



“Critical Language Ecosystem”: About Truth, Power, and Digital Media from a Marxist Critical Philosophy Approach

Mai, Pham Tran Quynh¹, Hung, Nguyen Khanh², Minh, Tran Nhat^{3*}

^{1,3}Academy of Politics Region II, Tang Nhon Phu Ward, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.

²Binh Tan Vocational and Continuing Education Center, Binh Hung Hoa Ward, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Article DOI: 10.55677/SSHRB/2026-3050-0803

DOI URL: <https://doi.org/10.55677/SSHRB/2026-3050-0803>

KEYWORDS: Critical language ecosystem, Marxist critical philosophy, truth language, false language, digital media.

ABSTRACT: Language is a product of labour, both a means of expressing the truth and a potential means of hiding and distorting reality. In the context of digital media and artificial intelligence, the dialectical movement between language's truth and falsehood becomes a central issue in interdisciplinary social science. This paper constructs a framework of “critical language ecosystems” grounded in Marxist critical philosophy to explain the origins, mechanisms, and social consequences of truth and falsehood. Drawing on modern language theories and Marxist theories of language, social consciousness, and alienation, the paper analyses the formation of truth and falsehood. It evaluates the amplification impact of digital media and generative AI on these two forms of language. The results of the study show that creating a “critical language ecosystem” contributes to restoring the truth-conveying function of language and to building a humane, honest language culture in the digital era. Thus, the article affirms its theoretical value by explaining the dialectical nature of truth and falsehood in the evolution of language and proposes a direction for protecting the foundations of human reason and freedom.

Corresponding Author
Minh, Tran Nhat

Published: August 07, 2026

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

INTRODUCTION

Language, in the history of human development, is not only a mere means of communication but also a form of reality of social consciousness. From the moment people emerged from the presocial state and began forming communities, language has become a specific product of collective labour, both reflecting and shaping real relationships. Therefore, language is associated with the social nature of human beings and is a tool for expressing truth, recreating the objective world, and maintaining social relationships. However, history also shows another side: language can be alienating, becoming a tool for concealment, distortion, or lies, serving alienated interests. The dialectical relationship between language as a means of transmitting truth and language as an instrument of false production is the starting point for developing a new approach, here called the “critical language ecosystem”.

In the current context, the problem of truth and falsehood in language is no longer limited to the traditional scope of social communication. Digital media, characterised by instantaneous propagation and multi-tiered spaces, has created new amplification mechanisms in which truth and falsehood intertwine, interact, and scramble for power. Artificial intelligence, with its ability to automate and produce language at scale, has expanded not only human expressive capacity but also the capacity to manipulate and produce false language at an unprecedented rate. Phenomena such as fake news, information manipulation, or machine learning systems capable of producing “real” text pose pressing philosophical and social challenges: whether language retains its function of reflecting truth or has been alienated into a dominant tool that leads people according to the logic of profit and power?

Marxist critical philosophy provides the theoretical basis for explaining this movement. According to Marx, language is a material tool of thinking, associated with labour and production relations, “the language of real life” (Marx & Engels, 2022, p.13). But it is in the alienated life that language bears the mark of alienation: it is separated from human life, becoming an instrument of social forces in opposition to human interests. This explains why language can be both a tool for expressing truth and a tool of deception. The alienation of language takes place not only at the level of vocabulary or syntax, but at a deeper level: language is governed by

power relations, by the structure of interests, and by the division of society into institutions such as the family, religion, the state, and the company. In that process, the truth and falsehood of language always exist in human life. The evolution of language is the process of affirming truth, negating falsehoods, and restoring language's alienated capacity to convey truth. To put language in the relationship between truth and falsehood is to re-ask the fundamental question of humanity: can man liberate reason, defend his truth, creativity, and freedom against the power of false language?

This article aims at two basic goals. *First*, it analyses the dialectical relationship between truth language and false language in social evolution, pointing out the mechanisms of their formation, transformation, and impact. *Secondly*, to create a framework for a “critical language ecosystem” grounded in Marxist critical philosophy to restore the truth-function of language, thereby contributing to the development of a humane and honest language culture in the digital era. Thereby, the article contributes to the philosophy of language and the social sciences, helping identify, criticize, and overcome forms of false language prevalent in modern media.

