

Joachim Grzega

Eurolinguistic Observations on Words of Peace and Conflict at the 2025 General Debate of the UN General Assembly

Abstract

This contribution addresses the overall question: How peace-oriented, or diplomacy-oriented, is the vocabulary of speeches given at the 80th General Debate session of United Nations General Assembly? After preliminary failed attempts with the help of ChatGPT and Copilot, the lexis of 36 English speeches (and another 6 non-English speeches) are analyzed with respect to four conflict-related vocabulary fields and four peace-related vocabulary fields and with respect to group differences and group similarities with the help of the program LIWC-22. As to the speeches, results say: (1) There are no statistically significant differences between (a) NATO and non-NATO, (b) Europe in a wider sense and non-Europe, (c) EU and non-EU, (d) but speeches from countries where English is not an official language display more conflict language than those from countries where English is an official language. (2) European features can be determined for one peace and three conflict vocabulary fields. (3) There are no further prominent clusters of peace-oriented vocabulary except that the three most peace-oriented speeches were given by speakers from small countries.

Sommaire

Cette contribution traite de la question générale suivante : dans quelle mesure le vocabulaire des discours prononcés lors de la 80^e session du débat général de l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies est-il orienté vers la paix ou la diplomatie? Après plusieurs tentatives préliminaires infructueuses avec l'aide de ChatGPT et de Copilot, le lexique de 36 discours en anglais (ainsi que de 6 autres discours prononcés dans d'autres langues) est analysé à l'aide du programme LIWC-22, en tenant compte de quatre champs lexicaux liés au conflit et de quatre champs lexicaux liés à la paix, ainsi que des différences et des similitudes entre groupes. Quant aux discours, on peut dire : (1) Il n'y pas de différences statistiquement significatives entre (a) les pays membres de l'OTAN et les pays non membres, (b) l'Europe *lato sensu* et les pays non européens, (c) les États membres de l'Union européenne et les États non membres ; en revanche, (d) les discours des pays où l'anglais n'est pas une langue officielle contiennent davantage de vocabulaire lié au conflit que ceux des pays où l'anglais est une langue officielle. (2) Des caractéristiques propres à l'Europe peuvent être mises en évidence pour un champ lexical liée à la paix et trois champs lexicaux liées au conflit. (3) Aucun autre regroupement prominent de vocabulaire orienté vers la paix n'apparaît, si ce n'est que les trois discours les plus orientés vers la paix ont été prononcés par des représentants de petits États.

Zusammenfassung

Dieser Beitrag geht der übergeordneten Frage nach: Wie friedensorientiert bzw. diplomatieorientiert ist der Wortschatz der Reden, die auf der 80. Tagung der Generaldebatte der Generalversammlung der Vereinten Nationen gehalten wurden? Nach mehreren zunächst erfolglosen Versuchen mithilfe von ChatGPT und Copilot wird der Wortschatz von 36 englischsprachigen Reden (sowie weiteren 6 nicht-englischsprachigen Reden) mit dem Programm LIWC-22 hinsichtlich vier konfliktbezogener und vier friedensbezogener Wortschatzfelder sowie im Hinblick auf Unterschiede und Gemeinsamkeiten zwischen verschiedenen Gruppen analysiert. Bezüglich der Reden lässt sich sagen: (1) Es gibt keine statistisch bedeutsamen Unterschiede zwischen (a) NATO- und Nicht-NATO-Staaten, (b) Europa im weiteren Sinne und außereuropäischen Staaten sowie (c) EU- und Nicht-EU-Staaten; (d) allerdings weisen Reden aus Ländern, in denen Englisch keine Amtssprache ist, mehr konfliktbezogene Sprache auf als Reden aus Ländern, in denen Englisch Amtssprache ist. (2) Für Europa lassen sich charakteristische Merkmale in einer friedensbezogenen und drei konfliktbezogenen Wortschatzfeldern nachweisen. (3) Darüber hinaus zeigen sich keine weiteren auffälligen Gruppierungen friedensorientierten Wortschatzes, mit Ausnahme der Tatsache, dass die drei am stärksten friedensorientierten Reden von Vertretern kleiner Staaten gehalten wurden.

1. Basic Idea and Motivation

This contribution addresses the question of how peace-oriented or diplomacy-oriented the vocabulary of speeches given at the 80th General Debate session of United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in September 2025 is, particularly with respect to speeches from European countries. The motivation for this question is threefold:

- (1) Norbert Reiter, who coined the term *Eurolinguistics*, saw Eurolinguistics also as an auxiliary discipline to create a feeling of European community and thus to promote peace (see Reiter 1995)—and this idea was also integrated in two manifestos, to wit ELAMA’s Pushkin Manifesto (URL01) and the EHP Memorandum on Establishing Eurolinguistics as a University Field (URL02).
- (2) Analyses of the US–Russia–Ukraine related cover pages of widespread political magazines in various European and non-European countries (see, e.g. Grzega 2023a and 2023b) had shown a clear use of the classical rhetoric principles used for preparing and continuing wars (see Ponsonby 1928 and Morelli 2001) as well as the use of a new principle that could be formulated as “Diplomacy is weakness”. Furthermore, the classical definition of *diplomacy* is challenged in the EU parliament (Grzega 2025a). Since nevertheless classical diplomacy seems to end most wars there is value in searching for diplomats and thus it seemed interesting to check how diplomatic the style of European and non-European politicians was when representing their country at the UNGA.
- (3) The growing elaboration of so-called “Artificial Intelligence” programs such as ChatGPT (URL03) and Copilot (URL04) made it interesting to examine how such programs could be helpful for multilingual analyses.

2. Preliminary Tests with ChatGPT and CoPilot

2.1. Experiences with ChatGPT

I selected the speeches of 12 countries, namely Germany, India, the Netherlands, Romania, Sweden, the UK, the US (all given in English) as well as (given in their respective state-wide official language) Brazil, France, Italy, Russia, and Spain. I put these in one file. My prompt to ChatGPT was this:

“In the file attached you are given 12 speeches given at the UN General Assembly. Imagine yourself in the position of an impartial linguistic researcher. Characterize the 12 texts according to word choice. Describe which speeches are closer to one another, which are more distant from one another.”

The result given by ChatGPT was several pages long and started as follows (boldprint, italics and the like in the original):

“The twelve speeches fall into several relatively distinct lexical families. (The PDF appears to contain one speech after another, beginning with French, then Italian, English, etc.)

