Joachim Grzega

# Names, Nations and Nature from a Eurolinguistic View:
# Notes on Peace-Threatening and Peace-Promoting Language

Abstract

The article has two major parts. The first part shows, by way of discourse analysis, how anti-Russian propaganda is created through semantically misleading or inappropriate words and phrases in the Wikipedia entries on Vladimir Putin, Barack Obama, and Sergei Skripal. The second part deals with quantitative research: (1) An analysis shows that in countries that have a "ministry of defense" [in general], there are more expenses for the military sector than in countries with a "ministry of national defense". (2) A further analysis takes into account the words for 'environment' in the official languages in the EU member states and compares them to ecological figures: If the word for 'environment' includes the word for 'around', people produce more carbon dioxide and a larger ecological footprint than if the word for 'environment' includes the word for 'middle'.

Sommaire

L'article ['Noms, nations et nature d'une perspective eurolinguistique: Notes sur les langages menaceant et promouvant la paix'] consiste en deux parts majeures. La première part illustre, à l'aide de l'analyse du discours, comment se forme de la propagande anti-Russe à travers des mots et phrases sémantiquement trompeux ou inappriorés dans les entrées en Wikipédia sur Vladimir Poutine, Barack Obama et Sergueï Skripal. La deuxième part s'occupe de recherches quantitative: (1) Une analyse montre que dans des pays qui ont un "ministère de la défense" [en général] il y a plus de dépenses pour le secteur militaire que dans des pays avec un "ministère de la défense nationale". (2) Une autre analyse considère des les mots pour 'environnement' dans les langues officielles des membres de l'Union européenne et les compare avec des chiffres écologiques: Si le mot pour 'environnement' inclut le mot pour 'environ', les gens produissent plus de dioxyde de carbone et une empreinte écologique plus grande que si le mot pour 'environnement' inclut le mot 'central, centre'.

Zusammenfassung

Der Artikel ['Namen, Nationen und Natur aus eurolinguistischer Sicht: Anmerkungen zu friedensbedrohender und friedensfördernder Sprache'] besteht aus zwei Hauptteilen. Der erste Teil zeigt mittels einer Diskursanalyse die Bildung anti-russischer Propaganda durch hinsichtlich ihrer Bedeutung irreführende oder unangebrachte Wörter in den Wikipedia-Einträgen zu Wladimir Putin, Barack Obama und Sergei Skripal. Der zweite Teil beschäftigt sich mit quantitativer Forschung: (1) Eine Analyse zeigt, dass es in Ländern, die ein "Ministerium für Verteidigung" [allgemein] haben, mehr Ausgaben für den militärischen Bereich gibt als in Ländern mit einem "Ministerium für nationale Verteidigung". (2) Eine weitere Analyse betrachtet die Wörter für 'Umwelt' in den Amtssprachen der EU-Länder und vergleicht diese mit ökologischen Kennzahlen: Wenn das Wort für 'Umwelt' das Wort für 'um' enthält, produzieren die Leute mehr $CO_2$ und einen größeren ökologischen Fußabdruck als wenn das Wort für 'Umwelt' das Wort für 'Mitte' enthält.

## 1. Introductory Remarks

Political language has often included violent language against the other. The extreme consequence is that this can lead to war. Arthur Ponsonby was the first to intensively analyze the connection between language and war in his book *Falsehood in War-Time* (1928). In this book he investigates how people were turned into enthusiasts for World War One through propaganda. The strategies that he found out for World War One were later also used in the propaganda surrounding several other wars, which was demonstrated by Anne Morelli (2001). Not many studies investigate the propaganda in more than two countries. In an article, Stig Nohrstedt and his group (2000) compared war propaganda in Swedish, Norwegian, Greek and British dialies. In a recent monography, Florian

Zollmann (2017) compared war propaganda in the German, British and US press in order to show that the explanatory Propaganda Model by Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman (1980) is also applicable outside the US. In this journal, Nora Hanusch (2014) and Nina Hippler (2016) have published contrastive analyses of war propaganda.

I myself have been interested in the relationship between language and violence/peace since the late 1990s. First I looked at it from a historical perspective (where do words for 'stranger' come from). Then I tried to raise awareness for this connection in my language teaching concepts Basic Global English and Sprach-Not-Arzt. At the first Eurolinguistics Conference at VHS Donauwörth, I included socioeconomic aspects in quantitative analyses and used elements from discourse analysis in qualitative analyses (Grzega 2017b). I brought all aspects of the connection between language and violence/peace together in an entire book (Grzega 2019a). I have always done this with a cross-linguistic, particularly Eurolinguistic perspective. In this article, I add some new findings. First, I will take into account the EU countries' official languages and analyse, by way of discourse analysis, how peace-threatening words in connection with names and nations are used by media that many may not expect to do so. Second, I will show that languages against "the other" may even include lexemes on the environment.

