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Terminology of General Semantics

The expression ‘General Semantics’ was used by Alfred Korzybski to describe the new theory. Alfred Korzybski called it General Semantics because he meant not only the linguistic definition or one’s response but also one’s response to words and events in the fullest sense. ‘Semantics’ is the study of meaning but the word ‘semantics’ in General Semantics refers to one’s total response to thing-events- not just word meaning. Later on, Alfred Korzybski began to refer to the phrase Evaluative Response rather than the semantic one. By semantic response or evaluative response, Alfred Korzybski meant the total response - neurological, emotional, cognitive, semantic and behavioural - to the thing-event.

There are a number of techniques and strategies of evaluating human behavior or any other events. Language provides the means and the environment by which this evaluative process occurs. General Semantics deals with studying the effects of language on our behavior and vice-versa. The theory of General Semantics which was introduced by Alfred Korzybski in ‘Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics’, later on proved to be one of the
important theories of evaluating human behavior. Alfred Korzybski believed that if one’s language was improved then one would improve one’s and one’s society. Alfred Korzybski believed that the language of science and mathematics was a model to follow.

By learning certain words and certain grammatical constructions, one would start thinking in a different way and could experience the world differently. Vocabulary does reflect the world in which one finds oneself. For example, the Eskimos have several words for ‘snow’ and the Arabs have many words for ‘camel’. A doctor who knew many words for illnesses would be a different type of doctor from one who did not know the names of illnesses. In the minimum, the one who knew the names of many illnesses would be more able to communicate and collect new information from others who also knew the names of the illnesses.

Understanding of Terms used in General Semantics:

Alfred Korzybski developed the theory of General Semantics. Every theory is based on terminology and through that terminology; the theory can be understood easily by comprehending the terms used in it. The theory which was introduced by Alfred Korzybski is also based on certain terms, devices, techniques, etc. The terms used in the theory of General Semantics are:
(1) Abstraction:

Abstracting is a constant process of selecting, omitting and organizing the details of reality so that one experiences the world as patterned, intelligible and articulate. An abstraction is a kind of synopsis of what the world is like, a generalization about its structure. "Abstracting by necessity involves evaluating, whether conscious or not, and so the
process of abstracting may be considered as a process of evaluating stimuli.”¹

The span and influence of *General Semantics* as a way of evaluating personal experience may be tested and experienced with Korzybski’s emphasis on the human process of *abstracting*. Human beings make abstractions all the time. An "abstraction", as used here, is that one simplifies, condenses or symbolizes what is going on in order to better talk about it or think about it. Human beings abstract at the three levels: 'Neurological level', 'perceptual level' and 'verbal level'. All the systems of human beings, interacting with the world are involved in selecting data from the world, organizing data, generalizing data.

Alfred Korzybski introduced the two technical terms to explain the concept of *abstraction* in detail. The terms are: Intensional orientations and Extensional orientations. Intensional orientations may be explained that the orientations based on verbal definitions, associations. Intensional orientation is the world of words about the events and things. Simple, one can say that in intensional orientation, one explains a ‘word’ in terms of other words. It is could be interpreted that an intensional fellow is ‘ear-minded’. By extensional orientations, one means the ‘actual reality’ to which those words refer to. Extensional orientations are based on ordering, observations, investigations, etc first and the verbalization next.
in importance. Extensional orientations are the world of the events and things. The world of things that one touches, sees, hears or otherwise experiences is called the extensional world. An extensional fellow could be termed as ‘eye-minded’. Alfred Korzybski voiced, “The extensional attitudes are based on the natural order of evaluation, which makes a natural theory of values possible, and leads to a workable theory of adjustment or ‘sanity’. Intentional orientations, then, represent the reversal of the natural order of evaluation and must introduce factors of misevaluation or maladjustment in human lives”.

A simple example is given here to elaborate the intensional orientations the extensional orientations. When one tries to define a ‘brick’ by saying, it is a kind of substance, a kind of solid substance, of such and such hardness and it is made from clay, one is telling the meaning of one’s term ‘brick’ intensionally, that is, in terms of other words, in terms of language. On the other side, if one shows the object i.e. the brick itself or showing the brick by using your finger saying “This is a brick. That is a brick. This table is not a brick...” that means one conveys the meaning of the term extensionally, that is, concretely, by giving the actual reality or concrete reality to which the language refers.

