ALFRED KORZYBSKI MEMORIAL LECTURE 1993

General Semantics, Doublespeak, and Linguistic Survival in the Twentieth Century

by

William Lutz

[At the Williams Club of New York City, October 22, 1993]

I am pleased and honored to be invited to give the 42nd Alfred Korzybski Memorial Lecture. I am even more honored to speak on the occasion of the celebration of the 60th year of the publication of Korzybski's *Science and Sanity*.

Some years ago, I taught for a few months at a university in the People's Republic of China, which had only shortly before my visit been Red China. Red China had stopped being Red China when in 1972 President Richard Nixon and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger decided to stop calling China Red and started calling China the People's Republic of China. The Chinese, of course, have since 1949 been calling their country the People's Republic of China and took great umbrage at anyone who called their country Red China. In any event, with the advent of diplomatic relations the transformation of China took place with the changing of a few words, and certainly not with any changes in either the government or people of China.

Part of my reward for this labor was a tour of some of the major cities in China. Thus it was that I found myself one day taking a commuter bus in Beijing. I had no guide, no translator. I had managed to leave them behind and strike off on my own. However, I soon learned how difficult such solo sightseeing can be in a country whose written language bears no resemblance to any language I had ever encountered as a student or a tourist.

I have managed to make my way in a number of countries. My procedure is simple enough: get a map and follow the signs. Even in countries where I had no familiarity with the language I could usually find my way because all I had to do was match the street names on the map with the street names on the street signs. Then, too, as I traveled I could always use as guideposts some of the significant landmarks highlighted on the map. A simple enough procedure in a country where the alphabet is the same as my alphabet. Difficult, and for me ultimately impossible, in a country whose written language bore no resemblance whatsoever to any form of writing I was familiar with.

But in Beijing there was a problem of which I was unaware. In my travels I had always assumed that the maps I was using were reliable, that they were as accurate as the map makers could make them. Certainly I ran into errors in maps from time to time, but the errors were never serious or significant enough to throw me far off course. It had never occurred to me that anyone would ever produce for general use a deliberately unreliable map. But as I traveled on that crowded bus down a seemingly endless street in Beijing, I began to worry that something was wrong with my map, or at least with my map-reading ability.

I had planned to watch for certain prominent buildings and when I reached a certain building I would know it was time to get off the bus. Since no one on the bus spoke English, or any language other than Chinese, and since all the signs in the bus, on all the buildings, and the street markers were all in Chinese, I needed to find those buildings to know where I was. But the building I was looking for never appeared, and many buildings that weren't marked on my map were there. I was lost. My map was of no help. Noticing my apparent panic, a friendly conductor managed to communicate to me that I should get off at the next stop. She pointed to a large building, and motioned me toward it. The building was the special department store accessible only to foreign visitors (and certain high ranking Chinese officials) where I quickly found someone who spoke English and helped me find my way to my hotel.

When I explained my adventure at dinner that evening, my dining companions, who were more experienced in using maps in China, laughed as they explained the source of my problem. It seems that the maps distributed by the Chinese government are deliberately altered lest they be used by invaders to find their way. Any knowledgeable tourist, I was told, knows that you cannot rely on the maps provided by the Chinese government. Those maps lie. "The map is not the territory," I muttered, reminding myself that Korzybski's advice holds true whether traveling in Beijing or finding your way through a semantic environment filled with doublespeak.

Well, I survived my false map in Beijing, but that experience serves for me as a constant reminder not just that the map is not the territory, but that there are a lot of false verbal maps offered to us, verbal maps drawn of doublespeak. These maps are also maps deliberately made false, maps that do not help us find our way safely, maps that do not lead but mislead. When maps bear a false or inaccurate relationship with their territories, those who try to use those maps to find their way quickly become lost, or worse.

The same is true for our verbal maps, those maps that guide our thinking and our behavior. A verbal map also works best when it corresponds as accurately as possible to the territory it is supposed to represent. Moreover, a verbal map has to be constantly checked for accuracy, and if it is found to be inaccurate we must adjust the map accordingly. Failure to constantly check a verbal map, or to adjust the map when it is found to be in error, produces confusion, distortion, and misunderstanding.