## 2. Anti-Russian Utterances in Left-Oriented Sources

NATO and conservative western sources consistently use onomasiological strategies through which one and the same type of actions gets different names depending on who has committed the action. Since officially NATO's goal is defense, not attack, all attacks by NATO are now called *preventive defense*. If non-NATO units kill people, NATO and conservative sources commonly call this "killing people" or "terrorism". If NATO kills people, NATO has been covering this by the term "collateral damage" since the Kosovo War. This lexical propaganda strategy has been prominently criticized by the Gesellschaft für deutsche Sprache through electing *Kollateralschaden* (the German form of *collateral damage*) "Unwort des Jahres" 'Un-Word of the Year' in 1999. However, already Chomsky and Herman (1988) more generally pointed out the strategy of double standards. And this strategy is also applied in the (re-)creation of an enemy, such as Russia.

The end of communism in eastern Europe around 1990 did not mean that propaganda ended. Just in contrast, for several anti-Russian propaganda has returned again, with Putin depicted as the personalization of the evil (cf. also, e.g., Bröckers/Schreyer 2014, Krone-Schmalz 2015). For some people, this may already be a pattern that they are well aware of. Therefore, one propaganda strategy is to have things be said from different angles: Since left-oriented sources are said to be Russia-friendly or to treat other countries in an equally open and friendly manner, statements putting Russia into a bad light will be thought to be true. Already in my book *Wortwaffen abschaffen!* ['Abolishing Word-Weapons!'] (Grzega 2019a: 93f.), I presented the analysis of Putin's name in the headlines of five left-oriented daily newspapers in the year 2017: the German *Frankfurter Rundschau*, the British *The Guardian*, the French *Le Monde*, the Spanish *El País*, the Italian *Corriere della Sera*, and the Polish *Gazeta Wyborcza*. The result was that in all five newspapers the name Putin was clearly more often presented in negative contexts than in positive contexts.

In the same book I also dealt with lead sections in Wikipedia of several lemmas. In general, Wikipedia allows everybody to co-author articles if they stick to Wikipedia rules. However, administrators decide on whether a contribution will remain or not. As a matter of fact, administrators have the power to keep an entry even if it violates Wikipedia rules and remove it even if it sticks to Wikipedia rules. As a consequence, studies have shown that Wikipedia is quite

reliable with non-topical, non-political entries, but it is problematic with topical, political entries (e.g. Schiller et al. 2007). It could be said that articles linked to friend-and-enemy creation show a higher number of "edit wars", but the versions accepted by the often unidentifiable administrators (as nicknames are used) reflect a western mainstream friend-and-enemy creation, far away from the goals of a neutral encyclopedia. My main focus in the following section will be on EU countries' view on Russia, which is, for some years, has been being renewed as the old new enemy.

When comparing the Wikipedia head sections on "Putin" and "Obama" on 15 September 2018, one found negative introductory versions for "Putin" in the German, English, Spanish, Italian, Hungarian and Swedish Wikipedia, while there were positive or neutral introductory sections for Obama. In the German Wikipedia, for instance, it said:

> "Seit der Annexion der Krim im März 2014 gelten die Beziehungen zwischen Russland und dem Westen als belastet. Russland wird von westlichen Politikern und Experten vorgeworfen, die europäische Friedensordnung zu verletzen."
> 'Since the annexation of Crimea in March 2014 the relations between Russia and the west are seen as burdened. Russia is blamed for violating European peace order.'

The article uses the term *Annexion*, which in German—both as a legal and as an everyday term—is connected with 'force', 'against the will of the people'. The term is used although several experts in international law claim that this term, which has a clear definition in international law, is wrong in the context of Crimea (e.g. Merkel 2014, Geistlinger 2014, Roggemann 2015; cf. also the avoidance of the term by van den Driest 2015). Immediately after these two sentences the German Wikipedia reads (still on 31 July 2019):

> "Ab September 2015 entsandte Putin Teile der russischen Luftwaffe zur Unterstützung der Regierungsarmee und des Präsidenten Assad nach Syrien."
> 'From September 2015 Putin sent parts of the Russia airforces to support the governmental army and President Assad  to Syria.'

In contrast, in the German Wikipedia the article on "Obama", there was and is no word on the US attacking Syria, and, consequently, there was also no word on the different natures of the presences of the US and Russia in Syria with respect to international law. Russia was asked by the elected president Assad to support him, which means Russia's presence in Syria complies with international law, while the US did neither have an invitation by Syria's government nor permission by the UN. Thus United States actions represent an attack on Syria. The lead section on Obama in the version of 15 September 2018 culminated in the sentence: "Am 10. Dezember 2009 erhielt Obama den Friedensnobelpreis." 'On 10 December 2009 Obama received the Nobel Peace Prize'. There was not even a word, for example, that Obama was the one to lead war on more days than any other president before him, namely on each day of his presidency (cf., e.g., Landler 2016). I presented these observations at a public lecture at VHS Donauwörth's "Lange Nacht der Demokratie" ['Long Night of Democracy'] on 15 September 2018. About a month later—whether as a result of the lecture or not cannot be determined—the wording in Obama's entry was at least changed into this: "Am 10. Dezember 2009 erhielt Obama in einer umstrittenen Entscheidung den Friedensnobelpreis." ''On 10 December 2009 Obama received the Nobel Peace Prize in a debated decision'.

