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EUPHEMISM AND POLITICAL LANGUAGE

Félix Rodríguez González
University of Alicante (Spain)

It is easy to notice the concomitance of some linguistic features, especially lexical ones, with factors of a social or political nature. If the linguistic system is taken as a reflection of social life, political changes leave an obvious mark on language since it is through them that the dynamics of social development accelerates. Now, we can also consider this relation conversely, that is, the influence of language upon man’s thought, on his perception of reality and his behaviour. This thesis, first advanced by the German Humboldt and further developed by the Americans Sapir and Whorf in the thirties, was developed later by the English writer George Orwell in his essays and novels. The theory of "linguistic relativity", another name by which this concept is known, has been criticised by the neopositivist critics because of its idealism (cf. Rossi-Landi 1974:35 ff.). In one of its formulations a total determinism of language upon thought is proposed. From there it follows that whoever controls the language people learn, will also control their thought, and thus wield power. This extreme manipulation of language for political purposes is well evident in the novel 1984. With a simplistic vision of language/reality and language/thought dialectics, Big Brother, through the hand of Syme, the philologist of the party in charge of the new edition of the Newspeak dictionary, deletes all words that have unfavourable connotations and may be critical of the regime. The 'signifier' having disappeared, the concept or 'signified' would also disappear:

It's a beautiful thing, the destruction of words (...). Don’t you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it... Every year fewer and fewer words, and the range of consciousness always a little smaller (...). The revolution will be complete when the language is perfect. Newspeak is Ingsoc and Ingsoc is Newspeak (Orwell 1984:48-49).

---

1This is a slightly modified version of the lecture I gave in January 1989 in the Sociolinguistics Seminar of the School of English and American Studies of the University of East Anglia, directed by Prof. Roger Fowler.
The result is the absence of an elaborated code that allows abstract thought and the nuances of meaning. As argued by Hodge and Fowler (1979:10), taking the well-known dichotomy of Bernstein, expression in 1984 is carried out only in "restricted code": the ‘proles’ by definition, and the members of the party because of the elimination from the dictionary of those words which constitute aspects of reality that may cause conflict. When reality becomes troublesome for the regime, if it is not abolished, it is at least masked, for which purpose there is a special vocabulary ("B Vocabulary") with words "intended to impose a desirable mental attitude upon the person using them", as is described in the Appendix "The Principles of Newspeak". No doubt this is extreme, although not strange in a work of fiction, but the manipulation of language with political aims is a recurrent fact in today's world, even in countries considered to be democratic, and basically makes use of the same mechanisms that Orwell stated in his works, above all in the already cited Appendix.

Among the mechanisms language has for ideological control, the one that stands out most clearly is euphemism, that is, the use of an ornamented expression which helps hide or deliberately obscure the reality that is concealed behind it. In a broader sense and from a functional perspective, Chilton (1987:17) describes euphemism as shallow sentence processing, a mental model of an unformed object or event which has the function of dissimulation. Within this perspective the linguistic devices of euphemism are threefold:

1. lexical: e.g. "neutralize" (kill)

2. grammatical (or syntactic):
   a) nominalizations: e.g. "nuclear release" (dissimulates agent or victim)
   b) passive construction: "a procedure may be developed" (dissimulates agent, and distances action)

3. presuppositions, hints, etc. e.g. "why NATO needs nuclear arms" (presupposes 'NATO needs nuclear arms')

Of these three types of euphemisms, the last two — which we could call syntactic and semantic (presuppositions)— have received considerable attention in recent times following the development achieved in the area of text linguistics.
(or discourse analysis). The first type — lexical — which I am going to concentrate on here, is the most typically euphemistic in that the 'euphemized' or dissimulated object and its effects are easier to notice by the addressee of the discourse and there exists a more conscious intention on the part of the addressee or speaker of the message. This explains why their registration has given rise to abundant literature and why interest in their study has gone beyond the fields of linguistics and sociology.