All of us, of course, constantly produce verbal maps which we use to get along in the extensional world. Then, too, there are quite a few verbal maps that others regularly produce for us, hoping that we will adopt their maps to guide our behavior. "Spin doctors," "commentators," "policy experts," "senior administration officials who asked not to be named," and many others are in the business of creating verbal maps that they want us to use in place of any maps we might have constructed for ourselves.

Politicians, of course, are great producers of verbal maps. They know well the power of verbal maps to shape not just our perception of the world but to directly affect our behavior. Indeed, an election may be viewed as a contest between competing verbal maps, and in choosing one candidate over others voters are really choosing a particular verbal map. Representative Newt Gingrich of Georgia demonstrated his understanding of this principle when a political action group he headed published a booklet titled "Language: A Key Mechanism of Control." The booklet, which was designed for use by Republican candidates for office, contained a list of 133 words which candidates were urged to use to attack their opponents and to praise themselves. "The words and phrases are powerful," said the letter to candidates. "Read them. Memorize as many as possible."

The booklet included 69 "Optimistic Positive Governing Words" to "help define your campaign and your vision." Among the positive words listed were "environment, peace, freedom, fair, flag, rights, duty, we/us/our, moral, family, children, truth, humane, care(ing), hard-working, liberty, reformer, vision, visionary, confident, and candid." Thus, using this handy little list candidates could call themselves "humane, confident, caring, hard-working reformers who have a moral vision of peace, freedom, and liberty that we can all build through a crusade for prosperity and truth."

The booklet also included a list of 64 "Contrasting Words" to "define our opponents" and "create a clear and easily understood contrast." The booklet recommended: "Apply these to the opponent, their record, proposals and their party." Among the words in this list were: "traitors, betray, sick, pathetic, lie, liberal, radical, hypocrisy, corruption, permissive attitude, greed, self-serving, ideological, they/them, anti-flag, anti-family, anti-child, anti-jobs, unionized bureaucracy, impose, and coercion." Using this list, candidates could call their opponents "sick, pathetic, incompetent, liberal traitors whose self-serving permissive attitude promotes a unionized bureaucracy and an anti-flag, anti-family, anti-child, anti-jobs ideology."

Now in all of that verbal mishmash there is little that could function as an accurate verbal map. It is empty language, parading and preening as if it meant something. The words in both lists, the "positive" and the "contrasting," are labels whose accurate use depends upon some semblance of relation between word and thing, as well as some social agreement that in any particular instance these words function as accurate labels. But the politicians who would fill their speeches with these words, and who would act as if these words really provided a workable verbal map, are offering us one that would certainly fall far short of what we need to guide our behavior. For Newt Gingrich words are ends in themselves and do not need to have any relation to any kind of extensional world.

Like much political language, the language promoted by Newt Gingrich falls into the trap of reification, or confusing words and things. Politicians, like many of us, are fond of saying "it *is*," and by that statement create a thing, giving "thingness" to an abstraction. We know, of course, that the word is not the thing, as Korzybski so valuably observed, but there is that part of our human condition that fuses language and reality, word and referent, symbol and thing symbolized, map and territory. It is precisely this tendency to reification that politicians, advertisers, and anyone else who would mislead us rely upon when they provide us with their carefully constructed verbal maps for our adoption, when they create the doublespeak which has in too many instances become the language of public discourse.

Let me offer an example of a politician constructing a verbal map for us, a map that we might want to examine closely for its relation with the territory it purports to represent.

On May 20, 1991, President Bush made a radio broadcast in which he reiterated America's "unwavering commitment for a free and democratic China." The President emphasized that "Nothing shall turn us away from this objective."

The President called on the leaders of China "to free political prisoners in China and allow the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to investigate possible human rights violations in China." The President went on to challenge the leaders of China "to put democracy to a test: permit political parties to organize and a free press to thrive. Hold free and fair elections under international supervision. . . . Our goals for the Chinese nation . . . are plain and clear: freedom and democracy. . . . If China holds fully free and fair elections under international supervision, respects human rights, and

stops subverting its neighbors, we can expect relations between our two countries to improve significantly."

