting a literary sociology approach, the researcher considered the socio-historical aspects of the novel's world. Data collection involved narratives and dialogues aligned with research objectives, drawing on Michel Foucault's theoretical concepts such as episteme, power/knowledge relations, disciplining (normalization), and panopticon. The research explored how power discourse significantly shaped social reality in Orwell's society, employing a critical analysis of the novel's narrative. Foucault's concept of epistemology examined the construction and maintenance of knowledge in the totalitarian government policies depicted. The interplay between power and knowledge raised inquiries into the control and utilization of information to uphold power structures. The discipline concept, focusing on normalization, analyzed the enforcement of obedience and conformity in a government-ruled society. Additionally, Foucault's panopticon notion scrutinized how surveillance and control involved invisible elements influencing individual behavior. Through these analytical frameworks, the research unveiled the intricate dynamics between power discourses and social practices in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, offering profound insights into the exercise and maintenance of power in an authoritarian society.*

Keywords: : Discourse, Social Practice, Sociology of Literature

INTRODUCTION

Literature, as a product of discourse, mirrors and engages with societal conversations. It serves as a powerful tool, wielded by governments or ruling entities, to propagate specific ideologies or messages, thereby becoming an influential means of expression. (Eagleton, 1996).

Writers can either support or challenge governments through literature, turning it into a powerful tool or weapon for conveying messages and influencing perspectives.

Nineteen Eighty-Four (1949), a novel by George Orwell, has made a huge impact on global thought and discourse over the years. Orwell's "*Nineteen Eighty-Four*" explores a dystopian world under authoritarian rule, with a focus on language control. The proposed thesis aims to analyze discourse power in the novel and its relevance to modern society, particularly in the digital age. It examines how language influences public perception, manipulates thoughts, and serves as a tool of power in a totalitarian society. Using Foucault's discourse concept in a genealogy approach, the research aims to unveil dual perspectives on the issue. Discourse, as defined by Foucault in Wiradnyana (2018), relates to the relationship between statements, conditions, and practices that structure and facilitate the understanding of any thought, action, or activity. The analysis of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* involves two aspects: examining socio-political practices and uncovering the underlying motives. This dual approach includes discourse analysis based on Foucault's methods, exploring power relations in knowledge. Additionally, Foucault's concepts of discipline and *panopticon* are applied, viewing the novel as a microcosm of a state a space where knowledge is transmitted and practiced.

According to Foucault in Wiradnyana (2018), disciplining or what is also commonly called normalization is a concept that, according to his framework, is used to explain the process and rules of how a practice can take place or not, be allowed or prohibited, normal or abnormal, in a certain discourse. The *panopticon*, as per Foucault, is a concept elucidating the existence of sites, whether in written, oral, rules, appeals, practices, or knowledge forms, that oversee and initiate the process of disciplining or normalizing a practice. Within the normalization or *panopticon* framework, there exist power and knowledge relations, shaping how discourse on specific practices operates and is comprehended based on their strategies and relationships.

This research aimed to unravel how discourse shaped society and politics, combating language manipulation. Drawing from George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it explored the correlation between language, power, and social practices. Adopting Michel Foucault's framework, it emphasized power-knowledge connections through the sociology of literature and the genealogy method. The study relied on the descriptive analysis of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* quotes, contributing to discourse power understanding. Acknowledging its place among various studies on *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it underscored the importance of evaluating diverse perspectives for a comprehensive understanding.

In the realm of previous research, various studies had scrutinized different facets related to the current topic. Teo (2019), in "*The Fabrication of Truth and the Maintenance of Power in Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four*," explored essential elements of George Orwell's novel pertaining to truth fabrication and power maintenance. Similarly, González (2022), in "*From the Ministry of Truth to the Filter Bubble: Manipulation of Discourse in Nineteen Eighty-Four and The Loudest Voice*," delved into political power and mass media's use of discourse for information control. Johnson (2021), in "*The Role of Implicated Meaning in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: Language, Thought, and Power*," focused on implied meaning's impact on language, thought, and power in Orwell's work.

Negm (2021), in "*The Notion of Discourse as 'Power' and 'Resistance' Revisited in the novel Nineteen Eighty-Four*," it built on the evolving interpretation of discourse as a tool for both attaining power and engaging in resistance. Mahardika (2021) in "*Representasi Kekuasaan dan Perlawanan dalam Film Nineteen Eighty-Four (Analisis Wacana Film "Nineteen Eighty-Four"*,

karya George Orwell”), analyzed the representation of power and resistance in the film adaptation of “*Nineteen Eighty-Four*” using film discourse analysis. Sarkar (2022), in “*George Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four and Surveillance in the Contemporary World*,” compared surveillance elements in Orwell’s novel with real-world surveillance practices.

