

THE UNITED NATIONS AND ITS CULTURE OF LANGUAGE

(a talk for the Johannes Guttenberg Institute of the University of Mainz, Germany, 28 May 2004)

Distinguished professors and doctors, instructors and students, I appreciate you for being here and resisting spring fever for a while longer before your break. I would like to start off by thanking both University Professor Dr. Sabina Matter-Seibel of the English Department and University Professor Dr. Birgit Menzel, of the Russian and Slavic Department for receiving me here today to say a few words about *The United Nations and its culture of language*. This is true détente in this ever changing world. I applaud your efforts to reach out and expand the possibilities of your graduates. With 10 new nations admitted to the European Union at the beginning of this month, your skills are more needed than ever.

I come, not as a representative of the Secretariat of the United Nations, but as an individual staff member, with close to twenty five years experience in the Official Records Editing Section. We who work for the United Nations are considered international civil servants, in a system established 60 years ago under an egalitarian ideal; restricted in its use of honorifics - the staff members referred to as “doctor” are only the medical doctors. I say this at the start because, although I want to give a bit of background on the evolving structure and goals of the United Nations, the topic is more about *the culture of language*, which can be applied in broad terms. I hope you will forgive me if sometimes I leave you uncertain whether I mean the United Nations organization or the united nations of the world. I am not a linguist, but an administrator in the one section which ensures that the final official records are accurate and read the same way in six languages. My hope is that, in this brief time, you will have ideas you can take away which will help you in not only deciding whether or not to chose a job with any international organization, but in choosing **what** to do with the language skills you learn at this, the Johannes Guttenberg Institute of the University of Mainz, be it translator, airline stewardess or occasional reader of foreign newspapers.

I hope to be practical and give you a taste of job opportunities and the working conditions within the United Nations, for those of you who might wish to pursue a profession there or

simply wish to understand how the staff has to function when you read about the state of the world. But as I said, this is a personal view, not necessarily those of other staff or administrators. Of course “administrators” are staff too, but they represent the administration, not themselves, which is why I separate the two. I was fortunate to spend seven years as the union representative for the unit incorporating the Office of the Under-Secretary General for the largest department, which was Conference Services, and also worked more than two years with the UN Polling Officer, conducting staff related elections and referendum. Currently I am a member of a small special task force, mandated by the general staff, to draft a new set of statutes and regulations for the UN Staff Union; something more vital and which addresses the changes in the more corporatized organization and world. I am not a lawyer, but as with Official Records Editing, *I believe my main contribution* is to try to create balance and draw out the best in our multicultural group, just as your Interdisciplinary Research Group for North American Studies gathers together scholars from nine departments. But let us now look at the purpose of the United Nations.

The United Nations is the successor to the League of Nations, a post World War Two system - although it's called an organization it's actually more of system of organizations - to “end the scourge of war by addressing its causes and create better world.” There were many noble themes in play. It was a frightened world crawling out of a horrific and destructive war, just twenty some years after what was called “The War to End All Wars”, only now we had nuclear weapons, fast aircraft, radio, television, and two super-powers gone from allies to enemies in what seemed like a day. Behind the scenes on both sides of The Iron Curtain there was also a certain amount of gloating at high-levels as the spoils of war were being divided and, not only Europe, but the whole world was having its map redrawn. How this would benefit the common people was still unsure - something about future commodities and ideologies.

One thing was sure: the new organization had to boldly address more than geographic boundaries. In the face of the end of monarchies, the draining and destructive effects of

imperialism, racial and class hatred, fascism and propaganda, something more comprehensive was needed than “the gentlemen’s agreements” by which a handful of powers had set up the weak and self-serving League of Nations. The UN began with an International Declaration of Human Rights and six principle organs were created to handle its priorities: The Trusteeship Council, Security Council, Economic and Social Council, General Assembly, International Court of Justice and the Secretariat (where I work), the administrative hub of all this. The Trusteeship Council had the task of overseeing the transition of colonies into independent nations. The Security Council is that 25 nation body of post-war super-powers and rotating members who are to deal with the crises, the wars, the violations and sanctions of agreements meant to keep world peace. The Economic and Social Council (or ECOSOC) was envisaged as a preventative to war, through facilitating trade and development, human rights, health and population control, international regulations of all types. When I joined the organization we were often reminded that most people misunderstood the UN; that more than 80% of its regular budget went towards Economic and Social Affairs, not military. The peacekeeping budget is separate, and has exceeded the regular budget since 1990s. In the year the Berlin Wall began to be torn down there were 5 operations launched, while there were only a total of 13 in the 40 years prior.

