

## PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

### MAPPING TERRORISM AND WAR: PERSPECTIVES FROM ALFRED KORZYBSKI'S GENERAL SEMANTICS

*Sapna Desai*

Vanita Vishram Women's College of Commerce, Vanita Vishram University, Vanita  
Vishram Campus, Athwagate, Surat.

Email: [sapna.vvwcc@gmail.com](mailto:sapna.vvwcc@gmail.com).

**Sapna Desai. Mapping Terrorism and War: Perspectives from Alfred Korzybski's General Semantics -- Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 18(9), 1058-1069. ISSN 1567-214x**

**Key Words: Terrorism, War, General Semantics, Language Pathology, Alfred Korzybski.**

#### **ABSTRACT**

The concept of terrorism is perplexing and controversial. There is a popular cliché which goes, "One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter." But can the two terms be used for a single person? Who decides who is a terrorist or a freedom fighter or a combatant or a militant? Can violence be justified? General Semanticists closely observe how labels function to address people in society. Terrorists are believed to be the misguided and cruel members of society, while freedom fighters are rebels fighting for independence. But these labels are too broad and such contentions complicate definition of terrorism. The paper proposes to examine these terms in relation to neuro linguistics and the effect of the terms on the human minds. The mind relates a terrorist to someone whose actions one does not approve and finds deplorable. It is the use of language that makes distinction between terrorism and freedom fighting. In *Manhood of Humanity*, Alfred Korzybski emphasized the role of symbolic language with its time binding potential as the most important factor to add to our knowledge and as a unique survival mechanism for our species. Also, the term war is used in a very loose sense, as today every movement or revolution is aimed to declare a war on something. The most recent is the war against Covid, then there is the war on corruption, elsewhere in the world there is war on drugs, then there is war on poverty, war on cancer and other issues. But the dictionary offers definitions of war "as a state of armed conflict between different countries or different groups within a country" (Oxford Dictionary), which also stands for the negative impacts and undertones of war. So, there is a need for careful examination and precise use of language expressions when confronting sophisticated issues of politics, foreign relations, military strategies, and the global economy.

## **INTRODUCTION:**

A major practical significance of general semantics is its utility for examining argumentative issues. One such issue is terrorism. Though terrorism has prevailed through ages in one form or another, it is difficult to define. But in the world in which we are living today, terrorism has become a part of our life where there is not a single day without terrorism and war making news in media. Terrorism as an issue is simple and at the same time perplexing. It is a very broad concept. It is the major problem encompassing the world. It is not confined to any nation, religion or ethno culture group. The news everyday shows the extent and spread of terrorism in the world at a very fast pace. The first analytical task concerning General Semantics about terrorism is to define the subject matter. Terrorism provokes extreme sentiments; some are a response to the horrors associated with it and some are concerned with its ideological context. Therefore, it becomes extremely difficult to construct a definition of terrorism which is precise enough for a meaningful analysis of the term and at the same time general enough to be agreed upon proclaiming a consensus by all. Because of such problems, many of the analysts have just come to point out that 'One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter'. This popular phrase though clichéd gives us an idea of the levels of difficulty faced by those who want to explore the dimensions terrorism for academic research or other varied purposes. But without the formulation of a basic definition, we cannot establish the extent to which terrorism should be treated as a threat, or how the nature of terrorism has emerged and changed over time and how to theorize terrorism to entail its effects in totality.

### ***Objectives of the Study:***

1. Application of General Semantics to carefully map the usage of the words "Terrorism and "War" and to differentiate between the labels 'Terrorist' and 'Freedom Fighter'.
2. Address the need for careful examination and precise use of language expressions when confronting sophisticated issues of politics, foreign relations, military strategies, and the global economy.
3. To examine the terms 'Terrorism' and 'War' in relation to neuro-linguistics, the loose usage of the term 'War' and the effect of the terms on the human minds.
4. To understand our vulnerability to language pathology and the need to maintain personal mental hygiene, attained through the practice of language hygiene and through the internalization of the extensional orientation.
5. To address the conflicts rooted in communication failure.