Tian (2019), in “*George Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four and Peter Weir’s The Truman Show: A Foucauldian Perspective on Surveillance and Control*,” examined similarities and differences in how societies in both works deal with surveillance using Michel Foucault’s social theory framework. For instance, studies like *Power and Knowledge as a Means of Social and Political Control, as Portrayed in the Novels Nineteen Eighty-Four and Animal Farm*, are particularly pertinent. The study by Shimal and Mohsen Hanif, Assistant Professor (2020), explored the interconnectedness between power and knowledge as portrayed in Orwell’s novels. Hama (2015), in “*Language as an oppressive device in Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four*,” focused on language as an oppressive device in “*Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four*” using Norman Fairclough’s lens for critical discourse analysis. Abdu & Khafaga (2019), in “*A Critical Discourse Analysis of Mind Control Strategies in George Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four*,” scrutinize mind-control methods in the novel using critical discourse analysis.

Rahayu (2016) stated that discourse analysis was concerned with how a text was produced, interpreted, and distributed. This research uniquely focused on power and discourse in George Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, exploring how the novel’s totalitarian government manipulated the masses through language. In contrast to broader studies, it exclusively analyzed this specific work, emphasizing its societal impact and the reader’s role in shaping perceptions of power and social control. The research offered a comprehensive understanding of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*’s relevance in a broader social and political context. This study aimed to specifically examine the influence of George Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four* on social practices. The research question was: *How does the discourse presented in George Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four impact the social practices depicted within the novel?*

This research was a crucial reference for practical and academic exploration, particularly in humanities studies using Michel Foucault’s theories. It enhanced our understanding of literature as a reflection of social reality, facilitating social criticism. Furthermore, it aimed to help the community grasp reality through discourse, encouraging individual vigilance, wisdom, and personal autonomy. This research deeply analyzed how George Orwell employed discourse in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* to depict power dynamics in a dystopian society. Focusing on key characters and situations, it explored themes of surveillance, language manipulation, and changes in history and truth within the social and political context. The aim was to understand the impact on individuals and groups in this suffocating environment.

This study employed Michel Foucault’s sociology of literature, focusing on discourse, power-knowledge relations, and episteme. It incorporated concepts like discipline (normalization) and panopticon in its theoretical framework. The sociological approach to literature involved analyzing literary works with a focus on their social and cultural aspects. This enabled readers to comprehend how literature reflected and shaped society and its people (Lelet, 2021). Considering Foucault’s views on power, discourse, and social control, the novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* vividly illustrated the realization of power and social control through language and discourse, resulting in the formation of a frightening totalitarian society as depicted by George Orwell. Through in-depth literary analysis, the researcher could

understand how Foucault's understanding of discourse was related to the representation of power in literary works.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research was classified as literary criticism because it examined literary works. According to Wallek & Warren (1949), literary criticism was the study that analyzed, interpreted, and evaluated literary works while applying literary theories as a theoretical framework. Therefore, this analysis applied Michel Foucault's power-discourse theory to dissect George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Foucault introduced five fundamental concepts to expose power dynamics at work in the novel, including discourse, power/knowledge relations, episteme, disciplinary practices (normalization), and the panopticon control mechanism.

The data collection process involved two methods: reading and note-taking. In the reading phase, the researcher engaged in multiple readings of the novel to identify and comprehend how power was depicted through discourse. Drawing on Michel Foucault's concept of discourses of power and social practices, the research delved into understanding how power manifested in society and how characters employed discourse to manipulate and control others. The recorded data was then meticulously analyzed to gain deeper insights. Given the precision and rigor required for this research, a specific note-taking model was employed to ensure detailed and accurate recording.

Patton (Moleong, 1990) defined data analysis as the process of categorizing and organizing data. In analyzing *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the researcher followed specific steps, including identifying themes like totalitarianism, state surveillance, and language manipulation. The study explored power discourse application in the novel, focusing on language manipulation in a totalitarian society. Additionally, George Orwell's narrative techniques, character dialogues, and the novel's structure were analyzed to understand power discourse's impact on the storyline.

FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

The Impact of Discourse on Social Practice in the World of George Orwell's Novel Nineteen Eighty-Four

In George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, a power-discourse system profoundly influenced social practices, demonstrating the destructive impact of such a system on individuals and society. The totalitarian regime of the Party and Big Brother used this system to control, manipulate, and suppress potential citizen resistance. The novel illustrated the interconnectedness of power-discourse with concepts such as power/knowledge relations, episteme, normalization (disciplining), and the panopticon. These crucial concepts, rooted in the work of French philosopher Michel Foucault, elucidated the operation of knowledge and power in contemporary society. Together, they constituted a power-discourse, or a "regime of truth," shaping what was deemed legitimate knowledge within a society. Foucault's critical discourse analysis framework provided a lens through which to examine the world depicted in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. In essence, the relationship between discourse, power/knowledge, episteme, normalization, and the panopticon established the foundation for understanding how

power and knowledge collaborated to create intricate systems of power. This amalgamation formed a power-discourse that explored how humans comprehended the world, influenced behavior, and shaped modern society. These ideas contributed to our understanding of how society embraced and sustained norms, values, and knowledge, while power played a pivotal role in influencing social practices and behavioral control.