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

Research directions on misinformation

In recent years, many works have focused on analysing the mechanisms of propagation and power structures that govern falsehood in the digital media space. Research by Vosoughi, Roy & Aral (2018) shows that fake news spreads faster than the truth on Twitter. Lazer et al. (2018), together with Wardle & Derakhshan (2017), formulate a theoretical framework in which misinformation, disinformation, and misinformation are manifestations of an “information disorder ecosystem”. These forms reflect both technological and institutional challenges. Tandoc et al. (2018) approach fake news as a socio-media phenomenon, while Pennycook & Rand (2019) focus on cognitive factors that make people more likely to believe falsehoods. Although different in approach, these works all expand the research space on truth and falsehood from the empirical level towards the creation of an interdisciplinary evaluation model. Notably, Broda & Strömbäck (2024) conducted a systematic review of 1261 scientific papers (2010-2021), categorizing them into three main categories: misinformation, disinformation, and fake news. Meanwhile, Minh & Mai's (2025) study proposes a critical approach: rather than focusing solely on falsehood-detection techniques, it is necessary to trace the structural conditions that produce false discourse. Money, norms, and power govern discourse in social institutions (family, religion, state, company).

Research on the relationship between AI and language

In the context of artificial intelligence playing an increasingly important role in knowledge production, many studies have focused on AI's role in automating and amplifying falsehood. Bender et al. (2021) warn of the risks associated with large language models (LLMs), which can generate false language at unprecedented scale and speed. It thereby makes recommendations on prudent funding, investment, and control of input data. Following this approach, Weidinger et al. (2022) synthesized data from computer science, linguistics, and sociology to conduct an interdisciplinary assessment of the potential risks posed by large language models. The authors argue that to ensure socially responsible technological progress, it is necessary to develop a deep awareness of the language risks posed by AI. Raeini (2025) agrees that the proliferation of automated verification tools not only fails to eliminate falsehood but also creates the risk of rational misrepresentation of language, especially when models lack clear positioning standards and reliable language validation practices. On the other hand, Roock (2024) analyses the impact of bilingual artificial intelligence (GAI) on the theory and practice of language education through case studies with ChatGPT. Based on his cognitive autobiography and lengthy “interviews”, the author uncovered numerous linguistic biases and racial justice issues. The results suggest that GAI requires a profound reconsideration of the value of language knowledge, posing a choice between accepting and disrupting the anti-human scenarios it creates. More generally, Quelle & Bovet (2024) analyse LLMs' ability to validate information in a multilingual environment. While LLMs can, in some situations, make more accurate judgments than humans when given full context, they are also susceptible to manipulation if falsehood is programmed in a sophisticated way. Overall, these studies make it clear that AI is not just a neutral tool in language production but also a discourse-reorganization agent. This raises an urgent need to build a critical linguistic-ecological framework that regulates technical controls and standardizes knowledge and ethics so that AI truly becomes a tool for transmitting truth rather than reproducing digitized falsehoods.

Direction of Marxist linguistic philosophy, critical discourse analysis, and ecology of language

From the perspective of modern language theory, Vološinov (1973) and Bakhtin (1981) laid the foundations for the understanding of language as a phenomenon associated with class struggle and social dialogue. Vološinov (1973) emphasizes that language is not neutral but an instrument of ideology. He argued that consciousness and language have always been associated with social relations, time, and history, reflecting social interactions and class struggles. The book builds on a Marxist approach to linguistic philosophy, which sees language as a political physical entity. Vološinov (1973) wrote: “First and foremost, the very foundations of a Marxist theory of ideologiess the bases for the studies of scientific knowledge, literature, religion, ethics, and so forth-are closely bound up with problems of the philosophy of language” (Vološinov, 1973, p.9). Bakhtin (1981) proposes that language is a phenomenon of dialogue, thereby refuting the idea of monologism. He introduces concepts such as heteroglossia, chronotope, and double-voiced discourse to illustrate how the linguistic world has always been multi-voiced, socio-historically influenced. Lecercle (2009) asserts that language is a socio-historical reality associated with power, class struggle, and ideology. The work provides an overview of the

problem of Marxism in language (from Stalin's pamphlet to Voloshinov's book, including an essay by Pasolini) and seeks to formulate concepts for a Marxist philosophy of language. Thereby affirming that language both reflects and creates reality, and at the same time is an environment for social reproduction and transformation.

Regarding the critical nature of language, Fairclough (1995, 2010) presents a critical approach to discourse analysis, viewing language as a tool linked to power, ideology, and social transformation. He emphasized the relational, dialectical, and interdisciplinary nature of discourse research. The "Discourse, analysis, critique - CDA" approach (Fairclough, 2010, p. 3) analyses the relationship between discourse and social structures, emphasizing the role of criticism in shaping perceptions and practices aimed at changing injustice. Mustafa Ar's (2015) study uses CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis) to analyse texts on globalization, showing that discourse is closely tied to ideology, particularly modern capitalism. Through keywords and language strategies, modern capitalism creates power, perpetuates inequality, and legitimizes the "survival of the strong" in the global economy.