1. The “multilateral institutional” cluster (very close to one another)

These speeches use a highly diplomatic vocabulary centered on institutions rather than actors. Typical lexical fields include:

- *multilateralism*
- *international law*
- *cooperation*
- *dialogue*
- *peace*
- *security*
- *development*
- *international community*
- *collective action*
- *UN Charter*
- *human rights*
- *international humanitarian law*

The French speech is an excellent example of this style. Words such as *multilatéralisme efficace, coopération, droit, responsabilité, cadre collectif, défis globaux*, and *agir ensemble* recur throughout the text.

This lexical family tends to:

- favor abstract nouns over concrete actors,
- use institutional rather than emotional vocabulary,
- repeat concepts like *collective, global, international, common, shared*,
- avoid colloquial language.

These speeches are linguistically the closest to one another.

2. The “normative European” cluster

Several speeches share a recognizably European diplomatic lexicon but are somewhat more policy-oriented.

Characteristic vocabulary includes

- sovereignty
- proportionality
- reconstruction
- humanitarian aid
- sanctions
- democratic institutions
- negotiations
- reform
- accountability

Compared with the first cluster, these speeches contain more legal terminology and more references to concrete policy instruments.

The Italian speech, for example, repeatedly combines legal vocabulary with diplomatic vocabulary:

- international law
- proportionality
- ceasefire
- humanitarian norms
- reform of the UN
- transparency
- responsibility

rather than the more inspirational language of the French address.

Lexically these speeches remain close to the French one but are slightly more technical.”

It moves on with several other clusters. The final overall assessment was:

“From a purely linguistic perspective, the twelve speeches do **not** form twelve completely distinct styles. Instead, they cluster into **three broad lexical traditions**:

1. **Institutional–multilateral diplomacy** (highly abstract, legal, cooperative).
2. **Developmental–economic diplomacy** (growth, investment, partnerships, technology).
3. **Security–conflict diplomacy** (war, sovereignty, deterrence, humanitarian crises).

Among them, the French speech is one of the most lexically **hybrid** texts: it draws extensively on all three traditions and therefore sits near the center of the overall lexical landscape rather than at one of its extremes.”

This sounded a good start, but on the other hand was too vague. So my next prompt read this:

“Imagine yourself in the role of a multilingual linguist analyzing texts for word-choice and discourse structure (not for grammatical structure). Analyze the texts I am attaching in a strictly impartial scientific way. Analyze, categorize and group the texts with respect to the following questions:

1. the use of words relating to “peace” vs. the use of words relating to “war” or “conflict”
2. the use of words relating to “diplomacy” or “dialogue” or “cooperation” vs. the use of words relating to “strength” or “military strength”
3. the use of words relating to “guilt of the other, blame on the other” vs. the use of words relating to “guilt of one’s own nation, blame on one’s own nation”
4. the mentioning of conflicts with an assignment of guilt vs. the mentioning of conflicts without an assignment of guilt
5. the use of evaluative words for different conflicts (e.g. “war of aggression”, “unjustified war”)

For each analysis of questions 1 to 4 give ratios for each text, together with the words analyzed; give the words in the original language and give a translation for them. For question 5, just give the list of conflicts followed by the evaluative words for each text; give the words in the original language and give a translation for them.”

ChatGPT, claiming to ask for more precise information for the methodology and presentation of results, asked a few more questions, strangely some elements of the questions were asked several times. Finally, what ChatGPT yielded was a set of unreliable results. When I had a text analyzed a second time, the results were completely different.

2.2. Experiences with Copilot

Then I moved to Copilot. The prompt was the same:

“In the file attached you are given 12 speeches given at the UN General Assembly. Imagine yourself in the position of an impartial linguistic researcher. Characterize the 12 texts according to word choice. Describe which speeches are closer to one another, which are more distant from one another.”

The result by Copilot, too, was several pages long and started as follows (boldprint in the original; instead of larger fonts, all caps are used):

“Below is a **linguistic, word-choice-based comparison** of the 12 UNGA speeches you provided. I’m treating them as an impartial researcher would: focusing strictly on **lexical patterns, rhetorical style, semantic fields, and discourse markers**, not on political evaluation. All citations refer to the uploaded document.

OVERVIEW: HOW THE 12 SPEECHES CLUSTER BY WORD CHOICE

Even without computational stylometry, the texts fall into **four clear linguistic families**:

Cluster	Speeches	Linguistic Traits
A. Hyper-personal, confrontational, colloquial	Text 1	Highly informal, self-referential, evaluative, repetitive, emotionally charged vocabulary
B. Formal, ideological, historically framed, anti-Western	Texts 2, 3, 8, 9, 11	Heavy use of abstract nouns, geopolitical terminology, historical analogies, moral-legal vocabulary
C. Formal multilateralist, institutional, technocratic	Texts 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12	Diplomatic register, multilateral verbs (“support”, “uphold”), UN-specific lexicon, structured argumentation

Cluster	Speeches	Linguistic Traits
D. Hybrid: formal but strongly moralizing	Text 4 and 12 (bridge texts)	Mix of institutional language with emotionally charged moral vocabulary

Let's examine each in detail.

CLUSTER A: TEXT 1 (UNIQUE OUTLIER)

Why Text 1 stands alone

Its **lexical profile is radically different** from all others. It uses:

- **Colloquial speech**: “You know what that means”, “I’m really good at this stuff”, “Who the hell ever heard of that one?”
- **Self-referential pronouns** at extremely high frequency (“I”, “me”, “my administration”).
- **Superlatives and intensifiers**: “the greatest”, “the strongest”, “never been anything like that”, “totally obliterating everything”.
- **Adversarial vocabulary**: “invasion”, “criminals”, “laughingstock”, “destroying your countries”.
- **Repetition as emphasis**: “We have to get it done. We have to get it done.”
- **Humor and anecdote**: the teleprompter and escalator stories.

Linguistic distance

Text 1 is **maximally distant** from all others because:

- It uses **spoken-language markers** rather than diplomatic prose.
- It relies on **evaluative adjectives** rather than abstract nouns.
- It uses **narrative digressions**, which no other text does.
- It contains **extreme emotional polarity** (very positive self-evaluation, very negative out-group evaluation).

Conclusion: Text 1 forms a **cluster of one**.”

Text 1 was Trump’s speech. And so the analysis moved on for each cluster. At first sight, this looked very useful. So I also inserted my second prompt:

“For each speech give me:

- (1.1) a list of all tokens (original language + English translation) of peace-words vs. war-words,
- (1.2) the counts of peace-words and the counts of war-words,
- (1.3) the ratio of peace-words / war-words,
- (2.1) a list of all tokens (original language + English translation) of diplomacy-words vs. strength-words connected to conflict
- (2.2) the counts of diplomacy-words vs. strength-words,
- (2.3) the ratio of diplomacy-words / strength-words,
- (3.1) a list of all tokens (original language + English translation) of blame-words on other vs. blame-words on self,
- (3.2) the counts of blame-words on other vs. blame-words on self,
- (3.3) the ratio of blame-words on other / blame-words on self.”