In Nineteen Eighty-Four, the ruling Party in Oceania utilized discourse, power/knowledge relations, and the concept of episteme as tools for control and dominance. The language-manipulating tool, Newspeak, was employed to regulate citizens' thoughts and language, ensuring the Party's continued supremacy. Power-knowledge relations underscored the mutual dependence of power and knowledge, with the Party's absolute control over information granting it authority over individuals. Through the manipulation of records and history, the Party sustained its narrative, preventing individuals from questioning the truth and reinforcing their powerlessness in a totalitarian society. Foucault (1994) defined episteme as the framework of knowledge that established the acceptable boundaries and types of understanding in a society at specific times. In Nineteen Eighty-Four, the Party tightly controlled the episteme of society, exemplifying the novel's episteme through its manipulation of history and culture.

The Party constructed an epistemic framework wherein truth was determined solely by their declarations, as evidenced by the assertion that " $2 + 2 = 5$ " if the Party commanded it. This demonstrated the Party's construction and deployment of epistemes as a means of controlling individuals' thoughts and knowledge. In summary, the concepts articulated in Nineteen Eighty-Four elucidated the Party's strategies for exerting control and exercising dominant power. The Party used strict control, surveillance, and punishment to discipline individuals and achieve its objectives, including the establishment of "re-education centers" to change individuals' beliefs. In Nineteen Eighty-Four, discipline transformed individuals into obedient citizens who submitted to authority, eliminating opposition to the Party and ensuring absolute obedience. The panopticon in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* served as a control mechanism to enforce discipline, accomplished through the utilization of Big Brother and the telescreen, allowing the Party to constantly observe and regulate individuals' behavior. Consequently, the Party established a behavioral pattern that created a feeling of uncertainty and ongoing scrutiny, fostering conformity.

To clarify, this research presented a multitude of data from George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Michel Foucault's analytical framework was utilized to analyze this data and uncover the underlying power-discourse shaping social practices within the novel. This research examined the various ways in which power operated in the novel by exploring the previously introduced concepts of discourse, power/knowledge relations, and episteme. Furthermore, it was essential not to overlook the interconnectedness of two concepts, normalization (disciplining) and panopticon. The researcher employed Foucault's critical discourse analysis model to thoroughly examine these concepts, presenting it in several parts concerning the power of discourse and its impact on social practices in the novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

Discourse as a Manipulative Tool

Discourse, as outlined by Foucault (1972), encompassed the manner in which language and narrative shaped societal and cultural understanding. Foucault contended that power extended beyond formal political structures, permeating everyday language and knowledge. According to Hall (cited in Rahayu, Abdullah, & Udasmoro, 2015, p. 25), discourse involved constructing knowledge about a specific topic or practice through a series of ideas, images, and practices. It influenced how we discussed, constructed knowledge, and behaved in relation to various societal aspects. Discourse not only reflected power but also served as the medium through which power was wielded. In George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the totalitarian Oceania government explicitly exploited discourse to manipulate individuals' thoughts and perspectives. The novel vividly illustrated this through the use of Newspeak and doublethink conventions, slogans and posters, speeches, campaigns, demonstrations, and even the manipulation of sound and music emanating from the telescreen. Newspeak, in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, was a language system by a totalitarian regime to control thought and communication, eliminating dissent. Selected novel excerpts revealed Newspeak's powerful influence on shaping societal minds.

Datum 1

It was his friend Syme, who worked in the Research Department ... "We're getting the language into its final shape—the shape it's going to have when nobody speaks anything else. When we've finished with it, people like you will have to learn it all over again. You think, I dare say, that our chief job is inventing new words. But not a bit of it! We're destroying words—scores of them, hundreds of them, every day. We're cutting the language down to the bone." (Orwell, 1949, p. 53-54)

The dialogue highlighted manipulative discourse in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Foucault's analysis emphasized the invisible power of destroying words and shaping language by a totalitarian government to control thought. Syme, from the Research Department, became an agent of power, altering language to reinforce the ruling ideology and limit individual expression. This underscored how power operated not just through formal institutions but also through knowledge production and language control in daily life.

Datum 2

"Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it. Every concept that can ever be needed, will be expressed by exactly one word, with its meaning rigidly defined and all its subsidiary meanings rubbed out and forgotten ... Every year fewer and fewer words, and the range of consciousness always a little smaller ... It's merely a question of self-discipline, reality-control" (Orwell, 1949, p. 55)

The dialogue in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* reflected Newspeak's attempt to limit thought through language control. According to Michel Foucault, this manipulation of discourse restricted thought, controlled reality, and normalized language. The statement *"It's merely a question of self-discipline, reality-control"* showed an effort to manipulate reality perception through language. Newspeak aimed to normalize language, erasing diversity that challenged government control. In Foucault's view, the dialogue exposed the government's bid to control thought by stifling self-expression and critical thinking.

