



Universidad de Valladolid

FACULTAD de FILOSOFÍA Y LETRAS
DEPARTAMENTO de FILOLOGÍA INGLESA
Grado en Estudios Ingleses

TRABAJO DE FIN DE GRADO

THE SOCIOLOGY OF TRANSLATION: ANALYSIS OF
TWO ENGLISH-SPANISH JURIDICAL TEXTS OF THE
EUROPEAN UNION

Lidia Novo Perona

Tutor: Esther Álvarez de la Fuente

2020/21

Abstract

The sociology of translation represents a new field within translation studies, aiming at showing the relationship across texts, their translations and the society that is bound to them. This approach is especially interesting when studying juridical texts, as they are both shaped by and shapers of society. For this reason, this dissertation aims at investigating how two English juridical texts of the European Union related to language policies and their translations into Spanish do have a reciprocal relationship with the societies that surrounds them. To do this, the texts will be analysed following a sociological and a linguistic approach. The results show that effectively there is a mutual feedback in the original and/or target text-society binomial, as the society feeds the content of the juridical texts of the EU and simultaneously and in return, those texts exert an influence on the European countries as members of the Union.

Keywords: Sociology of translation, European Union, English, Spanish, comparative analysis, juridical texts.

Resumen

La sociología de la traducción representa un nuevo campo dentro de los estudios de traducción, cuyo objetivo es mostrar la relación entre los textos, sus traducciones y la sociedad que está vinculada a ellos. Este enfoque es especialmente interesante cuando se estudian los textos jurídicos, ya que están formados por la sociedad y a la vez la conforman. Por ello, esta tesis investiga cómo dos textos jurídicos ingleses de la Unión Europea relacionados con las políticas lingüísticas y sus traducciones al español tienen una relación recíproca con las sociedades que los rodean. Para ello, se analizarán los textos siguiendo un enfoque sociológico y lingüístico. Los resultados muestran que existe una retroalimentación mutua en el binomio original y/o meta texto-sociedad, ya que la sociedad alimenta el contenido de los textos jurídicos de la UE y en contrapartida, esos textos ejercen una influencia sobre los países europeos como miembros de la Unión.

Palabras clave: Sociología de la traducción, Unión Europea, inglés, español, análisis comparativo, textos jurídicos.

Table of contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Understanding the sociology of translation approach	1
2.1. <i>Social power relations in the field of translation</i>	2
2.2. <i>The concept of habitus</i>	4
3. The sociology of translation applied to the analysis of the EU language	6
3.1. <i>The EU juridical texts as the translation product</i>	7
3.2. <i>The effects of juridical texts in cultural relations</i>	8
4. The main objectives of the study	9
5. Methodology	10
5.1. <i>The texts</i>	10
5.2. <i>Sociological aspects</i>	11
5.3. <i>Linguistic reflection of the sociological aspects</i>	12
6. Analysis and discussion of Texts 1 and 2 and their translations	13
6.1. <i>Sociological analysis</i>	13
6.1.1. <i>Text 1: the absence of multilingualism</i>	13
6.1.2. <i>Text 2: the absence of correspondence between content and reality</i>	15
6.2. <i>Linguistic reflections of the sociological analysis</i>	18
6.2.1. <i>Text 1: the vision of the productive agent</i>	18
6.2.2. <i>Text 2: Spanish in all its glory</i>	19
7. Conclusion and further research	20
8. References	23
Appendix 1: Text 1, Regulation No. 1	24
Appendix 2: Text 2, Multilingualism	26

1. Introduction

The sociology of translation represents a new approach within the fields of sociology and of translation. From the point of view of translation, it has been a reality since the early 2000s, and its relevance continues to grow nowadays as a way to interpret texts and their translations from a perspective that has been traditionally not considered: that of society. Texts, in general, are born from society itself, as authors are members of it; and so are their translations through the figure of the translators. This sociological link is even more pronounced when those texts, born from society, are aimed to regulate aspects of society itself, like, for instance, juridical texts of the European Union. This is why, in the present dissertation, we aim at demonstrating how through the lens of the sociology of translation, it is possible to understand the reciprocal relation between socially bound texts like juridical texts and their translations, and the societies reflected in these texts.

This dissertation is composed by eight different sections: firstly, section 2 provides an understanding of the approach of the sociology of translation pivoted in two main issues: power relations and the concept of *habitus*. Then, section 3 includes the application of said theoretical background to the context of the European Union. In section 4 we introduce the main objectives of the study. Next, in section 5 there is the methodology of the dissertation, explaining what are the texts that are going to be analysed and how they are going to be analysed. Section 6 shows the main results derived from the analysis and section 7 represents the conclusions of the dissertation, suggesting also some notes on further research, given the novelty of the field. Lastly, section 8 is a list of references that compose the theoretical background of the dissertation, and it is followed by two appendixes which include integrally both texts analysed, in order to give a better understanding of the study.

2. Understanding the sociology of translation approach

The field of sociology of translation is a relatively new branch of both the disciplines which conform it. To explain the relationship established between translation and sociology, we will adopt the perspective of the field of translation, in which several shifts of focus have occurred in the last decades, provoking the appearance of the sociological branch which occupies the centre of this dissertation's discussion. This

field's evolution started in the 1960's, as Zheng (2017, 28) records, when neither the translation nor the translator were considered to have any impact on the texts they worked on. Then, the field started to evolve through the 1990s, when the so-called "cultural shift" took place. This shift was announced by the consideration of the object of translation as a text affected by the source and target cultures. This represented a turning point on how translation needed to be addressed, as the text could no longer be understood without its cultural environments – of both the origin and the target languages. This cultural shift put the focus not only on the translations as they are but also on their translators, who represent in the end not only a channel through which the translation will be understood by the other language receptors, but also the bridge connecting the target culture – understood as a set of practices or attitudes that depict a society – with the original text. Thus, with this cultural shift of the focus of the discipline of translation, the union between sociology and translation started to arise and, as Zheng (2017, 29) asserts, by the 2000s "the sociological turn became one of the most prominent translation studies fields of research."

As a consequence derived from this sociological move in the translation field, the cultural surroundings of the text become essential to correctly interpret the text itself, and it is a member of the society – the translator – the one in charge of bringing the cultural context(s) to the textual reality. From this perspective, certain parameters of the sociology of translation, as an already established academic branch of its own, will be the theoretical approach adopted in the present dissertation, where the European Union's language legislation will be analysed considering the social elements of *field*, *agent*, *capital* and *habitus*, that is, the central concepts associated with the social relations in translation, which will be further explored hereunder.