The reality can be represented by means of signs such as language, thought and so on. These signs could never completely be sufficient
enough to represent the reality. General Semantics expresses this fact by saying that language abstracts from reality. Even our own perceptions abstract from reality.

The basic fact about language is that language does abstract; language contains within it various levels of abstraction. Alfred Korzybski explains, "The phrase 'levels of abstraction' is one of the key phrases in General Semantics theory.... Reality can be represented by means of language, thought, and so on. These signs are never completely adequate to the reality. Even our perceptions abstract from reality. According to General Semantics, one can arrange one's abstractions in a series, a hierarchy, and we can proceed from lower levels of abstraction of higher ones. Those levels are called lower the nearer they are to the full reality, and higher the remoter they are from complete reality".³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Abstraction</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I saw a cricket blue ball in the ground in the last evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I saw a ball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I saw something.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I had a sensory experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Role of ‘abstraction’ in *General Semantics*

The thing-event is something one cannot know fully because it includes so many internal structures and information which is outside the human range of perception, etc. One can never know the thing-event. One abstracts from the thing-event what one perceives to be the object and thing-event occurs in three dimensions and thing-event can occur all together. George Doris explains, “We abstract from our experience only a fraction of the totality, and that fraction is not ‘random’ but depends on our particular nervous system, our physical state at the time, our needs and objectives, etc. Thus, what I see, hear, feel on any occasion is particular to me and will not be exactly the same for anyone else at the ‘same’ time and place”.

The opinion clearly indicates that whatever event seen, heard, felt by a one person could not be compared with the reactions of somebody else to the same event because everyone experiences the world from his/her experiences only. One experiences the object, which can be a person, thing-event or process, etc. through one’s senses. One sees, hears, feels, smells and tastes and through these senses, one perceives only part of the thing-event. What one does perceive is the object. The object is an abstraction of the thing-event, because what one perceives is not the
whole thing-event. The abstracting process begins here, at the unspeakable level.

For example, if someone walks down the market, he/she might experience an incident taking place. Someone’s perceptions in himself/herself constitute an abstraction. Different people will experience the event differently, depending on where they perceive it from and how their perceptions work, and it will never be more than a portion of what went on, passed through certain filters of perception. So, that person will record certain images, pictures, sounds, emotions and so forth, which will form his/her representation of the event. He/she might then start presenting what he/she experienced and that will abstract it further. Someone could say, "I saw two planes, an Indian Airlines plane flying north and a Jet Airways plane flying south, and the Indian Airlines plane was turning right, but then the Jet Airways plane came out of its way and hit it". This description might give somebody else an idea of what went on, but really it is a very imprecise, incomplete, approximated description of what he/she actually perceived, which is again an imprecise approximation of what actually went on. The next day he/she might create a further abstraction by simply saying that he/she saw "a plane crash".
Thus what an individual sees, hears, feels on any occasion is particular to that individual and will not be exactly the same for anyone else at the ‘same’ time and place. As humans we make abstractions all the time. “No two things are the same” further Alfred Korzybski adds, “What we ordinarily call the same object, the same thing, is not really and strictly the same at different times. If we realize that the world is in a constant flux, incessant change if we realize that between any two different objects there are differences; that no two .... Are exactly the same, we will be on the road to sanity”\textsuperscript{5}.

It happens that at many times, even at the object level, we are unable to perceive everything. For example, some people are better or worse at perceiving colours or hearing sounds. Some of us cannot perceive as much of the object as others but if we actually pay more attention, we would be in a position to notice certain things.

Here is another example to explain the above viewpoint: while reading one’s own answer sheet, one would hardly find any errors in it but someone else may be the evaluator or teacher could easily point it out. Furthermore, one might not have noticed the parts of the object because of one’s position when s/he looks at it. The top of a cup can appear as a line, an oval or a circle depending on the angle of view. No one can view in 3 dimensions, and because one tries to see a cup as a 3 dimensional
object, one must clearly be distorting the experience of it. One cannot perceive the whole thing-event, and s/he abstracts from the object to create own response to the object, even before using the words.

