

## MILITARY EUPHEMISM AS A FORM OF COMMUNICATION: A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

*Alikulov Feruzbek Abdigobborovich*

*Head of the languages department of  
the mai of the ms and du of the ru*

**Abstract:** This article explores the concept of military euphemism as a distinct form of communication, analyzing its functions, forms, and significance in military contexts. By examining the various ways in which euphemisms are employed, this article seeks to illuminate their role in military operations, psychological warfare, diplomacy, and public relations.

**Key words:** **euphemism**, military discourse, collateral damage, neutralize, battle fatigue, weapons of mass destruction, operational setback, failure, **friendly fire**, civilian deaths.

### Introduction

Military communication is a specialized form of discourse that is highly structured, precise, and often emotionally neutral. One of the most intriguing and sometimes controversial aspects of military communication is the use of **euphemisms**—indirect expressions that serve to soften, obscure, or reframe harsh realities. Military euphemism plays a crucial role in shaping the way military personnel and the public understand and react to the complex and often brutal nature of warfare, combat operations, and military life. Euphemisms help mitigate the psychological, emotional, and public impact of difficult military concepts, such as casualties, deaths, violence, and defeat.

Euphemism is broadly defined as a form of communication that replaces a direct, often blunt or harsh expression with a more mild, less offensive, or more socially acceptable one (Orwell, 1946). In military contexts, euphemisms serve to obscure the brutal realities of warfare and to communicate sensitive information without evoking distress or public alarm.

The use of euphemism in the military is not merely a linguistic device, but a psychological and strategic tool. It serves various functions: reducing the emotional impact of traumatic events, fostering group cohesion, preserving morale, protecting political and military leaders, and managing public perception. Euphemisms are also strategically employed to maintain operational security, avoid legal repercussions, and frame military activities in ways that seem more palatable to both the troops and the public.

One of the primary functions of military euphemisms is to create psychological distance between soldiers and the often traumatic realities of war. War is inherently violent, and exposure to such violence can have severe psychological consequences, including post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, and moral injury (Hoge et al., 2004). By using euphemistic language, military authorities reduce the emotional burden of soldiers, allowing them to focus on their tasks without becoming overwhelmed by the harshness of what they are experiencing.

For example, the term “collateral damage” is commonly used to describe civilian casualties resulting from military actions. While this term softens the blow of describing the unintended deaths of innocent people, it also allows soldiers and commanders to maintain psychological distance from the human cost of warfare. The phrase “weapons of mass destruction” (WMD), often used to describe nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, depersonalizes the destructive potential of these tools, distancing them from the specific human suffering they cause.

Similarly, terms like “neutralize” or “take out” are used in place of “kill,” making the act of eliminating an enemy combatant less emotionally charged. In doing so, euphemisms help soldiers avoid feelings of guilt, remorse, or moral conflict, which can arise from the reality of taking lives during combat (Fitzgerald, 2005).

Another critical function of military euphemism is its ability to maintain morale among troops, especially in prolonged or high-stress operations. The use of euphemistic language can help soldiers and commanders avoid feelings of despair or defeat by reframing difficult situations in a more positive or manageable light.

For example, the phrase “operational setback” might be used to describe what would otherwise be termed a “failure.” While the latter term conveys an outright defeat, the former maintains a sense of hope and resilience, signaling that the mission can still be salvaged or that progress is still being made. Terms like “battle fatigue” or “operational exhaustion” refer to conditions like PTSD or stress-related mental health issues, while simultaneously downplaying the severity of these conditions. This helps in preventing the stigmatization of soldiers suffering from these disorders and encourages them to seek help without feeling weak or demoralized (Murray, 2017).

Euphemisms like “sustaining an injury” instead of “wounding” or “sacrificing for the cause” rather than “dying” are often used to present soldiers’ experiences as part of a noble or necessary duty. This reframing allows soldiers to feel as though their suffering and sacrifice are part of a larger, meaningful effort, even if the reality is far more brutal.

One of the most pervasive uses of euphemism in the military is in the reframing of violence and death. Combat operations, by their very nature, involve the threat of death and injury, and these realities are often framed in less alarming terms. This is

especially evident when discussing the loss of life, whether of soldiers, civilians, or enemy combatants.

The term "**friendly fire**" is a widely known euphemism used to describe situations where soldiers are accidentally harmed by their own forces. While the phrase softens the tragic nature of such incidents, it also has the potential to deflect blame and minimize the psychological impact on those involved. Similarly, "**non-combat related injuries**" (NCRI) is a euphemism used to describe injuries that occur outside of direct combat, often in training or logistical support operations. It reduces the perceived danger of military life by distinguishing these injuries from the direct consequences of warfare.