In particular, in *The Ecology of Language*, Haugen (1972) introduced the concept of "language ecology" as an approach to studying the relationship between language and its sociocultural environment. Language is not just a sign system; it exists within the network of interactions among communities, politics, history, and natural ecology. Whether a language is maintained, developed, or disappears depends on the social environment and the community's choice. The work lays the foundation for bilingual research, language preservation, and modern language policy. The term "language ecology" and its content can be combined with the critical meaning of language from the Marxist critical philosophy. What contributes to the development of a "critical language ecosystem" in protecting the truth-conveying function of language against the risk of false language production of power and generative AI? Eliasson (2015) assessed: "Einar Haugen is generally regarded as the founding father of 'language ecology' or 'ecology of language'" (p.78).

Modern works that extend this research direction include Jones (2018), which analyses Marx's influence on linguistics. The paper explores how Marxism can be used to analyse language, ideology, and power, thereby promoting a historical-theoretical dialogue between linguistics and Marxist philosophy. Beetz et al. (2018) open up the theme of "Marx & discourse" in social philosophy, especially the critique of power, ideology, and social inequality. Thereby, affirming the enduring importance of Marx for the study of discourse, and showing how modern discourse approaches both inheriting, critiquing, and restructuring Marxist concepts in the new context. Erfani (2025) points out that artificial intelligence is not only a technical tool but also operates as an ideological mechanism, shaping how humans understand and accept dominance. AI amplifies ideology through five dimensions: infrastructure, standardization, subjectivity, opacity, and simulation. As a result, domination is presented as a technical necessity, continuing while also transforming classical ideological functions from Marx and Althusser to Debord. The author suggests three directions of resistance: reoccupying infrastructure, using deviation, and deploying outwards to challenge the ideological dominance of AI.

THEORETICAL BASIS AND RESEARCH METHODS

The study applies a Marxist critical philosophy approach to explain the nature of language as a phenomenon associated with material activity, labour, and production relations. According to Marx & Engels (2022), "The production of ideas, of conceptions, of consciousness, is at first directly interwoven with the material activity and the material intercourse of men, the language of real life" (p.13). It is this cohesion that makes language express and reflect the function of conveying the truth of human life. Humans are entities with needs and abilities. The realization of needs and possibilities is expressed in social production and social exchange. Language was born as a means of production and social exchange. Therefore, the purpose of language is for human life. But in social exchange, alienated language becomes a means of transmitting falsehoods driven by the selfish pursuit of money and power, and by the downsides of generative AI. The truth function of language becomes a false tool to achieve money and status goals. "If in all ideology men and their circumstances appear upside down as in a camera obscura, this phenomenon arises just as much from their historical life-process as the inversion of objects on the retina does from their physical life-process" (Marx & Engels, 2022, p.13). The Marxist critical philosophy also criticizes linguistic alienation. The dialectical nature of truth and falsehood in the evolution of language. The language of truth is the language of man, and the language of falsehood is the language of anti-humanity. The categories "needs and abilities", "subjects and objects", and "purposes and means" are used in the article to describe the relationship between people and language, and between language and people, in the process of reconstructing real life. The development of the basis of Marxist theory can be mentioned in Anh Quoc (2025) when discussing inevitability and freedom, and shows that "dialectical relationship between freedom and necessity in individual and social life, thereby repositioning the individual as a creative subject in economic development for sustainable goals" (p.1). This shows that human beings are true creative subjects, that creativity is inseparable from inevitability and freedom in life. The language of truth reflects the inevitability and freedom of human life. Along with this, analysing critical discourse and transformation models and considering oppositions such as instinct and creativity in the educational process provides a basis for criticizing the false knowledge that is turning people into "biological robots" (Nhunh & Quoc, 2025).

On that basis, the article inherits and expands three theoretical sources: *First*, Haugen's (1972) view of linguistic ecology, which considers language as a living system, influenced by the socio-cultural environment; *Second*, the class approach and dialogue of language in the traditions of Vološinov (1973) and Bakhtin (1981), emphasizes the interaction between language and ideology and power; *Third*, Fairclough's (2010) critical discourse analysis (CDA) tool, focuses on the institutionalization and naturalization of

power relations in everyday discourse. These three platforms are repositioned in the contemporary context of global communication and the rise of artificial intelligence as an institution that creates language and knowledge. As such, language is considered in the context of human-AI interactions, money, and power. This interaction makes non-homogeneous language a means of expressing truth. That is, language becomes a means of maintaining the indulgence of language: The language of truth becomes a language of falsehood in the face of the impact of money, power, and generative AI.