As mentioned above, it is precisely an English writer — George Orwell — who has been distinguished for his reflection on the phenomenon of euphemism and its effects on thought, thus contributing to its divulgation. In his famous essay "Politics and the English Language", Orwell points to the typical use of insincere euphemisms in political language such as pacification, transfer of population, rectification of frontiers, elimination of unreliable elements. And in his novel 1984 the ministries of Peace, Love, Plenty, and Truth were misleading names for the contrary purposes that hid behind them.

Surely, this English writer did not need much imagination to use such euphemisms in his works, as memories of expressions like emigration, evacuation, final solution, relocation, resettlement and special treatment which had been used as code words by Nazis for their programme of methodical mass murder of European Jews, Gypsies, and other groups deemed undesirable, and others like assembly centres, protective custody camps, reception centres, relocation centres and transit camps to refer to camps of extermination (cf. Okamura 1982:95) were still fresh.

The Nazi period was unique in the history of human cruelty and in the use of euphemisms, but it was not an isolated fact. In recent days, in the name of an ideology we have heard of political prisoners missing (desaparecidos) in Chile and Argentina, campesinos supressed (suprimidos) in Peru, and Sandinista commandantes neutralized in Nicaragua.

In connection with the concept of death, one lexical field especially prone to the use of euphemisms is military language. In war reports one speaks of conflict instead of war, of air support instead of bombing, of incursions which are really invasions, of reconnaissance incursions (or missions) which cause death among people, of concentration camps, of voluntary or irregular forces for mercenaries, of military advisers who are really soldiers, of paramilitary forces for terrorists at the service of or with the compliance of the government, of detainees for people detained without trial, disturbances for riots (Hoggart 1986:181). For American briefers in the Vietnam war, planes did not drop bombs, they delivered ordnance, and they called napalm soft ordnance (cit. by

---

Bosmajian 1974:130). An accidental missile explosion that killed numerous servicemen was once termed an unplanned rapid ignition of solid fuel (cit. by Bruce 1987), and military planners have named the planned incineration of people demographic targeting (cit. by Totten 1984:45). During the recent Gulf War the Americans launched a surgical strike against Iraq, and the much vaunted new world order they have advanced is conceived as a "pax americana" (cf. also Keils (1973), Bosmajian (1973), Chilton (1985) and Rodríguez González (1989:155 ff.; 1991) on this point).

An extreme case of euphemism is the one which entails a total inversion of the meaning of words. This disintegration of language through systematic lying and conscious self-deception, a phenomenon which Orwell called "doublethink", is well epitomized in his fiction. In the totalitarian state depicted in 1984 the Ministry of Peace or Minipax was in charge of war, and joycamp was the name given to a concentration camp. But not even in this extreme case was the English author original if we consider the prison city of Terezin, which served the Nazis as a way station to the gas chambers at Auschwitz and was described in official literature as a health resort, model ghetto, celestial ghetto and retirement home (cit. by Okamura 1982:95).

This deliberate semantic inversion, or "antiphrasis", is not new, nor exclusive of the political field. In fact, names of this kind are well known in criminal or underground argots—or "antilanguages", to use the Halliday term—for example, to call a prison a hotel, but whereas in such groups they have a clearly humoristic or countercultural purpose (cf. Rodríguez González 1989:146), in the language of politics their creation responds to propaganda and hides serious and underlying mystifying aims.

A series of examples of such antonymic equivalences has to do with the concept of 'peace' and 'war'. Well-known are the pacification operations carried out by the Francoist dictatorship against the Basques in Spain, or by Iraq against the kurds. The same 'peaceful' objectives led the United States to remain in Vietnam, out of a wish to find peace with honor, as President Nixon liked to say, where the soldiers applied salvation techniques which included bombing, destruction and death (cf. Beauchamp 1974:469). More recently, and with similar aims in mind, the United States built Peacekeepers, which was the name President Reagan gave to the offensive and deadly MX missiles. In the same line of 'pacification' Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher proclaimed in 1983 "we are the true peace movement", a proposition not very consistent in a leader whose main objective during that year was the installation of American missiles in Britain (cf. Fowler and Marshall 1985:13).