### ***A General Semantics Approach to Terrorism***

Terrorism is a moral problem and a form of political violence. But the slippery nature of the concept of use of political violence is seen when we say that in some cases political violence is justified whereas in other cases it is not. There is a group of political scientists who believe that terrorists are freedom fighters. A number of commentators apply the term freedom fighter with whose cause they agree and the term terrorist for those with whose because they conflict. But calling a terrorist as freedom fighter or combatant is misleading and an example

of dilemma at its peak. Brian Jenkins in his paper on *International Terrorism: Trends and Potentialities* explains that the threat of violence, individual acts of violence or a campaign of violence designed primarily to instill fear is terrorism (Jenkins 1978). This definition of terrorism provides us with an idea of terrorism but still lacks clarity as freedom fighters too employ these tactics. Another scholar Michael Walzer considers that random terror for political achievement emerged as a strategy of revolutionary struggle after the World War II (Walzer 1980). According to some scholars like Walter Laquer the repression and violence exercised by the governments and states themselves is terrorism (Walter 1987). Substantiating a similar point of view, terrorism is considered as a substitute to explicit war by Jay Mallin. He says, "When diplomats fail soldiers take over, when soldiers fail, terrorists take over" (Mallin 1977). This problem in communication goes beyond its mere academic importance. As the term 'Terrorism' has multiple interpretations, the meaning of political terrorism has not been understood in correct perspective and its application is sometimes defended by sovereign states or individuals or political groups. At the International levels, help and support rendered to certain nations or political groups also sometimes work against the formulation of an international law, order and code of conduct for dealing with terrorism. Sometimes, a group is viewed by some nations as terrorist group that is not politically legitimate and exercises violence and unjust methods to achieve amoral ends, while on the other side that same group is viewed by other nations to be a legitimate representative of people who are oppressed and fighting for liberation using reasonable violence to achieve their morally just ends. Thus, terrorists continue to threaten mankind and, in many cases, escape punitive action by the nations or international organization because of the complexity and failure in defining terrorism. As the scholars continue to play the games of terminologies, the rebel, frustrated and misguided members of society have become a threat, who aim to destabilize an established system and adopt terrorism to achieve their goals. So, it becomes imperative to differentiate and define a terrorist and a freedom fighter or a militant and a combatant.

General Semantics, closely studies how tags are allotted to people in our society. Some people term terrorist as people who use violence to achieve their ends, but the same set of definition can even be applied for a freedom fighter who too resorts to violence to attain liberation. An application of general semantics would find both these definitions too broad and misleading. So, considering a General Semantic approach, an effort is made to cite the specific traits associated with a terrorist and how they differ from a freedom fighter. Similarly, through a general semanticist's approach, it is essential to avoid labeling a person as terrorist preferring to look at specific terrorist behaviours manifested by that individual. But the Behavioural description in this case also includes individual motivation, social scenario and political purpose. Because considering the differences in these other factors, the same behavior will or will not be viewed as terrorism by any particular observer. Also, for the purpose of analysis, a moral judgment about terrorism is also considered, without which it would be difficult to mark a happening as terrorist event.

Though drawing a line between terrorist and freedom fighter is too controversial to be accepted without criticism, it does not mean that differences cannot be

explained. For this reason, firstly it is important to point out behavioral characteristics that can be associated with a terrorist which are as follows:

1. A terrorist makes use of premeditated and politically motivated use of violence or its threat to create a climate of fear and terror.
2. He uses unlawful threat, force and violence against civilian and non-combatant targets which is directed towards a wider target and not only the immediate victims of violence.
3. The desire to attain power is at the root of such politically motivated violence and through the acquisition and employment of power, a terrorist aims to bring a complete change within a state.
4. The acts of terror exercised by a terrorist cause a sense or public outrage and are viewed by the society as abnormal as they break all the social norms and limitations.
5. Terrorists are often misguided individuals who have planned goals which may be political, social, ideological or religious and all their activities are centered on the achievement of these goals.
6. Terrorists long for publicity and they often claim the responsibilities for terrorist events they execute.
7. However, it is important to note that individual terrorists are psychopaths and are generally novice in the art of violence and are not guided or motivated by any political gains.