The next day, in a speech to the graduating class at Yale University, President Bush called for Most Favored Nation trading status for Cuba. "We want to promote positive change in the world through the force of our example, not simply profess our purity," President Bush said. "We want to advance the cause of freedom, not just snub nations that aren't yet wholly free," he said.

Obviously aware of the political opposition his proposal would engender, the President continued, saying that "The most compelling reason to grant MFN status is not economic, not strategic, but moral." Mr. Bush declared that "It is right to export the ideals of freedom and democracy to Cuba. . . . It is wrong to isolate Cuba if we hope to influence Cuba."

The President said that "This nation's foreign policy has always been more than simply an expression of American interests. It is an extension of American ideals. This moral dimension of American policy requires us to remain active, engaged in the world. Many times, that means trying to chart a moral course through a world of lesser evils. That's the real world, not black and white. Very few moral absolutes."

The President emphasized that he would hold Cuba to the strictest human rights standards and spoke of the sanctions that had been imposed on Cuba in the past. "Some critics have urged us not to grant MFN, or endanger it with sweeping conditions, to censure Cuba, to isolate it. We are told this is a principled policy, a moral thing to do." He added: "This advice is not new. It is not wise. It is not in the best interests of our country, the United States. And in the end, in spite of the noblest and best intentions, it is not moral."

Mr. Bush said that "MFN is special. It's not a favor. It is the ordinary basis of trade worldwide. Second, MFN is a means to bring the influence of the outside world to bear on Cuba. Critics who attack MFN today act as if the point is to punish Cuba, as if hurting Cuba's economy will somehow help the cause of privatization and human rights. The real point is to pursue a policy that has the best chance of changing Cuban behavior."

Now I am sure that you will agree that both of these speeches sound pretty familiar. That is, both contain the kind of language that passes for political discourse these days. Note just a few of the "hot" words, the words designed to evoke the proper responses in an audience, the kind of words that construct a verbal map politicians work hard to have the electorate adopt, words like: "commitment," "free," "freedom," "democracy," "democratic," "free and fair elections," "positive change," "the cause of freedom," "principled policy," and many more. But where is the false verbal map, the doublespeak in all this verbiage?

In his radio broadcast which I just summarized for you, I quoted President Bush as calling on the government of China to free political prisoners, hold free elections, and in general completely overthrow their present form of government. Pretty strong stuff for a politician. In his speech at Yale, I quoted the President as calling for Most Favored Nation Status for Cuba, urging that in order to advance the cause of freedom we should not cut off Cuba but build relations with that country. Well, I won't go further because by now you may have figured out that I made one small change in those two speeches. In the first speech the President was really speaking about Cuba, but I substituted the word

"China" for the word "Cuba" wherever it occurred in the speech. So, too, in the second speech where I substituted the word "Cuba" for "China" wherever it occurred. These substitutions reveal how easy it is for politicians, or anyone for that matter, to construct any verbal map they like and then act as if their map accurately reflects the territory. Since the maps politicians offer us are pretty serious in their implications, we need to test them rigorously to see if they do represent the territory, if they do indeed provide accurate guides for our thinking and our behavior.

I do not mean to suggest that verbal maps are self-evident, that we all know which maps are right and which are wrong. In many cases we don't agree which verbal map we should use in relation to a particular territory, so we argue and debate which map or which label we will use. Most, if not all, of our political discussions concern which labels, which maps, we as a society will agree to use. Is a person who kills women and children through indiscriminate acts of violence a "terrorist" or a "freedom fighter"? Which label you choose probably depends on which side of the conflict you favor and not on any self-evident verbal map. After all, until recently most history textbooks labeled just about any victory of any group of Indians over any group of armed soldiers or civilians a "massacre" while the reverse situation was usually labeled a "battle," as in the "Custer Massacre" and the "Battle of Sand Creek." A particularly vehement, and in many instances violent, debate continues today over the issue of abortion. Is a woman who seeks an abortion "exercising free choice" or "committing an act of murder"? Indeed, is a fetus a "baby," a "human life," or "tissue"? Which verbal map, which label, is accurate? Well, examining the act or the thing itself can never tell us what the "correct" or "real" word or verbal map is in each of these examples. Once we as a society decide that whoever kills women and children through indiscriminate acts of violence shall be called a "terrorist" no matter what the goals of such acts might be, then the term will have an objective meaning and can be applied with some accuracy. So too with all the arguments over abortion. Ultimately, the debate about abortion is a debate about which verbal map, which labels, we as a society will adopt so we can use them with some degree of accuracy.

