

The “Ize” Have It...

To contextualize: We (a discussion group meeting on Thursdays) were discussing the phrase "racializing the question" (part of a comment heard on a T.V. program). At the end of the discussion, after playfully coming up with some other words ending with "ize", someone said to me “That’s what you usually do--“generalsemanticize” (I usually tantalize the group with general semantics principles). The next day I received a list of over a thousand words ending with "ize". (I compliment the time-binder who felt energized and was ‘motivated’ to actualize the list at <https://www.bestwordlist.com/>). Then I discovered a special reference to “ize” or “izing” in my “Webster’s Collegiate, Tenth Edition”: “Almost any noun or adjective can be made into a verb by adding “ize” (hospitalize, familiarize)”. I was incentivized to publicize ways to ‘generalsemanticize’ (apply general semantics principles...especially ‘the calculus’) to help us understand and deal with many of our life problems and other situations. I decided to utilize some of the “ize” words from the list and ‘neologize’ others to editorialize, and emphasize aspects of my thinking about and applying general semantics principles. Selecting from the list of “ize”, the nearest I came to ‘precisify’ and ‘racialize’ aspects of my present evaluation of "general semantics" and our problems as a race, are the verbs "disillusionize" and “transcendentalize”...to go beyond, rise above. One way we ‘disillusionize’, and ‘transcendentalize’ involves times when we dis-identify (distinguish, discriminate, differentiate, recognize, and prize the fact that “symbols, signs, words, names, labels, definitions, beliefs, imaginings, opinions, theories, advertisements, speeches, promises, news, etc. (no matter the source), are not the same as (not identical with) what they symbolize...offered to be about, or are used to stand for.) **“The general semantic principles “non-identity”, and “non-allness” have been popularized and crystallized as memes “The word is not the thing” and “The map is not the territory”.** From words and other symbols we naturally create our individual meanings, values, and so on. And when we proleptically treat (identify, project) our inner semantic world as already parts of the world outside our imaginings, this contributes a great deal to our delusions, myths, and relationship problems at personal, social, national, international, and ecological levels. To grammaticalize: With “izeing”--we shift from nominalizing to verbalizing (subject acting on object), we become more mindful and more responsible: a way to “non-elementalize”...not conceptually separate what is actually not separate: For instance...ourselves from the consequences of our actions, the meanings and values we give, etc. “Izeing” is a way to practice being “conscious of abstracting” (more on this later).

To Philosophize, Soliloquize, and ‘Generalsemanticize’.

We can ‘jocularize’ and play the game of ‘izeing’ (even if words we lexicalize are not found in a dictionary). When we “ize” our names for instance, we self-consciously acknowledge ourselves as continuing developing functions: (I am ‘miltonizing. To romanticize: Imagine a world where babies were given “izeing” names!) We can ‘playfulize’, not ‘awfulize’, authorize, and ‘disciplinize’ our ‘minds’ to destabilize, problematize, agonize, and demoralize us with questions such as “What’s the meaning of existence? What’s the

meaning of life? Who am I? What does anything mean anyway? “What is justice? “Can we know the truth? (Notwithstanding, we could of course educe valuable insights in pursuing these questions as ways to mind-exercise.) With ‘izeing’ there are times (within limits) when we can euphemize experiences we found objectionable or disagreeable: But do individuals and societies benefit when some euphemize, socialize, normalize, and popularize “lies”, or words intended to deceive, with the words “fake news”? And does a society advance when a medium label, characterize, and publicize “gossip” (individuals talking with others about others) as “news”? Gossip advertized as news could be considered “fraudulent”, or an example of what Sartre in his “Being and Nothingness” referred to as “bad faith”. We ‘disillusionize-generalsemanticize’ when we utilize general semantics principles to intervene, and modify our thinking-feeling-reasoning, believing, communicating, planning, deciding, interacting, and other behaviours. We ‘disillusionize’ when we apply the methods and approach of science and mathematics (especially ‘the calculus’) as general problem solving tools, critical-thinking, and ‘dis-identifying’ standards; and when we closely examine our thinking to avoid, and not delude, deceive, and victimize ourselves with irrational, and impossible to realize ideas. We ‘disillusionize’ when we attitudinize ourselves to utilize ‘the calculus’ to expand our understanding, avoid and minimize conflicts, and actualize satisfying relationships. We ‘generalsemanticize-disillusionize-‘transcendentalize’ when we distinguish, discriminate, recognize differences...but also remember the fact of interdependence-and interactivity as ways to help us ‘metaphorize, ‘similarize’, and analogize. To ‘grammaticalize’ in terms of “subject, verb, object”: Practicing “Izeing” helps us become “conscious of ourselves as subjects abstracting” (selecting-and leaving out). “Izeing” helps us to effectively minimize our **tendency to “elementalize” (conceptually, imaginatively separate what actually is not separate). “Izeing” helps us think in terms of relationships.** For instance: Instead of automatically faulting another, we subjectivize, ‘non-elementalize’, apply ‘the calculus’, look for and take responsibility for ways we could have contributed to a problem or situation we find dissatisfying. We ‘non-elementalize’ when in experiencing a talk slow, boring and uninteresting, or an essay, annoyingly repetitious...we (as individuals) remember and contextualize “It might just be the case that “I am listening or reading too fast””.