Furthermore, propaganda discourse was also very influential in this novel. Party members used mass media and propaganda to spread a false understanding of reality and history. They carried out a constant revision of history, known as "decontamination," to erase traces of resistance and change the historical narrative according to their interests. This created uncertainty and confusion among citizens, who could no longer trust anything they saw or heard. Propaganda generated social distrust and strengthened Party power.

The totalitarian government in Nineteen Eighty-Four systematically altered history to manipulate public perceptions of their authority. The Ministry of Truth was responsible for modifying the historical record, erasing, or modifying information to align with the regime's interests. This generated an episteme where the historical truth was distorted based on the leaders' goal of retaining their power. For instance, consider the following illustrations:

Datum 3

The Party said that Oceania had never been in alliance with Eurasia. He, Winston Smith, knew that Oceania had been in alliance with Eurasia as short a time as four years ago. But where did that knowledge exist? Only in his own consciousness, which in any case must soon be annihilated. And if all others accepted the lie which the Party imposed—if all records told the same tale—then the lie passed into history and became truth. (Orwell, 1949, p. 37)

The narration above reflected the concepts of information manipulation and power put forward by Michel Foucault in his theory. Michel Foucault emphasized that power did not only reside at the political or institutional level but was also related to the production of knowledge and control over narratives or discourse. In this narrative, the Party controlled the historical narrative by insisting that Oceania had never been allied with Eurasia. Although Winston Smith had personal knowledge that contradicted the Party's claims, the Party's power lay in its ability to control and manipulate information. Knowledge of Oceania's connection to Eurasia existed only in Winston's personal consciousness, and the Party sought to erase it.

Datum 4

'Who controls the past,' ran the Party slogan, 'controls the future: who controls the present controls the past.' And yet the past, though of its nature alterable, never had been altered. Whatever was true now was true from everlasting to everlasting. It was quite simple. All that was needed was an unending series of victories over your own memory. 'Reality control' (Orwell, 1949, p. 37).

In Foucault's theory, the concepts of "power and knowledge" were reflected in the way a society controlled the narrative of history and reality. In the quote, the Party controlled the narrative about the past through control of information and manipulation of memory. Foucault highlighted how power could be exercised through the control of knowledge and the way society constructed an understanding of truth. By manipulating narratives about the past, the Party in the quote tried to ensure that their view of truth and reality became dominant. This manipulation involved controlling an individual's memory and changing the interpretation of history to suit their interests. Thus, the narrative reflected the concepts of knowledge control and manipulation in Foucault's theory, where control of historical narratives was used as a tool of power to control people's views and behavior.

Datum 5

It might very well be that literally every word in the history books, even the things that one accepted without question, was pure fantasy ... Everything faded into mist. The past was erased, the erasure was forgotten, the lie became truth (Orwell, 1949, p. 66)

The narrative above reflected elements consistent with Michel Foucault's theory, especially the concepts of "truth creation" and manipulation in discourse. Foucault stated that power lay in control over knowledge and the way that knowledge was conveyed. In this quote, the statement that *"every word in the history books... was pure fantasy"* showed that historical knowledge had been manipulated and changed in such a way that it became a lie or fantasy. The concept of erasure in the narrative was also consistent with Foucault's ideas about how truth could be shaped through control of the narrative and the erasure or manipulation of past information. The statement that *"the past was erased, the erasure was forgotten, and the lie became truth"* highlighted how power could change or erase certain parts of history to control the narrative and manipulate society's perception of the truth. In short, the narration above aligned with Michel Foucault's theory because it illustrated the manipulation of discourse, where power shaped truth through the control of knowledge and narrative. The discourse in the novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was also spread through slogans, such as:

Datum 6

*"War is Peace**Freedom is Slavery**Ignorance is Strength" (Orwell, 1949, p. 6)*

The slogan above, *"War is Peace, Freedom is Slavery, and Ignorance is Strength,"* from the novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* by George Orwell, could be considered a form of manipulative discourse. In this case, discourse referred to a way of speaking or a system of statements that influenced the thoughts and actions of individuals in society. This slogan, *"War is Peace,"* embodied the government's ideology, which posited that a state of war or constant conflict led to stability and peace within society. By perpetuating a state of war, the government maintained control and quelled internal rebellion. *"Freedom is Slavery"* reflected the government's policy that granting too much freedom to individuals could result in instability and uncertainty. Therefore, the novel's totalitarian government aimed to enforce obedience and stability by controlling and limiting individual freedoms. A government strategy was exemplified by the slogan *"Ignorance is Strength,"* which emphasized the importance of information and knowledge control. By actively keeping people in a state of ignorance or unawareness, governments manipulated perceptions and influenced people's understanding of the world, ultimately strengthening their power.