2.1. Social power relations in the field of translation

Social power relations need to be addressed when discussing the sociological dimension of translations. If we take the perspective of the French sociologist Bourdieu – that of genetic structuralism, a method which aims at evaluating society through the observation of the relations between the totality and its components – we assume that power relations are established between the different *agents* which conform the translational context (Sapiro 2014, 84). On the one hand, an *agent* is a

member of society, in this case, for instance, a translator, or a public officer who commands the translation of a given text. They establish a relationship of power among themselves within a context recognised as the *field*, which, according to Wolf (2011, 4) is “a structured system of social positions occupied by individuals and institutions, [...] a system of forces, which exists between these positions, structured in terms of power relations.” These social positions are occupied by two types of *agents* within the field of translation: those related to the production of translations themselves – this includes both the translators and the receivers of those texts – who are called *productive agents*, and the *dominant agents*, who are essentially the institutions which control the sociocultural *status quo* (Wolf 2011, 10). Thus, the way that these two agents have interacted, interact, and will interact in the future, shape the ways in which translations are executed and received by individuals and ultimately, by society itself.

The interaction of these social positions in the field of translation is also based on the types of *capital* that the different types of *agents* possess (Wolf 2011, 4). *Capital* is defined as “the accumulated labour which enables groups of *agents* to appropriate social energy (Zheng 2017, 28).” In other words, the *capital* is the social tools accumulated through life and granted by the context in which individuals and groups have been raised or formed. An example of a social tool would be, for instance, the possession and usage of a certain language in a certain cultural context: a social tool of a Spanish native speaker would be Spanish itself. In this case, the *capital* possessed by Spanish natives would be of a cultural type, but there are other types of *capital* used as social tools: economic, social, and symbolic. Out of these four types, there are two that are of special importance for the topic of the present dissertation: the symbolic and the cultural *capital*. The former has an exclusive version within the field of translation (Wolf 2012, 136), meaning that the symbolic *capital* of a translator is not the same as the one possessed by a teacher, for instance. If the symbolic *capital* of a teacher is the prestige he/she receives through the material used to teach his/her students, in the case of a translator (Wolf 2011, 4) his/her symbolic *capital* is the prestige received through the texts that he/she has to translate in this specific societal exchange. These texts are also cultural goods in the sense that they provide society with cultural *capital* expressed, for instance, in the knowledge that the translator grants to the receivers of the texts.

But the cultural *capital* is possessed not only by productive *agents* like translators but also by dominant *agents*, those in control positions who mark the center of power and force, and rule power relations in a way that will benefit them in order to prolong their strong position in society. These *agents* are also usually authoritative in terms of their economic and cultural *capital*, that is, they have the means and the knowledge to support their own goals. In the case of the field of translation, an example of a dominant *agent* would be the publishing companies which usually decide what is worth being translated and what is not. As Wolf (2011, 6) puts it, they are the ones who “initiate a translation” and thus “have power in their hands”. That is, the dominant *agents* within the field of translation are the ones to decide, for instance, what languages are at the centre of a given translation. And so, the *agents* that actually produce translated texts are subordinated to the dominant *agents*. But, at the same time, the later need the productive *agents* to actually have those texts translated.

Therefore, the productive *agents* involved with the production of translations do possess a strong form of symbolic *capital* as well – as mentioned above, the translated texts grant them prestige, given that they represent their work and contribution to society – only that it has always been silenced mainly by the dominant *agents*, exerting like that an unbalanced power relationship between both types of *agents*. However, a translation occurs not only because a dominant force like those dominant *agents* wants it to happen, but because it is produced by the productive *agents*, that is, the translators. In fact, the translators are the actors, the ones who shape the translations of texts in a more direct way: they execute the direct appropriation of a translated text through the act of translating itself, as explained by Sapiro (2014, 82). They are the ones who decide what words should be used, and thus they are the ones who ultimately shape what is going to be received by the target society. It is certainly paradoxical how the potential of translators as crucial and necessary cultural mediators has been shadowed by their own ‘invisible’ status within the *field* (Sapiro 2014, 83). To further understand the role of translators, the concept of *habitus* needs to be addressed.

2.2. *The concept of habitus*

The *habitus* situates the translator as an *agent* in the sociology of translation. Sapiro (2014, 84), reformulating Bourdieu’s theory, defines the concept of *habitus* as

– referring to translators – “their cultural and ethical disposition and the kind of resources they possess (economic, cultural, and social *capital*) according to their family background, education, and social trajectory.” This definition might be similar to that provided about cultural *capital* on section 2.1, however there is a basic difference: the *habitus* includes all the *capitals* within it, the *habitus* is the provider of all types of *capital*. That is, the *habitus* of the translator within this *field* is shaped by the culture they were raised in – a Spanish native translator’s *habitus* is marked by Spain’s cultures and ways of understanding life. Sapiro (2014, 91) adds that the *habitus* is constructed through the interaction – and competition – with other translators within the *field*: the *habitus* or the translators’ background sociocultural trajectory may differ from one translator to other in such a way that, taking institutional translators as an instance, these differences may lead to changes in the translated texts. In fact, every so often, institutional texts (e.g., legal regulations, policies, etc.) need to be revised, given that they need to follow the advancements of society, given the fact that these texts are born basically to regulate certain elements of social life. It is inevitable then, that if an original institutional text suffers an alteration, its translation changes as well, and the ones in charge of doing so, generally a different translator than the one who performed the first translation, have to establish their own position as professionals in order to make their own interpretation of a text as valid as the former has been for several years – sometimes texts are not revised in decades. Following the sociocultural trajectory of a translator, which shapes the *habitus*, then it is also important to consider that, for instance, an English text translated into Spanish by a Spanish translator will contain a series of nuances that will differ from those added by a French translator to a French version of the same English text. These nuances, that are the translator’s interpretation of the text, are key for their development of a given translation as different target cultures lead to different target texts, that is, translations are affected by the different *habitus* of the translator(s).

As part of the *habitus* or the sociocultural trajectory of the translator – the way of understanding the world–, the translator’s language inextricably affects his/her translations. As Wolf (2011, 3) states, the translation has to be considered always within a context to be fully understood, and ideally, within two contexts: the origin culture and the target culture. In the end, translating itself is accomplished by individuals who pertain to the social system – translators are members of society and

have a cultural background – and translation is a phenomenon that is related to social institutions – the dominant *agents* (Zheng 2017, 29). Thus, the translator must have as part of his/her *habitus* not only his own cultural *capital*, but also the knowledge of the original language and the original culture (also cultural *capitals*) to function as an effective channel of communication.

Thus, the concepts of *field*, *agent*, *capital*, and *habitus* are crucial within the field of sociology of translation and like that, to the analysis of translations that will be carried out on this dissertation regarding the EU's language policies. From this specific viewpoint, it is clear that we could not have a translation without its *agents*, both dominant – the European institutions, in our case – and productive – the translators of judiciary texts. These *agents* are jointly linked to a *field* that is the European political and economic system where they interact and create translations. The way in which they interact within said *field* is crucially marked by their *habitus*, that is, their trajectories as human beings and as professionals, and within it, by their cultural *capital*, represented here in the languages involved in a given translation (English and Spanish, in our case); and by their symbolic *capital*, that is the prestige granted by the realisation of that work. All the elements that have been hereby discussed in this section 2 will be applied then to the context of the EU for a better approach to the texts that will be analysed in this dissertation.