General Semantics, a Meta-system

The system “general semantics” constitutes a set of interrelated principles as psychological and self-development tools we can use to improve our inner conversations with and about ourselves, and our communication with the world outside. We can use these tools as semantic antidotes to help us avoid, and more satisfactorily deal with, many of our self-created problems—problems resulting from the ways we think, ‘talk’ about, imagine, believe, understand, value, give meanings, etc...ways that damage our relationships with our ‘selves’, other ‘selves’, and the world around us. Utilizing general semantics tools helps us broaden our understanding, and expand our horizons. To personalize, idealize, and deliberately ‘grandiloquize’: As general semantics deals with language and its influence on human behaviour-interacting-and interrelating; as it offers a theory of evaluation; a theory of psychotherapy, a theory of ethics, a theory of sanity, a theory of meaning, a theory of

human progress based on a proposition that science and mathematics are examples of the human 'mind' working at its best, and its emphasis on structure as the only content of knowledge: **I characterize "general semantics" as a meta-anthropology, a meta-psychology, a meta-ethics, a meta-epistemology, and a meta-communication system with general problem-solving tools, among many other features.**

To 'epistemologize' and hypothesize: General Semantic principles, including the method of 'the calculus', "consciousness of abstracting", "non-allness", "non-identity", non-elementalism, conscious time-binding, and others, formalize, systematize, unitize, and set "irrefutable semantic limits" to our knowing and understanding. Let's syllogize, structuralize, and rationalize based on the following reasoning to arrive at a calculus of "limits". If what we see, hear, experience, know, understand, is "not all"...but what we abstract (select, fractionalize) from what we could see, hear, and experience-- if we took more steps, looked more closely, listened more intently, thought more inclusively, and imagined more extensively. If what we understand and know about involves abstracting from our "abstracting" (sensing, experiencing, imagining, believing, reasoning, valuing, 'talking' about, etc.)--what we 'know' and understand in not covering all--will be limited. We definitize "abstracting" as "selecting-and leaving out". Whatever we do or not do, we abstract. **If we cannot not abstract...attempts to refute abstracting will involve abstracting, and limit our knowing and understanding.** Alfred Korzybski who created the system "general semantics", formalized the above in principles he labelled "**consciousness of abstracting**", "non-identity", "non-allness", and "non-elementalism".

Abstracting And Consciousness Of Abstracting

The philosopher Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J. wrote "We speak of abstraction, and commonly we mean a direction of attention to some aspects of the given with a concomitant neglect of other aspects." (Insight A Study of Human Understanding, page 355) In Science And Sanity, page 376, Korzybski wrote: "**We see what we see because we miss all the finer details.**" Our living, as a continuous function, involves continuous abstracting: We (as organisms and individuals) select-neglect-leave out when we sense, breathe, eat, imagine, think, 'say', do, believe, 'opinionize', assume, presume, expect, mythicize, mythologize, psychologize, spiritualize, philosophize and scientize. Our religions, psychologies, economic theories, politics, scientific explorations, artistic creations and activities, etc., qualify as abstractions...consequences of our abstracting. Abstracting happens automatically, **but "we can train ourselves to be conscious that we abstract"**. To what end? To consciously change, modify, stop, or improve what and how we are doing...we first have to be aware "that we are abstracting-doing". To metaphorize: **We can "think of consciousness of abstracting" as mind-reading, "mind' mapping 'mind'-abstracting". As an example of "indexing"...mind reminding itself of its limits; as "a semantic wedge of consciousness" mind opening a psychological door for promoting further mapping--a stalling-interrupting-intervening instance of conscious activity enabling-'operationalizing' us to modify our 'mapping-abstracting' to 'declutterize' our thinking and reasoning.** We 'declutterize', contextualize, and re-organize mind-operations when we recognize that "Whatever is going on" is not identical with, not the same as our thinking-feeling, believing, talking, writing, describing, assuming, romanticizing, speculating, philosophizing, theorizing, etc., about it.