Discourse as a Surveillance Mechanism

Foucault explained how power could be strengthened through surveillance and discipline. By connecting Foucault's concept to the context of the novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it could be observed that the totalitarian state in the novel used discourse as a monitoring mechanism. Oceania's government used language as a tool to control individual thought and

action, creating a reality that suited the regime's interests. Society was monitored not only physically through surveillance tools but also through the regulation of language and knowledge. The use of discourse as a surveillance mechanism in the novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* created a tense atmosphere where every word and action could be monitored, establishing deep control over the individual. Analyzing through the lens of Foucault's theory helped the researcher understand how the use of language and discourse could become instruments of power and control. This surveillance could take any form, even monitoring one's own thoughts, which was the role of the Thought Police. Furthermore, a telescreen, a type of modern technological tool, also assisted in monitoring. The novel provided the following data:

Datum 7

"Big Brother is Watching You" (Orwell, 1949, p. 3)

In the context of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, this slogan reflected a form of total and inevitable surveillance by "Big Brother" or the Government of Oceania. This created an atmosphere where individuals felt constantly watched, even in their personal space. This was consistent with Foucault's idea of the "panopticon," where power operated through constant surveillance, creating effective control without any real physical presence. By quoting this sentence, Orwell conveyed a message about the complete domination of state power and control over the daily lives of individuals. In Foucault's interpretation, this kind of supervision created social discipline and control that influenced the behavior and thinking of society as a whole.

In the world told in the novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the Thought Police was an invisible yet powerful force. Society was governed by the Party and Big Brother, who not only controlled physical actions but also delved into the realm of individual thoughts. In this case, the researcher presented and explained the findings from the novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* related to the Thought Police. Here were some illustrations:

Datum 8

Whether he went on with the diary, or whether he did not go on with it, made no difference. The Thought Police would get him just the same. He had committed—would still have committed, even if he had never set pen to paper—the essential crime that contained all others in itself. Thoughtcrime, they called it. Thoughtcrime was not a thing that could be concealed for ever. You might dodge successfully for a while, even for years, but sooner or later they were bound to get you. (Orwell, 1949, p. 21)

Based on the information presented, one could infer that all speech, actions, and thoughts had to align with the Party's ideology. The researcher might have employed Michel Foucault's analysis, particularly regarding "power/knowledge" within this account (1977). The passage discussed the concept of power discourse in Foucault's framework within the context of George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. This power extended to shaping social practices, creating an environment of constant surveillance and threat. The telescreen, a prominent tool of government control, aligned with panopticism by monitoring citizens, disseminating propaganda, and instilling a sense of constant scrutiny, influencing behavior through the fear of being observed

Datum 9

The telescreen received and transmitted simultaneously. Any sound that Winston made, above the level of a very low whisper, would be picked up by it, moreover, so long as he remained within the field of vision which the metal plaque commanded, he could be seen as well as heard. (Orwell, 1949, p. 4)

The narration could be seen as a representation of Foucault's discourse on power, specifically the concept of the panopticon. In the sentence, the telescreen, a modern surveillance device or "eye," played a crucial role in establishing the panopticon's atmosphere. The narration above described how the use of a telescreen in the excerpt represented the panopticon concept of Foucault's power-discourse. The telescreen ensured constant observation and hearing of individuals, like Winston, by the authorities, resulting in a state of unending surveillance. In the idea of the panopticon, people believed they were continuously watched, even without a real supervisor. In addition to the telescreen, the Party also possessed a microphone and a sound recording device.

Datum 10

There were no telescreens, of course, but there was always the danger of concealed microphones by which your voice might be picked up and recognized; besides, it was not easy to make a journey by yourself without attracting attention. (Orwell, 1949, p. 123)

The emphasis on the uncertainty of the possibility of hidden microphones created an atmosphere of the panopticon, where individuals felt constantly under surveillance without knowing when or how this surveillance was taking place. This power discourse had a significant impact on social practice in the novel. It burdened society with insecurity and hesitation, thereby reducing people's capacity to talk or move freely. People became wary and mistrustful of each other, leading to an environment of mutual suspicion and self-monitoring that reinforced government authority. Everyday activities, like having private conversations or traveling alone, were now considered hazardous, limiting personal freedom and independence.