However, when I checked the results with the actual speeches, several lists showed severe gaps. Thus the numbers were also fully unreliable.

I then decided to check what would happen if I had just one text analysed. I inserted France’s speech preceded by the following prompt:

“Imagine yourself in the position of an impartial linguistic researcher. In the following French text, mark all expressions related to war, conflict and the like in red and all expressions related to peace, reconciliation and the like in green. At the end, give me the quantity of all expressions in red and the quantity of all expressions in green.”

My own analysis showed that Copilot’s results, again, proved unreliable.

Finally, I tried the following prompt with the French text:

“Imagine yourself in the position of an experienced multilingual linguist who analyzes and categorizes texts. Look at the following text. Extract each word related to the semantic field of conflict/war. This words shall be called KWIC (= keyword in context). Quote each KWIC together with the citation of exactly 3 words before the KWIC and 3 words after the KWIC. List each quoted string of seven words on a separate line, preceded by a number in asecending order. At the end of this list give the exact total number of words included in this text (with “word” meaning a string of letters normally followed by a space, comma, semicolon, dot, dash, question mark, quotation mark, or exclamation mark).”

Again, my own analysis revealed that Copilot’s results were again unreliable.

My preliminary conclusion therefore is that ChatGPT and Copilot are useless for quantitative analyses of texts. The next step was therefore to find another, reliable methodology.

3. Final Research Questions and Methodology

Due to the disappointing performance by ChatGPT and Copilot, I decided to resort to LIWC-22 (Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count, 2022 Version) (see URL05). Way over 20,000 publications already seem to have used LIWC for the analysis of texts. LIWC is a program that enables to analyze a text for certain semantically grouped word-lists or lexical fields, which ae called dictionaries in LIWC-22. The user can select dictionaries which a text should be analyzed for and the program will give the percentage of tokens of the text that falls into each selected dictionary. Way over 20,000 publications already seem to have used LIWC for the analysis of texts. LIWC includes dictionaries in languages other than English, too, but since they represent different sizes, they are uncomparable. What is positive, though, is that users can also create lexical fields by themselves. Thus, I created a field “Diplomacy”, which includes the following words that I considered central to the concept of “diplomacy” as they all include the notion of ‘non-unilateral’ and ‘language use’:

accord
accords
agreement
agreements
arbitrate
arbitrated
arbitrates
arbitrating
arbitration
arbitrations
concord
concords
consent

consents
conversation
conversations
dialog
dialogic
dialogs
dialogue
dialogues
diplomacy
diplomat
diplomatic
diplomats
discussion
discussions

Then I determined a research question to which LIWC could be applied. From the speeches at the 80th UNGA General Debate (see URL06), I selected 36 speeches in English, namely the ones by the representatives of these countries (in alphabetical order, together with the abbreviations according to ISO 3166-1):

Australia (au)
 Austria (at)
 Belgium (be)
 Bulgaria (bg)
 Croatia (hr)
 Cyprus (cy)
 Czech Republic (cz)
 Denmark (dk)
 Estonia (ee)
 Finland (fi)
 Germany (de)
 Greece (gr)
 Hungary (hu)
 India (in)
 Indonesia (id)
 Ireland (ie)
 Latvia (lv)
 Lithuania (lt)
 Luxemburg (lu)
 Malta (mt)
 Moldova (md)
 Netherlands (nl)
 Nigeria (na)
 Norway (no)
 Portugal (pt)
 Republic of Serbia (rs)
 Romania (ro)
 San Marino (sm)
 Slovakia (sk)
 Slovenia (si)
 South Africa (za)

Sweden (se)
 United Kingdom (uk)
 Ukraine (ua)
 US (us)
 Vatican (va)

There are over 100 lexical fields in LIWC-22, a few of which are related to peace and conflict. For reasons of balanced analysis, I decided to choose the same number of peace-related and conflict-related fields. So I selected eight lexical fields, namely four lexical fields related to conflict and four lexical fields related to peace. The lexical fields related to conflict are:

- the LIWC lexical field “Drives: Power” (example words: *allow, order, own*)
- the LIWC lexical field “Social Processes: Conflict” (example words: *attack, fight, kill*)
- the LIWC lexical field “Tone: Negative” (example words: *bad, hate, wrong*)
- the LIWC lexical field “Emotion: Negative” (example words: *bad, hate, hurt*)

The lexical fields related to peace are:

- the LIWC lexical field “Social Processes: Prosocial Behavior” (example words: *care, help, thank*)
- the LIWC lexical field “Tone: Positive” (example words: *good, love, new*)
- the LIWC lexical field “Emotion: Positive” (example words: *good, love, happy*)
- my own lexical field “Diplomacy” (see above)

Based on the lexis of 36 speeches in English, characterized with respect to the four conflict-related and the four peace-related lexical fields, our research questions are whether there are:

- (RQ1) statistically significant differences (according to two-tailed t-tests for independent samples [URL07, Cohen 1988]) between
 - (RQ1a) NATO and non-NATO
 - (RQ1b) Europe lato sensu (i.e. from the Atlantic to the Urals) and non-Europe
 - (RQ1c) EU and non-EU
 - (RQ1d) English-official countries and non-English-official countries
- (RQ2) European features (according to the classification in Grzega 2013, see also Grzega 2025b)
- (RQ3) other salient clusters of peace-oriented lexis (according to Top Five and Bottom Five rankings)?

4. Analysis and Results

For the analysis, the speeches were uploaded into LIWC-22 as separate PDFs, each one freed from any added text such as logos, addresses, header and footer. LIWC-22 then calculated the values for its own selected categories plus the newly created category “Diplomacy”. The raw results are given in the Appendix.

4.1. Significance of Group Differences

After LIWC-22 had calculated the values, I classified the speeches into the various antonymic groups (see above: RQ1a through RQ1d) in order to see whether group differences were statistically significant. For this task, classical two-tailed t-tests for independent samples were proceeded (see URL07). The significance level was determined for $p=0.05$, i.e. every p-value under 0.05 is considered statistically significant. In addition, the results were converted into Cohen’s d, which

indicates the effect size, i.e. how many percent of the differences can probably be explained through the specific type of group difference.

With regard to the comparisons of NATO vs. non-NATO countries, countries from Europe lato sensu (i.e. countries from the Atlantic to the Urals) vs. those from outside Europe lato sensu and EU countries vs. non-EU countries, there are no statistically significant differences. As to the differences between countries with English as an official language and countries where English is not an official language, there are a few statistically significant differences regarding the lexical fields “Power” and “Negative Emotion”. This is shown in Fig. 1.