The book mentioned also casts light on the Wikipedia entries of "Russia" and the "United States of America" (Grzega 2019a: 85-87) as well as on Russia's presidential elections in 2018 (Grzega

2019a: 80-82). Part of the observations on the Wikipedia articles were also published in the German on-line journal *Rubikon* (Grzega 2019b).

When I was preparing the book *Wort-Waffen abschaffen!*, another west-east topic had not yet reached enough "historical distance", namely the issue of who is responsible for the poisoining of the Russian-British double agent Sergey Skripal. While analyses were still going on and answers still missing on 4 April 2018 (23:25 CET), the lead section of "Sergei Wiktorowitsch Skripal" in the German Wikipedia included the following sentence after the statement that he was found unconscious with signs of being poisoned one month earlier on 4 March 2018 in Salisbury:

> "Premierministerin Theresa May erklärte, Russland sei 'sehr wahrscheinlich' für den 'Giftanschlag' verantwortlich; dieses wies die Vorwürfe zurück. Die Angelegenheit löste eine schwere diplomatische Krise zwischen dem Westen und Russland aus. Rund 25 Staaten und die NATO wiesen als Reaktion auf den Anschlag etwa 150 russische Diplomaten aus, Moskau verwies im Gegenzug genauso viele westliche Diplomaten des Landes".
>
> 'Prime Minister Theresa May stated Russia is "very likely" responsible for the "poisoning attack"; Russia rejected the reproaches. The issue triggered a heavy diplomatic crisis between the west and Russia. Around 25 states and NATO, as a reaction to the attack, expelled about 150 Russian diplomats; in return, Moscow expelled equally as many Western diplomats'.

It remains unclear here what *die Angelegenheit* 'the issue, the affair' refers to. Semantically, it could only be Theresa May's statement of unproven claims. But the succeeding sentence on expelling Russian diplomats as a reaction to the poisoning attack is likely to make the reader believe that Russia is the culprit and not just a suspect. Even if the Russian government had later been proven to be the culprit, the fact is that Wikipedia used language which is false from a legal perspective, but clearly propagandistic language. As a disadvantage for anti-Russian propagandists, analyses of the OPCW (Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons), published on 12 April 2018, concluded that only the type of poison could be proven, but not the origin—while the type of poison was once invented in the Soviet Union, it could now be produced in many other countries including the UK itself (cf. the summary at https://www.opcw.org/fileadmin/OPCW/S_series/2018/en/s-1612-2018_e_.pdf). On May 1, The Guardian published an article entitled "No suspects yet in Skripal nerve agent attack, MPs told". Was the lead section changed after this result? At first, nothing happened. On 22 September 2018, the wording *Angelegenheit* 'issue, affair' in the German Wikipedia was then changed to *offensichtliche Anwendung eines Nervenkampfstoffes* 'obvious use of a nerve gas'. This does not make it better either, because with the preceding and succeeding sentences the reader is still led to the misbelief that Russia was the culprit. This misbelief could have been prevented by writing something like 'The suspicion of Russia triggered a heavy diplomatic crisis between the west and Russia. Around 25 states and NATO, as a reaction to the attack, expelled about 150 Russian diplomats. However, analyses could not determine the ultimate producer or applicant of the nerve gas'.

Yet things got even more propagandistic on 2 April 2019, when the passage was changed into this:

> "Die offensichtliche Anwendung eines geächteten Nervenkampfstoffes löste eine schwere diplomatische Krise zwischen dem Westen und Russland aus, welches bald gemäß Premierministerin Theresa May "sehr wahrscheinlich" für den "Giftanschlag" verantwortlich gemacht wurde."

'The obvious use of an outlawed nerve gas triggered a heavy diplomatic crisis between the west and Russia, which was soon, according to Theresa May "very probably", held responsible for the "poison attack".

The sentence is semantically definitely wrong (it should be *von Theresa May* 'by Theresa May' instead of *gemäß Theresa May* 'according to Theresa May') and is idiomatically akward (it should rather be *welches bald von Theresa May als "sehr wahrscheinlich" verantwortlich für den "Giftanschlag" bezeichnet wurde* 'which was soon termed "very probably" responsible for the "poison attack" by Theresa May'). Nevertheless, it is effectful from a propagandistic point of view, because Russia is once again linked to something that is illegal and immoral—paired with silence on the actual facts. Despite the semantic and idiomatic akwardness and despite its violation of the Wikipedia's NPOV rule, this is still the version six months later on 31 July 2019.

If we compare this to other languages, we observe less or no propagandistic language. The Italian Wikipedia version is like the first sentence of the German quote, but without the second and third sentences:

"Secondo il governo britannico «c'è un'alta probabilità» che la Russia sia coinvolta nell'avvelenamento. Le autorità russe hanno respinto le accuse."
'According to the British government 'there is a high probability' that Russia is involved in the poisoning. The Russian authorities have denied the accusations.'