The Impact of Discourse as a Manipulative Tool

Foucault taught that power was manifested through the production and distribution of knowledge, and the researcher had explored how the dystopian government in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* used discourse to manipulate perception, control history, and suppress opposition. By understanding Foucault's concept, the researcher could explore the deep impact of using discourse as a manipulative tool, detailing how power shaped reality and individual identity in a regulated society. The following was data taken from the novel, along with an analysis of its impact on social practice:

Datum 11

Syme had vanished. A morning came, and he was missing from work: a few thoughtless people commented on his absence. On the next day nobody mentioned him. On the third day Winston went into the vestibule of the Records Department to look at the notice-board. One of the notices carried a printed list of the members of the Chess Committee, of whom Syme had been one. It looked almost exactly as it had looked before—nothing had been crossed out—but it was one name shorter. It was enough. Syme had ceased to exist: he had never existed. (Orwell, 1949, p. 154)

This narration could be categorized as Foucault's power-discourse because it reflected the way the researcheritarian government in Nineteen Eighty-Four controlled knowledge and reality by erasing the traces of individuals who were deemed incompatible with the desired narrative. Syme "ceased to exist" as the government actively erased his traces from history and manipulated reality. The impact of this power-discourse was seen in the social practices in the novel. The government used power to control historical narratives, alter facts, and even erase individuals from collective memory. This created uncertainty and confusion in society, reinforcing the government's control over individual minds and identities.

Datum 12

Bad news coming, thought Winston. And sure enough, following on a gory description of the annihilation of a Eurasian army, with stupendous figures of killed and prisoners, came the announcement that, as from next week, the chocolate ration would be reduced from thirty grammes to twenty. The telescreen—perhaps to celebrate the victory, perhaps to drown the memory of the lost chocolate—crashed into 'Oceania, 'tis for thee'. (Orwell, 1949, p. 28)

The data above was a discourse, a kind of dissemination of information about the state of the war, as well as bad news: news of victory and of diminishing chocolate rations. While sharing this information, the Oceania, tis for thee song was played, which could be considered a way of anesthetizing or drowning out the memory of the bad news. In the excerpt, the Oceania government used manipulated news (a gory description of the annihilation) to manipulate people's perceptions while actually announcing a reduction in the chocolate ration. This created a narrative that altered collective understanding and reinforced ruling control. The impact of power-discourse on social practice in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* could be seen in the government's complete control over information and reality. The society in the novel lived in an environment where truth was controlled by the researchers, and the manipulation of information was used to control the thoughts and actions of individuals. The reduction of the chocolate ration also reflected how power could be used to manipulate people's basic needs as a means of social control. Overall, this power-discourse created a controlled reality that destroyed freedom of thought and empowered the ruler to maintain his dominance. The following passage from Goldstein's writing talked about Oceania's "cultural integrity":

Datum 13

It is absolutely necessary to [the state's] structure that there should be no contact with foreigners, except, to a limited extent, with war prisoners and coloured slaves. Even the official ally of the moment is always regarded with the darkest suspicion. War prisoners apart, the average citizen of Oceania never sets eye on a citizen of either Eurasia or Eastasia, and he is forbidden the knowledge of foreign languages. If he 64 were allowed contact with foreigners he would discover that they are creatures similar to himself and that most of what he has been told about them is lies. The sealed world in which he lives would be broken, and the fear, hatred and self-righteousness on which his morale depends might evaporate. (Orwell, 1949, p. 225–226)

In Oceania, language worked to isolate not just the person but the whole group too by preventing citizens from learning foreign languages and cultures. Thus, the community lived in a "sealed world" that could not be opened from the inside or influenced from outside because people at all levels lacked their essential communication methods. The person couldn't tell

another person that they felt really bad and unhappy with the system. They didn't have the right words to express their feelings and wishes, so they wouldn't even try to do it.

In the novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the government orchestrated information isolation by prohibiting interactions with strangers and foreign languages. This approach, in line with Michel Foucault's concept, depicted the manipulation of power to shape the desired knowledge by the government. Society was confined to predetermined perspectives, shielded from alternative realities, and lived in fear and hatred instilled by the government. These practices enabled the government to maintain control over the thoughts, emotions, and actions of individuals, fostering a dependence on the narrative they constructed.

The Impact of Discourse as a Surveillance Mechanism

Discourses of surveillance and monitoring figured prominently in Oceania's social practices. Constant and invasive monitoring systems, such as telescreens that probed citizens' private activities, created a constant sense of fear and inexorable obedience. Citizens felt constantly watched, and this resulted in very limited conformity and autonomy.

The *panopticon*, as described by Michel Foucault (1995), was a surveillance system that created uncertainty among individuals about being watched, which made them constantly monitor their actions. This was exemplified in "*Nineteen Eighty-Four*" through the telescreen and mycorophone, both being control mechanisms of modern technology. People never know if they were being watched, so they constantly live in fear and were monitored. This leads to self-discipline and obedience to the Party's beliefs.