Much of what human beings understand about the world is an "abstraction" from what is there in reality; as an abstraction, much is left out of the representations human beings make about the world, representations / abstractions that operate for them as "common sense" information.

These abstractions differ from person to person based on their particular experiences, their backgrounds, capabilities, interests, biases, etc. General Semantics aims to raise consciousness of this abstracting process, to teach people how to become more tolerant and accepting of the limitations and potentialities in themselves and others brought about by the process of abstracting. Michael Cole, Professor of Communication opines, "Abstraction is a kind of evaluation, in the sense that it picks out certain features of the world or of experience as of interest. The attempt to understand this distinction in a "scientific" fashion is meant to provide a basis for evaluating and modifying attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs of those being trained in General Semantics".6
(2) **Non-identity**

The realization of the *non-identity* principle, illustrated by Alfred Korzybski’s famous formulation, "Whatever you may say something *is*, it *is not!*" is at the root of the system of *General Semantics*. The world is continually in a state of flux and transform. Nothing remains the same. There aren't two truly identical thing-events in the world. At the thing-event level, electrons are continually leaving atoms in the thing-event and others are replacing them. The brain cells of human beings are continually being replaced at the atomic level. The bodies of human beings are not the same as they were even five minutes ago and they are probably totally different from what they were 7 years ago. One is not the same person one was as kid or even exactly the same person one was 5 minutes ago. Even two mass produced objects are not identical when examined scientifically yet people tend to act and believe in identity.

If one says Rahul is a criminal and Mona is a criminal then one can conclude that Rahul and Mona both are criminals and one reacts to them according to one’s intentional definition of criminal. Even though Rahul might be a serial killer and Mona broke the traffic signal. Quite clearly by assuming the identity of the word ‘criminal’ and the person without taking into account the extensional meaning can lead us well off target. The concept could be summarized,
• The object is not the same as the thing-event

• Our perception of the object is not the same as the object

• The words one uses to describe the object or one’s mental representation of it, are not the same as the object

• Being able to talk or write about a subject is not the same as being able to do that subject.

• The words a person utters are not the same as their actual feelings and thoughts.

Objectification

This is the error whereby one identifies or confuses:

• Words with objects and feelings,

• Memories and ideas with experiences which belong to the unspeakable level, or

• Higher order abstractions with lower.

It is forgotten that they are not identical and as it is forgotten, one loses the ability to evaluate properly. When it is objectified, people believe:

• The words used by an individual cover the object completely.

• Words have a value and certainty they do not have,
• The meaning one assigns to words is the meaning everyone ascribes to them,

• Words have emotional objectivity and value,

• Words have:
  o Permanence
  o One-value
  o Definiteness

When one objectifies, one responds to words with one’s full body, emotional, semantic reaction, rather than to ask for more details or clarification, in the knowledge that something is always left out of one’s evaluation.

While evaluating any situation, any incident, any problem or any person, one must keep in mind that no two things have exact common features. Even two physical things like two Maruti motor cars are not exactly same. If one tries to evaluate the situation, from the above mentioned concept, then one shall be moving towards the achievement of sanity.

One person might have different kind of thinking at the different stage of life. What a human being was able to evaluate any situation or relation at the age 10 would be different than what he/she could do at the age of 25 about the same situation or relationship. Similarly, the evaluation pattern may change when he/she shall be 50 or 60.
The theory of General Semantics advocates that knowledge consists of structure. A structure is an organization in which each part relates to other parts, and sequences occur in some order. One ought to do things in the right order to do anything in right way. Similarly, when building something, one has to do things in the right order and connect things to the right parts. In order to learn or know, one needs to do things in the right sequence and relate things together appropriately. When one has the right relationships and the right order, then one has a mental structure which is knowledge. For example, while preparing tea, one wouldn't put the tea-leaf in the tin and boil them and then add the milk and water and then sugar cubes as one knows that the order would be wrong and would not bring the expected results.