To achieve the purpose of researching and clarifying the connotation of the “critical language ecosystem” in the spirit of Marxist critical philosophy, the article also uses 3 methodological orientations, such as: (1) Analytical and critical methods in identifying and deconstructing power relations, profits, and manipulation mechanisms hidden under the discourse of “neutrality”; especially in the context of AI-generated language. (2) The historical and logical method of tracing the nature of the two forms of language, “truth language” and “false language”, in relation to money, power, and generative AI. (3) An interdisciplinary approach to integrating theoretical tools and frameworks from social linguistics, digital media, big data analysis, and AI ethics, to verify, illustrate, and expand philosophical arguments.

DISCUSS

Truth Language and False Language

Language, by its very nature, is a product of human reality. “Where speculation ends-in real life-there, real, positive science begins: the representation of the practical activity, of the practical process of development of men” (Marx & Engels, 2022, p.14). This shows that language is not a purely spiritual phenomenon but is associated with working life and the process by which people establish social relations. “Language is as old as consciousness, language is practical consciousness, as it exists for other men, and for that reason is really beginning to exist for me personally as well; for language, like consciousness, only arises from the need, the necessity, of intercourse with other men” (Marx & Engels, 2022, p.17). Productive labour and social exchange are the foundations of human life. Labour and social exchange are responsible for the formation of language. Language is born as a means for human beings; it serves to exchange, share, preserve, and develop knowledge. Language was born of that very need, and as a result, it reflects the realities of everyday life. The language of truth is faithful to the process of satisfying human needs and to the promotion of human abilities. Language is therefore closely associated with the need for survival and development, while also expressing human creativity.

However, during development, the language ceases to retain its original state. Language is alienated from its role as a means of truth into the purpose of social institutions. When society enters the stage of differentiation, forms of social organization such as the family, religion, the state, and the company emerge. These social institutions gradually developed their own mechanisms of power, norms, and interests. Language, instead of directly reflecting real life, begins to be shaped and shaped in the interests of these institutions. “It is self-evident, moreover, that “spectres”, “bonds,” “the higher being,” “concept,” “scruple,” are merely the idealistic, spiritual expression, the conception apparently of the isolated individual, the image of very empirical fetters and limitations, within which the mode of production of life, and the form of intercourse coupled with it, move” (Marx & Engels, 2022, p.19). Since then, the language of truth has gradually been alienated and deformed into a false language. False language has separated humans. False language is the purpose of social institutions. Social institutions produce and disseminate false language. False language is maintained and promoted so that the family, religion, state, and company exist. The families, religions, states, and corporations that exist are patriarchs, clergymen, civil servants, and capitalists who live. To survive the patriarchy, the clergy, civil servants, and the bourgeoisie maintain the existence and false language needs of people. Therefore, once people have a perverse need for language, the viability of social institutions depends on the use of false language. False language is no longer a means of maintaining the reality of human life, but has become a means of maintaining the lives of the patriarchs, clergy, civil servants, and capitalists. False language is alien to humans and, in some cases, anti-human language. False language no longer serves the need to reflect objective reality, but becomes a tool to legitimize power, maintain false norms, or cover up the oppressive nature of social relations. “Viewed apart from real history, these abstractions have in themselves no value whatsoever” (Marx & Engels, 2022, p.14). The appearance of false language is not accidental, but has socio-historical origins. It is the process of social differentiation, along with the increasingly strong domination of money, power, and imposed norms, that generative AI has produced forms of language alien to humans. In other words, false language is the alienated form of language, reflecting the alienation of human life in specific historical conditions. From this perspective, it becomes clear that the existence of false language is inevitable in the development of a class-based society, where symbolic power serves to maintain the dominant order.

However, the language of truth and the language of falsehood do not exist as two absolutely separate poles, but operate in a dialectical relationship. Each statement, each discourse, can express the truth and, at the same time, carry the risk of falsehood. *On the one hand*, people still rely on language to reflect reality, build knowledge, create culture, and affirm freedom. *On the other hand*, language itself can be exploited and manipulated to perpetuate inequality or hide the unjust nature of social relations. Therefore, the movement between truth and falsehood in language is not only a superficial phenomenon but a reflection of internal contradictions in social life. As society becomes more complex, the contradiction between these two aspects grows more acute, requiring critical and humanistic approaches to overcome it. The important implication here is that to build a critical language ecology, it is necessary