Datum 14

Winston kept his back turned to the telescreen. It was safer, though, as he well knew, even a back can be revealing (Orwell, 1949, p. 5)

Winston's action of turning his back on the telescreen in the novel "*Nineteen Eighty-Four*" reflected resistance to totalitarian government monitoring. In Michel Foucault's thinking, this reflected deep power dynamics, where the government monitored every individual action. The statement "even a back can be revealing" showed that even small actions could have big consequences. The impacts included psychological unfreedom, tension between the desire for privacy and the reality of government control, and the creation of an atmosphere of fear and oppression. This act became a symbol of resistance to government control and highlighted the destructive impact of constant monitoring on individual lives. Furthermore, here were the most terrifying things about the telescreen:

Datum 15

The most deadly danger of all was talking in your sleep. There was no way of guarding against that, so far as he could see. (Orwell, 1949, p. 67)

The *panopticon*, as described by Foucault on Hardiyanta (2016), was a form of surveillance structure that allowed the observer (ruler) to monitor continuously without the observer knowing. The statement that "*the most deadly danger of all was talking in your sleep*" reflected the impact of constant surveillance on every aspect of citizens' lives. The statement revealed that the greatest danger was talking in sleep, an act that the individual could not

usually control or anticipate. This indicated a very deep level of surveillance by the authorities, where not even the most private aspects of a person's life were overlooked. The impact was the creation of a tense atmosphere and constant insecurity among residents. Uncertainty about when and how surveillance would occur created constant fear and worry. Therefore, people lived in a state of profound unfreedom, where every action and word could be subject to monitoring and potential punishment. This analysis reflected Foucault's concept of a "society of surveillance," where power worked to monitor and control individuals on a very broad scale. In the context of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, this monitoring was not only about physical actions but even included a person's subconscious during sleep. This showed how explicit and comprehensive power control over individuals was, creating a totalitarian environment that enslaved society. In conclusion, the statement created a picture of how incessant monitoring could result in oppression and restriction of individual freedoms, forming a society that lived in constant uncertainty and fear.

Foucault's power theories aligned with contemporary control systems, asserting that in capitalist societies, control was internalized. The control system influenced individuals to self-monitor and self-discipline by endorsing and normalizing societal norms. This internalized pressure compelled individuals to conform for acceptance and success (Rahayu, Emelda, & Aisyah, 2014). So, the data below was about the intervention of the authorities in the intimate/internal sphere of the family.

Datum 16

And with good reason, for hardly a week passed in which 'The Times' did not carry a paragraph describing how some eavesdropping little sneak—'child hero' was the phrase generally used—had overheard some compromising remark and denounced its parents to the Thought Police (Orwell, 1949, p. 27)

In this passage from George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the researcher looks at how power was realized through the control of information and interpersonal relationships, so that:

Datum 17

The family could not actually be abolished, and, indeed, people were encouraged to be fond of their children, in almost the old-fashioned way. The children, on the other hand, were systematically turned against their parents and taught to spy on them and report their deviations. The family had become in effect an extension of the Thought Police. It was a device by means of which everyone could be surrounded night and day by informers who knew him intimately (Orwell, 1949, p. 140)

In the society depicted in the novel, power was manifested in the form of the Thought Police, who utilized the family structure as a means of control. Children were taught to spy on and report their parents, creating a constant atmosphere of surveillance and insecurity. The family, which was supposed to be a place of protection and support, instead became an extension of the security apparatus of thought. The impact of this discourse on social practice in the novel was the creation of a culture of mutual suspicion and the loss of personal freedom. Individuals lived in constant fear of surveillance and betrayal by those closest to them. This resulted in an alienated society where every social interaction was colored by distrust and tension.

Datum 18

A Party member lives from birth to death under the eye of the Thought Police. Even when he is alone he can never be sure that he is alone. Wherever he may be, asleep or awake, working or resting, in his bath or in bed, he can be inspected without warning and without knowing that he is being inspected. Nothing that he does is indifferent. His friendships, his relaxations, his behaviour towards his wife and children, the expression of his face when he is alone, the words he mutters in sleep, even the characteristic movements of his body, are all jealously scrutinized. (Orwell, 1949, p, 219)

In the example above, there was constant surveillance of every aspect of an individual's life, even in the most private moments. The impact of this power-discourse on social practice in the novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was the creation of a society that was constantly paranoid and fearful. Individuals became aware that their every action and thought could be monitored, resulting in forced conformity to the norms imposed by the totalitarian government. These restrictions also created uncertainty and individualized unfreedom, destroying private life and autonomy.

Thus, the Thought Police established a society with complete control, where even the most personal thoughts were subordinate to an undeniable authority. The family, as an extension of the Thought Police, perpetuated the discourse of the Party's ideology from an early age. Children were systematically encouraged to turn against their parents and were taught to monitor and report any wrongdoing or dissent. The family served as a means for individuals to be constantly surrounded by intimate informants day and night. This was why the term "child hero" existed.