Doublethink does not only entail the ambivalence of one lexeme, as the previous examples show; occasionally, the contradiction is clearly expressed at the syntagmatic level when two concepts intrinsically at variance with each other are juxtaposed. Thus, in Argentina under the last military rule there has been violencia 'legal' and fusilamientos 'limpios' y legales ('legal' violence and
'clean' and legal shootings), and in the United States terms such as clean bombs and surgical strikes have been used; but no state can claim legality and cleanliness while committing murder, no bomb can be clean and no attack can be surgical for he who suffers it. The pervasiveness of meaning reaches an extreme when one hears about reports of violent combat carried out in a non-military zone or about persons wounded in the course of a non-violent demonstration. Both phrases were cited by the American press during the Vietnam war and led one reader to wonder if, with such a type of stripping of meaning, the nation was not on the way to losing its sanity (cf. Marcuse 1969:77, fn. 6).

One could also consider some dissimulated ways of manipulation in which there is an attempt to make equivalents out of antithetic concepts or propositions. An example is the verb help, which is a characteristic word of Reaganspeak and in general of advertising where it is considered a 'weasel word', that is, a term used "to evade or retreat from a direct or forthright statement or position". It is a qualifier with great manipulative power since one can add to it virtually anything and one tends to forget the monosyllable and hear only what comes after it. Thus, in saying "the Star war would help demilitarize the arsenals of the earth" or that "our programs of security assistance help friendly governments to defend themselves", one focuses his attention on the concepts 'demilitarize' and 'defend', which are more attractive ideas than the means used to achieve such goals: the militarization of space and of European territory (cf. Bosmajian 1985:105). Another aspect related to the disguise of reality in political discourse is the deliberate and excessive use of specialized technical jargon, complex syntax and a high-flown style. It is what in 1984 Orwell called "duckspeak" and is familiarly known as "gobbledygook" and "bafflegab", a verbiage to which many politicians often resort in order to confuse or mislead their listeners, or when they do not really know what to say.

The effects on language are devastating if one considers that journalists, especially political journalists, are infected with that jargon, and we all know the important role fulfilled today by the mass media, not only as transmitters of news but also as generators and spreaders of neologisms and new speech patterns.

If someone says "Scenarios are programmed toward terminal objectives in an effort to maxime output in a zero-defect system", or "The public sector has been overdimensioned and has to be reset" instead of "the public sector is too big and has to diminish"3, it is the result not only of an attempt at hiding things but also of the general tendency to be pedantic, for fear that if one expresses himself plainly, his status as an intellectual will not be recognized. By expressing in such a complex way and with a highly abstract vocabulary, many

---

3 Cit. by Tamarón, "El habla nacional, ABC, 28-12-1985, Sábado Cultural/XII (translation mine).
politicians hope to be taken for real experts in the subject in question, knowing full well that, if they are not understood, it will be attributed to the sophistication of their thoughts and not to their ignorance (cf. Gambino 1974:25; Nieto 1987). And what is worse: the example spreads when this way of speaking becomes a distinctive feature of a prestigious professional group with which many like to be associated.

In American English this bureaucratic and political jargon is known by the pejorative names of *bureaucratese*, *officialese*, and *State-departmentese*. Because of its intentionality and social effects, Bolinger (1968:266) has called it "authoritative language" which corresponds with what others have called "functional language". According to Martínez Albertos (1987), one may distinguish a "totalitarian language" (in fascist and communist regimes), provided with a very special rhetoric in which the appellative component stands out, from a so called "functional language", essentially periphrastic, euphemistic and hermetic. This type of language is characteristic of the technocratic societies of today where ideological pluralism prevails.