to start by identifying the boundaries and mechanisms of transformation between truth and false language. The language of truth not only reflects reality but also serves as a liberating tool, helping people affirm their values, freedom, and creativity. Meanwhile, false language, although widely used in social institutions, can still be exposed and deconstructed if people persist in taking a critical and humanistic stance. This is the key point: affirming that the rehabilitation of the truth of language is not only an academic task but also a socio-historical requirement, associated with the development of culture and humanity. “Empty talk about consciousness ceases, and real knowledge has to take its place. When reality is depicted, philosophy as an independent branch of activity loses its medium of existence” (Marx & Engels, 2022, p.14). In other words, truth language and false language are two opposing forms in the evolution of language. Their existence not only reflects the contradictions in a class-based society, but also lays the foundation for theoretical efforts to build a “critical language ecosystem”, so that language is returned to its function of truth, serving man. It is from this dialectical relationship that the article affirms the importance of analysing, explaining, and critiquing false language, and opens the way to affirm and promote the liberating value of truth language.

Digital Media and Genesis AI and Its Effect on the Formation of Truth Language and False Language

The digital age, global communication, and the explosion of generative AI have opened up unprecedented opportunities for human expression and the circulation of knowledge. Roock (2024) points out that: “Generative AI (GAI) systems emerging as one of the most transformative and debated technologies” (p.590). Language, which was the real product of labour and social communication, is now amplified on an unprecedented scale. It can transcend the traditional limitations and biological capacities of human beings, becoming a central means of language formation across the globe. It is in this process that the truth of language is promoted as a power of social connection and organization. However, language with false capabilities is also cloned, automated, and commercialized to a degree that is difficult to control. The problem of truth and falsehood in language is already latent from the division of society into family, religious, state, and corporate institutions. Currently, technology and AI are having a strong impact on the evolution of language. That influence manifests as both a driving force to unleash reason's potential and a fertile ground for falsehood to erupt. “There is worldwide concern over false news and the possibility that it can influence political, economic, and social well-being... False news reached more people than the truth” (Vosoughi, 2018).

The mechanism of false language generation and cloning in digital media and generative AI is associated with three dimensions: *Firstly*, the profit and power motives, the process of automating and amplifying information. Modern communication operates within the framework of a global market, where language is commoditized. Clicks, views, and public attention become sources of value that are accumulated and exchanged. Digital platforms, driven by capitalist logic, optimize their algorithms to maximize profits. As a result, false language, which is shocking, contagious, and arousing, has been prioritized for display and replication over the truth. This practice proves Marx's observation that in a capitalist society, all values are reduced to exchange values, and language is not exempt from this law of alienation. Falsehood becomes a special form of “language commodity”, which is reproduced and distributed to maintain the order of power and maximize profits.

Second, the decline of humanistic norms creates an environment conducive to the spread of falsehoods. The language of truth is associated with human life, serving people, reflecting their historical needs and abilities. But in the context of digital media, human standards are eroded by fierce competition and pressure to commercialize. Language is increasingly moving away from people's real needs, instead being swept along by trends in taste, sensationalism, or false “norms” created by powerful institutions. Alternative forms for content and images overwhelm meaning, and falsehood gradually becomes the survival instinct of social institutions in the digital space. Family, religious, state, and corporate institutions use language as tools of power. Thanks to the added power of communication and generative AI, false language is legitimized as a commodity. As a result, the truth is often distorted and obscured by layers of language designed to reinforce authority and interests.

Third, the advent of generative AI makes falsehood not only maintained but also automated and amplified. The automatic language generation capabilities of large language models enable the production of a wide range of texts, images, and videos in a very short time. AI can simulate voices, create fake images, and create unreal stories that are still highly “persuasive”. It is this automation that makes false language a “big flow”, far beyond human verification. Moreover, the spread of the network mechanism makes falsehood easy to replicate and amplify on a large scale. In traditional media, false language requires specific institutions of power to be reproduced; now, with AI and social networks, every individual can participate in producing and spreading falsehood. In particular, each individual and each organization becomes a “social agent” capable of fabricating and spreading false language as a survival instinct.

In that picture, the central question is not only how to prevent falsehood, but also how to restore the truth function of language. Because when false language is rampant, it not only weakens social trust but also directly threatens the foundation of human reason. Reason can only be liberated when language returns to its true nature: reflecting real life, serving people, and creating truth. Therefore, the “critical language ecosystem” is proposed as a theoretical framework to both identify the mechanisms of falsehood production and replication and to propose solutions for the restoration of truth language. From the perspective of Marxist critical philosophy, the task of the “critical language ecosystem” is to outline the alienation of language in digital media and AI, and to expose the relationships among falsehood, money, power, and false norms. At the same time, all methods of language reform must be people-centered and purpose-oriented. Fully identifying these dimensions allows not only for the critique of the alienated power-

interest structures that feed falsehood, but also for the creation of humanistic and technological norms that restore the truth-conveying function of language.