ECOSOC has a host of subsidiary organs and specialized agencies, such as the World Food Programme, The Food and Agricultural Organization, World Health Organization, International Civil Aviations Organization, United Nations Children’s Fund, UNESCO (The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), Universal Postal Union, International Maritime Organization, just to name a few, which keep airplanes flying without crashing, letters arriving, phones working, disease combated, in ways impossible without some global agency of one kind or other standardizing regulations and representing those workers.

But from the inception there was a certain group, known as the Bretton Woods Group, which were seen to oversee the most crucial economic controls as controlled by the great victors of World War II: those bodies being the World Bank, International Labour Organization and General Agreement on Trade and Tarrifs (known as GATT) which is now the World Trade Organization. Much of this you might know or can get from the website, www.un.org or from the sites for any of the specific organizations. But the General Assembly is the most

important organ of all, despite occasional attacks from the United States, declaring it to be useless or attacks from most of the rest of the world, calling it an intimidated echo of American interests. Yet, between these truths much of the work gets done which sets the tone and rules by which the world continues to coexist, one nation, one vote, even if the consensus gets ignored by certain nations in certain situations. The shock and awe of flagrant violations has to be factored into the decision making of a government before it betrays its contempt for the rest of the world.

I explain this to show you the great diversity within this interconnected system of organizations. It is not enough to speak foreign languages, one must follow one's interests and develop specialized knowledge in a wide range of areas. Writer Amos Oz said "*Translation is like trying to make love through a blanket.*" There is a search engine called GALAXY to hunt for jobs at the United Nations, but out of all of the thousands of applicants only 3% find jobs. I explain all this also so that you appreciate the range of agendas, as well as languages, which come into play when dealing with an international organization such as this. The UN is a non-profit organization, prohibited from borrowing from banks or outside funds, placed in a precarious sink-or-swim situation by the few founding post-war countries who wanted an easy way to be rid of it if its members ceased to believe in it, or in other words, it got out of control. The General Assembly was originally designed with a generous 84 seats, no one could imagine that they would need to accommodate more. Now it has 181 members, with Switzerland just coming in only a year and a half ago.

Unspent funds are to be returned to the member states. Many of you are aware that with the Reagan Administration in 1980, the US began withholding its dues, saying that it was trying to pressure for (quote) **reforms** (unquote). The figure exceeds 1 billion dollars and the "reforms" have largely been compulsive corporate downsizing, salary freezes and the trend towards ending permanent contracts. But the UN is not a corporation; and it is true that the prime objective was not a profit margin. I find the UN staff to be composed of idealists and ex-patriots, hoping for programs to succeed, understanding to be reached and a better future to arise from their work. Even the ex-patriots who left a repressive regime or are glad to make a good salary so they can send money home, have their own political idealism, based on life experiences not theory. And this is what I mean by "the culture of language" – all these

different delegations, different cultures, different languages, different agendas, being filtered through an even more diverse multicultural workforce.

* * * * *

There's an old joke which keeps circulating on the internet called:

ON CULTURE & MEANING – here's how it goes...

A while ago, a worldwide survey was conducted by the UN.

The only question asked was: "Would you please give your honest opinion about solutions to the food shortage in the rest of the world?"

The survey was a huge failure...

In Africa they didn't know what "food" meant.

In Eastern Europe they didn't know what "honest" meant.

In Western Europe they didn't know what "shortage" meant.

In China they didn't know what "opinion" meant.

In the Middle East they didn't know what "solution" meant.

In South America they didn't know what "please" meant.

And in the USA they didn't know what "the rest of the world" meant.

A little something to offend everyone, but you see the point. When working in language, no matter where you might work, what you might be doing, I want you to imagine, when working in language, no matter where you might work, what you might be doing, the end user. This requires several different mindsets working together. In the preface to Johannes Fritsche's excellent "*HISTORICAL DESTINY AND NATIONAL SOCIALISM IN HEIDEGGER'S **BEING AND TIME***" Fritsche points out how the English verb, "**to translate**" by virtue of its Latin root means to transfer, but does not specify by what or how, while the German word "*übersetzen*" meaning "**to translate**", may in fact mean to carry someone over a body of water. So now I'd like you to take this journey with me into other people's minds...