Country	E off	power	emo_neg
AT	n	4.91	0.72
BE	n	5.45	0.52
BG	n	4.30	0.37
CY	n	4.59	0.47
CZ	n	4.98	0.65
DE	n	4.24	0.43
DK	n	4.60	0.35
EE	n	4.34	0.76
FI	n	4.84	0.68
GR	n	3.99	0.35
HR	n	4.95	0.29
HU	n	4.44	0.54
ID	n	5.53	0.78
LT	n	6.21	1.11
LU	n	4.56	0.52
LV	n	5.24	0.57
MD	n	6.95	0.25
NL	n	2.75	0.69
NO	n	4.78	0.50
PT	n	4.11	0.16
RO	n	3.58	0.24
RS	n	3.40	0.49
SE	n	5.80	0.75
SI	n	5.57	0.45
SK	n	4.59	0.66
SM	n	4.60	0.81
UA	n	5.01	0.42
VA	n	4.73	0.53
AU	y	4.08	0.38
IE	y	5.23	0.33
IN	y	3.89	0.31
MT	y	2.83	0.40
NA	y	3.71	0.34
UK	y	3.84	0.65
US	y	3.19	0.39
ZA	y	3.69	0.06
mean n		4.75	0.54
mean y		3.81	0.36
median n		4.67	0.52
median y		3.78	0.36
t		2.88	2.15
p		0.0069	0.0309
Cohen's d		1.15	0.90

Fig. 1: Correlation speeches from English-official countries and the lexical fields “power” and “negative emotion”

Also of note, the Diplomacy vocabulary makes up less than 1 percent of the words—even if you

include English translations of the speeches from France, Italy, Poland, Russia, China and Brazil. This is shown in Fig. 2. Note that nine countries do not show any words from the lexical field “Diplomacy” at all (Belgium, Denmark, Italy, Latvia, Poland, Ukraine, Macedonia, China, Nigeria).

Country	diplomacy
SK	0.66
RU*	0.61
BG	0.55
NL	0.55
RS	0.52
VA	0.50
AT	0.43
LU	0.41
HR	0.40
ZA	0.38
CY	0.37
CZ	0.37
MT	0.33
FI	0.32
GR	0.32
PT	0.32
DE	0.31
EE	0.30
HU	0.29
BR*	0.28
FR*	0.28
AU	0.26
LT	0.20
US	0.20
RO	0.19
SM	0.18
SI	0.17
IE	0.16
SE	0.12
UK	0.12
NO	0.11
ID	0.07
IN	0.06
BE	0.00
CN*	0.00
DK	0.00
IT*	0.00
LV	0.00
MD	0.00
NA	0.00
PL*	0.00
UA	0.00

Fig. 2: Frequency of lexical field “Diplomacy” (* = speech given in a language other than English)

In sum: Speakers from countries where English is not official language use more conflict language than those countries where English is official language. According to Cohen's *d*, 86 and 90 percent of the differences can be related to the respective variable (status of English). Needless to say that correlation is not yet causation, but it is a good indicator for further research. All in all, though, there are not many vital differences, which means that either the representatives from all countries can be seen pretty much alike or that the differences are very individual.

4.2. European Features

Since there were not many statistical differences, my next step was looking for European features. This raises the question of when values on a scale should be called "European". It is useless to define something as "European" only if it exists in 100 percent of the European languages. One will hardly ever find such a feature. The definition must be a clear majority, such as 66 or 75 percent, depending on the amount of languages that are analyzed: the larger the number of languages, the lower the percentage that will be needed. At any rate, the selection of languages must be representative.

For scales, the definition is even more complex. For example, one may have five countries (A to E) with the presence of a linguistic element in an analyzed corpus expressed in the values A=99, B=70, C=67, D=51, E=49 (on a scale from 100 to 0). It does not make sense to say that the majority of countries show values of over 50 and therefore consider A, B, C and D as typical. First, the 50 as a threshold for defining presence or absence of something is problematic. 51 and 49 are basically the same, namely presence and absence of a feature are basically balanced. Hence, 33%-ranges are more useful: 100–67 = feature present; 66–34 = presence and absence of feature balanced; 33–0 = feature absent.

Another aspect is that the value 99 in our example is much more away from all the others. Therefore, such a definition does not help. Moreover, in a natural texts a linguistic feature can hardly every be present for 100 percent.

I had discussed this in earlier Europragmatic studies (Grzega 2013: 37-41) and will present my thoughts again here. For scales from 0 to 100 I will take the median of the European values and then see whether 66 percent of the European languages are within the median's surrounding 33 percentage range, in other words: whether 66 percent of the European values cover the range from the value 16 percentage points below the median to the value 16 percentage points above the median. If a scale goes from 0 to 100; 100 means that all words in the corpus fall precisely into that one selected lexical field. This is, of course, impossible with natural texts. However, there is also not a clear natural maximum that can be determined. Therefore, we can resort to the procedure that 100 represents the highest determined score of a European language or culture. I have also suggested (Grzega 2013: 39)

"to exclude borderline countries here. This will exactly enable us to see how these borderline cases behave in comparison to the members that are 'clearly' European and how the clearly non-European countries behave (so that researchers will be able to label a European feature 'exclusively European' or 'European, but not exclusively')."

In other words, one should first have a look at a rather narrow definition of Europe. For this study, the EU seems best suited for a definition of "Europe in a narrow sense".

In the following, Figures 3 through 6 give those categories where we do find European features in the sense described, namely "Power", "Negative Emotions", "Negative Tone", "Positive Tone".

Each figure consists of two parts. The left side gives the values of speeches from those European countries which can be seen as “Europe stricto sensu” (here: EU members); their scores are also given in bold print. The green scores indicate that there are more than 66 percent of the values that fall within the 33-percent range around the median of the scores of these European countries strictu sensu. The right side adds the values of the speeches from those countries that can only be called *European* in a wider sense.