The use of incomprehensible jargon has very remote origins; the old Egyptian clergy and the Chinese mandarins were already distinguished for it4. But the divorce between the language of the ruling class and that of the community received an unprecedented thrust after the Second World War, becoming more noticeable in the last decades, and this in turn has contributed to a great development of marginal argots, especially among the young.

In the Anglo-Saxon world the split was evident immediately after two well-known events: Vietnam and Watergate. In the sixties Americans faced a bureaucratic jargon (words like *attrition*, *defoliation*, *body counts*, *progressive squeeze-and-talk*, and the already mentioned *pacification*) which was systematically used as a wall to protect them from the horrible reality of Indochina. During the Nixon administration, after the famous Watergate scandal, the degeneration of political language reached its highest level. From the officials of the White House came expressions such as *stroking sessions*, *running out of the bottom line*, *touching it out*, *the hang-out road*, *how do you handle that PR-wise*, etc. which constituted a linguistic massacre, a verbicide (cf. Schlesinger 1974:558). This jargon so peculiar and prototypical for its marked baroque style and evasive effects is known in the literature as "Nixonese".

It is interesting to note that, while "Newspeak" reduced its vocabulary day by day in order to reduce the possibilities of thought, "Nixonese" impoverished language by augmenting its lexical and syntactic structure. The officials of the White House seemed to be committed to the proliferation of phrases that would camouflage their real intent. We could say that "Nixonese" seemed to be designed to diminish the range of thought by rapidly increasing the number of words used. Slater (1975:463) illustrates this argument well by comparing the

effects of such language to a child who is taken into a shop which has only one type of sweet available and then into another where there are so many on display that indecision torments him. In both cases the result is the same: the passivity and the shrinking of thought. It is the same effect that, at another level, is produced by the current news explosion which, in providing copious information mixed with irrelevant things, far from informing, hides real informative data (cf. Aranguren 1975:10).

As shown by the examples cited in this article, the semantics of lying is not only an instrument at the service of totalitarian countries, but is also a common practice in all developed countries, even in the most advanced ones where it is not rare to question governments about their inclination to obscure and deliberately distort information. In fact, many of the euphemisms quoted in the literature are good examples of the psychological resources which the art of persuasion has in capitalist countries, where a "propaganda of integration" is developed in order to induce the audience to adjust to the status quo (cf. Kelly 1976:66).

If the aim of propaganda is to attain social control through language, and ultimately control the mind, it should be the role of education to try to liberate and it is the responsibility of writers, educators, teachers and sociologists of language to make the keys of the language of politicians known.

In the United States, with Vietnam and Watergate on its heels, the sensitivity to the subject of political propaganda has been remarkable in the last decades. Outstanding in this respect has been the task carried out by the renowned linguist Noam Chomsky who, devoted since the sixties to delving deeply into political thought, has been documenting the slant frequently used by the American press when covering international events. Within the press itself one should also mention the weekly section of The Nation, run by the prestigious Alexander Cockburn, and the magazine Extra, both dedicated to showing cases of manipulation and systematic lying. Getting down to the particular field of euphemism, the central point of this paper, the interest has not been lacking, as is shown by the essays commented upon here. The best proof, perhaps, is the publication of some dictionaries of euphemisms, among them Rawson (1981) and Newman and Silver (1983), which contain many entries related to the political field, as well as many glossaries and compilations of 'double language'. Furthermore, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) has created the Committee on Public Doublespeak made up of 33 teachers of English, Rhetoric and Semantics, whose aim is to criticise the distortion of language in the mass media especially by those who hold influential posts in public life. Among its activities there is the annual granting of an ironic prize (the Doublespeak Award) to those who have been

---

distinguished in the abuse of language. The first one was granted in 1974 and the same year the Committee began to publish a leaflet, which later became a periodical, the *Quarterly Review of Doublespeak* (Lutz 1987:21). They also publish books and other materials among which stands out an extensive study, *Language and the Public Policy*, edited by Hugh Rank.