As an aside: To ‘grammaticalize’: We can think of “consciousness of abstracting” as describing a mode of conscious; as a self-reflexive verb--we are conscious of being conscious; as an adverb--modifying an activity...we are aware how we are being conscious...selecting-and leaving out; as a noun, it names a principle and an activity; as an adjective--it qualifies the activity of abstracting. The principle “consciousness of abstracting” can also be taken as an admonition, an advice, an imperative--Korzybski’s cautioning the race (humans) across times: **For better relationships--to contribute to the survival of the species—“Wise up”: Be conscious of abstracting as a start to sanitize your thinking, believing...and especially relationships with your ‘selves’.** (It’s possible that no matter what we do...Cosmic forces could excise us.) To ‘anthropologize’: When we utilize “consciousness of abstracting”, and historicize, we become more conscious of the kinds of human we have been and are being: and might come to realize that if we don’t ‘refine’ and sanitize our ways of thinking, interrelating--verbalizing, inferentializing’, and institutionalizing our ‘primitive’ attitudes, etc....We might just wipe ourselves out first.

General Semantics and ‘The Calculus’

Korzybski characterized **general semantics principles as “generalized science and mathematics”** (S. & S., page 752) Scientists succeed in their search to understand the physical world through mathematizing and structuralizing their imaginaries, theories and explorations of physical structures-operations and interrelationships. Korzybski theorized that by studying and applying the methods and approach of science and mathematics as superb critical thinking-evaluating standards, self-therapeutic, self-development, and self-improving tools, we could succeed in avoiding and resolving many of our personal, social, and international problems. In “Science And Sanity”, page 728, he wrote **“Science and mathematics show the working of the ‘human mind’ at its best. Accordingly, we can learn from science and mathematics how this ‘human mind’ should work, to be at its best.”** ‘The calculus’ holds a special place in Korzybski’s general semantics. In his second book “Science And Sanity” Korzybski apotheosized: **“It (‘the calculus’) is structurally and semantically the logic of sanity”** (page 574). On page 582, he wrote “...it must be emphasized that **the main importance of the calculus is in its central idea; namely, the study of a continuous function by following its history by indefinitely small steps....**” And on page xcvi: **“The experimental development of science and civilization invariably involves more and more refined discriminations.”** Following Korzybski’s characterizing: We can idealize the calculus and mathematics in general, as “general problem-resolving tools” and “critical thinking-evaluation standards.” (Readers are invited to create a word for applying a calculus approach.) To relativize the power of ‘the calculus’: Anything that exists can be thought of as a “continuous function” (changing interrelationships which we can study to varying degrees of minuteness). To understand big, highly complex problems or situations, we can follow Descartes: customize our application of ‘the calculus’...break the problem-situation down to smaller, more manageable bits—take small exploratory heuristic steps, and within limits, explore diverse goings on and interactivities, to achieve broader, more inclusive, higher levels of knowledge and understanding. For instance: To maintain a personal or professional relationship we apprise, we can apply ‘the calculus’ and closely study this relationship as a continuous function (ongoing interactions) which, in

anticipating change resulting from entropic interventions, it suits us to keep learning ways to improvise, and compromise, so we can better empathize and harmonize to achieve a more satisfying relationship. When we utilize ‘the calculus’ as a general problem-solving tool, it suits us to apprise that **“The quality (accuracy) of our information, understanding, and knowledge of anything, is a function of (depends on, is related to (not caused by)) the quality of our abstracting--steps we take-and steps we leave out, factors we recognize and others we ignore.** We can consider applying ‘the calculus’, and “being conscious of abstracting”, as complementary methods and approach to our understanding and knowledge of the continuous function--ongoing changing relationships that constitute our living. Being conscious of abstracting involves abstracting and as such, is the smallest step we can take in our evaluating-abstracting. This sets **a non-allness limit** to our abstracting, knowing, and understanding.

On Critical Thinking

“Critical thinking” in this article refers to “a thinker whose thinking, evaluating, believing, philosophizing, scientizing, theorizing, rationalizing, judging, deciding, criticizing, etc., are guided by self-consciously recognized premises, principles, assumptions, standards, biases, beliefs, ‘meanings’, values, and so on: A critical thinker (from this perspective) ought to know the premises, values, standards, etc. which guide their criticisms, and support their belief that her/his thinking supersedes the values, premises, and ideas behind the thinking or whatever is being criticized. These characterizations spring from prizing general semantics principles (including “consciousness of abstracting” and ‘the calculus’, and a theoretical-propositional-heuristic approach) as facilitating and guiding conscious time-binding self-corrections and self-improvements, serve as critical-thinking standards.