Country	power	score		Country	power	score
LT	6.21	100		MD	6.95	112
SE	5.80	93		LT	6.21	100
SI	5.57	90		SE	5.80	93
BE	5.45	88		SI	5.57	90
LV	5.24	84		BE	5.45	88
IE	5.23	84		LV	5.24	84
CZ	4.98	80		IE	5.23	84
HR	4.95	80		UA	5.01	81
AT	4.91	79		CZ	4.98	80
FI	4.84	78		HR	4.95	80
DK	4.60	74		AT	4.91	79
CY	4.59	74		FI	4.84	78
SK	4.59	74		NO	4.78	77
LU	4.56	73		VA	4.73	76
HU	4.44	71		SM	4.60	74
EE	4.34	70		DK	4.60	74
BG	4.30	69		CY	4.59	74
DE	4.24	68		SK	4.59	74
PT	4.11	66		LU	4.56	73
GR	3.99	64		HU	4.44	71
RO	3.58	58		EE	4.34	70
MT	2.83	46		BG	4.30	69
NL	2.75	44		DE	4.24	68
				PT	4.11	66
median		74		GR	3.99	64
=E from		90		UK	3.84	62
to		58		RO	3.58	58
				RS	3.40	55
				MT	2.83	46
				NL	2.75	44
				median		74
				=E from		90
				to		58

Fig. 3: “Power” words converted into scores; left side Europe stricto sensu, right side Europe lato sensu; =E means ‘33% European range’, bold means ‘Europe stricto sensu’, green indicates ‘more than 66% of states’

Country	emo_neg	score		Country	emo_neg	score
LT	1.11	100		LT	1.11	100
EE	0.76	68		SM	0.81	73
SE	0.75	68		EE	0.76	68
AT	0.72	65		SE	0.75	68
NL	0.69	62		AT	0.72	65
FI	0.68	61		NL	0.69	62
SK	0.66	59		FI	0.68	61
CZ	0.65	59		SK	0.66	59
LV	0.57	51		CZ	0.65	59
HU	0.54	49		UK	0.65	59
LU	0.52	47		LV	0.57	51
BE	0.52	47		HU	0.54	49
CY	0.47	42		VA	0.53	48
SI	0.45	41		LU	0.52	47
DE	0.43	39		BE	0.52	47
MT	0.40	36		NO	0.50	45
BG	0.37	33		RS	0.49	44
GR	0.35	32		CY	0.47	42
DK	0.35	32		SI	0.45	41
IE	0.33	30		DE	0.43	39
HR	0.29	26		UA	0.42	38
RO	0.24	22		MT	0.40	36
PT	0.16	14		BG	0.37	33
				GR	0.35	32
median		47		DK	0.35	32
=E from		63		IE	0.33	30
to		31		HR	0.29	26
				MD	0.25	23
				RO	0.24	22
				PT	0.16	14
				median		47
				=E from		63
				to		31

Fig. 4: “Negative Emotion” words converted into scores; left side Europe stricto sensu, right side Europe lato sensu; =E means 33% European range’, bold means ‘Europe stricto sensu’, green indicates ‘more than 66% of states’

Country	tone_neg	score		Country	tone_neg	score
LT	4.38	100		LT	4.38	100
AT	3.54	81		AT	3.54	81
LV	3.47	79		LV	3.47	79
HU	3.42	78		UA	3.43	78
IE	3.38	77		HU	3.42	78
SI	3.07	70		SM	3.40	78
SE	2.93	67		IE	3.38	77
LU	2.90	66		NO	3.11	71
CZ	2.86	65		SI	3.07	70
SK	2.69	61		SE	2.93	67
DK	2.62	60		LU	2.90	66
EE	2.52	58		CZ	2.86	65
MT	2.34	53		VA	2.75	63
BE	2.33	53		SK	2.69	61
NL	2.20	50		DK	2.62	60
FI	2.08	47		EE	2.52	58
CY	2.06	47		MD	2.48	57
GR	1.96	45		MT	2.34	53
BG	1.96	45		BE	2.33	53
DE	1.96	45		NL	2.20	50
HR	1.90	43		FI	2.08	47
RO	1.38	32		CY	2.06	47
PT	1.01	23		GR	1.96	45
				BG	1.96	45
median		58		DE	1.96	45
=E from		74		HR	1.90	43
to		42		UK	1.71	39
				RS	1.52	35
				RO	1.38	32
				PT	1.01	23
				median		58
				=E from		74
				to		42

Fig. 5: “Negative Tone” words converted into scores; left side Europe stricto sensu, right side Europe lato sensu; =E means 33% European range’, bold means ‘Europe stricto sensu’, green indicates ‘more than 66% of states’

Country	tone_pos	score		Country	tone_pos	score
HR	6.27	100		HR	6.27	100
DE	5.52	88		MD	5.71	91
BE	5.45	87		DE	5.52	88
LV	5.32	85		VA	5.46	87
LU	5.29	84		BE	5.45	87
BG	5.03	80		LV	5.32	85
SE	4.61	74		LU	5.29	84
AT	4.26	68		UK	5.08	81
GR	4.12	66		BG	5.03	80
CZ	4.06	65		SE	4.61	74
FI	3.80	61		AT	4.26	68
PT	3.74	60		GR	4.12	66
RO	3.68	59		CZ	4.06	65
CY	3.64	58		SM	3.93	63
EE	3.38	54		FI	3.80	61
SI	3.35	53		PT	3.74	60
LT	3.33	53		RO	3.68	59
NL	3.23	52		CY	3.64	58
SK	3.15	50		EE	3.38	54
MT	3.13	50		SI	3.35	53
DK	3.05	49		LT	3.33	53
HU	2.83	45		NL	3.23	52
IE	2.72	43		RS	3.18	51
				SK	3.15	50
median		60		MT	3.13	50
=E from		76		DK	3.05	49
to		44		NO	3.00	48
				UA	2.88	46
				HU	2.83	45
				IE	2.72	43
				median		60
				=E from		76
				to		44

Fig. 6: “Positive Tone” words converted into scores; left side Europe stricto sensu, right side Europe lato sensu; =E means 33% European range’, bold means ‘Europe stricto sensu’, green indicates ‘more than 66% of states’

For the sake of completeness, the categories that do not allow for determining a European feature, which means where fewer than 66% of the countries are located in the 33% range around the median, are also given. Fig. 7 shows the scores for the category “Conflict”.

Country	conflict	score		Country	conflict	score
LT	1.70	100		LT	1.70	100
CZ	1.38	81		CZ	1.38	81
LV	1.20	71		MD	1.36	80
AT	1.16	68		LV	1.20	71
SE	1.12	66		AT	1.16	68
IE	1.03	61		SE	1.12	66
EE	0.91	54		UA	1.07	63
BG	0.86	51		IE	1.03	61
DK	0.85	50		SM	0.92	54
SI	0.85	50		EE	0.91	54
CY	0.84	49		BG	0.86	51
HU	0.83	49		DK	0.85	50
FI	0.81	48		SI	0.85	50
MT	0.73	43		CY	0.84	49
LU	0.73	43		HU	0.83	49
HR	0.58	34		FI	0.81	48
GR	0.55	32		MT	0.73	43
BE	0.52	31		LU	0.73	43
RO	0.48	28		VA	0.72	42
PT	0.43	25		UK	0.65	38
DE	0.43	25		RS	0.64	38
NL	0.41	24		HR	0.58	34
SK	0.39	23		NO	0.56	33
				GR	0.55	32
median		49		BE	0.52	31
=E from		33		RO	0.48	28
to		65		PT	0.43	25
				DE	0.43	25
				NL	0.41	24
				SK	0.39	23
				median		49
				=E from		33
				to		65

Fig. 7: “Conflict” words converted into scores; left side Europe stricto sensu, right side Europe lato sensu; =E means ‘33% European range’, bold means ‘Europe stricto sensu’, red indicates ‘less than 66% of states’

Fig. 8 and 9 give the scores for “Positive Emotion” and “Prosocial Behavior”.