From all these Behavioural traits, it is important to note that the practice of violence and terror is involved in all activities of terrorism. Words and attitudes wrap around meaning especially when there is some difficulty in differentiating violence perpetrated by a terrorist from a freedom fighter. A clear distinction between them is necessary because there is always an inclination to place both under a same heading though there are differences between them. Thus, in differentiating between terrorist and freedom fighters, it is appropriate that we take aid of the rational system of general semantics in discussing the topic. The concept of Time Binding in General Semantics explains how using language can lead to think about the subject question in terms of how the present has been affected by the past and how this helps to generate the future. By the application of the time binding concept, we can say that the long-standing double standard that exists up to the present is laden with the potential for more progressive attitudes to surface.

“The map is not the territory” is the leading maxim of General Semantics which serves a cover for its other principles. Here, in our case concerning terrorism, it implies that the word ‘terrorist’ does not give specific details about it. Through General Semantics, we are warned of not getting deceived to think that a word tells us exactly what a thing *is*, because such thinking would be basic and misleading. Also, according to the idea of General Semantics, words don’t tell us about the subject either and so it is erroneous to characterize people by labels. Therefore, taking the reference of behaviors, in order to differentiate between a terrorist and a freedom fighter it is important to consider their characteristic differences in relation to their individual motivation, social scenario and political purpose which are as follows:

1. The first significant difference is that no individuals or group of individuals of a particular nation could be recognized as freedom fighters which is registered under the UN charter because it would endorse sub nationalism within a country leading to civil discord and anarchy. As long as the individuals or group of individuals have recognized nationality of an independent sovereign nation they cannot be termed as freedom fighters. If the individuals belonging to these nations engage in acts of violence, then they may very well be identified as terrorists rather than freedom fighters.

2. Another major distinction between them is from the point of view of objective. Freedom fighters fight for a cause whereas terrorists fight for a pseudo cause or in other words their political, economic or religious cause is not a cause but just a set of demands. Freedom fighters too have a set of demands but their main objective is to attain independence by any means. But the primary objective of a terrorist is to instigate fear and terror and they are motivated primarily by demands and not objectives. Their claims of having determined objectives are fluctuating and are even satisfied with partial autonomy. Freedom fighters sacrifice their trifling demands in order to attain higher objectives of freedom and independence whereas this is not the case with terrorists.

3. Then we have the use, magnitude and nature of violence used as a differentiating factor to distinguish between a terrorist and a freedom fighter. Terrorists are recognized with violence that create fear psychosis (Jenkins). Brain Jenkins defines terrorism in terms of violence and fear. He states that threat of violence, individual acts of violence, or a campaign of violence designed primarily to instill fear is terrorism. Thus, violence is a pre-condition for terrorism but in case of freedom fighting the magnitude of violence shifts according to circumstances. Freedom fighters even involve in peaceful negotiations and independence is even achieved following a non-violent path. But terrorism is synonymous with violence and there can be no terrorism without violence. Also, freedom fighters if at all use violence, it is directed towards government or such other authoritarian agencies and not on common people. But the terrorists target innocent masses so as to exert their power and pressurize governments.

4. The existence of freedom fighting can be attributed to the prevalence of colonialism. But today when colonialism is no longer in existence, we cannot justify the violence in liberated countries by giving it the name of freedom fighting. Such violence can have no moral or legal justification. Violence or terror practiced in this case can only take shape of terrorism which aim to cause political destabilization. Here the people responsible for killing and deaths are terrorists and not freedom fighters. To brand a terrorist as a freedom fighter is grossly unethical and immoral.

5. Terrorists kill innocent people whereas the freedom fighters fight to liberate the masses from exploitation. The violence of terrorist is amoral as they purposely target crowded places to kill the innocent people. But the freedom fighter tries to attain its objective without deviating from the moral course of action. A Terrorist creates a fear psychosis, but a freedom fighter considers all the ethical values to support the freedom movement.

6. The activities of a freedom fighter confine only to national boundary of the country. But a terrorist operates from foreign countries. Freedom fighter only gathers moral support from within the nation as well as the world. But a

terrorist not only relies on local means but takes aid in the form of financial assistance and arms and ammunition from across the border to get the demands accepted.