3. The sociology of translation applied to the analysis of the EU language

As the sociology of translation approach is the theoretical perspective adopted in our analysis of the juridical language used in translations performed within the European Union (EU), all the concepts defined in section 2 will be linked on this part 3 to this concrete context. From this perspective then, the *field* of the social interaction our research is focused on is the EU and how the language policy followed by this institution affects the translations of English juridical texts into Spanish. The concepts of *agent(s)* and *habitus* are also acknowledged in our proposed analysis as certain power relationships between these two elements will be explored to understand the sociological spectrum of the EU multiple cultures – i.e. the Spanish and English cultures being the *habitus* contrasted. In the following sections, all these concepts related to these texts and context will be further discussed.

3.1. *The EU juridical texts as the translation product*

There are three main ways of applying sociology of translation to the reality of the field of translation according to Wolf (2007). Each one is ruled by where the focus of the analysis is put: the process, the product, or the *agents*. Sociology of ‘the translation **process**’ addresses the components that build the development of a translation: for instance, what are the social norms that bound a translation, such as work relations, that is, the relationship between the translator and the client that requires the translation. Then, sociology of the ‘translation **product**’ focuses on studying how the text is received by society and how it is affected by it – an example of this could be the translation of the Bible into Spanish: it has marked not only the understanding of religious concepts, but also the wording of religious rituals that affect a chiefly Christian society and way of living. Lastly, the sociology of the ‘translation *agents*’ puts the focus mainly on the productive *agent*’s context of action – that of the translator – to understand how these professionals construct society through their work, and to what extent these effects last. Although for this dissertation we will mainly focus on the sociology of the ‘translation product’, given that the analysis of both target and original texts will be analysed, the process of translation and the *agents* will be taken also into consideration, as there is no translation without combining the three elements simultaneously.

When applying this classification to the analysis of the *field* of the EU language policy through juridical texts, it is crucial to first associate each concept previously discussed on section 2 to the specific EU context. Like that, we find that the dominant *agents* are personified in the form of the Institution itself, the EU: and within it, in the form of those EU member countries that possess the higher economic, cultural, and symbolic capital. To exemplify this, we can think of United Kingdom – an already former member – or members such as France or Germany, who chiefly rule the European context¹. Thus, the dominant *agents* will always try to possess the

¹ Within this EU context, another example of dominant *agents* are the taxpayers, as can be seen in the official European Union’s website (https://europa.eu/european-union/abouteuropa/language-policy_en): When addressing the language policies, in the text contained in that source, it is explicitly recognised that an official website will be translated according to the interest of principal taxpayers. Therefore, these taxpayers or dominant *agents*, although not identified as particular officials, are the owners of that economic power – the *capital*.

sociocultural *status quo*'s head through the investment of their capital: an instance of this is the crucial presence of English as lingua franca in the EU instead of the existence of real multilingualism in the Institution, hinting that the United Kingdom's investment on cultural capital – language – has been higher than the rest, which has also been possible due to this country's powerful possession of the other forms – mainly economic – of capital.

Then, the social context that surrounds the EU juridical texts is found in both the origin and target cultures and societies – that is, the *habitus* – and the agents in charge of the production are the translators – the productive *agents* – who work for the EU – the dominant *agent* – and are thus bound to their powerful position. However, these juridical texts are not only affected by that context, as they are also key elements which shape society: this will be furtherly explored in the next sub-section.

3.2. The effects of juridical texts in cultural relations

As shown in previous sections, the sociology of translation is a new research area that has become useful to show how the relations of power in the field of translation are predominant in today's society. Additionally, it reflects how important it is for translators to be conscious of their social background and, in exchange, how the texts they produce influence on society. More specifically, it is crucial to understand the power of certain texts, like the juridical ones, exert back in society and the effects that they have in cultural relations. Berneking (2016, 267) defines the translator as “a social agent who is at the same time both constructed by society and constructing within society, affected and affecting all the elements in these social networks.” This means that the translator thus embodies a reciprocal relation with the text and the culture which is then transmitted into the text: he/she is the channel between both entities.

Therefore, not only the translator is in contact with elements such as the receivers of the texts or the original authors, but also the texts are in contact with society itself. Juridical texts in particular affect cultural relations, and vice versa. When applying this to the context of the EU, concretely the legislation related to cultural aspects (or cultural capital) such as language policies, it becomes evident that the texts (both cultural and symbolic capital) used in this specific linguistic context are shaping the

way that the target society should conceive their own cultural capital in relation to other surrounding societies' capital – for instance, when the EU regulates legislation issues where different official languages are mentioned, the Spanish language occupies a certain place in comparison with other official languages of the UE that will make Spain's cultural capital to be conceived as higher or lower in relation to other countries' cultural capital (like France's or Poland's, for instance). However, there is sometimes a conflict between what is intended with the redaction of juridical texts and what reality ends up being: society cannot be entirely modulated by a concrete written text, though it is affected to some extent. An example of this will be explored in this dissertation, when the content of the language policies of the EU does not correspond with the linguistic or sociocultural realities of the Institution: multilingualism understood as a balanced compendium of various official languages is an asset of the EU, but it is not a reality, given that English is the predominant force in the Institution and the predominant lingua franca in most European societies.

4. The main objectives of the study

The aim of this dissertation is to show how through the field of sociology of translation it is possible to better understand the translations of juridical texts as more than simple products to be used in a juridical institution, but as cultural and symbolic goods which have a place in two cultures, as Bassnett and Lefevere affirm (c.f. Wolf 2010, 33):

There is always a context in which the translation takes place, always a history from which a text emerges and into which a text is transposed. [...] Translation as an activity is always doubly contextualized since the text has a place in two cultures. (1990, 11)

So, the context within which a translation happens is at the basis of the process of translation. Then, it is crucial to understand the context of the translation considering not only one culture but two, which in the case of this dissertation, are both the English and the Spanish culture.

On another note, the relation between translations and society should be reciprocal, as translations affect society – as already exemplified in section 3 – and society affects them – in the way that language evolves within a given society. That is, the objective of this dissertation is also to observe the existence of these bidirectional effects between

juridical texts (translations or versions) and social relations in the context of the EU. This will be shown through the analysis and comparison of the Spanish and English versions of two different linguistic policies of the European Union, aiming at demonstrating the importance of those texts in the way that European society is formed and evolves linguistically and it affects the construction of future juridical texts in return.

5. Methodology

Prior to the proper application of the aspects discussed in sections 2 and 3, we will hereby describe the procedure with which the analysis of the texts will be accomplished. It will cover two aspects which are sociological the ones and the linguistic ones in order to elaborate an analysis that addresses the sociological dimensions of two Institutional texts of the European Union. It is crucial to consider that both aspects are correlated, and even though a distinction is going to be made in order to propose a description of the procedure of the dissertation, both can and in fact will end up being intermingled.