Mathematizing, Scientizing, Measuring

Based on records of success, we can ‘celebratize’ the methods and approach of science and mathematics (involving ordering, structuralizing, measuring, etc.) as general problem-solving tools and critical-thinking standards”. “If our living involves ongoing “relating-abstracting”, we could ‘paradigmize’, generalize, learn from, and utilize the methods and approach of science and mathematics, to understand our diverse, everyday, societal and international problems as structural, relationship, and measuring problems. **‘Measuring’ (scientific or everyday) inherently involves “comparing-judging based on a standard”** (declared or not). In exploring relationships, scientists mathematize their measuring...and with the specificity of numbers, actualize agreement on standards. It’s unlikely that scientists would succeed using everyday language as standards: “more, less, sooner, later, near, far, cold, hot, heavy, light, fast, slow, big, small, good, bad,” would not do. In our everyday evaluations, a lack of specificity usually leads to disagreements and unending argumentation. To generalize: Without numbers, we are not usually aware how much our living (biological-psychological-physical-spiritual) involves constant measuring-comparing-judging. A great deal of biological measuring-‘judging’ goes on when we breathe, eat, sleep, sing, play, move, move things, drive, find fault, are dissatisfied, complain, experience disappointment, etc. We are measuring-judging, when we misprize, misstep, mistake, misinterpret, misunderstand, fail at a task, find behaviours unethical, immoral, experience surprize when something we tried to lift feels heavier than we thought, etc. We are

'measuring' with our "shoulds, oughts, must be so, can only mean", and when we estimate and size things up, judge (this is the best, right, wrong, only, thing to do, etc.). We are measuring-judging when we believe, give values, criticize, disagree, decide, and expect.

Constitutions, laws, regulations, rules, and policies, serve as societal standards against which, judges and other arbiters compare-measure-judge behaviours. Disagreements, conflicts, rebellions, etc. arise when parties, unaware of their own standards, and the fact that they naturally measure-and judge, disdain, disvalue, and dismiss the standards, beliefs, and values, (measurements-abstractions) of others. When we scientize and mathematize ('generalsemanticize'), we are not engaged in experimenting and solving numerical problems and equations: we are taking a heuristic experimental-learning approach to our living. With this approach, we expertize--we do not fail: we get useful information enabling us to consciously time-bind--"review and refine our standards, measuring-and judging." And times when we are dissatisfied or disappointed, we could 'jocularize' and think of our experience as the outcome from an experiment. We mathematicize when we 'functionalize', and relativize (apprize, think and behave in terms of interrelationships). To mathematicize-psychologize: "Our orientation is a function of (related to) our foundations." (Orientation involves beliefs, values, attitudes, interest, biases, prejudices, behavioural tendencies, etc.) Think of foundation in terms of how we are influenced by our early "neuro-linguistic" and "neuro-semantic" environments...time-space, geography, parents, culture, social, religion, politics, beliefs, education, training, language, etc.-- "where we are coming from" as it were. Although our orientations can produce new foundations, new foundations do not devitalize the old. Young developing 'minds' experience and are influenced by the neuro-linguistic and neuro-semantic environments they inhabit and which inhabit them. **The future of 'democracies', is a function of the way young developing minds (children and students) are influenced by the political foundation 'parents', politicians, political parties, party members, media, and others, normalize.** The ways of our present human world, are functions of earlier "abstractions-time-binding institutionalized foundations" (myths, language, words, ideas, insights, 'meanings', values, beliefs, etc.). Later generations, unaware of "natural or conscious time-binding potentials" are oriented to institutionalize, promote, normalize, socialize, and protect these earlier abstracting products. (Re. time-binding: **We time-bind naturally: Using language and other symbols, and without any training, we start from, and build on (a way to improve), what ourselves and others 'produced'**). To ironize and 'paradoxicalize': "Natural time-binding" sometimes leads to improvements that result in anti-time-binding consequences: Nation-tribes build better bombs, missiles, poisonous chemicals, computerize and arm drones, etc., capable of killing more time-binders much faster than earlier times and time-binders. **We "consciously time-bind" when we recognize our natural time-binding abilities, and work to transcend its sometimes harmful consequences.** With "conscious time-binding" we ethicize, think-act, and endeavour to minimize our natural anti-time-binding behaviours; we 'potentialize' ourselves to contribute to a better human world. We mathematicize when we prize logical consistency aided by clear, critical, rigorous thinking, and recognize the importance of "specificity" and "order" (order in terms of what comes before or after). To personalize, structuralize,

visualize, politicize, and radicalize: Remove fingers before closing doors. First be apprized of people's problems before setting out to represent them. Before 'exiting' an agreement, contract, treaty, or union, "first" be apprized of the terms of leaving, and visualize economic, possible societal, and other consequences. We mathematize when we apply the algebraic notion of the unknown variable "x". (We can learn lessons about clear thinking and reasoning when we 'algebraicize' and geometricize.) We can think of our living and anything, situation, happening, etc., as an "x"—a given, an unknown function to which we can apply 'the calculus' to study, understand, and keep unravelling. We avoid many problems when through being "conscious of abstracting" and applying "the principle of non-allness", we think of the problem or situation, as a variable "x". This helps us to anticipate that "x" will be 'seen', judged, evaluated, given different meanings and values from different orientations (points of viewing, frames of reference, etc.). When we 'algebraicize' and 'functionalize' we orient ourselves to learn how to better 'criticize' (appreciate, 'see' different sides), theorize, rationalize, 'derivatize', differentiate and anti-differentiate ('see' how later situations emerge from earlier abstracting (ideas, values, 'meanings', etc.), and how earlier situations contribute to later developments).