I work in the Official Records Editing Section. We incorporate corrections submitted by delegations, other departments, translators and those we find ourselves. We do the footnoting,

standardize grammar, layouts and generally verify the accuracy of the record; all this in the six main languages of the United Nations; Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. The final process is called concordance, during which the document is read aloud from cover to cover while the editor of each language makes sure that he or she has included all the changes and the text reads the same. After going through us the text is no longer considered a translation, but the **authentic** record; fully legally binding as a contract.

In my first year I noticed certain correspondence concerning a record referring to a German businessman named Mr. Stark (S-T-A-R-K). In other letters Mr. Stark's name was spelled S-T-A-A-R-K - a simple typing mistake? I thought not, and after further investigation we found that Mr. Staark with the two "a"s was a South African businessman, pretending to be German so as to get around the trade embargoes sanctioned against South Africa at the time. I learned that you have to be a bit of a detective in this profession and not to take anything for granted.

Differences in tenses, expression of gender, the use of verbs, the absence of articles, can all make one translation look perfect until it is matched against the original text or another supposedly perfect translation where the disparities revealed. Sometimes it can have the opposite meaning. Sometimes delegations play with this, for instance stating in a meeting that they have done something and later making a correction saying that they said that they *will* do something; that there was a bad translation or minor error on their part. This might have to do with millions of dollars in aid or programs that never get initiated. It has been my job for 24 years to receive and register these corrections and I used to have to send quite a few to editors or assistants so that the sound recordings could be reviewed for discrepancies. In the old days most of the corrections came from delegations, not they mostly come from the translation services. My section pioneered desktop publishing at the UN, producing camera ready texts so as to avoid errors introduced by the typing pools, even with their proofreaders. This is still not done in Geneva.

But the vocabulary changes even faster than technology. Now you have to know an ever increasing range of scientific, military, economic and sociologic terms being invented as we speak. This requires constant updating and adoption of standardized phrases, terminology and protocols. The use of acronyms is so pervasive that many people do not know what they mean. Over a year ago American President Bush's spokesman, Ari Fleischer, announced the disastrous campaign into Iraq as Operation Iraqi Liberation. It took days for some bright person to note that

the acronym spelt OIL and the war was changed to Operation Iraqi Freedom. The basic system for tracking these thousands of documents at the UN is called eDRITS. A few months ago I was by my chief of section what it stood for and I found three official documents, including instruction manuals, which said it meant Electronic Documents Retrieval Tracking System and Electronic Documents Records Tracking System, and Electronic Documents Record Tracking System.

I wrote a paper in graduate school, provocatively called THE FRENCH LIARS, positing that the French language, with its lexicon one-third the size of English was an excellent language for lying, poetry and diplomacy. I offered that English, like German, with its huge storehouse of words, looked for the most precise one to express a meaning, while French, with its use of placement and nuance to express meaning, something more subject to subtle misinterpretation. Of course a number of French have argued the exact opposite, which I accept, but I was having fun.

American English has, for good or ill, become the universal language on the planet, yet not that many non-professionals understand how different it is from British English. It extends beyond spelling rules and occasional bits of usage to definitions and emphasis. At the UN British English is the accepted standard. Again technology has had its impact, from the days of telegraph, with the use of email, sound-bits, msms. Now speech patterns are shortened, collapsed and there is much that is missing that is supposed to be understood. Twenty or so years ago Australian ran low on money for text books and devised a system called Whole Language, by which students were taught English with whatever material was available and the rules of grammar were quite secondary to “grasping” the general meaning of sentence. When Sputnik took off it frightened the wits out for the American politicians, who mandated what was called New Math, to accelerate a new generation of physicists. This had its damage which is still being felt and although the US produces an exceptional amount of brilliant scientists, many would feel lost without their electronic calculators. The same effect is being felt by the generations of those taught through Whole Language.

In the United States Mr. Bush is ridiculed for being the first president who has not published a book, is not able to make a full sentence, and commits verbal errors that a child would not make. There is rather interesting book, *“THE BUSH DYSLEXICON: Observations on a National*

Disorder”, by Mark Crispin Miller, which analyses his speeches and finds that when he is making a humane, empathetic statement is when he makes these mistakes, but when he is trying to sound hard and tough he makes less of these gaffs. Newsmen, who should be the standard for oral presentation, frequently seem to forget what tense should be used and no one seems to notice. Black English, which was often purposely incorrect, is mimicked by the younger generation with no appreciation of the rules. In slave days and even in today’s southern United States the blacks with perfect grammar were often suspect and held in contempt by the racist community. The French in the South, the Spanish in the West, the hundreds of types of immigrants have added their dialects to the language in ways that never happened in England.