Thus, it becomes obvious from the discussion that a major difference lies between terrorists and freedom fighters and one cannot justify the acts of terrorism masking it behind the title of freedom fighting. Violence, fear and terror is all that encompasses terrorism and no fancy titles can justify these acts. General Semantics dwells deep into ascertaining the behavioral characteristics of terrorist and freedom fighter to differentiate between the two. Here the labels terrorist and freedom fighter may serve to be beneficial if we use them to denote specific roles that are employed by people at different times. The term terrorist and the term freedom fighter serve as descriptors of how people may be operating at a specific point of time. This helps to develop a clear understanding how the terrorist and freedom fighter operate.

### ***Korzybski's views on Language Pathology and it's Time Binding factor:***

According to Korzybski, the essence of being human is the ability to communicate. Having an additional capability to use symbols makes humans different from plants and animals. Also, as humans can make use of symbols to communicate, they are capable of passing on the collective experiences of the past. Korzybski referred to humans as "time binders", as humans have a decent urge to exercise their ability of language skills. Now, this language used by humans also has a high value for survival. So, the use of language for communication purpose is a serious responsibility, which the humans need to carry on without error. But the truth is that, we fail to make proper use of language for communication. We build a massive maze of words and then get caught in our own symbolic grids. We share a common inability to articulate our situations clearly. The web of words and the structure of language that often leads us off track is the cause of human misery. A careless and irresponsible handling of words becomes the reason for misunderstanding. Therefore, Korzybski guides us that language should be used with immense care and that a cautious and scientific use of language will safeguard us against the ineffectiveness, disorder and futility that words sometimes produce. When we refer dictionaries for finding out meanings of words, we forget that dictionaries don't tell us how words *should be* used; dictionaries merely reflect how words *are* used. But General Semantics guides us by urging us to alter the structure of language so that our word usage matches the clarity of scientific inquiry in mapping out reality. Here by the analogy of Korzybski, words and statements are like maps that describe territories. Therefore words, like maps, only represent reality and are not reality itself: the map is not the territory. General semantics emphasizes the importance of constructing accurate verbal maps to convey one's meaning in the most accurate manner possible. This quest is not so much a theory as it is a methodology to ensure that language more clearly mimics reality or a perspective to show the limitation of words.

In *Science and Sanity* Korzybski pointed out our vulnerability to language pathology. The opposite of great truth as stated by Korzybski is also a great truth. Not only does language serve as the instrument of survival for human

species but also the vehicle in which humanity is rushing towards extinction. With these views of Korzybski regarding language pathology, another important topic that needs serious discussion is the general semantic approach to “War”. The usage of the word War invokes the ideas of death and devastation, cruel massacre and carnage, malady and hunger, poverty and loss. War in the literal sense has now become a starkly visible prospect. If there is another World War and if the superpowers exhibit their supremacy making use of their nuclear power than it will lead to our planet becoming devoid of sun rays as the nuclear smoke will encompass the planet. The planet being devoid of the sunlight, would lead to the destruction of all the sources of food and if this happens no one will survive. Now the question which arises is that how is war related to language pathology. The prospect stems from a paralysis induced by confusing words with what the words stand for or else by succumbing to the delusion that words always mean what they are supposed to mean. Humans are never in direct contact with reality. Between us and reality stands the screen of language. We attain knowledge about reality by reading what is on the language screen, that is, only by what we tell ourselves about reality. Reality in our world depends upon how accurately it is projected. Accuracy here stands for how the different portions of the picture correspond to the objective word quite closely. The languages of the exact sciences i.e physics, chemistry, biology etc. project more or less the objective reality. We can say this because correspondence between reality and predictions about observation is constantly checked and whenever discrepancies occur, the reality or the ways of projecting reality are improved upon. Some realities are less accurate but can serve various practical purposes. Still other realities do not purport to be accurate representations of reality. For our human race it is not so easy to tell one kind of reality from another. Finally, there are even definitions that have no relation either to reality or to creative imagination. For our word in concern, the dictionaries describe War “as a situation in which two or more countries or groups of people fight against each other over a period of time” (Oxford Dictionary).