Country	emo_pos	score		Country	emo_pos	score
NL	0.69	100		NL	0.69	100
PT	0.69	100		PT	0.69	100
HR	0.58	84		HR	0.58	84
HU	0.54	78		HU	0.54	78
BE	0.52	75		BE	0.52	75
LV	0.50	72		LV	0.50	72
DK	0.42	61		VA	0.44	64
FI	0.41	59		DK	0.42	61
MT	0.40	58		RS	0.42	61
SE	0.37	54		FI	0.41	59
CZ	0.37	54		MT	0.40	58
GR	0.35	51		SE	0.37	54
SI	0.34	49		CZ	0.37	54
LU	0.31	45		GR	0.35	51
DE	0.31	45		UK	0.35	51
RO	0.29	42		SI	0.34	49
AT	0.29	42		LU	0.31	45
CY	0.26	38		DE	0.31	45
BG	0.25	36		RO	0.29	42
IE	0.25	36		AT	0.29	42
LT	0.20	29		CY	0.26	38
SK	0.13	19		SM	0.25	36
EE	0.10	14		BG	0.25	36
				IE	0.25	36
median		51		MD	0.25	36
=E from		67		LT	0.20	29
to		35		UA	0.14	20
				SK	0.13	19
				NO	0.11	16
				EE	0.10	14
				median		51
				=E from		67
				to		35

Fig. 8: “Positive Emotion” words converted into scores; left side Europe stricto sensu, right side Europe lato sensu; =E means 33% European range’, bold means ‘Europe stricto sensu’, red indicates ‘less than 66% of states’

Country	prosoc	score		Country	prosoc	score
HR	2.82	100		HR	2.82	100
DE	2.39	85		DE	2.39	85
BG	2.09	74		BG	2.09	74
PT	2.08	74		PT	2.08	74
LV	1.98	70		SM	2.02	72
BE	1.95	69		LV	1.98	70
LU	1.76	62		BE	1.95	69
NL	1.65	59		MD	1.86	66
CY	1.63	58		LU	1.76	62
AT	1.59	56		NL	1.65	59
RO	1.38	49		CY	1.63	58
SE	1.37	49		AT	1.59	56
GR	1.29	46		RO	1.38	49
SI	1.25	44		SE	1.37	49
CZ	1.20	43		RS	1.30	46
DK	1.13	40		UK	1.30	46
SK	1.05	37		GR	1.29	46
IE	0.99	35		VA	1.26	45
FI	0.95	34		SI	1.25	44
LT	0.92	33		CZ	1.20	43
HU	0.88	31		UA	1.16	41
EE	0.81	29		DK	1.13	40
MT	0.70	25		SK	1.05	37
				IE	0.99	35
median		49		FI	0.95	34
=E from		65		LT	0.92	33
to		33		HU	0.88	31
				EE	0.81	29
				NO	0.72	26
				MT	0.70	25
				median		49
				=E from		65
				to		33

Fig. 9: “Prosocial Behavior” words converted into scores; left side Europe stricto sensu, right side Europe lato sensu; =E means 33% European range’, bold means ‘Europe stricto sensu’, red indicates ‘less than 66% of states’

Fig. 10 gives the scores for the lexical field “Diplomacy”. Again, it also includes the figures of speeches who were given in a language other than English (which are marked with an asterisk).

Country	diplomacy	score		Country	diplomacy	score
SK	0.66	100		SK	0.66	100
BG	0.55	83		RU*	0.61	92
NL	0.55	83		BG	0.55	83
AT	0.43	65		NL	0.55	83
LU	0.41	62		RS	0.52	79
HR	0.40	61		VA	0.50	76
CY	0.37	56		AT	0.43	65
CZ	0.37	56		LU	0.41	62
MT	0.33	50		HR	0.40	61
FI	0.32	48		ZA	0.38	58
GR	0.32	48		CY	0.37	56
PT	0.32	48		CZ	0.37	56
DE	0.31	47		MT	0.33	50
EE	0.30	45		FI	0.32	48
HU	0.29	44		GR	0.32	48
FR*	0.28	42		PT	0.32	48
LT	0.20	30		DE	0.31	47
RO	0.19	29		EE	0.30	45
SI	0.17	26		HU	0.29	44
IE	0.16	24		BR*	0.28	42
SE	0.12	18		FR*	0.28	42
BE	0.00	0		AU	0.26	39
DK	0.00	0		LT	0.20	30
IT*	0.00	0		US	0.20	30
LV	0.00	0		RO	0.19	29
PL*	0.00	0		SM	0.18	27
				SI	0.17	26
median		46		IE	0.16	24
=E from		62		SE	0.12	18
to		30		UK	0.12	18
				NO	0.11	17
				ID	0.07	11
				IN	0.06	9
				BE	0.00	0
				CN*	0.00	0
				DK	0.00	0
				IT*	0.00	0
				LV	0.00	0
				MD	0.00	0
				NA	0.00	0
				PL*	0.00	0
				UA	0.00	0
				median		46
				=E from		62
				to		30

Fig. 10: “Diplomacy” words converted into scores; left side Europe stricto sensu, right side Europe lato sensu; =E means ‘33% European range’, bold means ‘Europe stricto sensu’, red indicates ‘less than 66% of states’

Even if we include the clearly non-European representatives here, the highest score in the lexical category “Diplomacy” is achieved by Slovakia. In sum, in all four conflict categories we find common traits among the European speakers, while among the peace categories, only the “Positive Tone” category allows for the definition of a characteristic feature among European speakers. This also means that the category “Diplomacy” displays very individual manifestations.

In addition, we can also check how speeches representing peripheral European or non-European countries were designed. Fig. 11 shows where such speeches employ, in each category, more peace-oriented vocabulary than the 33% range around the European median (+1) or less peace-oriented (−1) or the same way (0). The right-most column could be considered an indicator of which speeches were in sum lexically more peace-oriented or less peace-oriented than typical Europe or equally as peace-oriented. Clearly more peace-oriented were the speeches by the representatives of Nigeria (Vice President Kashim Shetima), the Vatican (Archbishop Paul Richard Gallagher) and Australia (Prime Minister Anthony Albanese).