We mathematize-scientize when thinking of our living, and any undertaking, as an ongoing function "x", we take an experimental heuristic approach to study, learn about, learn from, and conscious time-bindingly build on and refine, to improve results we get. We scientize when we recognize that things are not how we define, label, think and say they are, but proceed to explore their structures-operations-and relationships. We scientize when our thinking-utterances include propositions, probabilities, and theories, as ways to avoid interminable argumentation, and irresolvable disagreements. Towards higher levels of understanding and communicating, it helps if we "first" (not often cherished) definitize our semantic foundations (principles, premises, 'meanings' etc.) to make clear to ourselves and others just what we 'think' we are talking about. We can avoid much confusion, disagreeableness, conflicts, delusions, and dissatisfactions, when we memorize the fact that **we live in a world of interrelationships and asymmetric relationships...a world of differences, and inequalities.** We scientize when, conscious of abstracting, we ask: Are my ideas, beliefs, values, opinions, conclusions, etc., based on reliable, accurate, and up-to-date information, 'measurements' and judgments? Am I prepared to refute, falsify, and refine them, based on new, reliable and accurate information? Following the principle of non-allness, it suits us to scientize: take "an experimental, heuristic, theoretical, probabilistic (let's see how this works out) approach" as a thinking-behavioural paradigm--guiding and modifying laws, opinions, ideas, beliefs, planning, deciding, etc. We scientize, 'disillusionize' and 'transcendentalize' when we recognize that our selection--our ways of seeing things, the ways we 'measure', our standards, etc., do not represent all possible ways.

We can practice "non-allnessing" through modifying our thinking with the following words when appropriate: "some, sometimes, probably, to some degree, to me, as far as I know" (to mention a few). Using "nouns", names, and labels, are ways we individualize, atomize, localize, emphasize differences--and also sometimes "identify" and 'elementalize' (forget that 'things', situations, are not the names we give them). There is also this about names

and labels: With names we create semantic entities (some existing only in our imaginations)...then engage in dissatisfying argumentation as if they had physical existence. We use names and labels to collectivize. The labels “books”, “refugees”, and “immigrants” refer to many kinds of books, and many different individuals. **Using “indexing” helps us dis-identify and distinguish:** Friend (1) is not friend (2). The terms ‘conservatives’ and ‘liberals’ label sets of individuals with millions of members. ‘Conservative’ or ‘liberal’ (1) is not ‘conservative’ or ‘liberal’ (2). If we are not conscious of abstracting, nouns, in association with the “is of identity”, support “identifying” and “allnessing”, and can lead us to conceptualize a static world of unrelated (and unrelated to us), inactive, unstructured, unchanging, timeless events: Compare “He is a liar”, with “He sometimes lies”; “This is not art, with “Some, at this time, do not categorized this as art.” Compare “point of view” with “point of viewing”, “financial schemes” with “financial scheming”; “I am quite sure of this” with “I am ‘certaining’...and could be identifying and ‘allnessing’”.

When we consciously verbalize and “ize” when appropriate, we expand our thinking to recognize a dynamic world of change, movement, and interrelationships (things acting on, influencing, changing, etc., other things). We ‘prolepticize’, and ‘intensionalize’ when for example, we imagine ideals labelled “civilizations”, “democracy”, “justice”, and others, as if already achieved. We could ‘disillusionize’-‘transcendentalize’ and think instead: “We are striving to “civilize” and “democratize” our tribe (having first specified what these words and ideas are about). This could be another way to keep improving our human relationships. When (nation-tribes) non-consciously ‘prolepticize’, mythicize, and delude themselves to believe-act as if they are all already great, civilized, and fully ‘democratized’, there is no impulse to improve their cultural socio-political behaviours before deciding to proselytize, promote, politicize, and export their primitive unrefined political delusions. (In “Science and Sanity”, page lxxvii, **Korzybski cautioned: “... a ‘democracy’ without intelligence of the masses under modern conditions can be a worse human mess than any dictatorship could be.”**)

To theorize: When we (as individuals) internalize, externalize, de-territorialize, generalize (generally apply and utilize) general semantics principles): We “expand our horizons” and ‘transcendentalize’. (Within limits, we go beyond some present understanding and approaches): We ‘disillusionize’ when we do not aggressively clutch and defend initial beliefs, ideas, values, and opinions—forgetting that “in a world of large numbers of abstracting beings, different **perspectives, points of viewing, meanings given, beliefs and values held, etc. “do not cover all possibilities” (“the principle of non-allness”).** We disillusionize, when we don’t just verbalize, ‘academicize’, prioritize, and ‘intensionalize’ (give higher values to words, ideas, and definitions, than we give to what they are about); we use the structural differential (See “Science And Sanity”, Chapter “On The Structural Differential”) to remind ourselves to contextualize our abstractions: “What is going on” is different from (not identical with) what we see, hear, think-feel, say, assume, believe, theorize, generalize, speculate, philosophize, romanticize, etc., about it. (Sounds simplistic eh?) When we contextualize, we do not “intensionalize”--allow words to hypnotize and mesmerize us: We use general semantic principles as guides to analyse, radicalize,

structuralize, and sanitize our usual ways of thinking-feeling about, understanding, and doing things.