Thus, digital media and generative AI both expand the possibilities of expression and replicate the risk of falsehood. Language, from being an instrument of truth, easily becomes a tool of falsehood when dominated by profit, power, and technology. But it is in that contradiction that there is also the potential for liberation. Liberation is accomplished if the language is placed in a “critical language ecosystem”. This ecosystem is an interdisciplinary social philosophy whose purpose is to rehabilitate the function of truth, protect reason, and affirm human truth. The “critical language ecosystem” is grounded in Marxist critical theory. It is established with 3 basic tasks:

- (i) Identify the mechanisms of power and profit and technology that are feeding falsehood.
- (ii) Analysing the distortion of language in digital space to indicate the alienated nature of language;
- (iii) Propose humanistic norms and orient the use of technology to restore the truth function of language.

The role of the “critical language ecosystem” is not only to map the phenomenon but also to achieve the goal of liberating human reason and affirming language as an instrument of truth, creativity, and freedom. From this, it can be affirmed that digital media and generative AI, although posing significant challenges regarding truth crises, also open opportunities for the theoretical and practical development of critical language ecology. Only within this critical framework can we overcome contradictions and turn language back into the means of man and for people.

Building a “critical language ecosystem” to restore the truth-conveying function of language

Throughout its history, language has been not only a means of communication but also a medium of human survival. When language reflects real life, tied to labour and historical needs, it becomes the language of truth. But when language is detached from life, it becomes a tool of concealment and distortion, and serves the interests of a powerful group; it alienates into false language. In the context of society's differentiation into institutions, digital media, and generative AI, the risk of this alienation is multiplied, threatening the foundations of human reason and creativity. Thus, the central issue of the study is not only to analyse the mechanism of falsehood production but also to find a way to restore the truth-function of language. It is in this line of thinking that the concept of “critical language ecosystem” is created, as an attempt to combine Marxist critical philosophy with language's inherent mission to reposition it in relation to truth, power, and human life.

The “critical language ecosystem” is first and foremost a *reflexive theoretical framework*. It places language within an ecosystem influenced by labour, economics, politics, and culture, and that contributes to the creation of social structures. From a Marxist critical philosophy point of view, language has always been associated with the division of society into institutions. That differentiation makes language both capable of expressing the truth and at risk of being exploited to maintain the order of power. The “critical language ecosystem” exposes alienation and demands the restoration of language to its true nature as a tool in the service of people, for people. This is a prerequisite for defending the foundation of reason, when the explosion of digital information risks turning people into victims of false discourse.

Second, the “critical language ecosystem” is a *humanistic strategy*. If false language is language separate from real life, then truth language is associated with human needs and abilities. In fact, all theories and policies must put people at the center of reality. In theory, a policy that is not human-centered is a manifestation of anti-human language. This means that the rehabilitation of the truth of language is not only about combating misinformation or censorship of falsehood, but also about creating a social environment in which the language of truth can survive and spread. A humanistic society is one where language honestly reflects the practical needs of life, from working conditions and living conditions, to creative aspirations and freedom.

Third, the “critical linguistic ecosystem” is an *interdisciplinary system of social philosophy*. Restoring the truth-conveying function of language requires a combination of language philosophy, critical discourse analysis, media sociology, data science, and AI ethics. In other words, it is an interdisciplinary form of social philosophy. Critical philosophy provides the tools to identify the relationship between language and power; critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, Wodak) explains the mechanism of ideological reproduction through language; social linguistics and digital media help survey specific linguistic behaviour in cyberspace; Data science and AI provide the ability to detect, track, and analyse falsehoods at scale. This integration not only aims to expose the mechanisms of language manipulation, but also to create a tool to restore the spread of truthful language.

One of the core contents of critical linguistic ecology is to identify three levels of falsehood production: (1) Profit and power motives; (2) The deterioration of humanistic norms; (3) The process of automation and amplification of technology. Correspondingly, the Critical Linguistic Ecology Framework proposes three principles of the truth rehabilitation of language: (1) Transparency of interests and power in social discourses; (2) Re-establish humanistic norms such as honesty, responsibility, respect for people and people-centered in social communication (real and virtual); (3) Applying AI technology in the direction of humanity, that is, using AI to detect, limit falsehood, and at the same time amplify the language of truth. These three principles not only have theoretical significance but also suggest practical directions across education, media management, and technology design. More importantly, the “critical language ecosystem” asserts that the restoration of language's truth function is also the liberation of human reason. When language is alienated from its role as a tool of falsehood, people are deprived of the ability to self-criticize and to create. Only when the language of truth is restored can people approach reality honestly, expand their rational capacity, and develop freely.