5.1. *The texts*

Two texts will be analysed: they are written specialised juridical texts belonging to the European Union legislation that addresses the issue of the use of language(s) in the institution. Text 1, p. 385–386 (*Regulation No 1 determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community, 1958*) – the English original text and its translation into Spanish (*Reglamento No 1 por el que se fija el regimen lingüístico de la Comunidad Económica Europea, 1958*) –, is part of the first agreement of the EU, and as such, the original text was written only in German, French, Italian and Dutch. It seems obvious that it is impossible that the three languages were the original language of the text, as for its redaction only one must have been used as ‘lingua franca’, but no clear conclusions are made about which language out of the four was the original one. Ever since, this text dealing with which languages and how they are to be used in the European Community was translated into diverse other languages, like Spanish, as other member countries were adhered to the EU.

Then, to see how that first legislation has evolved and so affected differently the European society (or *vice versa*), we will also consider Text 2, p. 59–64

(*Multilingualism: an asset for Europe and a shared commitment European Parliament resolution*, 2010) – again, the English original text and its translation into Spanish (*Multilingüismo: una ventaja para Europa y un compromiso compartido*, 2010) –, which is the current legal text marking the linguistic policy of the EU. In this text, the main theme is the declaration of multilingualism as a main goal of the Institution. This was also declared in Text 1, however, it has not been yet achieved. According to the EU, there is multilingualism, but the reality is different. Bielsa (2017, 2) describes English as the “McLanguage” of a globalised ‘McWorld’, or as the ‘Eurospeak’ of our multilingual continent.” As happens with Text 1, we will be taking the English versions of Text 2 as the “original” one given that English is considered right now as the lingua franca of the European Union; and the Spanish text, as a version or translation of the same.

Therefore, it is clear that the two texts about language regulations under analysis have also important implications from a sociological viewpoint, which will be explored in the following section.

5.2. Sociological aspects

As for the sociological aspects that will be analysed in both texts, 1 and 2, the *habitus* or context of the productive *agent* or translator (see section 2) is intrinsically linked to that of the text, and that is what will be studied mainly through the exploration of the cultural and social settings surrounding both texts. More specifically, to carry out a sociological analysis of the texts, it is important to focus firstly on the *habitus* that surrounds both documents. When the EU was first formed, the members of the Institution were only Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and West Germany. Nonetheless, power relations were already established, and France was the leader of these countries – Robert Schuman, who proposed the Treaty of Rome, was French. In this political context the first regulation was born, including Text 1, the first text to be analysed in this dissertation. On it there is already a predisposition to implement a form of multilingualism, however French was at the centre of the discussions between the different members, and thus that original asset was never accomplished at the time.

Text 2 is set in an entirely different world – 52 years separate each other. In 2010 the EU was formed by 27 member states within an already globalised world with the United States of America at its head, and countries like the United Kingdom, Germany, or France at the head of the Institution itself. Sapiro (2014, 86) discusses that this globalisation increased the presence of translations around the world significantly, but it did not mean a diversification: it was the contrary, these translations were concentrated around the English language, provoking thus a strong asymmetry between English as lingua franca and the rest of the EU languages. In this socio-political context, a treaty referring to the language policies of the EU arose (being Text 2 part of it), with multilingualism as its main focus as the non-English-speaking dominant agents were conscious of the risks of the over-presence of the English language within the institution.

Thus, having considered the *habitus* of the texts, the content itself of the documents – both the here assumed as originals and the translations or versions – will be explored in order to see the correlation of the content with the reality of society, and if those measures were reflected in reality or not. Additionally, in order to observe if there is any kind of reciprocity between this reality from each historical context (1958 vs. 2010) and the translations produced from both texts, we also took into consideration the linguistic analysis of each target text.

5.3. *Linguistic reflection of the sociological aspects*

As part of the *habitus* of the translator, given that language is part of it, the linguistic aspects of the text cannot be overlooked. In fact, it is central since language is part of the cultural *capital* which conforms the social tools of the translator (see section 2). The way to address this in both texts is focusing mainly on the lexical changes from the English text into the Spanish one. This is so because it will show the translator²'s attitude toward the content, and how this affects the way the target public will be receiving it. These lexical changes might signify a change in the content's sense, thus, a change in the semantic prosody – this refers to how the discourse of a

² Unfortunately, there is no chance of knowing directly who that person might have been, as there is no acknowledgement of his/her identity when researching about those texts, a circumstance that leads to consider that the translator's or productive *agent*'s invisibility (mentioned in section 2.1) is still an issue in this specialized translation field.

text, written in this case, can be perceived in a negative or positive way by the receivers of that product –, which will be the central linguistic point of analysis in the Spanish translations.

6. Analysis and discussion of Texts 1 and 2 and their translations

On this section of the dissertation, the analysis of both texts previously discussed will be accomplished following the two branches which conform the sociology of translation approach: first, the sociological analysis – which has the main role on the field – and then, a linguistic analysis of some aspects of the texts.

6.1. Sociological analysis

6.1.1. Text 1: the absence of multilingualism

One of the main points that strikes us when reading the assumed original version of Text 1 from a sociological perspective is that the European Council only considered four main languages when it was redacted in 1958 (see Appendix 1): “The official languages and the working languages [...] shall be Dutch, French, German and Italian” (Article 1). Again, it is important to remember that when the EU was formed, the member countries were Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and West Germany. Whereas at first sight the choice of using said languages seems fair – the four chosen languages are official languages of said countries – if we take the case of the Netherlands, for instance, there are other co-official languages that co-exist in the territory, such as West Frisian and Papiamento, which were disregarded when composing Text 1. In the end, Text 1 is soaked by its socio-historical context given that it was the beginning of a Union of countries unprecedented after two World Wars that were originated in Europe. But unfortunately, what Text 1 gave back to a great part of the European society – in an example of reciprocity between the texts and the reality that surrounds them – is a sense of disconnection, instead of unification. Only four languages – cultural *capital* – are considered ‘worthy’ of being the official languages of this Union, and, if we put ourselves in the shoes of a Papiamento speaker reading this text in 1958, we will feel like our language, our *capital*, is going to be completely disregarded in this new European *field*, almost condemned to disappearing. This hints us that equal multilingualism – that did not

appear as a term in Text 1 – was not really consideration at a time, even though it appears that a multilingualism of only four main languages is proposed. Therefore, the reciprocal and so bi-directional relationship between the text and the society is proven in this case as the social reality gives form to the textual content of the original text and, at the same time and in return, the content of the original text makes the society to relegate one cultural *capital* to non-existence highlighting others’.

Nonetheless, when we look at the Spanish version of Text 1, we find out that in its headline – one of the most visible parts of a text –, the translator chose to interpret “Regulation n°1 determining the **languages to be used** by the European Economic Community” as “Reglamento n° 1 por el que se fija el **regimen lingüístico** de la Comunidad Económica Europea”. The utterance ‘languages to be used’ could have been directly translated as ‘los idiomas que se van utilizar’, for example, but by choosing ‘régimen lingüístico’, the translator gives the Spanish version a less individual reference to non-used languages than in the English text and so providing a more inclusive attitude in the target text-Spanish society reciprocity. Again, in the English version we can grasp that a multilingualism of four languages is proposed, whereas in the Spanish version, we see hints of a change toward a more complex linguistic reality. This can be explained by when did the United Kingdom join – 1973 – and when did Spain – 1986. The different versions that appeared of this text whenever a country joined the EU are considered as a special edition translated into the different official languages. Then, there is a gap of thirteen years between each merging during which English started to become that ‘McLanguage’ that Bielsa (2017) wrote about – see section 5.1.– and language globalisation started to represent a worry for non-English speaking countries, Spain among them, which began to regard their cultural *capital*, represented in their languages, at stake.