### *The Connotations of ‘War’: Application of Korzybski’s Standpoints*

But the word War is now not confined to warfare and conflicts. The term war is used in a very loose sense, as today every movement or revolution is aimed to declare a war on something. In the first chapter of the novel *1984* by George Orwell, there is the use of the phrase ‘War is Peace’. This seemingly contradictory phrase with antagonistic words is one of the Party slogans. **“The Party believed that they could endlessly engage in a war to keep peace in the country. This slogan describes the reality of accepting two mutually opposing beliefs simultaneously as correct. This was also a major program of the Party to promote “double thinking.” Hence, it is a good example of double thinking, though contradictory, but the people of Oceania in the novel accepted both ideas correct”** (Literary Devices). But as Korzybski says, when two truths seem to contradict each other, there is a consequence of a less than perfect fit between our language and reality. Today, the world is filled with numerous such usages especially linked with the usage of the word War. We have the ongoing War Against Covid-19 in the world, War on Corruption, War on Poverty, War on Drugs, War on Terror, War on Cancer, War on Freedom, War and Fake News, War on Guns, War on Hunger and the list goes on alphabetically,

resulting in the over usage of the word War. So, with a general semantic approach we can “compare maps with territories, i.e., words with what they are supposed to represent in the world of not-worlds, the world of real events” (Rapoport 1986).

The First question that arises is that what provokes the use of the word ‘War’ for every revolution? General Semantics states that the meanings of words reside not only in the things the words are supposed to stand for but also inside the thoughts of the user of these words - the speakers of these words as well as the listeners of these words. So obviously there is a thought within the speakers of these words that motivate them to use them, and there are contemplations within the listeners activated by these words. In the light of general semantics, these motivations are triggered reactions as the ultimate meanings of words, meaning on the “colloidal level” as Korzybski used to say. War evokes images of killing and devastation. But in today’s world, it is much easier to sell War than peace. The old slogans like for God and country as in ‘Nation against Corruption’, ‘Drugs Ruin Lives’, ‘Make Poverty History’ etc. don’t work anymore. Populations can no longer be driven into frenzy by use of peaceful words.

In linguistics, the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis states that “the way people think is strongly affected by their native languages” (Whorf). However, now this hypothesis is controversial, but still, we cannot deny the fact that language has influence on our thought process. So, let us now discuss what motivates the authorities at the top of the decision hierarchy to invoke with words like War. The most logical answer is that these words persuade the masses in executing corresponding actions that add up to the actions of the state, which the authorities believe to be in the national interest. The authorities are responsible to the populations and therefore it becomes very necessary to legitimize their decisions and sayings. The words used by the authorities trigger the thought processes within the listeners of these words. These words have a signal reaction on the listeners so much to the extent that they fail to reflect further or employ a closer examination of what these words can possibly refer to in reality.

This phenomenon is at the core of the problem concerning the double role of language. The truth that language is the chief source for survival is also accompanied by its apparent opposite truth that language is driving us towards destruction. On the one hand, language frees our imagination. It enables us to think without binding the thought to the immediately perceived. It makes us aware of the distant past and of the numberless possible futures. On the other hand, symbolic language can induce us to be misguided in our path by grossly distorted maps. The language of today’s time that aims to create an awareness produces map of this sort, they serve to block awareness of the ghastly realities of the war, it serves to block the imageries of women, men and children, old and young, being burnt alive or literally being peeled live or facing a horrific death due to the result of War. No visuals of these sort are conjured by the words ‘War against Covid-19’, ‘War on Corruption’, ‘War on Poverty’, ‘War on Drugs’. The world has become so used to the use of the word ‘War’ that it evokes no feelings of horror or even sympathy for those who have undergone the terrors of War. This kind of casual attitude towards War may be of consequence if the



generations of tomorrow fail to trace the impacts of War seriously and indulge in War. The word 'War' no longer seems dreadful and we fail to recognize or contemplate about its negative outcomes if it is so often associated with every new positive revolution. Also, when phrases like 'War on Corruption' or such other slogans are used, the masses take the literal meanings of the word War which aggravates feelings of hostility or aggressiveness towards those involved in corruption or such other social wrong doings. This generates feelings of hatred not towards the societal evils but towards practioners of these evils. Like a hatred not for corruption but towards the corrupt.

One traditional concern of general semanticists has been personal mental hygiene, attained through the practice of language hygiene and through the internalization of the extensional orientation. Another has been improvement of communication, again by inculcating awareness of how language tends to do our thinking for us, of how to reach other people by encouraging them to reach us, of how to be a better listener and so on. Improvement of communication appears to be an equally important contribution towards prevention of War or of an aggressive mentality. All of us have witnessed conflicts rooted in communication failure. Most people make no effort to make corrections in communication not only because it is difficult but also because they don't know the dangers of employing incorrect words in communication.