Therefore, the “critical language ecosystem” is not only a theoretical framework for language research but also a humanistic project associated with human emancipation in the context of globalization and artificial intelligence. It is to affirm that the goal of the “critical language ecosystem” is to create an environment in which truth language can promote social functions, false language is identified and restricted, and people are protected as truth-creators. This is not only a scientific requirement but also a humanistic task to ensure that, in the digital age, language retains its essence: the language of people and for people.

RESULT

The results of the study show that the movement of language in the social process is not simply the development of forms of expression, but rather the dialectical struggle between truth language and false language. From the Marxist critical philosophy, it can be asserted that language is the product of labour and social exchange; therefore, it is associated with the capacity to reflect objective truth. However, alongside the division of classes and social institutions, language is gradually alienated, becoming a tool that serves separate interests and conceals and distorts reality. This is the starting point for the formation of falsehood as a form of false language. A striking outcome of the study was the establishment of a theoretical framework for the “critical linguistic ecosystem”. This framework considers language as an ecosystem that interacts with economics, politics, culture, technology, and daily life. On this basis, the study analyses and systematizes three levels of falsehood production: (i) Profit and power motives, which dominate the content of discourse and make language an instrument of ideology; (ii) Deterioration of humanistic norms, making language gradually detached from human life and turned into a tool of manipulation; (iii) Automation and amplification of technology, in which digital media and artificial intelligence reproduce and replicate falsehood on an unprecedented scale.

These results also indicate that rehabilitating the truth-conveying function of language requires building a “critical language ecosystem” that combines three aspects: transparency of interests and power, the re-establishment of humanistic norms, and the application of humanistic technology. It is in that synthesis that language can retain its essence as an instrument of reflecting reality and serving people. Another contribution is that the study has provided evidence from digital media practices and generative AI, showing that the mechanism for spreading falsehood is structural, not merely a technical incident or personal bias. Phenomena such as fake news, deep fakes, data manipulation, or discourse automation show that falsehood is not just a discrete phenomenon, but has alien language production in the context of globalization and digital technology. From these results, the study confirms that constructing a “critical language ecosystem” situated in the dialectical relationship between truth and falsehood contributes to the restoration of truth language as the foundation of human nature and social exchange.

CONCLUDE

Research has confirmed that language, in its historical course, has both the function of expressing truth and the potential to be alienated into a tool of deception. Drawing on the background of Marxist critical philosophy and realist humanism, the article clarifies the mechanism by which language is distorted by power, profit, and technology, and points to the possibility of restoring language's truth function through the framework of critical linguistic ecology. The results of the study emphasize that false language is an inevitable product of a society divided into institutions such as the family, religion, the state, and the company. In the context of digital media and artificial intelligence, this process is cloned and amplified, increasing the risk of global language alienation.

An important contribution of the research is to build a theoretical basis and approach for the formation of a “critical language ecosystem”, focusing on three aspects: critiquing the power-profit relationship, re-establishing the humanistic norm, and developing humanistic technologies. On that basis, language can be restored as a tool for reflecting on objective reality and nurturing human reason, creativity, and freedom. The significance of the research extends beyond the philosophy of language to the interdisciplinary social sciences, providing a theoretical framework for identifying, analysing, and overcoming manifestations of linguistic alienation in the digital era. This is the basis for safeguarding the foundation of reason, the value of truth, and human dignity in a world profoundly transformed by globalization and artificial intelligence.

VALUES, LIMITATIONS, AND DIRECTIONS OF FURTHER RESEARCH

The value of this research lies in initially forming the theoretical framework of “critical language ecology”, based on Marxist critical philosophy, to explain the dialectical relationship between truth and falsehood in the evolution of language. This framework not only expands the scope of the philosophy of language but also complements critical discourse analysis and social linguistics by linking linguistic phenomena to the context of power, profit, and technology. At the same time, the research also contributes to the development of a philosophical basis for the creation of an honest and humane language culture in the era of digital media and artificial intelligence.