Country	diplomacy	prosocial	tone_pos	emo_pos	tone_neg	emo_neg	conflict	power	sum
NA	-1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3
VA	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
AU	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
ZA	0	-1	0	0	1	1	1	0	2
RS	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
IN	-1	0	-1	1	0	1	1	0	1
MD	-1	1	1	0	0	1	-1	-1	0
US	0	-1	0	1	0	0	0	-1	-1
ID	-1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	0	0	-2
SM	-1	1	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	-2
UA	-1	0	0	-1	-1	0	-1	0	-4

Fig. 11: Indicators of more or less peace-oriented lexis than Europe

4.3. Top Five and Bottom Five

In order to see which speeches were lexically most peace-related and least conflict-related, we can give the Top Five speeches in the peace-related lexical fields and the Bottom Five in the conflict-related lexical fields 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 point respectively. Fig. 12 gives the results (all other countries received 0 points).

Country	diplomacy	prosocial	emo_pos	tone_pos	conflict	power	emo_neg	tone_neg	sum
PT		2	4		3		4	5	18
NL	3		3		4	5			15
HR		5	1	5			1		12
SK	5				5				10
ZA					1		5	4	10
DE		4		3	2				9
BG	4	3							7
RO						1	3	3	7
MD				4			2		6
RS	2					2		2	6
ID			5						5
US			2			3			5
MT						4			4
VA	1			2					3
BE				1					1
SM		1							1
UK								1	1

Fig. 12: Ranking of Countries with “Peace-Related” Lexis

In other words, the speeches from the representatives of Portugal (President Marcelo Rebelo de Sousa), the Netherlands (Prime Minister Hendrikus Wilhelmus Maria Schoof) and Croatia (President Zoran Milanović) were particularly peace-oriented in lexical respects. All three countries, by the way, are rather small countries.

5. Conclusion and Outlook

Looking again at our research questions (RQ), we can state the following: With respect to our four lexical fields related to conflict and our four lexical fields related to peace, we can say this about the selected speeches:

- RQ1a: There are no statistically significant differences between NATO and non-NATO.
- RQ1b: There are no statistically significant differences between Europe *latu sensu* and non-Europe.
- RQ1c: There are no statistically significant differences between EU and non-EU.
- RQ1d: Speeches from countries where English is not an official language display more conflict language than those from countries where English is an official language; however, it can be highlighted that the lexical category “Diplomat” shows no group features, but very individual manifestations.
- RQ2: European features can be determined for three conflict categories (“Power”, “Negative Tone”, “Negative Emotion”) and one peace category (“Positive Tone”).
- RQ3: There are no further salient clusters of peace-oriented lexis except the fact that the three most peace-oriented speeches were given by representatives of small countries (Portugal, the Netherlands, Croatia).

In short there is—except for two categories among speeches from countries with English as an official language—no clear cluster of peace-oriented vocabulary.

Although the speeches analyzed here represent countries and although more people than the speakers themselves (if at all) will have authored these speeches, the analysis here does not allow us to make any assumptions on national rhetoric styles nor national political rhetorical styles. The

analyses here are only snapshots that can give some insights into the small circle of diplomatic and/or geopolitical rhetorical styles which are employed by high-end diplomats. It is nevertheless a circle that has decisive impact on common people's lives.

At the beginning of this contribution I mentioned Eurolinguistics' connection to peace ideas and linguistic observations around the geopolitical US–Russia–Ukraine issue. This article is, of course, a linguistic study only, but it may yield a basis for selecting someone who could serve as a mediator in this conflict, a mediator that could pave the way to peace more quickly. Since time and again, both representatives of the EU and representatives of Russia see EU and NATO countries as war participants, the high representatives of a EU or a NATO country do not seem in the position to be selected as a mediator. It does not mean that other citizens of these countries could not serve this role (e.g. Russia suggested Germany's former chancellor Gerhard Schröder as a mediator, but Germany opposed the offer). If one wants to take this very study as an aid for the choice of a mediator, the following different considerations may be taken into account:

- (a) Should there be the choice of a speaker close to EU features (with the idea that the EU's interests are not forgotten)? — In this regard, the three highest-ranking representatives are the one of the Holy See (i.e. the Vatican), Archbishop Paul Richard Gallagher, the one of San Marino, Minister for Foreign Affairs Luca Beccari, and the one of Serbia, President Aleksandar Vučić.
- (b) Should there be the choice of a speaker distant from EU features (including a small portion of conflict language and a large portion of peace language)? — Then the three best choices are Serbia's President Aleksandar Vučić, Moldova's Permanent Representative to the United Nations Gheorghe Leucă, and the Vatican's Archbishop Paul Richard Gallagher.
- (c) Should there be the choice of someone who generally uses a large number of diplomatic words? — The three best choices would then be Serbia's President Aleksandar Vučić and Archbishop Paul Richard Gallagher as well as South Africa's President Cyril Matamela Ramaphosa.

So the two recurring figures are Archbishop Paul Richard Gallagher (representative of the Holy See, that is the Vatican) and President Aleksandar Vučić (representative of the Republic of Serbia). Clearly non-European and non-NATO representatives who showed a high degree of peace-related languages are India's Minister for External Affairs, Subrahmanyam Jaishankar, Nigeria's Vice President, Kashim Shetima, and South Africa's President Cyril Matamela Ramaphosa.

It is the goal of the project unit InES (*Innovative Europäische Sprachlehre* 'Innovative European Language Teaching'), among other things, to raise the awareness of the use and effect of language through research that is also made accessible to a broader, non-linguistics-trained audience. This is why the abstract at the beginning is largely free from technical language. Keeping in mind InES's goal, I would also like to state: No matter to what extent this article serves to create more peace, it hopefully helps at least to raise the awareness for conflict-related and peace-related vocabulary.