The phrase "**force projection**" is often used to describe the strategic movement of military forces into foreign territories or conflict zones, reframing the aggressive nature of such actions as part of a broader strategic goal rather than an overt act of invasion or occupation. This linguistic distancing allows military leaders and political authorities to present their actions as measured, deliberate, and aimed at preserving peace and stability, rather than as acts of aggression (Mahnken and Tan, 2009).

The concept of "**collateral damage**" is a particularly important euphemism in military discourse. The term refers to unintended civilian casualties or the destruction of civilian infrastructure during military operations. While it may appear to be a neutral or bureaucratic term, it serves to depersonalize the human cost of military actions, focusing instead on the "damage" caused as a result of military activity.

In contrast, direct terms like "civilian deaths" or "massacre" convey far more explicit moral and emotional weight. By using euphemistic language like "collateral damage," the military can distance itself from the ethical implications of its actions. This term has been used extensively in the context of airstrikes, bombings, and other large-scale military operations, often when unintended casualties are inevitable due to the nature of the weapons employed (Cohen, 2001).

In the age of 24/7 media coverage and instant communication, military euphemisms are an essential tool for managing public perception. The use of euphemism allows military officials and political leaders to shape the narrative surrounding military operations, avoiding panic, outrage, or backlash.

For instance, the term "**peacekeeping mission**" is often used to describe military interventions that may involve the use of force, but which are framed as efforts to restore order or protect civilians. The term presents the military's actions as benevolent, aimed at preventing further violence or humanitarian disaster, rather than framing them as aggressive or imperialistic.

The term "**intervention**" is similarly used to avoid terms like "invasion" or "occupation," which have more negative and aggressive connotations. By using euphemisms, governments and military leaders can present their actions as temporary

and focused on maintaining peace, stability, or humanitarian relief, rather than long-term occupation or imperialism (Ricks, 2006).

While euphemisms play a crucial role in military communication, they are not without their ethical implications. Critics argue that the use of euphemism can mask the true nature of military actions, downplay the human cost of war, and obscure accountability. The use of terms like “**collateral damage**” or “**pacification**” can trivialize the suffering caused by military operations, particularly when the civilian death toll is high.

In the context of war crimes or violations of international law, euphemisms can also be used to obscure responsibility. By reframing torture, unlawful killings, or other atrocities with terms like “**enhanced interrogation**” or “**extraordinary rendition**,” military and intelligence agencies avoid the legal and moral weight of such actions, presenting them as part of necessary or justified counterterrorism measures.

Furthermore, euphemisms can contribute to a culture of impunity, in which military personnel and political leaders are not held accountable for the consequences of their actions. This can perpetuate a cycle of violence and misrepresentation, where the true costs of war are hidden from the public eye, making it easier for governments to justify future military engagements.

## CONCLUSION

Military euphemism is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that plays a significant role in shaping military communication, public perception, and the psychological resilience of soldiers. Through the use of euphemisms, military leaders can reframe violent, traumatic, and morally ambiguous actions in ways that mitigate their emotional impact and maintain public support. However, the use of euphemism is not without its ethical challenges. By obscuring the true nature of military operations and their consequences, euphemisms can contribute to a culture of detachment and moral ambiguity, making it easier for military authorities to avoid accountability for the human cost of warfare.

As the military and political landscape continues to evolve, so too will the language and strategies used to communicate complex military realities. The ethical considerations surrounding military euphemism will remain an important area of discussion as we seek to balance the necessity of military action with the need for transparency, accountability, and respect for human life.

## REFERENCES:

1. Cohen, R. *The Ethics of War and Peace*. Princeton University Press, 2001.
2. Fitzgerald, R. *Morale and Combat Stress in War: An Analysis of the Psychological Impact of Combat on Soldiers*. Routledge. 2005.
3. Hoge, C. W., et al. *Combat Duty in Iraq and Afghanistan, Mental Health Problems*,

and Barriers to Care. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2004. 351(1), 13-22.

4. Mahnken, T. G., & Tan, A. The Grand Strategy of the United States: Military Transformation and the Role of Euphemism. *International Security*, 2009. 33(4), 39-64.

4. Murray, W. *The Psychology of War: Understanding Combat Stress*. University of California Press. 2017.

5. Orwell, G. Politics and the English Language. *Horizon*, 1946. 13(76), 252-265.

6. Ricks, T. E. *Fiasco: The American Military Adventure in Iraq*. Penguin Press. 2006.