Due to the method's specificity, the article focuses more on theoretical analysis and conceptual critique; it lacks sufficient support from large-scale quantitative data or multilingual empirical surveys. Evidence from digital media and AI is mainly used at a general level, not accounting for the diversity of languages, cultures, and institutions. In addition, the implementation of the new “critical language ecosystem” framework stops at the level of theoretical orientation, which has not been widely verified in practical research. From the above limitations, future research needs to expand in three main directions. *First*, combine philosophical analysis with quantitative data and AI modelling to measure the pervasiveness of falsehood and truth in digital media. *Second*, conduct interlingual

and intercultural comparisons to assess differences in the mechanisms underlying false language production across social contexts. *Third*, develop ethical standards and legal frameworks associated with artificial intelligence to ensure that language is used as a tool to convey truth, serve people, and be for people.

REFERENCES

1. Anh Quoc, N. (2025). The Dialectic of Freedom and Necessity: Individuality, Norms and Creativity in the Structure of Sustainable Development. *Asian Journal of Arts and Culture*, 25(3), e284237. <https://doi.org/10.48048/ajac.2025.284237>
2. Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin & London: University of Texas Press.
3. Bender, E. M., et al. (2021). *On the dangers of stochastic parrots. FAccT '21 Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
4. Beetz, J., Herzog, B., & Maesse, J. (2018). Introduction special issue Marx & discourse. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 2018, Vol 15, No 4, 321-324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2018.1456944>
5. Broda, E., & Strömbäck, J. (2024). Misinformation, disinformation, and fake news: lessons from an interdisciplinary, systematic literature review. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, Vol. 48, No. 2, 139-166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2024.2323736>
6. Roock, R. S. (2024). To Become an Object Among Objects: Generative Artificial “Intelligence,” Writing, and Linguistic White Supremacy. *Research Review Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.569>
7. Erfani, F. (2025). Not “just a language model”: AI’s ideological functions. *AI & Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-025-02623-0>
8. Eliasson, S. (2015). The birth of language ecology: interdisciplinary influences in Einar Haugen's “The ecology of language”. *Language Sciences*, Volume 50, July 2015, 78-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2015.03.007>
9. Haugen, E. (1972). *The ecology of language*. US: Stanford University Press.
10. Fairclough, N. (1995/2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London and New York: Longman.
11. Jones, P. E. (2018). Karl Marx and the language sciences - Critical encounters: introduction to the special issues. *Language Sciences*, Volume 70, November 2018, Pages 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2018.08.003>
12. Lazer, D. M. J., et al. (2018). The science of fake news. *Science*, 359(6380), 1094-1096. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao2998>
13. Lecercle, J. (2009). *A Marxist philosophy of language (G. Elliott, Trans.)*. Chicago: Haymarket Press.
14. Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1995). *Complete Volume*, Volume 3. Hanoi: National Political Publisher.
15. Marx, K. & Engels, F. (2000). *Complete Volume*, Volume 42. Hanoi: National Political Publisher.
16. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2002). *Complete Volume*, Volume 1. Hanoi: National Political Publisher.
17. Marx, K. & Engels, F. (2022). *The German Ideology*. Paris: Foreign Languages Press.
18. Minh, T.N. & Mai, P.T.Q. (2025) Truth and Falsehood in the Process of Social Stratification. *International Journal of Social Science Humanity & Management Research*, Volume 04, Issue 05, May 2025. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58806/ijsshrm.2025.v4i5n13>
19. Mustafa Ar. (2015). Language and Ideology in Texts on Globalization: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *International Journal of English Linguistics*; Vol. 5, No. 2; 2015, 63-78. DOI: [10.5539/ijel.v5n2p63](https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v5n2p63)
20. Nhung, L.T.T., & Quoc, N.A. (2025): Knowledge, freedom, and responsibility: A philosophical approach to education in the age of AI. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology* (ISSN: 2576-8484), Vol. 9, No. 8, 701-7102025. DOI: [10.55214/2576-8484.v9i8.9398](https://doi.org/10.55214/2576-8484.v9i8.9398)
21. Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2019). Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning. *Cognition*, 188, 39-50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.06.011>
22. Quelle, D. & Bovet, A. (2024). The perils and promises of fact-checking with large language models. *Front. Artif. Intell.* 7:1341697. doi: [10.3389/frai.2024.1341697](https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2024.1341697)
23. Raeini, M. G. (2025). The evolution of language models: From N-Grams to LLMs, and beyond. *Natural Language Processing Journal*, 12, 100168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlp.2025.100168>
24. Tandoc, E., et al. (2018). Defining “fake news”. *Digital Journalism*, 6(2), 137–153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2017.1360143>
25. Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380), 1146-1151. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559>
26. Vološinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. New York & London: Seminar Press. (Original work written in 1929)
27. Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). *Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework*. Council of Europe report.
28. Weidinger, J., et al. (2022). Ethical and social risks of AI. *arXiv preprint*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.04359>