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Abstract. This article describes a possible source of political differences among people based on language differences.

The hypothesized sources of political conflict most often reflect the usual suspects. They include instinctual aggression, needs for resources that overwhelm resource availability leading to instrumental competition, dynamics based on social cognition that lead to the construction of ingroups and outgroups, psychodynamic splitting, and overcompensation mechanisms for feelings of inferiority.

A less researched suspect encompasses notions that people with generic differences in language may actually see the world differently and, thus, more often be confronted with conflict. What would support these notions? Although the transformational grammar of Chomskian psycholinguistics suggests that all humans may share some basic similarities both in the foundations of thought and of language, psychological research based on Whorf’s hypothesis suggests that language and thought are, at the least, thoroughly interrelated in constructing a picture of the world and a worldview—implying that language and thought differences among people may beget political differences.

One psychological research tradition germane to this discussion posits cognitive differences between people who learn only an alphabetic language, e.g., English or French, versus those who learn only an ideographic one, e.g., Chinese or Japanese. (People who learn both at the same or different times will be briefly discussed below, while people who learn sign language alone or in combination with alphabetic and/or ideographic languages will be left for a future IBPP article.) Consider the following.

In a clinical case study, a 56-yr-old Japanese male with a lesion in the left posterior inferior temporal lobe of the brain manifested both alexia (loss of the ability to read) and agraphia (loss of the ability to write) of the ideographic kanji system of Japanese writing. The same brain lesion in a Western patient would probably be associated with alexia without agraphia of the relevant Western language (Hamasaki et al, 1995).

Japanese students accomplished a sequence of tasks—either responding with the name of the color in which an ideograph or syllabic orthograph (equivalent to an alphabetic character) is written or the name of the color that the ideograph or syllabic orthograph expresses. (This latter color might be consistent or inconsistent with the color in which the ideograph or syllabic orthographs is written.) The students found less difficulty with the inconsistent stimuli than do Western research subjects. Results also supported the hypothesis that ideographic characters and colors are processed in the nondominant right cerebral hemisphere, while syllabic characters are processed in the dominant left cerebral hemisphere (Morikawa, 1981.)

Additional research suggests that ideographic versus alphabetic stimuli engage different psychological processing mechanisms (Besner & Coltheart, 1979). Koreans educated in both the alphabetic and ideographic Korean writing systems show better recognition and free recall memory for words presented ideographically than alphabetically (Park & Arbuckle, 1977), and Japanese employing
ideographs show a similar but simpler approach to Westerners employing alphabets in deriving socioemotional impressions of psychological identities and actions (Smith et al, 1994).