However, when paying attention to another main point of Text 1, we discover that something similar to multilingualism was intended to be applied by the Council, when they stated that “Regulations and other documents of general application shall be drafted in the four official languages” (Article 4). Here, we see the clear intention to equalise the importance of the four languages chosen in order not to position one on top of another. This intention is not without its flaws, as it results highly improbable for a Council to redact texts such as Text 1 simultaneously in four different languages. It represented a problem solved within this same juridical text, as if we look at Article 6, the Council also

stated that “the institutions of the Community may stipulate in their rules of procedure which of the **languages are to be used** in specific cases.” So, four languages shall be used at the same time, but since it is clearly unrealistic, the Institutions shall choose one of the four to communicate. The Spanish version of this confirms what has been attested in the previous paragraph, since once again the translator juggles with the Spanish language: “Las instituciones podrán determinar las modalidades de aplicación de este **régimen lingüístico** en sus reglamentos internos.” Avoiding, like so, to state that a language was on top of the rest, wanting to give the Spanish receivers of the target text a lesser tone.

The content of Text 1, studied from a sociological perspective, leaves the reader with the feeling that there were first and second-rate languages not only within the different regions of the Union, but also within the so-called four official languages; or what is the same, the cultural *capital* of a great part of the European society was disregarded in favour of that of the other part. This original text then clearly reflects a Europe that needed unification after two World Wars, but in the wanting of that, many members of that same society were disconnected from their own cultural *capital* and thus, their own identity. This disconnection, however, some years later in the Spanish version, was slightly attenuated.

6.1.2. Text 2: the absence of correspondence between content and reality

Text 2 is structured in three well differentiated parts, with the two first parts serving as a path to understand the third one. The first content part, marked by dashes, explores past texts which are a base for the construction of the present. The second part, marked by different letters, marks the considerations taken into account when composing the text (see Appendix 2). Both parts are fostering in a way the third and last part – the longest part as well – where the European 2010 Council enumerated a series of fifty-one remarks concerning their language policies. We say that the two first parts foster the third one because they gave like that a background to Text 2: by referencing other texts, they recognised the symbolic and cultural *capital* that was present when writing Text 2. This happens in both English and Spanish versions of the text.

Contrary to Text 1, when analysing Text 2 through the sociological lens we find that multilingualism is indeed very much present in it: it is mentioned 24 times in the

relatively short span of 6 pages – in Text 1 it is mentioned a total of zero times, so this is a considerable change. On the considerations part, we find that the Council stated that “multilingualism is of increasing importance in the context of relations between Member States, cohabitation in our multicultural societies, and in the Union’s common policies” (61) directly recognising the role of multilingualism, as means to seek unity between the different societies and countries of the EU. This is repeated throughout the text on several occasions, stating once and again that it is an objective of the Institution to achieve that multilingualism. When looking at its translation into Spanish, the correspondent term ‘multilingüismo’ appears the same amount of times it appeared on the English counterpart to transmit the same idea: that the EU is really trying to achieve multilingualism as a reality within the social life of the Institution. This over-presence of the term can be explained when looking at the single appearance of its socio-cultural counterpart: ‘globalisation’, translated as ‘globalización’ in the Spanish version, which is mentioned as well on the considerations part of the text where the Council asserts that “linguistic and cultural diversity have a significant impact on the daily life of citizens of the European Union due to media penetration, [...] advancing globalisation” (60). This quote can be interpreted as a way of saying that, given that in society we find globalisation, the European society needs that multilingualism as a means to preserve that daily life marked by diversity. In other words, the dominant agents – the European Council – observed that globalisation was jeopardising cultural diversity – cultural *capital* – and created this text as a means to stop it from happening. Society fed this text through the increasing presence of globalisation but, it is also interesting to consider in which ways the text influenced society back – if in any way. In this respect, we should take into consideration that in the bi-directional influence in the binomial text-society, it seems that the first or earlier direction of the movement is from society to texts, while in the movement in the opposite direction (texts’ influence on society) the effects are reflected later and it takes longer to be perceived back in the society.

We observe that Text 2 is mainly composed of fifty-one points where the importance of having a multilingual reality is explained and insistently proposed. This perspective may apparently contrast with the Institution’s current contradictory attitude towards multilingualism in their official webpage, where there is a section – within the language policy site – where the Institution explains to the members of society why a webpage or text is not translated into their language: “some sites are only available in 2

or 3 languages - or even just one (usually English).” This goes directly against point 6 of Text 2, where it is stated “the importance of translation, both literary and technical, in the lives of citizens and for the EU’s long-term development” (61). This same importance is stated in Spanish with the translation of this part being almost direct: “la importancia de la traducción, tanto literaria como técnica, en la vida de los ciudadanos y para el desarrollo a largo plazo de la UE.” The juridical Text 2 included a series of points eleven years ago that do not correspond completely with our new reality as such, given that in the end, the real importance continues to be given to English mainly (bilingual education) – and 2 or 3 other languages – as said on the example already mentioned of the official EU site. However, it depends on what is understood by “multilingualism” (as 3 languages implies multi- already) the point is that the cultural *capital* will be reduced to only 3 – presumably English, French and German, it is not clearly stated – where English is still at the forefront. As explained by Leal (2016, 4), while the EU is officially multilingual – and it promotes multilingualism with different programmes – in reality, it is more a monolingual Institution with English at its centre. Yes, multilingualism is aimed to be achieved but it is contradictory how in fact only a few languages are at the heart of said multilingualism. Like this, the European citizen continues to perceive the sense that there are first and second-rate languages within the Institution, playing along with the globalisation that is supposedly feared.

Lastly, another important aspect of Text 2 needs to be mentioned from the sociological perspective: the recognition of the role of the *productive agents* – the translators – within the *field* of the EU. This can be seen in point 10, where there is a proposition to introduce “a European Day of the Translator and Interpreter, taking account of and raising the profile of these professions [...]” (61). This part has been translated into Spanish as “propone que se establezca un día europeo del traductor y el intérprete o se tomen en consideración y se valoricen estas profesiones [...]” which is very much similar to the original, without any interpretation from the part of the translator – he/she wanted this message to be transmitted integrally. This might have been because it is highly remarkable given the fact that this significantly feeds the symbolic *capital* of these *agents*, that is, they gain recognition from the dominant *agents* in front of the whole of the European society. However, the European Day of the Translator and Interpreter is not yet a thing – once again, Text 2 does not fully correspond with the current reality of the Institution.