Joachim Grzega
Innovative Europäische Sprachlehre (InES), VHS Donauwörth
 Spindeltal 5
 DE-86609 Donauwörth
joachim.grzega@vhs-don.de
 oder:
 Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt
 Ostenstr. 26
 DE-85072 Eichstätt
joachim.grzega@ku.de

References

- Cohen, Jacob (1988), *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed., Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Grzega, Joachim (2013), *Studies in Europragmatics: Theoretical Foundations and Practical Implications*. [Eurolinguistische Arbeiten 7]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Grzega, Joachim (2023a), “Medien-Kriegsrhetorik: Essenz und Effekt geopolitischer Coverttexte aus zehn Staaten”, *Wissenschaft & Frieden* 41/3: 51-55. <<https://wissenschaft-und-frieden.de/artikel/medien-kriegsrhetorik/>>.
- Grzega, Joachim (2023b), “Conflict or Peace Language? Cover Texts of 2022 from 17 European and Non-European Countries”, *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* 20: 12-30. <<http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/SLF/EngluVglSW/ELiX/grzega-231.pdf>>.
- Grzega, Joachim (2025a), “Beobachtung zum Begriff ‘Diplomatie’ beim Thema Ukraine im Europäischen Parlament”, *Diskursmonitor* 2025. <<https://diskursmonitor.de/review/beobachtung-zum-begriff-diplomatie-beim-thema-ukraine-im-europaeischen-parlament/>>.
- Grzega, Joachim (2025b), “Basic Definitions of Eurolinguistics”, in: Grzega 2025c: 3-16.
- Grzega, Joachim (ed.) (2025c), *The Routledge Handbook of Eurolinguistics*, London: Routledge.
- Grzega, Joachim / Hinrichs, Uwe (2025), “Major Developments and Perspectives of Eurolinguistics”, in: Grzega 2025c: 17-31.
- Morelli, Anne (2001), *Principes élémentaires de propagande de guerre: Utilisables en guerre, chaude ou tiède*, Bruxelles: Aden.
- Ponsonby, Arthur (1928), *Falsehood in War-Time: Propaganda Lies of the First World War*, London: Allen and Unwin.
- Reiter, Norbert (1995), “Eurolinguistik – Sinn und Verfahren”, *Vierteljahresschrift der Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft* 35/1: 30-38.
- URL01 = <http://www.el-a.eu/manifest.htm>
- URL02 = <http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/SLF/EngluVglSW/ELiX/memorandum-161.pdf>
- URL03 = <https://chatgpt.com/>
- URL04 = <https://copilot.microsoft.com/>
- URL05 = <https://www.liwc.app/>
- URL06 = https://gadebate.un.org/en/sessions-archive?f%5B0%5D=choose_a_session_ungad%3A626
- URL07 = <https://www.socscistatistics.com/tests/studentttest/calculator/>

-

first version received 3 August 2026
revised version received 9 August 2026

Appendix

Raw results of LIWC analysis (* = speech not English; Euro ls = Europe lato sensu; E off = English official language)

Country	NATO	Euro ls	EU	E off	diplomacy	prosocial	tone_pos	emo_pos	tone_neg	emo_neg	conflict	power
AT	n	y	y	n	0.43	1.59	4.26	0.29	3.54	0.72	1.16	4.91
AU	n	n	n	y	0.26	1.19	4.93	0.47	1.96	0.38	0.64	4.08
BE	y	y	y	n	0.00	1.95	5.45	0.52	2.33	0.52	0.52	5.45
BG	y	y	y	n	0.55	2.09	5.03	0.25	1.96	0.37	0.86	4.30
CY	n	y	y	n	0.37	1.63	3.64	0.26	2.06	0.47	0.84	4.59
CZ	y	y	y	n	0.37	1.20	4.06	0.37	2.86	0.65	1.38	4.98
DE	y	y	y	n	0.31	2.39	5.52	0.31	1.96	0.43	0.43	4.24
DK	y	y	y	n	0.00	1.13	3.05	0.42	2.62	0.35	0.85	4.60
EE	y	y	y	n	0.30	0.81	3.38	0.10	2.52	0.76	0.91	4.34
FI	y	y	y	n	0.32	0.95	3.80	0.41	2.08	0.68	0.81	4.84
GR	y	y	y	n	0.32	1.29	4.12	0.35	1.96	0.35	0.55	3.99
HR	y	y	y	n	0.40	2.82	6.27	0.58	1.90	0.29	0.58	4.95
HU	y	y	y	n	0.29	0.88	2.83	0.54	3.42	0.54	0.83	4.44
ID	n	n	n	n	0.07	0.85	5.25	0.92	3.40	0.78	0.71	5.53
IE	n	y	y	y	0.16	0.99	2.72	0.25	3.38	0.33	1.03	5.23
IN	n	n	n	y	0.06	1.17	2.78	0.37	2.41	0.31	0.56	3.89
LT	y	y	y	n	0.20	0.92	3.33	0.20	4.38	1.11	1.70	6.21
LU	y	y	y	n	0.41	1.76	5.29	0.31	2.90	0.52	0.73	4.56
LV	y	y	y	n	0.00	1.98	5.32	0.50	3.47	0.57	1.20	5.24
MD	n	y	n	n	0.00	1.86	5.71	0.25	2.48	0.25	1.36	6.95
MT	n	y	y	y	0.33	0.70	3.13	0.40	2.34	0.40	0.73	2.83
NA	n	n	n	y	0.00	1.83	4.11	0.29	1.88	0.34	0.51	3.71
NL	y	y	y	n	0.55	1.65	3.23	0.69	2.20	0.69	0.41	2.75
NO	y	y	n	n	0.11	0.72	3.00	0.11	3.11	0.50	0.56	4.78
PT	y	y	y	n	0.32	2.08	3.74	0.69	1.01	0.16	0.43	4.11
RO	y	y	y	n	0.19	1.38	3.68	0.29	1.38	0.24	0.48	3.58
RS	n	y	n	n	0.52	1.30	3.18	0.42	1.52	0.49	0.64	3.40
SE	y	y	y	n	0.12	1.37	4.61	0.37	2.93	0.75	1.12	5.80
SI	y	y	y	n	0.17	1.25	3.35	0.34	3.07	0.45	0.85	5.57
SK	y	y	y	n	0.66	1.05	3.15	0.13	2.69	0.66	0.39	4.59
SM	n	y	n	n	0.18	2.02	3.93	0.25	3.40	0.81	0.92	4.60
UA	n	y	n	n	0.00	1.16	2.88	0.14	3.43	0.42	1.07	5.01
UK	y	y	n	y	0.12	1.30	5.08	0.35	1.71	0.65	0.65	3.84
US	y	n	n	y	0.20	0.61	3.07	0.59	2.51	0.39	0.65	3.19
VA	n	y	n	n	0.50	1.26	5.46	0.44	2.75	0.53	0.72	4.73
ZA	n	n	n	y	0.38	0.83	3.31	0.25	1.34	0.06	0.45	3.69
BR*	n	n	n	n	0.28							
CN*	n	n	n	n	0.00							
FR*	y	y	y	n	0.28							
IT*	y	y	y	n	0.00							
PL*	y	y	y	n	0.00							
RU*	n	y	n	n	0.61							