Michel Foucault's theory suggested that power was dispersed throughout society, exercised through control and surveillance. George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* exemplified this idea with a totalitarian government manipulating information and employing constant surveillance to shape individuals' thoughts and actions. Foucault would argue that power not only oppressed but also generated knowledge and social norms that influenced behavior. The novel depicted the government using power to alter reality and control the narrative, evident in practices like Big Brother's pervasive surveillance. This led to a culture of fear, a focus on conformist thinking, and the emergence of an obedient society. Foucault's influence was evident as authoritarian power shaped accepted reality through control and manipulation, establishing a directed and supervised social order.

CONCLUSION & SUGGESTION

The findings of this study demonstrated that power-discourse played a key role in shaping and organizing the social practices depicted in the novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The study concluded that power-discourse was a crucial factor in the portrayal of social practices in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. As per Foucault, the concept of episteme served as the foundational basis for knowledge production, and its impact was reflected in the novel's narrative. Power and knowledge relations created an institutional framework that regulated truth and knowledge. Disciplining and normalizing mechanisms were used to control individuals and society to conform to the authorities' desired norms. In George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the concept of panopticon reflected the government's tight control over citizens and constant surveillance. Therefore, it could be inferred that power-discourse, according to Foucault's concepts, exerted a significant influence on shaping and regulating social practices in this literary piece. This mirrored intricate and perpetual power dynamics.

In this context, future research can focus on further exploring the influence of power discourse on social practices in the novel "Nineteen Eighty-Four" by referring to key concepts in Michel Foucault's theory. By examining the correlation between episteme, power/knowledge relations, disciplining (normalization), and panopticon, a clearer understanding of power-discourse as a crucial tool in shaping and regulating social reality can be achieved.

REFERENCES

- Abdu, K. S. T., & Khafaga, A. F. (2019). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Mind Control Strategies in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(6), 421. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n6p421>
- Eagleton, T. (1996). *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Foucault, M. (1972). The Archaeology of Knowledge And The Discourse On Language. In *Michel Foucault*. Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. (C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, Trans.) New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1994). *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (Vintage Bo). Random House.
- González, A. V. (2022). From the Ministry of Truth to the Filter Bubble: Manipulation of Discourse in 1984 and The Loudest Voice. *Forum for World Literature Studies*, 14(1), 97–117.
- Hama, B. S. (2015). *Language as an oppressive device in Orwell's 1984*. *International Journal Of Humanities And Cultural Studies* Issn 2356-5926. 2(1), 265–277. <http://ijhcschiefeditor.wix.com/ijhcs>
- Hardiyanta, P. S. (2016). *Michel Foucault, Disiplin Tubuh: Bengkel Individu Modern* (II ed.). Yogyakarta: LKiS.
- Lelet, angelina. (2021). Analisis Sosiologi Sastra dalam Novel. *Jurnal Skripsi*, 1(1), 1–20.
- Mahardika, H. I. (2021). *Representasi Kekuasaan Dan Perlawanan Dalam Film 1984 (Analisis Wacana Film "1984" karya George Orwell)*. Purwokerto: Universitas Jenderal Soedirman.
- Moleong, L. (1990). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Negm, M. (2021). The Notion of Discourse as 'Power' and 'Resistance' Revisited. *International Journal of Advanced Humanities Research*, 1(2), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.21608/ijahr.2022.253251>
- Orwell, G. (1949). *1984* (6th ed.). London: Penguin Books.
- Rahayu, M. (2016). Identity politics in Aladdin: from Arabian Nights to Disney animated film.
- Rahayu, M., Abdullah, I., & Udasmoro, W. (2015). "Aladdin" from Arabian Nights to Disney: The change of discourse and ideology. *LiNGUA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra*, 10(1), 24–34.
- Rahayu, M., Emelda, L., & Aisyah, S. (2014). Power Relation In Memoirs Of Geisha And The Dancer. *Register Journal*, 7(2), 151–178.
- Sarkar, S. (2022). *George Orwell 's 1984 and the surveillance in the contemporary world Student 's Full Name & Signature : August*, 1–46.
- Shimal, K. K., & Hanif, M. (2020). Power and knowledge as route to social and political control as depicted in the novels *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *Animal Farm*. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 12(8), 175–191.

LILICS

Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies

Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 195-210

E-ISSN: 2986-9552

Website: <http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index>

LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, & Cultural Studies

- Teo, H. R. (2019). *The Fabrication of Truth And The Maintenance Of Power In Orwell's 1984*. Universitas Sanata Dharma.
- Teo, H. R. (2019). *The Fabrication of Truth and the Maintenance of Power in Orwell's 1984*. Yogyakarta: Faculty of Letters Universitas Sanata Dharma.
- Warren, W. (1949). Theory of literature. *Theory of Literature*, 424 Retrieved on June 18 2023.
- Wiradnyana, K. (2018). *Arkeologi Pengetahuan dan Pengetahuan Arkeologi*. (Y. Santosa, Trans.) Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.