The wording was not changed after the results of the analyses were published so the reader is left uninformed here and may still wonder if Russia was responsible or not. In the Russian version, it says:

"По мнению британского правительства, к отравлению были причастны российские спецслужбы; руководство России все обвинения отвергло"
'In the opinion of the British government, the Russian special services were involved in the poisoning; the leadership of Russia denied all charges'.

The English version reads "The poisoning is being investigated as an attempted murder" and this utterly neutral phrasing is also used in the Spanish version ("El envenenamiento está siendo investigado como un intento de asesinato."). The French version simply describes Skripal as a "victime avec sa fille d'un empoisonnement en mars 2018" 'victim with his daughter of a poisoning in March 2018'. In the Polish Wikipedia there was no reference to the poisoning in the lead section at all.

The Dutch entry is very strange:

"De vergiftiging wordt onderzocht als een poging tot moord. Kort na het incident verklaarde de Russische regering dat ze geen informatie hadden over de nationaliteit van Sergej Skripal; de Britse politie zei dat hij een Brits staatsburger is."
'The poisoning is investigated as an attempt of murder. Shortly after the incident the Russian government stated that it had no information on the nationality of Sergei Skripal; the British police said that he is a British citizen.'

This last sentence is accompanied by eight footnotes. What does this have to do with the crime? Why is this aspect put so much focus on that it is linked to eight footnotes? Do the Dutch Wikipedians simply want to present Russia as ignorant or incompetent? As a matter of fact, the

claim contradicts what we read in the British version on Skripal: "He holds both Russian and British citizenship. On 21 March 2018 Russian ambassador to the UK Alexander Yakovenko said that Sergei Skripal is also a Russian citizen."

In sum, the few examples suffice to show that Wikipedia uses manipulative words and constructions that are misleading or even inappropriate.

## 3. Vocabulary Features and Violence

In the book *Wort-Waffen abschaffen!* (Grzega 2019a), but also in an earlier article (Grzega 2017b), I have already pointed out some connections between lexis and military expenses. The method of such analyses has to be well chosen. This means a certain lexical phenomenon solidly has to be determined valid for the whole country. This can be held true if at least 90 percent of a country's citizens share the same language according to the CIA World Factbook (https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/). EU countries in which less than 90 percent have a common mother tongue are:

- Bulgaria
- Belgium
- Estonia
- Latvia
- Luxemburg
- Rumania
- Slovak Republic
- Slovenia
- Spain

These countries can only be taken into account when the two or more idioms that make up 90 percent of the population possess the same linguistic variant for the variable in question. Bulgaria is linguistically so diverse that it is too heterogeneous to be included. With respect to Malta, it has to be stressed that Maltese children usually first acquire Maltese as their mother-tongue; but nearly all of them get into contact with English at such an early period of their life (and also have to acquire English as official language and the language of secondary schools) that Malta can be considered at least bilingual. Italian is also spoken by many citizens, but is given more and more the role of a foreign language. This means that the analysis of a variable includes the following countries if the succeeding languages have the same linguistic variant:

- Belgium:      Dutch and French
- Estonia:      Estonian and Russian
- Latvia:       Latvian and Russian
- Luxemburg:   Luxemburgish, French and German
- Malta:        Maltese and English
- Rumania:      Rumanian and Hungarian
- Slovakia:     Slovak and Hungarian
- Slovenia:     Slovene and Croatian
- Spain:        Castilian/Spanish and Catalan

Country abbreviations used in all tables are the Internet TLDs.

What has to be accepted for the analysis are the corresponding standard versions in the languages as this is the variety that most speakers of the country know. If the standard variety provides more than one variant for a given variable or if a variant is not distinctly classifiable, then the country is to be excluded from the study of the variable.

All in all, there have so far been much fewer correlations between language and violence/peace than with other socioeconomic aspects (cf. in contrast Grzega 2017a). Nevertheless there are some correlations. One finding is that countries in which the majority of people uses the same word for "quiet" and "peaceful" show less military expenditure in percentage of the gross national product as given by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute [SIPRI] (Grzega 2017a: 44f.). Another finding is that a lack of the distinction between an informal and a formal address pronoun shows a tendency for less military expenditure per capita; moreover, it is correlated with a higher score on the Peacefulness Index, which gives the average of percentages of the EU Special Eurobarometer 437 informants who accept muslims, atheists, handicapped people, people under 25 and people over 65 as colleagues as well as the percentages of informants who regard talking about religion, ethics, sexual orientation and gender identity as positive (Grzega 2019a: 45f.).