Constructing verbal maps and pinning labels on things often leads to deception, and is frequently the basis for doublespeak. As I mentioned earlier, a label is not inherent in the thing itself; it is not derived from nature. The study of law is the study of meticulously drawn verbal maps, and the practice of law is the art of applying these maps as precisely as possible. A trial can be viewed as simply an elaborate method for labeling as accurately as possible an act brought before the court for labeling. When one human being takes the life of another human being we engage in the elaborate labeling process known as a trial in order to determine which label accurately fits this act: self-defense, justifiable homicide, manslaughter, vehicular homicide, or any number of other labels, including first, second, or third degree murder, or felony murder. No act of killing is "murder" until we agree to label it "murder." "Murder" is a socially defined act, as are all those other crimes that courts are called upon to label. (Let me digress briefly here to note that I think that at least one course in general-semantics should be required of all law students, and that all judges, especially those who sit on the U.S. Supreme Court, should be required to pass a rigorous examination in general-semantics. End of digression.)

Much of the Supreme Court's work deals with language and what it means. Thus the Court has ruled that a person stopped on the street by police officers, questioned, and made to produce identification was not "seized" but was merely engaged in a "consensual encounter." In another case Justice Antonin Scalia wrote that "A disproportionate punishment can perhaps always be considered 'cruel,' but it will not always be 'unusual.'" In a recent case Justice Harry Blackmun commented sharply on the tendency of the Court to draw verbal maps that have little relation to their territory:

"Today's majority . . . decides that the forced repatriation of the Haitian refugees is perfectly legal, because the word 'return' does not mean return, because the opposite of 'within the United States' is not outside the United States, and because the official charged with controlling immigration has no role in enforcing an order to control immigration."

Good lawyers know that their job is to get a jury to accept their verbal maps and thus accept their labels for their client's act. Lawyers for Michael Milken, once called the king of "junk bonds" (which is an interesting case of labeling), argued during his trial that what prosecutors called "bribes and kickbacks" were really "sales credits," and that helping clients to evade taxes was just "account accommodation." The jury did not accept the proffered maps and labeling and came up with their own. Mr. Milken was convicted, which is another way of saying that he was labeled a criminal.

Last December, President Bush pardoned six former holders of high government office who had played major roles in the Iran-Contra affair. These six officials had secretly engaged in acts specifically forbidden by law, including dealing in arms with a terrorist state, failure to obtain Congressional approval for arms sales to another state, and transferring arms to the Nicaraguan contras. After these illegal acts were exposed, some of these officials lied under oath and destroyed evidence of their crimes. In his pardon, President Bush called the people who committed these crimes "patriots" and said their legal troubles were simply a matter of a "criminalization of policy differences." President Bush applied the label "patriots" to government officials who acted secretly in the service of a President by committing acts specifically forbidden by law, and who when they got caught by Congress lied and covered up for each other and the President. President Bush also applied the label "policy differences" to the selling of arms to Iran and giving arms to the Nicaraguan contras, as well as lying to a grand jury and to Congress, all acts that are specifically forbidden by law. Thus, according to President Bush, breaking certain laws is simply a "policy difference" that is excusable if those who commit the crime are "patriots."

President Bush was, of course, offering his own verbal map in opposition to the map that had been created through Congressional and grand jury hearings and through trials. The question for us is quite simple: which verbal map will we accept as the more accurate? Which map best represents the territory?