One of the ways to understand 'structure' is to consider the simplest question: When someone sees the color yellow, how that someone knows that another person has the same sensation? One can gather samples of yellow, and ask the other to name them. One can carry out all sorts of test and one reaches conformity on all of them. Structurally one's response to colours appears to be the same, but one still doesn't know whether one has the same sensation. But for all practical purposes one does. If one present a sample of what one calls yellow, and someone says it is pink
and whenever one says yellow, or a shade of yellow, someone says pink or a shade of pink, one can figure out that both of them are responding to the same thing-event but both of them are calling it by different names. The structure is the same in both cases but the words by both of them are different.

(4) **Time Binding**

The human capacity of intercommunicating and transmitting the accumulated experiences of individuals and the race from individual to individual and generation to generation is characterized as the *time binding* capacity. As time binders, human beings can accumulate knowledge from the past and communicate what they know to the future. So, *time binding* is the unique human method of transmitting experience and knowledge over time. Human beings are influenced by the past and the future at the present time because they are related to these through *time binding*. One's own personal history affects one now and in the future because of time binding. Time binding is the human ability to pass information and knowledge between generations at an accelerating rate. Korzybski claimed this to be a unique capacity, separating human beings from other animals. Animal pass knowledge, but not at an exponential rate, i.e. each generation of animals does things pretty much in the same way as the previous generation. For example, at one time most human
societies were hunter-gatherers, but now more advanced means of good production by using the scientific tools, qualitative seeds, cold storage system, markets prevail. Hardly any other animals are skill-looking, i.e. they don't grow or raise food. Korzybski began to notice that men were clearly different from animals with what he called this, 'time-binding' faculty. The main means of accomplishing the binding of time is the symbol. But our capacity to symbolize is dependent upon and integral to another process called 'abstraction'.

Steve Stockdale has summarized 'time binding' with the following points:

i. "Language serves as the principal tool that facilitates time-binding."

ii. Only humans have demonstrated the capability to build on the knowledge of prior generations.

iii. Time-binding forms the basis for an ethical standard by which to evaluate human behavior.

iv. We are related to the future and to the past through time binding. But what happened in the past is not happening now. We can tend to live in the past, and we can tend to live in the future, but the only place we can really live is now, in the present."
(5) Non-allness

Human beings never experience all of the thing-event or the object and the words do not capture the whole of the object, the concept of non-allness reminds that there is always more than human beings know. If an ordinary sentence is mentioned such as, 'This panel is made of wood', and study it, one cannot tell by the structure of the sentence itself what level of abstraction one is talking about. That is one way in which language is false to fact. For example, when a solid sheet of brown wood is seen on the walls, one does not see the internal contents of which these panels of wood are made up. When one uses words to describe what one sees, it can be said that one has abstracted. If one describes these panels as made of wood, one has said by no means the full truth about them. One didn't say whether the wood was polished or not; whether it was sawed or smoothened out of a log; one didn't say what kind of wood it was: bamboo, teakwood, pine. In fact, the speaker has left out many numbers of facts about the wood that you were speaking about. Alfred Korzybski says, "I've already mentioned by implication another basic fact about language and about thought which is signified by the slogan, non-allness. No matter how hard we try, we may come closer and closer, but we do not get all the way to the full reality that there is to be described. That is, we do not ever say all that is to be said about anything."
(6) Non-elementalistic

Elementalistic expressions are those expressions that are taken out of context and their relationship with other thing-events has been omitted. Sometimes it happens that any real representation of a word is not thought of, then it might be considered the word as elementalistic, and it may not have any meaning. Non-elementalistic is related to non-identity. There is a concept of identity where two things are made equal when they are merely similar, in the same way; there is a concept of elementalism wherein two things are separated when they should be kept together. The ‘mind’ and the ‘body’ might be wrongly separated when it is said the one and the other are quite independent.