Even after the publication of the book I keep searching for such relations. What I recently detected is that an eye should kept on the connection between the name of the ministery that is responsible for the military forces and the military expenses per capita according to the SIPRI figures. The majority of these ministeries include the word for 'defense'. But there are some exceptions. In Malta, 'security' is used instead of 'defense' (*Ministry for Home Affairs and National Security*). In Lithuania, they have the "National/Country Protection Ministry" (*Krašto apsaugos ministerija*). In Estonia, the name includes a word that covers both 'defense' and 'protection' (*Kaitseministeerium*). In 2017, France changed the name of the ministery into "Ministry of the Armies" (*Ministère des Armées*). Before, it was the "Ministery of Defense" (*Ministère de la Défense*). Within the group of ministries whose name include "defense", there are two types: one group are those that are "Ministry of Defense" and the other group are those that are "Ministry of National/Nation/Country Defense". Belgium has to be odded out because the French variant is "Ministry of Defense" (*Ministère de la Défense*), while the Dutch variant is "Ministry of <u>Country</u> Defense" (*Ministerie van <u>Lands</u>verdediging*). It would be interesting to see whether the type of name has an influence on the military expenditures per capita. Table 1 shows the results for the years 2012 through 2016, so that France is included. Since a Shapiro-Wilk test (cf. Shapiro/Wilk 1965) confirms normal distribution of the data at the 0.5-alpha-level, a Welch's t-test is applied (cf Welch 1947). The effect size will be calculated with Cohen's *d* and transferred into the common language effect size indicator (CL) (cf. Cohen 1988; McGraw & Wong 1992; Dunlap 1999).

| Country | ministery <nation? | military expenditure per cap. (USD) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| CY | n | 367.0 | 337.2 | 310.1 | 281.4 | 299.8 |
| CZ | n | 203.5 | 197.5 | 178.5 | 167.2 | 185.5 |
| DK | n | 789.6 | 749.7 | 718.4 | 593.4 | 617.7 |
| FI | n | 664.1 | 694.4 | 656.9 | 554.4 | 587.9 |
| FR | n | 944.5 | 977.6 | 992.1 | 859.4 | 862.4 |
| DE | n | 577.4 | 570.1 | 571.7 | 493.4 | 509.3 |
| HU | n | 132.8 | 129.0 | 122.3 | 114.8 | 127.8 |
| IE | n | 248.0 | 256.0 | 255.1 | 212.7 | 212.0 |
| IT | n | 564.7 | 567.0 | 528.1 | 423.0 | 467.4 |
| LV | n | 125.5 | 140.9 | 148.7 | 143.5 | 208.2 |
| NL | n | 618.8 | 608.4 | 612.6 | 512.1 | 545.1 |
| SK | n | 188.4 | 178.6 | 184.0 | 181.7 | 190.8 |
| SI | n | 263.5 | 245.4 | 235.3 | 193.8 | 195.5 |
| ES | n | 404.4 | 371.2 | 371.4 | 323.9 | 323.6 |
| SE | n | 654.2 | 678.4 | 675.6 | 550.9 | 540.2 |
| UK | n | 920.1 | 889.1 | 920.0 | 832.3 | 741.3 |
| AT | y | 376.9 | 380.5 | 388.1 | 311.9 | 334.2 |
| GR | y | 532.4 | 511.5 | 502.8 | 451.7 | 455.6 |
| LT | y | 108.9 | 119.7 | 146.4 | 163.7 | 223.3 |
| MT | y | 120.1 | 129.1 | 135.3 | 123.7 | 137.2 |
| PL | y | 232.8 | 240.2 | 267.9 | 264.5 | 242.1 |
| PT | y | 393.5 | 451.6 | 395.3 | 343.6 | 365.5 |
| RO | y | 105.4 | 123.9 | 137.0 | 132.3 | 142.8 |
| | | | | | | |
| t | | 2.26 | 2.08 | 2.07 | 1.94 | 1.97 |
| p | | 0.0366 | 0.0522 | 0.0528 | 0.0660 | 0.0634 |
| df | | 18 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 19 |
| mean | n | 479.16 | 474.41 | 467.54 | 402.36 | 413.40 |
| mean | y | 267.16 | 279.51 | 281.80 | 255.92 | 271.53 |
| median | n | 484.55 | 469.1 | 449.7 | 373.4 | 395.5 |
| median | y | 232.8 | 240.2 | 267.9 | 264.5 | 242.1 |

*Tab. 1*

The Welch's t test may only unveil a statistically significant relation for 2012, with Cohen's *d* of 1.07 as effect size value (which means that if you compare two countries each coming from different groups, in 65 percent of cases the country who has a "Ministry of Defense" will have more military expenditures than the country which has a "Ministry of National Defense"). However, the figures for 2013 through 2016 are very close to the 0.5-level of significance. The development in the years to come will have to be observed. For the moment, we can assume that a national parliament tends to spend less money for the military sector when the ministery is literally responsible for "national defense" only, but it tends to spend more money when it is terminologically responsible for "defense" in general.

An enlarged understanding of peace and violence toward "the other", which I have not covered in earlier publications, is the environment in general. Do we violently harm it or do we peacefully handle it with care? And is this connected to lexis? Some linguistic communities see the environment onomasiologically as an "around-thing" (e.g. Fr. *environnement* [whence E. *environment*], G. *Umwelt*), others as a "mid-thing" (e.g. Sp. *medio ambiente*, Pl. *środowisko*); the

rest has different, in part opaque designations. Is the onomasiological type of a speech community related to the way it treats the environment?