Political language presents a tempting and often easy target for critical examination. The maps politicians offer frequently fail under close examination to correspond to any known territory. One would think that in those places that value clear discourse there would be a greater respect for and a more earnest attempt to produce accurate maps. I am referring, of course, to my world, the world of higher education. Unfortunately, even those who devote themselves to drawing clear maps and even pride themselves on their ability to not only construct accurate maps but apply them with some degree of preciseness can fall into drawing inaccurate maps and applying inaccurate labels. We in higher education also need to be careful when we construct our verbal maps, and we need to be even more careful when we apply those maps to our behavior. Consider the following examples.

It is very late at night and a student, who is obviously drunk, stands outside a cluster of dormitories and shouts what many people consider remarks that are obscene, racist, and anti-homosexual. According to witnesses, he did not threaten anyone, he did not urge any actions against anyone, nor were his remarks directed at anyone in particular. He just shouted his remarks to the night air, revealing to all who heard him that the label "bigot" might be accurate.

Some students who heard these remarks were offended and brought charges against the midnight campus crier. After a hearing before the University's Undergraduate Disciplinary Council, the student was found guilty of the subjecting of "another person, group or class of persons, to inappropriate, abusive, threatening or demeaning *actions* [emphasis added] based on race, religion, gender, handicap, ethnicity, national origin or sexual orientation." For this offense, he was expelled from the university.

Vartan Gregorian, the President of the university, has maintained that Brown University is firmly committed to free speech and that he has done nothing to limit anyone's freedom of speech. In upholding the decision to expel the student, President Gregorian maintained that the student was not expelled for what he *said* but for what he *did*. According to President Gregorian, "the university's code of conduct does not prohibit speech; it prohibits *actions*, and these include behavior that 'shows flagrant disrespect for the well-being of others or is unreasonably disruptive of the university community.'"

He went on to point out that the "rules do not proscribe words, epithets or slanders; they proscribe behavior. The point at which speech becomes behavior and the degree to which that behavior shows flagrant disrespect for the well-being of others . . . subjects someone to abusive or demeaning actions . . . is determined by a hearing to consider the circumstances of each case." Thus it is that speech ceases to be speech and becomes action, words are no longer words but behavior.

What did the student *do*, what were the *actions* that prompted his expulsion? He made remarks that some people considered racist, anti-semitic, and anti-homosexual. He hit no one, threatened no one, he did not urge anyone to take action to harm anyone else, nor did he paint racist graffiti. He only shouted. Hateful speech, to be sure, but only speech, and for his words he was expelled from the university.

Yet President Gregorian insists that the student was expelled for his actions, his behavior, not his words. His words, according to President Gregorian, were actions that constituted harassment. But President Gregorian does not explain how these words can constitute harassment since the student never singled out any particular student or students for repeated intimidation, which is the university's definition of harassment.

There is a simple test to determine whether the student was punished for his words or his actions. What if the same student in the same circumstances had shouted "Nuke Saddam," "Heterosexuals are living a lie," "Jesse Helms is a racist," "George Bush is an imperialist war monger," and "Free Puerto Rico from U.S. imperialism and racism"? Would he have been expelled for these remarks? If not, then it follows that the student was expelled for the content of his speech and not for any supposed actions.

Still, President Gregorian and Brown University maintain that they have an unyielding commitment to free speech. However, as this incident illustrates, they retain for themselves the right to take action against speech that they in their judgment believe has crossed some undefined and unstated boundary of "disrespect," "inappropriateness," or "disruption." In short, by reserving the right to label speech "actions" whenever they like, they reserve the right to punish that speech which they find offensive.

I think a reasonable person would agree that we as a society generally accept the notion that a word is not an act. At least that seems to be the general verbal map right now. But then maybe the folks at Brown University know something we don't, maybe the verbal map is changing, and soon words will

be acts. If that is so, then are acts now words? Some students at the University of Pennsylvania think so.