The theory of General Semantics, introduced by Alfred Korzybski, 70 years ago, advocates, ‘evaluation’, that is very much close to ‘critical thinking’. Alfred Korzybski used the term ‘evaluation’ instead of ‘thinking’ mainly because he must have thought that the term ‘evaluation’ is more accurate representation of the psychological process referred. Alfred Korzybski has classified the term ‘thinking’ as “elementalistic” in ‘Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics’ and the following description can be very apt in understanding the concept:
"Language have structure, thus we may have language of elementalistic structure such as ‘space’ and ‘time’, ‘observer’ and ‘observed’ ‘body’ and ‘soul’, ‘senses’ and ‘mind’ ‘intellect’ and ‘emotions’, ‘thinking’ and ‘feeling’, ‘thought’ and ‘intuition’; which allow verbal division and separation or we may have languages of a structure of non-elementalistic structure such as ‘space-time’…”

He further says, “If we use languages of a structure non-similar to the world and our nervous system, our verbal predictions are not verified empirically we cannot be ‘rational’ or adjusted”...

Korzybski also writes, “We do not realize what tremendous power the structure of a habitual language has. It is not an exaggeration to say that it enslaves us through the mechanism of semantic reactions and that the structure which a language exhibits, and impresses upon us unconsciously, is automatically projected upon the world around us”

It is said that the world is seen through the structure of our languages; our attitudes, behavior, personal relationships, institutions, society international relations, etc; are functionally related to the structure of the languages we use to communicate with ourselves and others. One creates one’s human world in the ‘light’ of one’s words.

Everything is related to everything else and it is wrong to separate parts artificially which belong together. For example, matter and energy; space and time; thought and emotion and behavior. Education, for example, is
about someone or something causing someone or something to learn something using some technique. When you think about education, you cannot forget the students, teachers, methods of study, books, etc which is all related. Words like communication have the same effect of abstracting, and therefore deleting the communicators, about what they are communicating, through which channel, in which media, etc. would not bring the expected result. It is the time to note that there is nothing wrong with these words and if something is then it is that one forgets that one is abstracting and therefore scrubbing out.

(7) Multi-ordinality

A *multi-ordinal* term is one that can be applied to statements containing that same term infinitely. Sometimes, the most pathetic confusions and maladjustments of every degree have been frequently led to when one fails identify the multiordinality. Words don’t just have one right meaning. Words and symbols have different meanings to different people and different meanings in different contexts. A word or sentence in itself doesn’t necessarily say anything finite, unless you find out what it is linked up with. The following are examples of *multi-ordinal* words:
If someone asks, “Do you like tea?” or “Do you dislike coffee?” One may say ‘yes’ in both the cases but in the first case, the content conveys different situation. This multiordinality of words makes the evaluation method more challenging and interesting. To quote Alfred Korzybski, “Multiordinality terms represent the most important words in our vocabulary. These have no general extensional meaning but their content is exclusively given by the given context. The realization of the extensional, multiordinality of such terms eliminates an endless array of misunderstandings, quarrels and finally human maladjustments because we are using a language similar in structure to the facts of life”.12
Multiordinal terms correspond to the multiordinal neuro-semantic and neuro-linguistic mechanisms which operate in us. Take for example, ‘Never say never’. In the sentence, both words ‘never’ look alike, are spelled similar; yet they are on different levels of abstraction and have different values, one unlimited, limiting the others. A statement about a statement is a higher order of abstraction that the statement. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Abstraction</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I like to walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I like my 'liking to walk' because it makes me happy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I dislike my 'liking my liking to walk because it makes me happy' because it seems rather selfish to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I like my 'dislike of &quot;my liking &quot;my liking to walk because it makes me happy&quot;&quot; because it seems rather selfish to me&quot;, because it makes me laugh.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I like extremely liking my 'dislike of &quot;my liking &quot;my liking to walk because it makes me happy&quot;&quot; because it seems rather selfish to me&quot;, because it makes me laugh', because it shows how crazy we are as humans!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The word 'like' is used in a multi-ordinal way. Interestingly, most people cannot consciously take in embedded clauses like this to a level greater than 3. Some can manage 4, but beyond this most people get lost. This means that levels 4 and 5 are likely to incomprehensible. What is important here is that by thinking in this, one can fail to understand some of one's reactions. *Multi-ordinality* reminds that there are special words which can lead human beings into confusing levels. Alfred Korzybski emphasizes, "*Multiordinal* terms have only definite meanings on a given level and in a given context. The avoidance of multiordinal terms is impossible."⁴¹³

If multi-ordinal words clearly indicated their level then they wouldn't be as dangerous as they are. Similarly, the same world could have different meanings in the different situations.