When we ‘generalsemanticize’, structuralize, and visualize, we do not only academicize... we ‘transcendentalize’: We go beyond our usual ways thinking-asking and accepting answer to “Why”? We ask “How”? and explore possible related structures-operations-and relationships.” We structuralize when we give more value and significance to the make-up of things-situations-their operations and relationships, than to words about them. On page 280, S&S Korzybski wrote: **“Starting with the “non A” (non-Aristotelian) denial of identity, we were compelled to consider structure as the only possible link between the empirical and the verbal worlds.”** Think of “structure” as being about “how parts interconnect-interact and work together as a whole”. Think of the different cells, organs, muscles, etc. that constitute our bodies. We structuralize-visualize when we move from words to visualize what the words could be about. We structuralize when we do not ‘intensionalize’--academicize, understand, judge, accept without questioning, the words, opinions, definitions, classifications, meanings, values, etc. of experts, leaders, friends, etc. , Structuralizing is one way we can modify our tendency to ‘certainize’ our inner world of ideas, beliefs, values, ‘meanings’, opinions and myths based on our intensional ways of defining, thinking-and feelings about happenings based on earlier non-conscious stages of time-binding development and ‘meanings’. We externalize- structuralize when we work at developing our abilities to visualize. (Read the words “Tomorrow I will visit my friend”: then imagine-visualize what this involves, things you will have to do, and so on.) Note differences between verbal structures and structures you visualize. When we visualize (deliberately, purposefully create mental images), we become more structurally aware--including awareness of “multidimensional structures” (structures within structures...): we expand our horizons; we ‘see’ things from many different points of viewing; we more easily ‘see’ “one thing-structure-operation” as being somewhat like another or other thing-structure-operations; we notice structural similarities between seemingly unrelated things and happenings (“This is somewhat, and in some ways, like that”). Finding similarities in differences and repeated patterns are ways to ‘extensionalize’ our understanding and keep awake our ability to synthesize, metaphorize, and discover unity in diversity--consistencies in inconsistencies, and regularities in irregularities.

With visualizing skills, we prioritize, externalize, ‘objectify’, and structuralize a search for the inner and outer functional relationships that constitute our living. When we habitualize our ability to structuralize, we enable ourselves to more easily homologize, analogize, ‘similarize’, and ‘metaphorize’. This helps us sensitize ourselves to how we can better ‘humaneize’ our interactions and relationships. To rationalize: If we translate McLuhan’s “The medium is the message”, to **“The message is the medium”**: We can utilize ‘the calculus’ to visualize, and structuralize-operationalize the continuous function-medium “television”. (Structures-operations include what producers present to the public, what they leave out, and especially **how** they present what they present.) In my explorations so far, I subtilize, inferentialize, hypothesize, and anthropomorphize the message that’s “TV” and other “Social Media” companies” this way: **“Media that train minds to support the commercialization of time.”** As their survival is a function of income from advertisements,

and income from advertisements is a function of viewing times, producers do what they can to get and keep people watching. For instance: Commentaries (especially Nature programs) to gain advertisement time: words and images are speeded up, glamorized, and dramatized with intrusive musical accompaniment which sometimes entangle words-and images beyond easy comprehension. (BTW. As an “in between” anything can be considered a medium...a cosmic variable, a continuous function we can study.) To sermonize: In searching for structures-operations-and relationships, we retrain and restrain our impulse to categorize-and finalize our first impressions and judgments. ‘Objectifying-consciencizing’ (self-consciously attending to) is a first step to re-cognize, organize, re-organize aspects of our thinking-and feelings, and understanding, to sensitize ourselves to how we can better ‘humaneize’ our interactions and relationships. When we utilize general semantics principles, we semantically fertilize our spirits, and harmonize ourselves in our personal, social, and working relationships.

When we resist a tendency to elementalize, dogmatize, demonize, antagonize, and polarize, we can authorize ourselves not to terrorize traumatize, and destabilize ourselves and others: In so doing, we revitalize, self-consciously contextualize, and optimize the way we think and feel about things, ourselves, others, everyday situations, and the world--in and around us. With a broader, more inclusive horizon, we are mindful that we have our ways, and do not trivialize, but conscious time-bindingly study and learn from ‘meanings’, values, and beliefs--foundations that orientate the ways ourselves and others attitudinize and use words.