How do we measure how peacefully or violently we treat the environment? When we shed light on the environment we have to make sure that we do not shed light on differences that may be due to geological differences. The EU normally extends over two ecozones, or biomic zones (cf. Schultz 1995): the southern zones of subtropic regions with Mediterranean forests (Portugal, Spain, Italy, Croatia, Greece, Cyprus), and a northern zone of humid, temperate climate areas with broadleaf forests. It has to be admitted that the major parts of Sweden and Finland fall into taiga regions—an extreme northern zone, as it were. Yet the majority of these countries' populations live in humid, temperate climate regions. For this reason, Sweden and Finland are not considered a separate ecozone type for these studies.

One way to measure nations treatment of the environment may therefore be carbon dioxide ($CO_2$) emissions per capita. Respective figures are provided until 2014 by OWID (Our World in Data) (https://ourworldindata.org/). An additional analysis for the year 2017 is provided by the the EDGAR database created by the European Commission and the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (Munteal et al. 2019).

Table 2 orders the linguistic communities in onomasiological groups ("around-thing" type vs. "middle-thing" type)  and gives the countries' $CO_2$ emissions for four years, measured in tons per capita (according to OWID for 2012, 2013 and 2014 as well as according to EDGAR for 2017). Underneath it shows the data, together statistics results gathered through a Welch's t test (Welch 1947) for the year 2017, after a Shapiro-Wilk test (cf. Shapiro/Wilk 1965) has confirmed normal distribution at the 0.5-alpha-level of the data for this year, but not the preceding years.

| environm't < a=around-thing, m=mid-thing | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | OWID (Our World in Data) | | | EDGAR |
| | | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2017 |
| | environm't? | t pc | t pc | t pc | t pc |
| AT | a | 7.4 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 8.3 |
| BE | a | 8.5 | 8.7 | 8.3 | 9.1 |
| CY | a | 6.1 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 6.0 |
| CZ | a | 9.6 | 9.4 | 9.2 | 10.3 |
| DE | a | 9.2 | 9.4 | 8.9 | 9.7 |
| FI | a | 9.1 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 8.5 |
| FR | a | 5.1 | 5.1 | 4.6 | 5.2 |
| GR | a | 7.2 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 6.5 |
| HR | a | 4.2 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.2 |
| HU | a | 4.5 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 5.2 |
| LT | a | 4.6 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 5.3 |
| LU | a | 20.1 | 18.5 | 17.4 | 16.4 |
| NL | a | 10.2 | 10.3 | 9.9 | 10.3 |
| SI | a | 7.2 | 6.9 | 6.2 | 7.3 |
| ES | m | 5.7 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 6.1 |
| PL | m | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.5 | 8.4 |
| PT | m | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 5.5 |
| | | | | | |
| t | | | | | 1.11 |
| p | | | | | 0.3104 |
| df | | | | | 6 |
| mean | a | 7.95 | 7.59 | 7.31 | 7.86 |
| mean | m | 4.10 | 4.07 | 3.93 | 4.63 |
| median | a | 7.2 | 6.6 | 6.2 | 6.9 |
| median | m | 6.15 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 6.95 |

*Tab. 2*

Both the arithmetic means and the medians (i.e. is the value separating the higher half from the lower half of an ordered data sample) reveal that there is a difference. However, the difference is not big enough or the data not numerous enough to say that the difference is statistically significant since the p value is not under 0.05, which means that the probability that the difference is based on pure coincidence is not under 5 percent. But there are also other environmental indexes that can be checked.

Another parameter to measure our harm to the environment we may take the ecological footprint. The ecological footprint is an index created 25 years ago by Mathis Wackernagel under the auspices of William Rees (Wackernagel 1994, Wackernagel/Rees 1996) to measure the quantity of natural ressources it takes to keep up the standard of living of an individual or a country. For this, it calculates the required space for food growing, fiber production, timber regeneration, absorption of carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel burning, and accommodating built infrastructure. It is now predominantly measured by the Global Footprint Network (https://www.footprintnetwork.org) and also supported by the European Commission (cf. Best et al. 2008).

Again, the following table groups the linguistic communities according to onomasiological types, gives the countries' ecological footprint from the three most recently published years, measured in global hectares per capita according to the Global Footprint Network (http://data.footprintnetwork.org/#/) and shows the statistics results gathered through a Welch's t

test (Welch 1947), after a Shapiro-Wilk test (cf. Shapiro/Wilk 1965) has confirmed normal distribution of the data at the 0.5-alpha-level.