Although systematic and institutionalized actions such as these are not known in Britain, there is no lack of individual action like the one taken recently by the liberal newspaper *The Guardian* which dedicates one section of its weekly supplement to monitor the jargon and euphemisms used in the press.

This euphemism hunt has aroused strong criticism from some observers, among whom we can mention the American linguist L. Grant (1977). In his view, the imposition of reality on others, the insistence on calling a spade a spade, is politics, and the majority of euphemism-hunters are politically motivated, although they persist in disguising their intentions with the argument of keeping watch over the purity of language.

More interesting is the criticism which he levels from a purely linguistic angle against the abuse of the concept of euphemism itself. He argues that there is abuse as long as one accepts the premiss that the word which the euphemism substitutes for is the "reality word", and that is not always the case. In language, and even more so in the field of politics, there are almost no neutral words, their connotations being favourable ("euphemisms") or unfavourable ("malfemisms"), and lexical choices are tinged with ideology, depending on the point of view of the speaker. Furthermore, words, he argues, do not have a fixed, stable meaning; meaning varies according to context as modern studies on semantics have shown.

In my opinion Grant’s criticism has some merit but he goes too far, more because of what he does not say than because of what he says. A more moderate and well founded position is the one held by Bolinger (1968; 1980) who accepts the same linguistic premisses when stating that euphemism is a sin which we all commit at times. Bolinger believes we unwittingly let our own words filter their particular connotative meaning, but at the same time he underlines their mystifying role, although he admits that euphemism and mystification may be confused, for the line that divides them is not always easy to distinguish. And there, I think, lies precisely the corrupting power of euphemism, which finds shelter in the natural disposition of human beings to ornament their speech. Getting deeper into the psychology of euphemism, one could also take account of some cognitive and pragmatic aspects. In his study of euphemisms in the military field, especially of those referring to nuclear missiles, Chilton (1987:13 ff.) quotes the work of Osgood as the pioneer of the "cognitive dissonance" theory which maintains that people try to resolve or

---

suppress contradictions in their perceptions and beliefs, and among the psychological solutions used is the suppression or evasion of unwanted knowledge by means of the mental tactic of denial. When cognitive dissonance takes place, then euphemism enters into operation as a recourse to dissimulate it.

On the other hand, and in relation to the interpersonal aspects of euphemism, he points to our tendency to look on the brighter side of things, to prefer pleasant subjects to unpleasant ones. Euphemism would form part of the verbal avoidance strategies aimed at preserving the "negative face" (Goffman), that is, respecting the wish of the hearer or addressee not to be disturbed. And it is clear that the risk of nuclear war is a disturbing and thorny issue in so far as it menaces the cognitive coherence of man and society.

One can accept this account but one cannot but compare this explanation, as Chilton (1987:8, 15) does, with Habermas’s discursive criticism, in particular when he refers to the validity of discourse with respect to "intelligibility", which no doubt suffers, and the "sincerity" of the intention of the speaker, which does not always exist. One could also argue from a strictly linguistic level, that the linguistic sign is arbitrary as we learned from Saussure, but, on the other hand, one cannot but feel indignation at the frequent use of elaborate periphrases with generic references instead of with their corresponding unequivocal and conventional monolexematic referents. It is obvious that when the invasion of Panama by the United States is described not as a military attack but as an emergency deployment and readiness exercise which does not cause hundreds of civilian deaths but simply collateral damage, we are evading concreteness and thus truth. In this context one will understand and take as valid the words of Confucius: "If names are not correct, language will not be in accordance with the truth of things".

The intentional edulcoration of language with not always licit aims is particularly noticeable in the political sphere where one starts from a rhetorical philosophy by which all symbolic human actions are understood as more or less conscious attempts of some speakers to persuade others (the audience) to adopt certain attitudes (cf. Burke 1982:45), attitudes which are often at variance with ethics. From the side of power everything seems to be designed to glorify or justify any political action, and hence the constant recourse to euphemism, to the most favourable connotation. From the opposition, Spanish socialists, to cite an example near to us, continuously reaffirmed their socialist principles as part of their electoral strategy; in government, if they continue to drift to the right, it will always be due to 'realism' and never due to a withdrawal from their principles.