### *Language Pathology and the 'War against Covid-19'*

Today there is comparison between the deaths due to World War I and II and due to Covid-19. When all over the world death toll is increasing, the journalists and authorities are tempted to look at the pandemic in comparison with the historical wars that shook the world. But the question which arises is that can we make such comparisons? When we are comparing these two different occurrences, we are actually equating the deaths of soldiers in war with death of patients in hospital. When soldiers die, they are honored as martyrs in battlefield, do we have the right to weigh the deaths of patients with death of soldiers? War is a phenomenon which brings deaths not only in huge numbers, but from it emerges many infectious diseases. It inflicts mental trauma on war soldiers and their families, it initiates the vicious circle of poverty and disease, suicide due to traumas increase, it brings starvation and addiction, homelessness and cold- war. The destruction of War is not just about counting the number of dead bodies on battlefield. So, comparing the pandemic to war, even for the sake of comparison of death tolls is hazardous. Both pandemic and war are different crisis disasters and to compare one with the other is like comparing apples to oranges. The language used during wars had taken different connotations when we talked about doctors at "frontlines", the Covid-19 virus as the enemy, and the world at "War" against it in context of Covid-19. However, the repercussions of Covid-19 have not been less, and so it is tempting to equate the losses due to Covid-19 with destructions during War. However, the rhetoric of war is dangerous and this type of analogy though beneficial to raise awareness regarding the severity of the situation and the enormity of the losses, should in future be used with discretion and precaution.

### *Language Pathology and the 'War on Drugs'*

Ignorance is taken advantage of by those who want to yield power over people. They yield it by manipulating language. Get control of language and you can get people to do anything. We can examine this phenomenon through the example of the 'Philippine Drug War' which was a campaign against [illegal drugs in the Philippines](#) in which suspected [drug users](#) and distributors were killed by police and [vigilantes](#). [Rodrigo Duterte](#) won the [2016 Philippine Presidential election](#) on May 9 promising to kill tens of thousands of criminals, and urging people to kill [drug addicts](#). As Mayor of [Davao City](#), Duterte was criticized by groups like [Human Rights Watch](#) for the [extrajudicial killings](#) of hundreds of [street children](#), [petty criminals](#) and [drug users](#) carried out by the [Davao Death Squad](#), a vigilante group with which he was allegedly involved.

According to Amnesty International, President Duterte had alleged that the Philippines is becoming a "narco-state" in order to justify the so-called "War on Drugs". There is little evidence to show this is true. The Philippines has a low prevalence rate of drug users, compared to the global average, according to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (Amnesty International, October 7, 2016). In speeches made after Duterte's [inauguration on June 30, 2016](#) he urged citizens to kill suspected criminals and drug addicts. He said he would order police to adopt a [shoot-to-kill](#) policy, and would offer them a bounty for dead suspects. So, thousands of people had been killed since the war on drugs began, according to the Philippines National Police. Many were killed in encounters with police and many in extrajudicial or vigilante-style killings. Though, the war on drugs had brought international criticism, but in the Philippines, Duterte's popularity remained high. He rose to fame on a wave of populist discontent and a promise to crack down on drugs. But behind his populist platform, there was a dark, open secret in which he openly called on police and citizens to kill drug dealers and users on sight. At his election victory party in June 2016, he had told his supporters, "Do it yourself if you have the gun. You have my support".

Just five months after Duterte took office, the capital, Manila, was reeling from thousands of murders. Duterte, while denying any knowledge of these murders, remained unapologetic. In a interview with Al Jazeera, he said, "You destroy my country, I kill you. It's a legitimate thing. If you destroy our young children, I will kill you. That is a very correct statement." This kind of attitude of the authorities and the governing people remain shocking and what is all the shocking is that such authorities remain popular, accepted and uncontested champions by a larger part of the people.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

We can examine this kind of phenomenon of mass obedience, where the people are induced to go into a battle, commit offences or become vigilantes, or kill other citizens suspected to be involved with illegal activities like the terrorists. Through this we can conclude that we live at a time when the fate of this planet rests into the hands of a handful of individuals. Just by pronouncing certain words like 'War', these individuals can invoke destruction and mass anger. It is

small consolation to know that in doing this, they will also surely destroy themselves.