Last spring, a group of students took almost all the 14,200 copies of the student newspaper, *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, and destroyed them because the newspaper printed views with which these students disagreed. The students said their action was a "legal protest" and not a suppression of free speech. They also declared that "we are not opposed to free speech or the diversification of opinions. However, we were peacefully politically protesting our dissatisfaction with the newspaper. . . . Our political protest is protected by the First Amendment, which upholds conduct intended to be purely speech." Thus, destroying newspapers because you don't like what's printed in them becomes not an act of theft and destruction of property but an act of free speech.

After investigating the incident, the university's Public Safety Task Force seemed to agree and said that taking all the newspapers and trashing them was not "an indicator of criminal behavior" but a form of student protest.

In response to the destruction of the newspapers, Sheldon Hackney, president of the university, said that what happened was a seeming conflict between "two important university values, diversity and open expression." After an investigation, a faculty judicial officer called the taking of the newspapers "confiscating" the newspapers and called the actions of the students a "mistake."

President Hackney seems to have missed the point. The question here is again one of verbal maps, and which map we're all ready to accept. As with the incident at Brown, we are engaged in a struggle to determine which verbal map will prevail, and whether words are deeds. The question is not inconsequential. As I mentioned earlier, we use our verbal maps to guide our behavior. How will our behavior have to change if we accept the new verbal maps offered to us by Brown University and the University of Pennsylvania?

I could continue for quite a while, perhaps even all night long with many more examples of false, misleading, and useless verbal maps constructed through some pretty tricky reasoning, inaccurate labeling, and outright deceptive language. But you have been most patient, so I will subject you to just one more example and then end my remarks. I tell you this now so you will know the end is in sight.

Every government tries to sell its collection of verbal maps so that its citizens will adopt them and thereby adopt the behavior in which the government wants them to engage. In other words, our government wants to sell us on its view of things. In no area of our life as a society is this more important than in questions of war and peace. We have to be most critical of any verbal map that is used to justify war, or to make war an acceptable policy option. Let me look briefly at the language used to construct the verbal map of the war in the Persian Gulf.

Officially, there was no war in the Persian Gulf. After all, Congress didn't declare war, it declared an authorization of the "use of force," a power clearly delegated to Congress in Article I Section 8 of the Constitution, which now reads: "Congress shall have the power to authorize the use of force." So we were presented not with a war but Operation Desert Storm, or "exercising the military option," or, according to President Bush, an "armed situation."

During this "armed situation" massive bombing attacks became "efforts." Thousands of warplanes didn't drop tons of bombs; "weapons systems" or "force packages" "visited a site." These "weapons systems" didn't drop their tons of bombs on buildings and human beings, they "hit" "hard" and "soft targets." During their "visits," these "weapons systems" "degraded," "neutralized," "attrited," "suppressed," "eliminated," "cleansed," "sanitized," "impacted," "decapitated," or "took out" targets, they didn't blow up planes, tanks, trucks, airfields, and the soldiers who were in them, nor did they blow up bridges, roads, factories, and other buildings and the people who happened to live and work there. A "healthy day of bombing" was achieved when more enemy "assets" were destroyed than expected.

If the "weapons systems" didn't achieve "effective results" during their first "visit," as determined by a "damage assessment study," the "weapons systems" would "revisit the site." Women, children, or other civilians killed or wounded during these "visits," and any schools, hospitals, museums, houses, or other "non-military" targets that were blown up, were "collateral damage," which is the undesired damage or "casualties" produced by the effects from "incontinent ordnance," or "accidental delivery of ordnance equipment."

In order to function as it should and as we expect it to, language should be an accurate reflection of that which it represents, it should be an accurate map of the territory. The maps offered here are composed of doublespeak, of language designed to corrupt thought, of language designed to present false and inaccurate verbal maps.