In general, the sociological analysis of both Texts and their translations results in the fact that there are two main issues that are affected by the reciprocal relationship between society and juridical texts' translations: the issue of translation itself, and that of multilingualism. On Text 1, multilingualism nor translation are considered in the English version, however there are some differences on the Spanish version as it hints a social change in the way society itself regarded its own cultural *capital*: all languages started to be equally important, and this is made more explicit in the Spanish version of Text 1. This trajectory was completed, with time, when Text 2 was written and translated, as multilingualism is recognised as of utter importance, and the role of the translator too. However, the reciprocity between what was translated and what it reflected back into society was partly violated in the way that eleven years later, some of the said changes that appear on Text 2 are yet to be a reality. Both Text 1 and 2 are influenced by the social changes and events of their respective moments, however Text 2 appears to not have impregnated well the society of the EU yet where the against-globalization attitude of the Institution seems contradictory with the fact of their cultural *capital* being almost only the English language, which is being used in the last decades as the main linguistic vehicle to reach globalization.

6.2. Linguistic reflections of the sociological analysis

6.2.1. Text 1: the vision of the productive agent

When analysing Text 1 from a linguistic perspective, we take the view of the translator or productive *agent* and we discover that there were some significant changes made from the English version into the Spanish one. First and foremost, the bigger headline that reads “the council” in the English version was omitted when translated into Spanish. This gives the Spanish version a less serious look when compared to the English counterpart, and this can be interpreted as a way not to uncover who is the dominant *agent*: the council.

In this same sense, we opine that when the translator decided to interpret “el presente reglamento será obligatorio en todos sus elementos y directamente aplicable en **cada** Estado miembro” as a translation for “this Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in **all** Member States” instead of using ‘en **todos** los Estados

miembros’; the translator intended to reduce the tone of the text considering their Spanish *habitus*, that is, their way of understanding the world from a Spanish perspective. We cannot assume that the translator was a native Spanish speaker, but we do assume that by acquiring the knowledge of a cultural *capital* represented in learning Spanish, he or she did indeed acquire a series of experiences and ways of seeing the world from the perspective of Spanish society. Like so, the translator was influenced by the *habitus* when understanding that ‘en **todos**’ could sound more like a direct obligation for the Spanish society than ‘en **cada**.’

Another aspect that has to be marked here is a change of order in the enumeration of languages in Article 1. In English, the order is like so: “Dutch, French, German, and Italian.” However, in Spanish, the translator decided to order them like so: “el alemán, el francés, el italiano y el neerlandés.” This can represent that the translator’s *habitus* – his life experience – led him/her to change the order of importance of each country or language in front of the others. He or she did not change the order anywhere else in the text, and this is so deliberate that leads us to believe that in the 80s in the power relationship between the productive *agents* and the dominant ones, some of the dominant *agents* – Germany as the institutional part of the EU – seemed to be more powerful (to the productive *agent* or the Spanish translator at least) than the others, showing also how, according to his/her *habitus* – that is, their cultural and life experience –, countries or languages such as French or Italian – these language being *cultural capitals* – come earlier than Dutch in the order of importance.

There are no further linguistic elements analysable in Text 1 relevant for the discussion of this dissertation, specially given that this Text 1 is comparatively shorter than Text 2 – one single page vs. six pages. However, given that Text 1 is so short, what has been found from a linguist perspective is rather interesting for the sociology of translation’s perspective.

6.2.2. Text 2: Spanish in all its glory

If in Text 1 we saw that the tone of the translation was more precise and closer to the original in English, in Text 2 what needs to be highlighted is the opposite: the translator chose to display the Spanish language in all its glory through a series of devices, instead of persecuting a major resemblance to the English language. First, there is a

significant use of synonyms to refer to the same word that is constantly repeated in English: for instance, ‘asset’, which is repeated 6 times in Text 2, is translated as ‘ventaja’, ‘active’, ‘bien’, and ‘valor añadido’; the word ‘stresses’, repeated 8 times, is translated in the Spanish version as ‘considera fundamental’, ‘subraya’, ‘considera muy importante’, ‘destaca’, ‘resalta’, ‘considera’ – alone – and ‘observa la necesidad.’ All this display of Spanish synonyms to refer to terms that are simply constantly repeated in English gives the reader a sense of diversity when comparing both languages, and the translator must have been aware of so when performing his or her job. We believe that he or she, mastering the Spanish language – cultural *capital* –, understood that the repetition of the same term in this language is received as a poor elaboration of writing, and thus decided to diverge from the English version – in English this repetition might be perceived as well as a formality – by elaborating a wide arrange of synonyms.

Besides this daunting presence of synonyms, we have found that the translator entered also to assess certain concepts that are not assessed like so at all in the English version. Like this, the productive *agent’s* “invisibility” is not so obvious here, given that in this power relationship he/she contributes to the content of the article with his/her own *habitus*. For instance, when in the English version we find the sentence “The EU welcomes the submission of the Commission...” (61), in the Spanish version we have “acoge con agrado” (61). The addition of the adverbial to the verb, instead of having translated the verb ‘welcome’ literally as ‘da la bienvenida’ hints a reinforcement of the emotion that is common in Spanish, but not necessarily needed when translating this text. From this stressing of a positive emotion toward the content of Text 2, we can grasp that the productive *agent’s* intention here is to transmit that positiveness to the receivers of the text – the population.

The linguistic analysis of both Texts 1 and 2 and their correspondent translations hint a marked linguistic evolution on the way the productive *agents* – the translators – managed the cultural *capital* represented both in the Spanish language. On Text 1, there are some changes related to the semantic prosody that seem intended to lower the tone of the content in general, as the English version of it seems more serious and has comparatively stronger wording than the Spanish one. This tendency of lowering the tone, or making it sound less serious, continued when Text 2 was translated into Spanish. However, there is a further linguistic change on Text 2, when instead of following a more ‘conservative’ translation of the text – that is, creating a more direct translation – the

translator opted for a considerable augmentation in the number of synonyms utilised – when compared to the English counterpart – and a certain inclusion of adjectives and adverbs that hint a value judgement that might have been unintentional but, considering the parameters provided by the field of the sociology of translation, is provoked by the translator's *habitus* – specially because Text 2 directly addresses the profession and recognises its importance.