The Organism-as-a whole-in Environments

This principle also helps us remember the power of symbols, words, stories, images, pictures, music and other sounds, to automatically affect and infect our neural-mind-brain (conscious and non-conscious) operations. We do not (for instance) let words some advertize--tranquilize, mesmerize, and hypnotize us into action: words such as “Save more, spend more”, or “You are what you eat, what you wear”, and others. There is no surprise when politicians fail to produce the ten thousand jobs they promised. And when some apologize for what they said or did, we can again apply the “organism-as-a whole” principle and wonder: Does apologizing semantically pulverize, detoxify, initialize a change...or neutralize the foundational mind-set contributing to an orientation expressed in the attitude behind what was said or done? **To structuralize, analogize, psychologize, ‘ontogenize’, and ‘phylogenize’:** A nation, or any system or organization with a set of interdependent-interactive ‘parts’ working to harmonize, stabilize, and maintain a well ‘functionalized’ whole, is like a human organism. We could gain some rudimentary understanding of our ‘minds’-our organisms-and our ‘selves’ through noting some structural similarities between ‘mind’-operations, and the more complex interrelationships and interactivities--mind structures-operations we label “organizations, groups, cults, political parties, societies, and nations”...and vice versa. ‘Parts’-operations of the human mind, like ‘parts’-operations of more complex mind structures do not always work to support the whole. ‘Minds’, lacking self-repairing and self-organizing tools such as general semantics principles to deal with inner turmoil, sometimes need outside help (family, friends, psychotherapists, etc.). But some ‘minds’ are too disorganized to accept help.

Similarly, external ‘mind’ structures-operations, like individuals, sometimes help others in distress--and as continuous functions of time, sometimes also need help...But for many reasons (cultural, religious, political, too fractionalized, and so on), cannot accept help and so become increasingly disorganized. ‘Parts’ of an organism, organization, or system, has to work supportively to maintain the integrity of the whole against internal and external entropic disorganizing forces. When parts-operations of a whole do not do their part, the whole will eventually fall apart. (In politics (often ignoring contributing factors) some label these symptoms (derivatives) “populism, uprising, rebellion, coups”, etc.)

I fantasize and sermonize: Some nations, with time-binding skills have become highly technologized, but in many ways, still behave like some ‘primitive’ tribes. From this foundation springs an orientation to normalize, weaponize, and settle differences with modernized arrows and spears (smart bombs and smart missiles). Both national and international **relationships might improve when ‘tribes’ “prize and institutionalize a goal to promote natural intelligence...and utilize artificial intelligence to extend and ‘rhisomize’ human intelligence to create more humanely smart people”**. (Rhisomize: Check out the plants; think of the internet...not in terms of content but diversity and extensibility.) Nation-tribes lag behind in learning to ‘dialecticize’ and improve their conflict resolving skills. Nation-tribes have their “Ministries of War”...No “Ministry of Intelligence” (not spying). If nation-tribes recognize that they fictionalize when they proleptically treat (as if already realized) ideals promoted by such words as “civilization, democracy, justice, meaning, great, the best, the truth”, ‘transcendence’, and others too many to mention, they might evolve to “standardize, institutionalize, scientize, and nationalize general semantics principles and the calculus as critical thinking-reasoning standards and educational paradigms. The race could be moving towards a less suicidal form of existence if nation-tribes became more general-semantically radicalized. But the probability that such a drastic change will succeed diminishes if not supported by individuals, not so politicized, unionized, polarized, and provincialized that they are unable to politically ‘transcendentalize’). A big question: Could anyone or group emerge and survive long enough to initialize “nation-tribes” to vitalize efforts towards becoming more civilized, more humaneized?

Do ‘we’ (anyone thinking along these lines) hyperbolize, idealize, aggrandize, and messianize in thinking the human race can sanitize and harmonize itself? We (human race) face enormous racial and cosmic challenges: To anthropomorphize: Although we do at times behave like sheep: We are a race of polymorphous ‘minds’ in a world of asymmetric relationships. Given the wide and diversified range of imagination, creative and power impulses, artistic expressions, intelligences, interests, concerns, unrealizable beliefs, systems of beliefs, drives, skills, different stages of conscious time-binding development, values, ‘meanings’ held, etc.: Given a world of forces and movements, unavoidably, there will be collisions, crashes, destructions, conflicts, and coalitions. We could apply ‘the calculus’, and ask: **Is it beyond the limits of billions of human minds to collectively learn ways to sympathize, empathize, and synchronize their differences?** Can nation-tribes ‘collegialize’, collectivize, and organize efforts to satisfactorily balance the impulses of those who want to communize, and tribalize, against those who prefer to republicanize and ‘democratize. Can

polymorphous ‘minds’ collectively balance impulses to democratize against impulses to revolutionize? Will ‘tribes’ stop fighting each other based on differences...religions, beliefs, ‘looks’, etc., and those who prize the idea “Live free or die” against those who prize a strong leader? Can nation-tribes resolve differences between some who like to philosophize, theorize and scientize, and others resolved to provincialize, ‘commonsensicalize’, mythicize and ‘mysticize’? Can the race resolve conflicts between those who believe “words-things have meanings”, and others who think “Not so. **We give meanings**”? Can the race resolve differences between those who believe we have free will, and others who believe that in a world of relationships “Nothing is free”? Can ‘the race’ resolve conflicts between those who strongly believe and proselytize “the idea that it is possible to successfully politicize-and actualize the ideas of freedom and equality”, and those who don’t?