(8) **Projection**

Intensional meanings can persist because one tends to experience the world in terms of these meanings. When one suspects one's colleague's honesty, one might find all kinds of (false) evidence for this. One projects meaning on the object and what might be rather insignificant might be made conclusive proof because of one's projections on reality.
Indexes are used to identify the specific object. An object is indexed when it is specifically identified. Use of 'indexing' shows that no two things are identical. To assist in helping ourselves remember that things with the same name are different, Alfred Korzybski recommended that a simple form of indexing should be employed. Indian cricketer₁ is not Indian cricketer₂; Gujarati₁ is not Gujarati₂ and so on.

If one knows two or more people named Rahul and one hears that Rahul got promoted, then one need to find out which Rahul in particular the speaker is talking about. A rather academic way of doing this is to give each occurrence of the same word with a different referent a different number index. So it might be referred to Rahul₁ and Rahul₂ to identify which one the communicator is writing or talking about. Korzybski also borrowed the scientific practice of indexing to represent change over time. Alfred Korzybski explains, "If I refer to a lot of people as people or as human beings, I am stressing the similarities at the expenses of the differences. Instead of the sentence saying, 'All of us here are persons', I can say, 'I'm person₁, you're person₂, he’s person₃', and so on. That is indexing.......Indexing is a simple but helpful technique of reminding us of differences alongside of similarities."¹⁴
(10) Chain-indexes

Indexes differentiate two similar thing-events at two different times. The role of the chain indexes is to provide a technique for the introduction of environmental factors, conditions, situations, etc. It includes not only environmental factors but psychological and socio-cultural, too.

So the chair₁ is not the same as the chair₂ which is in the reading room with a cushion and it is not the same as the chair₃ which has been in a store room. The chairs have a continuous existence but they are not the same in different circumstances. Sometimes it happens one may have a very bad relationships with a particular person and later on they became good friends probably because person₁ as a person one did not like and person₂ now is not the same person and that is why the relationship between two persons was rebuild, although they both are very similar in some respects.

(11) Dating:

When any name or anything is mentioned in any form of conversation, one should develop the habit of affixing a date to it so that one could understand that people and things change over time. That is one should frequently use ‘time markers’ which are known as ‘dating’. Use of ‘dating’ shows that no one thing is ever twice the same, for example,
Sachin Tendulkar1995, Gujarat University1970 and so on. Alfred Korzybski explains, “In dating, we force upon our attention the differences between the same person at different times. I remind myself that I’m not what I used to be.”

The fact that a dog bites me 10 years ago does not mean that this dog is going to sting me now. This present dog is not the same dog as the one ten years ago, and the uneasiness of being bite10 years ago is not appropriate at this moment, it is in the past. If I were angry with you ten years ago, it doesn't mean that I am angry with you now. By confusing thing-events in time we experience major inappropriate present time meanings.

(12) *Et cetera*

The use of a mental *et cetera* when one experiences something or recalls something can remind one’s that there is more than one has taken in. The use of ‘et cetera’ reminds that whatever is experienced is never the whole of what could be experienced or of what actually exists. ‘*Et cetera*’ is used as a reminder that people cannot say or know all about anything.

Korzybski has strongly recommended, adding a mental "et cetera" on the end of each sentence to remind that there is always more to say. This advice is reflected in the title of the journal on General Semantics, ‘ETC:"
A Review of General Semantics', an Interdisciplinary quarterly published by the Institute of General Semantics. The believers of General Semantics caution against the use of inclusive terms like all, always, every, and entirely as these terms push language to the extreme by implying that everything is known. They even suggest beginning and ending each story with the word and. The use of ‘etc’ as a part of the evaluating processes leads to awareness of the indefinitely many factors in a process which can never be fully known or perceived. Alfred Korzybski explains, “When I talk about the different kinds of people, instead of saying ‘Americans, Englishmen, Frenchmen’, and trying to give a complete catalogue by nationalities, it would be well to say ‘Americans, Englishmen, Frenchmen, etc.’, reminding myself that I have not given a complete inventory.”