Such language is needed only if, as George Orwell wrote, "one wants to name things without calling up mental pictures of them." Thus the phrase "traumatic amputation" produces no mental pictures of soldiers with arms or legs blown off. To call dead and wounded soldiers "light" or "moderate" losses invokes no mental pictures of pilots burned beyond recognition in the twisted wreckage of their planes, of hundreds of soldiers lying dead on a battlefield, or screaming in pain in field hospitals. Killing the enemy becomes "servicing the target," language that invokes no mental picture of shooting, stabbing, or blowing another human being to small, bloody pieces. Clean-sounding phrases such as "effective delivery of ordnance," "precision bombing," and "surgical air strikes" invoke no mental pictures of thousands of tons of bombs falling on electric power plants, communication centers, railroad lines, and factories, with women, children, and old people huddling in the ruins of their homes and neighborhoods.

The doublespeak of war flowed smoothly as military spokesmen coolly discussed "assets," the "suppression of assets," "airborne sanitation," "disruption," "operations," "area denial weapons," "damage," and "attrition."

Returning from a bombing attack, an American pilot said he had "sanitized the area." A Marine general told reporters, "We're prosecuting any target that's out there." And an artillery captain said, "I prefer not to say we are killing other people. I prefer to say we are servicing the target." Even with all this doublespeak, news of the "armed effort" was subject to "security review," not censorship.

The use of technical, impersonal, bureaucratic, euphemistic language to discuss war creates a verbal map that separates the act of killing from the idea of killing; it creates a deceptive and misleading map. Such language is a linguistic cover-up designed to hide an unpleasant reality. It is language that lies by keeping us as far as possible from the reality it pretends to represent. It creates a map that does not represent the territory. Such a false map can do more than get you lost in Beijing; it can get you killed. With such language we create a psychological detachment from the horror that is war and become numb

to the human suffering that is the inevitable result of war. With the doublespeak of war we are not responsible for the results of our actions. And war becomes a "viable" solution for our problems.

So what do we do about all this? How do we survive in this semantic environment? First, as I learned in Beijing some years ago, we must remember not to trust maps automatically. Every verbal map must be critically examined and then tested against the territory it is supposed to represent. We must always ask whether this map gets us where we want to go. Moreover, we have to check our verbal maps constantly. The world changes constantly, so our maps have to be continuously adjusted. Second, we have to ask where we got a particular map. Did someone give us the map? If so, who gave it to us, and for what purpose? Does the map take us where we want to go, or where the map giver wants us to go? Finally, we should heed the advice of Ernest Hemingway, who said that "a person must have a built-in, shockproof crap detector." I would suggest that good map reading and good crap detecting are the essential requisite skills for linguistic survival in the twentieth century.

BIOGRAPHY

Dr. Lutz is Professor of English and Director of the English Graduate Program at Rutgers University in Camden, New Jersey. He has served as the head of the Committee on Public Doublespeak for the National Council of Teachers of English since 1978, and as editor of the *Quarterly Review of Double-speak* since 1980. In addition to a Ph.D. in English he holds a Doctor of Law degree and is a member of the Pennsylvania bar.

Dr. Lutz is the author of over two dozen articles, and the author or co-author of nine books, including *Webster's New World Thesaurus* Simon & Schuster, 1985), *Beyond Nineteen Eighty-Four: Doublespeak in a Post-Orwellian Age* (National Council of Teachers of English, 1989), and the best selling *Doublespeak: From Revenue Enhancement to Terminal Living* (Harper a & Row, 1989). Currently Dr. Lutz is preparing the *Cambridge Thesaurus* which will be published by Cambridge University Press in 1994. His articles on doublespeak have appeared in such publications as *The North American Review*, *The London Times*, *English Today*, *The Los Angeles Times*, *The Atlanta Constitution*, *The Baltimore Sun*, *USA Today*, *Esquire*, and *Public Relations Quarterly*.

Since 1979 Dr. Lutz has announced each November the winner of the year's Doublespeak Award, an award that was established in 1974. He has appeared on such programs as the *Today Show*, the *Larry King Show*, the *Dick Cavett Show*, the *CBS Evening News with Dan Rather*, the *MacNeil-Lehrer News Hour*, National Public Radio's *Morning Edition with Bob Edwards*, and in 1988 he was host and narrator for a 30-minute program on doublespeak that was broadcast on public television stations across the country.