So as not to marginalize: There are some humans who are at peace when things are going well, and others who get bored and feel energized to stir things up. Can nation-tribes learn to resolve conflicts between tribes and individuals who see or anticipate problems, where others see opportunities? How can the race deal with some who kill themselves and others based on a belief that “It’s the next life that’s important...not this one.”? To editorialize: Can the race resolve differences between those who say “We are moving too fast”, against frustrated ones who say “Not fast enough”? Will ‘tribes’ ‘biologize’, psychologize ‘anthropologize’, historicize, scientize, visualize, and prize the notion, that **“to realize a better (saner, more humane race), in order to improve, we need to re-cognize...not deny our human natures.** (As display of skilled, imaginative, creatively disciplined flexibility, we can learn a great deal about our human natures from works of art...novels, plays, poetry, paintings, sculptures, songs, music, dance, architecture, and so on.) We could prize and institutionalize the study of a Universe (with structures-operations not yet discovered, imagined or thought about), as a first step to harmonize, and ‘humaneize” our relationships? Can the race embrace both establishmentarians and disestablishmentarians? I presently think “Probably not”. To generalize one of Newton’s laws of motion: For every motion, there is an equal and opposite commotion. It’s very likely that for any widespread ‘humaneizing’ efforts, there will be opposing factions and reactions. **But at personal levels, we can be conscious that we abstract--and consciously time-bindingly improve our relationships with our ‘selves’, our understanding of the ‘world’, and our ‘selves’ and others in the world.** To improve our relationships, we can learn to structuralize more, mythicize less, ethicize more, and being more attentive, minimize many of our stupid anti-conscious time-binding behaviours. We can inferentialize and ‘foundationalize’ early stages of some of the above named behaviours from observing two years young: Some will cling to parent or guardian, others will “play runaway”. Some will reach for help...others will unceremoniously ‘box’ help away. Some will grab another’s toy...responding, some will cry, others will share and let go, and others will quite aggressively protect their toy. To anthropologize, and ethicize: The human race is not a whole. And might never become whole, if its parts (nation-tribes) are unable to transcend natural tribal tendency involving self-maintaining, self-reinforcing, self protecting, neuro-semantic forces ...space-time, history-beliefs-values-and-language. But each one of us can contribute to creating neuro-semantic-and neuro-linguistic fields irradiating pockets of sanity. I emphasize: The above

does not finalize our differences or ways to ‘generalsemanticize’. I invite readers to ‘transcendentalize’. Just for fun. Do try some “izeing”.

So as not to absolutize, dogmatize, or ‘messianize’, Korzybski cautioned: **“I must stress that I give no panaceas, but experience shows that when the methods of general semantics are applied, the results are usually beneficial, whether in law, medicine, business, etc., education on all levels, or personal inter-relationships, be they in family national or international fields. If they are not applied, but merely talked about (philosophized, and ‘academicized’) no results can be expected .”** (Science And Sanity, Page xxxi) Sometimes when things are not going well with us, we can use general semantics principles as “self-therapy--self-healing, self-transcendentalizing tools” to help us find ways to go well with things. We can also think of Universe as medium and message: For more satisfying human relatings: It suits us to ize up. ‘Transcendentalize’: Review, refine, scientize, utilize ‘the calculus’, generalsemanticize for a start.

Milton Dawes/19

References

Science and Sanity. Alfred Korzybski. Fifth Edition. Institute Of General Semantics. Englewood, New Jersey, U.S.A.

A Tour of The Calculus. David Berlinski: Vintage Books. A Division of Random, Inc. House. New York.

Insight. A Study of Human Understanding. Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J. Third Edition. Philosophical Library. New York.

Mathematics A Cultural Approach. Morris Kline. New York Wesley Publishing Company, Inc. Reading, Massachusetts. Palo Alto. London.

Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, 10th. Edition

And many other time-binders too numerous to mention.

For more on general semantics principles as self-development, transcendentalizing, self-transforming tools: Visit <The Institute of General Semantics>

<www.balvantparekhcentre.org.in>, Read Bruce Kodish “Korzybski. A Biography”

<korzybskifiles.blogspot.com> Read Martin Levinson's "[Sensible Thinking for Turbulent Times](#)" and "[Practical Fairy Tales for Everyday](#) (available from “The Institute of General Semantics”) Visit <miltondawes.com>

Milton Dawes/19