| environm't < a=around-thing, m=mid-thing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| | environm't? | footpr, gha/pc | footpr, gha/pc | footpr, gha/pc |
| AT | a | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| BE | a | 6.9 | 6.4 | 6.3 |
| CY | a | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.7 |
| CZ | a | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| DE | a | 5.0 | 4.9 | 4.8 |
| FI | a | 6.0 | 5.9 | 6.3 |
| FR | a | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.4 |
| GR | a | 4.3 | 4.1 | 4.3 |
| HR | a | 3.6 | 3.8 | 3.9 |
| HU | a | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| LT | a | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| NL | a | 6.1 | 5.7 | 4.8 |
| SI | a | 4.7 | 4.9 | 5.1 |
| ES | m | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| PL | m | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.4 |
| PT | m | 3.7 | 4.0 | 4.1 |
| | | | | |
| *t* | | *2.87* | *3.25* | *2.71* |
| *p* | | *0.0168* | *0.0064* | *0.0178* |
| *df* | | *10* | *13* | *13* |
| *mean* | *a* | *4.69* | *4.62* | *4.60* |
| *mean* | *m* | *3.97* | *4.07* | *4.17* |
| *median* | *a* | *5.0* | *4.9* | *4.8* |
| *median* | *m* | *3.8* | *4.0* | *4.1* |

*Tab. 3*

This time, we see a statistically significant correlation (all years' p values are below 0.05): If the environment is onomasiologically "around" them, people produce a larger ecological footprint, if the environment is onomasiologically "the center", "the middle", then people produce a smaller ecological footprint. Cohen's *d* as indicator of the effect size ranges from 1.74 to 2.08. Expressed in Common Language Effect Size this means that if you compare two countries each coming from different groups, in about 75 percent of cases the country where the environment is onomasiologically a "center" notion will have a lower ecological footprint than the country where the environment is onomasiologically an "around" notion.

These first observations show that it could be fruitful to delve more deeply into environmental lexemes and environmental indexes.

## 4. Outlook

Language and peace/violence are connected. The general result is not new, but the article has shed light on sources and aspects that have so far been only marginally studied. Furthermore, it presented a methodology that links language and peace/violence in a way that must still be termed alternative, or innovative. Basically, I have addressed two aspects of peace-threatening language. First, I gave examples how venues that one would could consider democratic or rather left-wing have their share

in creating an enemy image. Actually, Article 20 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (in effect since 1976) forbids any propaganda for war as well as any promotion of national or religious hatred that incites discrimination, hostility or violence by law. And it shall be added that Paul Rutherford (2004) called propaganda a weapon of mass persuasion. Against this background, it seems particularly noteworthy to see strongly biased articles in an encyclopedia. Whether this situation was planned or is just something that gradually emerged cannot be decided here. What seems important to me is to raise awareness among Wikipedia authors and readers so that procedures can be designed that render Wikipedia trustworthy also when it comes to entries of current politics.

Furthermore, indicators were shown that talking about the environment and dealing with the environment. indicators can be interconnected. Thus, the connection of violence and language seems not restricted to talking about other people or nations.

I would like to point out a few works as a reminder of the last Eurolinguistics conference at VHS Donauwörth. While Francisco Gomes de Matos was likely to be the first general advocate of the conscious use of language for the promotion of peace (cf. Friedrich 2012), it was Marshall B. Rosenberg, who presented a fully working interpersonal peace-promoting communication technique, which he called *non-violent communication* (e.g. Rosenberg 2005). I would like to recommend that not only when we talk <u>to</u> someone, but also when we talk <u>about</u> someone or something, we should strive for words that omit morpho-semantically clear peace-threats.

*Joachim Grzega*
*Innovative Europäische Sprachlehre (InES)*
*Vhs Donauwörth*
*Spindeltal 5*
*DE-86099 Donauwörth*
*joachim.grzega@vhs-don.de*
*or:*
*Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaftliche Fakultät*
*Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt*
*Universitätsallee 1*
*DE-85072 Eichstätt*
*joachim.grzega@ku.de*

# References

Best, Aaron et al. (2008), Potential of the Ecological Footprint for monitoring environmental impacts from natural resource use: Analysis of the potential of the Ecological Footprint and related assessment tools for use in the EU's Thematic Strategy on the Sustainable Use of Natural Resources. Report to the European Commission, DG Environment.
https://ec.europa.eu/environment/archives/natres/pdf/footprint.pdf (31-07-2019)

Bröckers, Mathias / Schreyer, Paul (2014), *Wir sind die Guten: Ansichten eines Putinverstehers oder wie uns die Medien manipulieren*, Frankfurt (Main): Westend.

Chomsky, Noam / Herman, Edward (1988), *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*, New York: Pantheon.

Cohen, Jacob (1988), *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences,* 2nd ed., New York: Academic Press.

Dunlap, William (1999), "A Program to Compute McGraw and Wong's Common Language Effect Size Indicator", *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers* 31/4: 706–709.

Friedrich, Patricia (ed.) (2012), *Nonkilling Linguistics: Practical Applications*, Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling.

Geistlinger, Michael (2014), "Der Beitritt der Republik Krim zur Russländischen Föderation aus der Warte des Selbstbestimmungsrechts der Völker", *Archiv des Völkerrechts* 52/2: 175-204.