(13) Quotes

Quotes are used to indicate that elementalistic terms are used and that they should be treated with caution. Quotation marks are used as a reminder that a word is not being used in its usual sense.

Quotes as in ‘body’, ‘mind’, ‘emotion’, ‘intellect’, and etc. alert us that elementalistic or metaphysical terms are not to be trusted and that speculations based on them could be misleading or dangerous. Homer
Moore views, “Quotation marks are used to cover ‘facts’ in their context too.’ Facts’ themselves means nothing, but only in ‘context’ are they valuable. ‘Facts’ in ‘context’, ‘meaning’ a ‘situation’, etc. have value.”

(14) Hyphens

Hyphens remind the complexities of the interrelatedness in the world. They enable us to avoid elementalism by properly relating thing-events. Thing-events are composed of matter and energy, and these are closely related so one might refer to matter-energy to draw this point out. Hyphens, therefore, remind the complexities of the world, and remind to link together similar ideas. So the hyphens are used to unite elemental terms to produce non elemental terms. A few examples are given below:

- psycho-somatic
- neuro-physics
- bio-nutrition
- neuro-communication
- mind-body
- space-time
- matter-energy
- Non-elementalistic
(15) Similarity and Differences

Certain objects, whether they be people, thing-events, or processes are unique individuals and nothing is the same as anything else, yet some objects are similar to others, and other objects are different. Some are very similar, but never identical, and others are very different, but never totally different, because everything is related to everything else. That is, they are both non-elemental and non-identical. By learning to recognize that everything is unique and individual, and that everything is part of the same interrelating thing-event, but not the same as this thing-event, one can learn to be more rational.

The main aim of General Semantics is better human relationships at all levels of our human interactions—personal, interpersonal, societal and international. This can be highly and unceasingly attentive to the ways one speaks, listens, understands, interprets, gives meanings to, gives values to, ‘thinks’ about and evaluates words, symbols and features of human and physical environment. From a General Semantics perspective, successes and problems are functionally related to discriminate and indiscriminate use of words. General Semantics as a critical ‘thinking’ system provides the principles, formulations and practical devices that can be used to help individual becoming more attentive words user. General Semantics as a critical evaluating system provides the tools, one
can use not only to improve one’s critical ‘thinking skills’ but also oneself.

The primary application of *General Semantics* is in training individuals to view their environments using the *General Semantics* world view, to think in terms of levels of abstraction, to use the extensional devices, to become aware of making assumptions, to extensionally check them out, and to be prepared for them to be wrong. Michaël Cole, Professor of Communication points out, “*General Semantics* is a theory of language and meaning that shares a great deal of methodological and theoretical positions with the contemporary study of human communication. *General Semantics* posits a fundamental distinction between the sensory world of experience and the verbal world of symbols and language.”¹⁸

*General Semantics* is not just some part of “philosophy,” or "psychology," or "logic," in the ordinary sense. It is a new extensional discipline which explains and trains us how to use our nervous systems most efficiently. By applying the methods of *General Semantics*, disagreement may be reduced, some psychological disorders can be overcome, and reasoning will be improved.

The main aim of communication is to establish, promote and develop human relationships amongst the people with whom you are connected. Communication is a process of establishing relationships, bring about
understanding and convincing people through speaking, listening, behaving properly, adjusting and experimenting the words, symbols, etc, at all levels of our human interactions—personal, interpersonal, societal and international. From a communication point of view too, our successes and problems are functionally related to our discriminate and indiscriminate use of words.

The primary application of Communication is in training individuals as well as groups to view their environments using the Communication world view and by applying its techniques, disagreement will be reduced, some psychological disorders can be overcome, and reasoning will be improved. Communication is also not any "philosophy," or "psychology," or "logic," in the ordinary sense. It is a human engineering, a discipline which explains and trains us how to use our words most efficiently, effectively and purposefully.

Thus, primarily it is seen that there is some remarkable connection between Business Communication and General Semantics. The correlation between General Semantics and Business Communication needs to be assessed.
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