However, I certainly do not wish to give you the impression that the persuasive use of language is ignored in the United States. There has been a standardization and emphasis over the last 15 years which certain people are highly aware of. In 1990 the Republican Party’s action committee distributed a short book of guidelines to all its members called “*Language, a Key Mechanism of Control*,” along with an audio-cassette by its brainchild, Newt Gingrich. In it he lists 131 words and phrases, tested on focus groups, which Republican politicians, party workers and adherents should use or avoid in the new social context. Under the heading “Optimistic, Positive, Governing Words” are: **share, debate, care, change, compete, tough, challenge, control, liberty, prosperity, principle, unique, conflict, family, crusade, empower, we...** Under the “Contrasting Words” are: **decay, deeper, crisis, urgent, status quo, consequences, ideological, radical, liberal, red tape, shame, endanger, taxes, unionize, they/them...** A new set of code-words developed overnight.

This political and sociological war spills over to the Battle of the Sexes. There is a good American book for educators called “*READING DON’T FIX NO CHEVY’S: LITERACY IN THE LIVES OF YOUNG MEN*” by [Michael W. Smith](#), [Jeffrey D. Wilhelm](#). The findings are related closely to Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi’s (University of Chicago) 25 years of worthwhile work on “flow experiences”: how people pursue what they are completely absorbed in. Smith and Wilhelm show how more and more young males read and enjoy only what they think will be of use to them – basically non-fiction, manuals, things they think “practical”, while women are more likely to read fantasy, fiction. Yet, as with internet chat-rooms, the non-fiction texts are not extended, overarching or philosophic, but truncated, literal and explaining things piecemeal. The

authors posit from these studies that women are excelling in an ability to understand global thinking, sustained theories, while men are being left behind.

Now understand with this the problems presented when delegates from Africa, Asia, the Mid-East, everywhere make their presentations at the UN in their non-native English. This is more than “interference”, by which a foreign speaker injects his rules into his translation or interpretation; it is almost the opposite.

At the same time cultural differences involve patterns, protocols and allusions. Some cultures, such as many in Africa, communicate largely through parables and old teachings. Arab countries have intricate forms of solicitations and invocations at the beginning and end of their addresses. Some nations draw lessons commonly understood from the Christian bible, or Koran or Buddhist texts, not to invest religion into the proceedings, but to express a non-sectarian sense of what they feel is human and rational. It has been said the average Russian or Irish peasant or teenager knows more of his own national poetry than the academics of some countries know about their own. The laws of rhetoric, investing authority through factual references and using the poetics of the language, might seem as constant as the rules for writing a sonnet, but effective speech breaks the rules, reinvents the rules, revitalizes the language. After all, for good or bad, this is the Post-Modernist age.

Many of you might be familiar with President Putin’s famous address when he used vulgar and astonishing language to make his point about the war in the Caucasus. It was not just the imagery and forcefulness which shocked many, but the use of linguistic cases and forms never used in public speaking or among the bourgeoisie. He was aligning himself with the soldiers and the lowest elements to express the extreme nature of what he was trying to get across. In a training session on the excellent and exhaustive new UN Terminology search engine, examples were show from this speech, without the background information I was already familiar with, explaining the problems this created for the terminologists who had to cross-reference the basic language programs and syntax of the application. There are many things you do not learn in school.

But there are other cultural differences which must be factored into your work. In ORES (that is The Official Records Editing Section) as with all UN translation and interpretation services, the

final product is produced for each language is the mother tongue of a professional who has declared that mother tongue upon hiring. German is considered a semi-official language, their Translation Service is paid for by Germany, Austria and Luxemburg, and they basically translate into German from our final English text, comparing it to other language texts if need be. I have served as liaison with the German Section for 24 years, making sure they get these texts and referring them to the right editor or assistant should there be queries. Before Perestroika, all Russian and Chinese translators or editors came straight from excellent language institutes in the USSR or the People's Republic of China. They came qualified as both translator and editor, unlike the rest of the world where there were separate criteria and examinations. Consider now how many Spanish editors I have encountered, from so many countries, each with their particular pride and understanding of the language. Sometimes there is a bit of war within the house. But all those in ORES, put together with our many language groups instead of the insular halls of their individual Translation Service, all have expressed profound thanks for the opportunities to work inter-culturally, to see and solve problems with the help of an "outside view" and to learn about more than language from working close to their colleagues.