Grzega, Joachim (2017a), *Wohlstand durch Wortschatz? Wie Wörter die Leistung europäischer Länder prägen und uns Chancen zum Besserem bieten*, [ASEcoLi Publications by the Academy for SocioEconomic Linguistics 10], Berlin: epubli.

Grzega, Joachim (2017b), "Qualitative and Quantitative Comments on Peace and War ", *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* 15: 48-62.

Grzega, Joachim (2019a), *Wort-Waffen abschaffen! Beobachtungen zu Europas gewaltvoller Wortwahl und Ideen für eine friedensstiftende Sprache*, Berlin: epubli.

Grzega, Joachim (2019b), "Zweierlei Maß: Durch die unterschiedliche Darstellung Russlands und der USA macht sich Wikipedia zum Propagandainstrument", *Rubikon* 11-07-2019.
https://www.rubikon.news/artikel/zweierlei-mass-2 (31-07-19).

Hanusch, Nora (2014), "From Words to War: Eine Analyse des metaphorischen Sprachgebrauchs internationaler Printmedien vor Ausbruch des Irakkrieges 2003", *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* 11: 44-50.
http://www.eurolinguistix.com (31-07-19).

Hippler, Nina (2016), "Der Syrien-Krieg in den Medien – eurolinguistische Analysen", *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* 13: 28-80.
http://www.eurolinguistix.com (31-07-19).

Krone-Schmalz, Gabriele (2015), *Russland verstehen: Der Kampf um die Ukraine und die Arroganz des Westens*, München: Beck.

Landler, Mark (2016), "For Obama, an Unexpected Legacy of Two Full Terms at War", *New York Times* 15.05.16.
https://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/15/us/politics/obama-as-wartime-president-has-wrestled-with-protecting-nation-and-troops.html?_r=0 (31-07-2019)

McGraw, Kenneth O. / Wong, S. P. (1992), "A Common Language Effect Size Statistic", *Psychological Bulletin* 11: 361-365.

Merkel, Reinhard (2014), "Kühle Ironie der Geschichte: Die Krim und das Völkerrecht", *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* 06.04.2014.
https://www.faz.net/aktuell/feuilleton/debatten/die-krim-und-das-voelkerrecht-kuehle-ironie-der-geschichte-12884464.html (31-07-19)

Morelli, Anne (2001), *Principes élémentaires de propagande de guerre: Utilisables en guerre, chaude ou tiède*, Bruxelles: Aden.

Muntean, Marilena et al. (2018), *Fossil $CO_2$ Emissions of All World Countries: 2018 Report*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/JRC113738/kjna29433enn.pdf (31-07-19)

Nohrstedt, Stig A. et al. (2000), "From the Persian Gulf to Kosovo – War Journalism and Propaganda", *European Journal of Communication* 15: 383-404.

Ponsonby, Arthur (1928), *Falsehood in War-Time: Propaganda Lies of the First World War*, London: Allen and Unwin.

Roggemann, Herwig (2015), *Ukraine-Konflikt und Rußlandpolitik*, Berlin: BWV.

Rosenberg, Marshall B. (2005), *Speak Peace in a World of Conflict: What You Say Next Will Change Your World*, Encinitas: Puddle Dancer.

Rutherford, Paul (2004), *Weapons of Mass Persuasion: Marketing the War Against Iraq*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Schiller, Dietmar et al. (2007), "Qualität der Wikipedia – eine vergleichende Studie", in: *Open Innovation – neue Perspektiven im Kontext von Information und Wissen?, Beiträge des 10. Symposiums für Informationswissenschaft und der 13. IuK-Tagung der wissenschaftlichen Fachgesellschaften*, 77-90, Regensburg: Universität.
https://epub.uni-regensburg.de/6836/1/OpenInnovation_ISI2007_UVK.pdf (31-07-2019)

Schultz, Jürgen (1995), *The Ecozones of the World*, Heidelberg: Springer.

Shapiro, Samuel S. / Wilk, Martin B. (1965), "Analysis of variance test for normality (complete samples)", *Biometrika* 52: 591–611.

van den Driest, Simone F. (2015), "Crimea's Separation from Ukraine: An Analysis of the Right to Self-Determination and (Remedial) Secession in International Law", Netherlands International Law Review 62/3: 329-363.

Wackernagel, Mathis (1994), Ecological Footprint and Appropriated Carrying Capacity: A Tool for Planning Toward Sustainability, PhD thesis, Vancouver, Canada: School of Community and Regional Planning. The University of British Columbia.
https://circle.ubc.ca/bitstream/handle/2429/7132/ubc_1994-954027.pdf?sequence=1 (31-07-2019)

Wackernagel, Mathis / Rees, William (1996), *Our Ecological Footprint: Reducing Human Impact on the Earth*, Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.

Welch, Bernard L. (1947), "The Generalization of 'Student's' Problem When Several Different Population Variances are Involved", *Biometrika* 34: 28-35.
Zollmann, Florian (2017), Media, Propaganda and the Politics of Intervention, New York: Peter Lang.