7. Conclusion and further research

The present dissertation has aimed to show how the field of sociology of translation is a new field that results as an effective way to further understand the translations of juridical texts as elements both shaped by and that shape the society that surrounds them, in this case two juridical texts of the EU related to language policies. To do this, the approach of the field of sociology of translation was firstly discussed, exploring the three main concepts related to this field within translation studies: *agent* – members of society involved in the translation –, *field* – the context in which those members interact –, *capital* – the social tools granted by the cultural context –, and *habitus* – the cultural context itself, the professional trajectory of an *agent*. Then, all these concepts were translated into the context of the EU, more specifically on the sociological and linguistic analysis of two juridical texts on language policies and their respective translations. As a result, we have attested that there certainly is a bidirectionality between the original and target texts and the original and target societies of the EU. However, we have found that Text 1 (1958) presents a content that corresponds more effectively to the social reality than what can be attested from Text 2 (2010): this might be related to the fact that Text 1 has been more time published than Text 2 – there is a gap of fifty-two years between both, and like this, Text 1 has had more time to accommodate within society than Text 2. Then, we have seen that there is certain reciprocity between society and the texts also on the linguistic reflection of the sociological analysis, marked by our observation of an evolution in the translation of Text 2 when compared to Text 1: we have attested that both Texts tend to give the juridical Spanish versions a more ‘mundane’ tone than what can be grasped in the English version. However, when translating Text 2, the translator utilised different devices such as changes of the semantic prosody, and the inclusion of numerous synonyms where there is only repetition in the original. This is influenced by a certain understanding of the Spanish cultural *capital* by the productive *agent* and his/her *habitus*,

thus there is a marked social influence on the linguistic construction of the texts. This can be seen reflected back into society in the way that a Spanish reader of the juridical text would effectively recognise Text 2 as related to their culture, and thus will feed the understanding of Spanish society of their own cultural *capital*.

On a further research final note, it would be deeply interesting to study future translations of juridical texts of the EU after the happening of Brexit, as English as a *lingua franca* might with time be overlooked. Besides, it would be also compelling to investigate and analyse whether our results can be extrapolated to other translations of the same texts explored in this dissertation to see whether this is just a case of the Spanish culture and language, or it is applicable to other languages or societies. On this same sense, another further research discussion could be derived of the question of whether these results apply to other juridical texts and not only those which are related to the regulation of languages.

8. References

- Berneking, Steve. 2016. "A Sociology of Translation and the Central Role of the Translator." *The Bible Translators*. 67:3. 265-281. SAGE.
- Bielsa, Esperança and Antonio Aguilera. 2017. "Politics of Translation: a Cosmopolitan Approach." *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology*. European Sociological Association.
- Gouanvic, Jean-Marc. 2010. "Outline of a Sociology of Translation Informed by the Ideas of Pierre Bourdieu." in *MonTI 2*: 119-129. Montreal: Concordia University Press.
- Leal, Alice. 2016. "Translation at the European Union and English as a Lingua Franca: Can erasing language hierarchy foster multilingualism?" *New Voices in Translation Studies*. Viena: University of Viena.
- Sapiro, Gisèle. 2014. "The Sociology of Translation: A New Research Domain." *A Company to Translation Studies*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Wolf, Michaela. 2007. *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. John Benjamins Publishing: Amsterdam.
- Wolf, Michaela. 2010. "Translation 'Going Social'? Challenges to the (Ivory) Tower of Babel." in *MonTI 2*: 29-46. Montreal: Concordia University Press.
- Wolf, Michaela. 2011. *Mapping the Field: Sociological Perspectives on Translation*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Wolf, Michaela. 2012. "The Sociology of Translation and its 'Activist Turn'." *Translation and Interpreting Studies*. 7:2. 129-134. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Zheng, Jing. 2017. "An Overview of Sociology of Translation: Past, Present and Future." *International Journal of English Linguistics*. 7:4. Canadian Center of Science and Education.

Appendix 1: Text 1, Regulation No. 1

English version:

Official Journal of the European Communities

59

6.10.58

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

385/58

THE COUNCIL

REGULATION No 1

determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY,

Having regard to Article 217 of the Treaty which provides that the rules governing the languages of the institutions of the Community shall, without prejudice to the provisions contained in the rules of procedure of the Court of Justice, be determined by the Council, acting unanimously;

Whereas each of the four languages in which the Treaty is drafted is recognised as an official language in one or more of the Member States of the Community;

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

The official languages and the working languages of the institutions of the Community shall be Dutch, French, German and Italian.

Article 2

Documents which a Member State or a person subject to the jurisdiction of a Member State sends to institutions of the Community may be drafted in any one of the official languages selected by the sender. The reply shall be drafted in the same language.

Article 3

Documents which an institution of the Community sends to a Member State or to a person subject to the jurisdiction of a Member State shall be drafted in the language of such State.

Article 4

Regulations and other documents of general application shall be drafted in the four official languages.

Article 5

The Official Journal of the Community shall be published in the four official languages.

Article 6

The institutions of the Community may stipulate in their rules of procedure which of the languages are to be used in specific cases.

Article 7

The languages to be used in the proceedings of the Court of Justice shall be laid down in its rules of procedure.

Article 8

If a Member State has more than one official language, the language to be used shall, at the request of such State, be governed by the general rules of its law.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 15 April 1958.

For the Council

The President

V. LAROCK

Spanish version:

8	Diario Oficial de las Comunidades Europeas	01/Vol. 01
358R0001		
6. 10. 58	DIARIO OFICIAL DE LAS COMUNIDADES EUROPEAS	Nº 385/58

REGLAMENTO Nº 1
por el que se fija el régimen
lingüístico de la Comunidad Económica Europea

EL CONSEJO DE LA COMUNIDAD ECONÓMICA EUROPEA,

Artículo 4

Visto el artículo 217 del Tratado, según el cual el régimen lingüístico de las instituciones de la Comunidad será fijado por el Consejo, por unanimidad, sin perjuicio de las disposiciones previstas en el reglamento del Tribunal de Justicia,

Los reglamentos y demás textos de alcance general se redactarán en las cuatro lenguas oficiales.

Considerando que las cuatro lenguas en las que ha sido redactado el Tratado son reconocidas como lenguas oficiales cada una de ellas en uno o varios Estados miembros de la Comunidad,

Artículo 5

El *Diario Oficial de la Comunidad* se publicará en las cuatro lenguas oficiales.

HA ADOPTADO EL PRESENTE REGLAMENTO:

Artículo 1

Las lenguas oficiales y las lenguas de trabajo de las instituciones de la Comunidad serán el alemán, el francés, el italiano y el neerlandés.

Artículo 6

Las instituciones podrán determinar las modalidades de aplicación de este régimen lingüístico en sus reglamentos internos.

Artículo 2

Los textos que un Estado miembro o una persona sometida a la jurisdicción de un Estado miembro envíe a las instituciones se redactarán, a elección del remitente, en una de las lenguas oficiales. La respuesta se redactará en la misma lengua.

Artículo 7

El régimen lingüístico del procedimiento del Tribunal de Justicia se determinará en el reglamento de procedimiento de éste.

Artículo 3

Los textos que las instituciones envíen a un Estado miembro o a una persona sometida a la jurisdicción de un Estado miembro se redactarán en la lengua de dicho Estado.

Artículo 8

Por lo que respecta a los Estados miembros donde existan varias lenguas oficiales, el uso de una lengua se regirá, a petición del Estado interesado, por las normas generales de la legislación de dicho Estado.

El presente Reglamento será obligatorio en todos sus elementos y directamente aplicable en cada Estado miembro.

Hecho en Bruselas, el 15 de abril de 1958.