* * * * *

Great hopes were placed on Computer Assisted Translation (CAT), but with things that need precision that is a dream for the future. I'm sure that if you have ever tried using any of these programs you might have seen results that look like abstract poetry written by Martians. We use text comparison software to see changes in documents which are similar year after year, and unfortunately that is one of the demoralizing sides of our work, when resolutions are passed and not complied with or need fine tuning to reach a new agreement.

Arabic and Chinese are the two latest official languages to be included in the work of the organization. When a Chinese word processing module was needed, WordPerfect, a good company operating out of the Mormon state of Utah, was approached. They hired Taiwanese developers, at great expense, who over a great deal of time, came up with a package everyone thought was suitable. But in the testing stage it was discovered that certain commonly used Taiwanese phrases were included; such as "*congfee*" which refers to all Mainland Chinese, but

translated as “Communist Bandits”. It was back to the drawing board. Technology is as perfect as the humans who design it...and use it, and market it...

Yet, despite these safeguards, ORES has been targeted by the American Right-Wing think tank, The Heritage Foundation, since 1987, who wrote an entire issue of their publication attacking Conference Services, especially my section where they imagined that Russian editors were changing the texts of their English documents before they came out. Too bad they had nobody to read the documents and apologize for their charges. Too bad the head liaison between the US Mission and the United Nations is now a high-level member of the Heritage Foundation.

In this modern corporatized world, technology is seen as the savior of mega-bucks while humans seem more and more of a liability. But you cannot replace the trained, intuitive mind. My section was formally, though covertly, abolished as part of the “Reforms” announced in August 2002. There were dreams of a Computer Assisted Editing application no one had come up with yet. Suddenly the legal section said they could find no provision for the editing of official records once they had been adopted by General Assembly or Security Council. One delegate told the Under-Secretary General essentially – “How dare you, how dare you, after we have been up all night hammering out an agreement, sweating over every comma and semi-colon, how dare you change one thing!” Well, that’s part of the answer: 181 tired, fed-up delegates, who are not linguistics experts or might have had a few drinks, can make mistakes and overlook them.”

Several nations came to our rescue over the next six months. France wanted a proposal specified to be written in *the conditional tense*, explaining how the work of the organization was going to be done without us. By the way, that is part of the reality of the United Nations. In the official records you never say **will**, **shall** or **can**, but change these words to **would**, **should** or **could**. No one knows the future. Documentation is produced in what is commonly, sometimes mockingly, called “UNese”. It is a hybrid of technical, legal and diplomatic language. We were eventually reinstated, but at the loss of one-third of the staff and eleven offices. We are currently conducting a third layer of editing called “pre-concordance” in which we go over the preliminary documents, going through the same editorial and concordance procedures we have to do afterwards anyway, so that the meetings have a more finished text when they meet and change things. However, as one of my colleagues said upon retirement, “Editing is a digestive best

served after the meal, not before it.” This has its advantages for the meetings and our end product, but the cost in man-hours is staggering, especially in a section so thoroughly downsized.

But this is part of the language culture, or culture of language. A few years ago my department, The Department of Conference Services, changed its name and later changed it again. Now we are the Department of General Assembly Conference **Management**. The move has been to empower the organization to expedite the deliberations and overall process. Delegations are told to keep their written texts to within 8 pages and to present it to text-processing, editing and reproduction in a much shorter timeframe. Great pressure has brought home the message that financial considerations do not allow for lengthy, thoughtful discourse.

When the East-West conflict was of paramount importance, especially during the Reagan Administration, the General Assembly, with its one-vote, one-nation uncertain view was dismissed as unimportant, while the Security Council, with its small group and fixed agenda called the shots. I won't go into nightmarish stories of how many times Security Council resolutions were vetoed or by whom or what on. But after the end of the Soviet Union, with the new economic order, when the North-South struggle of a handful of wealthy industrialized nations trying to handle the vast under-industrialized nations became the priority, the General Assembly was seen as a necessary forum to portray consensus. More and more misrepresenting resolutions has been the excuse to do what one wants. I am not here to make political statements at all, but there is an excellent book, entitled *CALLING THE SHOTS: HOW WASHINGTON DOMINATES TODAY'S UN*, by Phyllis Bennis. It makes worth while reading when trying to understand today's world and the need for all of you to participate in the process.