The question that arises is that how our world is heading towards getting into such crucial circumstances? It has been centuries since the abolition of the regimes where rulers ruled and masses merely obeyed, where authorities solely had the power to allot life and death to someone.

Even after the accumulation and passing of knowledge through generations, we again stand at a place where only a handful of individuals have the power to decide correct from incorrect and have the power of deciding life and death for others. Such are the questions to be asked and answered. The answer to these questions lies in the crust of the theories of language pathology where when two truths seem to contradict each other, there is a consequence of a less than perfect fit between our language and reality. It reminds us that many of the people have become accustomed to think with ears instead of with brains. Most of the people are mesmerized by words that evoke certain reassuring images but which, if they stand for anything at all, stand for just the opposite of what they evoke.

There is a widespread notion that War is a manifestation of inherent human aggressiveness. We can still link War to aggressive tendencies and other relative determinants of aggression, for instance frustration and hatred. Aggressiveness is important if populations have to be mobilized and kill each other in combat. But the usage of 'War' to bring about positive revolutions where awareness and not aggression is needed is misleading. Here General Semantics aids to shatter the myths and incitations nurtured by the corrupt language that serve as props to legitimize the usage of the term 'War'. Therefore, the first priority of the creative application of General Semantics is to enhance the prospects of Peace by dissuading the use of aggravating language and words that threaten to dismantle the order of Peace.

#### REFERENCES:

- Alfaro, Sherwin and Elizabeth Roberts. *Philippines: More than 5,900 deaths in 'war on drugs' since July*. CNN News. December 13, 2016.
- Griffin, Em. *A First Look at Communication Theory, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Boston: McGraw Hill, 2006.
- Hayakawa, S. I. *The use and misuse of language*. Greenwich, CT: Fawcett, 1962.
- Hayakawa, S.I. *Language in Thought and Action (5th edition)*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1990.
- Jenkins, Brian. "International Terrorism: Trends and Potentialities." *Journal and International Affairs* 32.1 Spring/ Summer (1978): 115-123.
- Kay, Paul & Willett Kempton. "What Is the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis?" *American Anthropologist* 86.1, 65-79, 1984.
- Korzybski, Alfred. *Manhood of humanity*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1921.
- Korzybski, Alfred. *Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics*. Lakeville, CT: The International Non-Aristotelian Library Publishing Co. (now part of the I.G.S., Englewood, NJ). 4th edition, 1958.

- Laquer, Walter. *The Age of Terror*. London: Wiedenfield and Nilcolson, 1987.
- Levinson, Martin H. *A Continuing Education Guide to Teaching General Semantics*. Institute of General Semantics. Web. 1 June 2017.
- Mallin, Jay. "Terrorism as a Military Weapon." *Air University Review* XXVII.2 Jan/ Feb (1977): 54-64.
- Paul, Richard. "Chapter 33 Critical Thinking and General Semantics: On the Primacy of Natural Languages". *Critical Thinking: What Every Person Needs to Survive in a Rapidly Changing World*. Foundation for Critical Thinking, 2012.
- Rapoport, Anatol. "General Semantics and Prospects for Peace." *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, vol. 43, no. 1, 1986, pp. 4-14. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/42576784](http://www.jstor.org/stable/42576784). Accessed 12 July 2021.
- Sullivan, Michael. *In Philippine Drug War, Death Toll Rises and So Do Concerns About Tactics*. NPR News. November 28, 2016.
- Walzer, Michael. *Political Principles*. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1980. pp. 201-203
- "War Is Peace - Meaning and Usage." *Literary Devices*, 26 Mar. 2019, [literarydevices.net/war-is-peace/](http://literarydevices.net/war-is-peace/).
- Whorf, B. L. *Language, thought, and reality*. Berkeley: University of California Press, New York: Wiley. 1956.
- Woodruff, Bob Karson Yiu, Emily Taguchi and Geoff Martz. *Inside the Controversial President of the Philippines War on Drugs That Has Left Thousands of Dead*. ABC NEWS, Dec 13, 2016.