In the opposition, all problems that the executive power had to face were big; once in government, when problems arose, they were little 'dysfunctions' or difficulties in socialism's path. From the opposition, in the face of grave social conflicts or disorders one saw the 'police' —with that name— as a
harmful power in charge of keeping ‘law and order’; from the government, they are seen as ‘security forces’ of the state which intervene ‘to maintain the democratic law’, although sometimes they have committed the same abuses as in the previous fascist regime.

As can be noticed, there is a change of discourse along with the change in political stance, but there is a change in strategy and in perlocutionary motives. There is no space for an unfavourable concept when politicians speak about themselves, they may present the side of things which corresponds with literal truth but, beware, for this can also be manipulated. One can say, as on a certain occasion the head of the CIA, William Colby, did, that there were no journalists from the staff of a certain newspaper on the CIA’s payroll and be telling the truth, but this without admitting that there were four who, without being put officially on the payroll, had been asked to collaborate in a secret operation (cf. Bolinger 1980:109).

Likewise we are accustomed to hearing true statistical data but this information is manipulated through the selection that is made of them. Occasionally the mere comparison of some data is uncomfortable and macabre, as when in the course of the Vietnam war the number of casualties was compared with those produced by traffic accidents (when this was higher), thus implying that being killed in war, or the war itself, was not that bad after all, or that it was a normal event of ordinary life (cf. Leinfellner-Rupertsberger 1986:8).

Faced with this omnipresence of the manipulation of language one cannot but recall the words of the journalist I. F. Stone: "Every government is run by liars and nothing they say should be believed" (cit. by Stine 1983:25). Exaggerated words, no doubt, but indicative of the insincerity which pervades much political rhetoric.

In view of this state of affairs which Grant’s article overlooks — and could not his omission be considered politically induced as well? — and faced with the ambiguous function of euphemisms, one could ask if it makes sense to carry out a lexicographic registration of them in the hope of developing some type of verbal therapeutics. The answer needs some explanation. On the one hand, one cannot be so ingenuous as to believe that in order to change society all one needs to do is change the language; in the same way the changes proposed by Anglo-Saxon radical feminism (e.g., chairperson for chairman, Ms for Mrs/Miss) will not turn out to be very effective if they are not accompanied by a growing awareness of sex discrimination. But this does not mean that tracing language discrimination and proposing more valid alternatives will be unrewarded efforts, for they at least serve as a reminder to potential discriminators which produces some kind of restraint.

---

Likewise, the monitoring and the research into euphemism and other mechanisms of political mendacity by itself will not lead to their eradication but at least it can help as a safeguard so that our minds are not drugged or desensitized, and this is certainly within our reach. Not long ago Chomsky gave us some examples of the "ideological pressures which destroy the mind in the United States". Jefferson was very conscious of the power of this mental anaesthesia when he said that we had to prevent tyranny by illuminating our minds (cit. by Kelly 1976:142).

Thinking about this illuminating effect, we may consider as beneficial, apart from the documentation and critical work of the press that we have commented upon, and the lexicographic attestation of euphemisms, the frequent recourse to the ironical apostrophe and to glossing which are used to underline these euphemisms and explain them, as is done by most of the liberal and independent press (The Guardian, Le Monde and El País are three known examples). One cannot forget that the corruption of politics is linked to the corruption of language itself. As Etiemble said, "Qui pervertit la langue, pourrit la politique.

Finally one should stress, as a corollary, that if the corruption of language has such effects, if it moulds our minds in some ways, one must admit that the Whorf's hypothesis which we commented on earlier makes some sense. It is also proof of the circularity of the relationship that exists between language and society or language and thought, which Orwell from the beginning turned into one of the leit-motivs of his work: "language corrupts thought and thought corrupts language" (Orwell 1969:226).
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