But these resolutions are not simple tools to be used or disregarded; there really is a cumulative price to pay for such arrogance, so there really is a lot of attention paid to the crafting. In Rwanda, in 1994, while 800,000 were being slaughtered, during those 60 days the Security Council was paralyzed in discussion. Some western nations were insisting that any resolution with the word “genocide” would be vetoed, because such a declaration would immediately call into effect Chapter 7 of the Security Council rules and requisite a military response. So phrases such as “genocide like” were bandied about to avoid action. The US Spokeswoman, Caroline Shelly, would use the phrase “acts of genocides” in press conferences, as though they were isolated, unpredictable cases. The Tutsi government used these delays and confusion to gather

up people in so called “safe areas”, so that they could more easily and thoroughly be executed. The UN military commander of the operation, despite pleas for sufficient support and the go ahead to remove caches of weapons, was reminded repeatedly that his mission was one of peacekeeping, not peacemaking, precise terms in this regard, which prevented any strategic intelligent action. It was not sufficient to say later that those in New York did not know the seriousness of the situation; wordplay was seriously used to prevent a massive tragedy. Likewise, when the 12,000 pages of weapons inspections reports were flown into New York’s JFK Airport and seized by the US government on route to the UN for verification, translation and distribution, who knows what might have happened if this information was in the right hands at the right time?

* * * *

So finally I’d like to conclude with some thoughts on the Power of Language, a bit of the metaphysics of it. It’s been said that during Medieval Times, when the world felt cut off from God and His Grace, that everyone, high and low, thought in three ways at once – the Literal, The Figurative and the Spiritual. Why not? This is how humans function, even atheists. In general in Italian you do not say that someone *made you* mad, you would not want to give them that much power; you take responsibility for yourself. They use the reflexive verbs to indicate that something causes you to make *yourself* mad. While in English you “make sense” in German something “has sense”, as if it is something intrinsic to be found, not something crafted by words or reason. Put aside your semiology, phenomenology, ontology, deconstructionism and post-modernism long enough to re-read Dante’s “*De vulgari eloquentia*” and ponder the concept of a “pure language”. Adopt a little radical thinking, “radical” coming from the Latin for “roots”. Understand that language evolves from literature in a way similar to science evolving from science fiction. Read George Orwell’s 1984, Huxley’s *BRAVE NEW WORLD* and Joseph Heller’s *CATCH 22*, so that you truly know what people are talking about when they describe situations in these terms.

As long ago as the 1930 a Russian scientist invented Kirlian Photography which showed the patterns and energy of plants and living creatures. It has been used to show through scientific measurement, how improved a plant might be if you talk affectionately to it or play the right music, and how damaged it can become when subjected to the wrong stimulus. In more recent years studies with new and vastly improved devices has shown that words can be imprinted even

in water, even at a subatomic, ionizing level. Whether this accounts for the purported effects of Holy Water or the healing sources at Lourdes, I can't tell, or whether there were minerals dissolved in the waters which replicate at a homeopathic level might be true also. But the measurement do show a vibration imprinted on these substances according to the words which are spoken. Much has been learned about the workings of the Left and Right Halves of the brain; the analytical versus the visionary, which is analogous to how mankind started, the hunter/gatherer societies where the men went off to focus for hours as they stalked their game and the women spread out their minds to perceive any wide-ranging threat as their children wandered about while their mothers worked the fields. Please don't surrender to only half of your wits.

I feel that those great orators; the poets and preachers, politicians and philosophers, lawyers and teachers, intuitively seek out the best words, the most effective and persuasive words, introducing the most powerful ones judiciously to achieve the best over-all message. This applies to those ten new nations of the European Union as well as the read of the dominant world. It is up to you as students and academics, to open up to all that is imparted, so that you can, as translate the most perfect meaning, in the most perfect form. You should look, read and listen to the common culture as well as the elite, for that is where the language grows, from the people. Invest in and develop your cultural studies, for that's what makes your profession an art, rather than a craft, that's what makes your fine institute an important place, instead of just another vocational school.

And that's enough for now. Thank you for your kind attention.