Por el Consejo

El Presidente

V. LAROCK

Appendix 2: Text 2, Multilingualism

English version:

6.5.2010

EN

Official Journal of the European Union

C 117 E/59

Tuesday 24 March 2009

29. Calls on the Member States to implement a preventive strategy of social action aimed at protecting minors without stigmatising immigrant communities, through public programmes and social services aimed at both preventing these practices (training, education and awareness-raising among the communities at risk) and assisting the victims who have been subjected to them (psychological and medical support including, where possible, free medical treatment to repair the damage); calls also on the Member States to consider, in accordance with child protection legislation, that the threat or risk of being subjected to FGM may justify intervention by the authorities;

30. Calls on the Member States to draw up guidelines for health professionals, teachers and social workers aimed at informing and educating parents, in a respectful manner and with the assistance of interpreters if necessary, about the enormous risks of FGM and the fact that such practices are considered as a crime in the Member States, and also to cooperate with and fund the activities of the networks and NGOs that are working to educate, raise awareness and mediate in the sphere of FGM, in close contact with families and communities;

31. Calls on the Member States to disseminate accurate information which can be understood by an illiterate population, in particular at the consulates of Member States when visas are being issued; takes the view that information on the reasons for the legal ban should also be communicated by the immigrant services when people arrive in the host country, so that families understand that the ban on a traditional act is in no way to be seen as cultural aggression, but as legal protection for women and girls; considers that families should be informed of the consequences under criminal law, which may entail imprisonment, if mutilation is ascertained;

32. Calls for an improvement in the legal status of women and girls in countries where FGM is practised, in order to increase women's self-confidence and their independent initiative and responsibility;

33. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission and the governments and parliaments of the Member States.

Multilingualism: an asset for Europe and a shared commitment

P6_TA(2009)0162

European Parliament resolution of 24 March 2009 on Multilingualism: an asset for Europe and a shared commitment (2008/2225(INI))

(2010/C 117 E/10)

The European Parliament,

- having regard to Articles 149 and 151 of the EC Treaty,
- having regard to Articles 21 and 22 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union,
- having regard to the 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage,
- having regard to the Commission Communication of 18 September 2008 entitled Multilingualism: an asset for Europe and a shared commitment (COM(2008)0566) and to the accompanying Commission staff working document (SEC(2008)2443, SEC(2008)2444, SEC(2008)2445),
- having regard to the Commission Communication of 13 April 2007 entitled Framework for the European survey on language competences (COM(2007)0184),

Tuesday 24 March 2009

- having regard to the Commission working document of 15 November 2007 entitled Report on the implementation of the Action Plan Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity' (COM(2007)0554), and to the accompanying staff working document (SEC(2007)1222),
 - having regard to its resolution of 10 April 2008 on a European agenda for culture in a globalising world⁽¹⁾,
 - having regard to its resolution of 15 November 2006 on a new framework strategy for multilingualism⁽²⁾,
 - having regard to its resolution of 27 April 2006 on measures to promote multilingualism and language learning in the European Union: European Indicator of Language Competence⁽³⁾,
 - having regard to its resolution of 4 September 2003 with recommendations to the Commission on European regional and lesser-used languages — the languages of minorities in the EU — in the context of enlargement and cultural diversity⁽⁴⁾,
 - having regard to Decision No 1934/2000/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 July 2000 on the European Year of Languages 2001⁽⁵⁾,
 - having regard to the Presidency Conclusions of the Barcelona European Council of 15 and 16 March 2002,
 - having regard to the conclusions of the Education, Youth and Culture Council of 21 and 22 May 2008, with specific reference to multilingualism,
 - having regard to the Conclusions of 20 November 2008 of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on the promotion of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue in the external relations of the Union and its Member States⁽⁶⁾,
 - having regard to the opinion of the Committee of the Regions on multilingualism of 18-19 June 2008⁽⁷⁾ and to the opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee of 18 September 2008 on multilingualism,
 - having regard to Rule 45 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Culture and Education and the opinion of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs (A6-0092/2009),
- A. whereas linguistic and cultural diversity have a significant impact on the daily life of citizens of the European Union due to media penetration, increasing mobility and migration and advancing globalisation,
- B. whereas the acquisition of a diverse range of language skills is considered to be of the greatest importance for all EU citizens, since it enables them to derive full economic, social and cultural benefit from freedom of movement within the Union and from the Union's relations with third countries,

⁽¹⁾ Texts adopted, P6_TA(2008)0124.

⁽²⁾ OJ C 314 E, 21.12.2006, p. 207.

⁽³⁾ OJ C 296 E, 6.12.2006, p. 271.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ C 76 E, 25.3.2004, p. 374.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ L 232, 14.9.2000, p. 1.

⁽⁶⁾ OJ C 320, 16.12.2008, p. 10.

⁽⁷⁾ OJ C 257, 9.10.2008, p. 30.

Tuesday 24 March 2009

- C. whereas multilingualism is of increasing importance in the context of relations between Member States, cohabitation in our multicultural societies, and in the Union's common policies,
- D. whereas the evaluation of multilingualism needs to be validated by recognised instruments, such as the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and others,
- E. whereas certain European languages form a vital bridge in relations with third countries and between peoples and nations from the most diverse regions of the world,
- F. whereas linguistic diversity is acknowledged as a citizen's right in Articles 21 and 22 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, and multilingualism should also have the goal of encouraging respect for diversity and tolerance, so as to prevent the emergence of possible conflicts, whether active or passive, between the different linguistic communities within the Member States,
1. Welcomes the submission of the Commission Communication on multilingualism and the attention paid to it by the Council;
 2. Reiterates the positions it has upheld over time on multilingualism and cultural diversity;
 3. Insists on the need for recognition of parity between the EU's official languages in all aspects of public activity;
 4. Considers that Europe's linguistic diversity constitutes a major cultural asset and it would be wrong for the European Union to restrict itself to a single main language;
 5. Stresses the crucial role of the EU institutions in ensuring respect for the principle of linguistic parity, in relations between Member States and in the EU institutions themselves, as also in EU citizens' relations with national administrations and with Community and international institutions and bodies;
 6. Recalls that the importance of multilingualism is not confined to economic and social aspects and that attention must also be paid to cultural and scientific creation and transmission and to the importance of translation, both literary and technical, in the lives of citizens and for the EU's long-term development; and last but not least, the role played by languages in shaping and strengthening identity;
 7. Stresses that multilingualism is a transversal issue that has a major impact on the lives of European citizens; calls on Member States also, therefore, to mainstream multilingualism in policies other than education, such as lifelong learning, social inclusion, employment, media and research;
 8. Stresses the vital importance of creating specific programmes to support translation and of setting up multilingual terminology database networks;
 9. Recalls that information and communication technologies are to be used for promoting multilingualism and therefore emphasises the role and the use of the appropriate international standard (ISO 10646) - which allows for the representation of the alphabets of all languages - in European and Member States' administrative systems and media;
 10. Proposes introducing a European Day of the Translator and Interpreter or taking account of and raising the profile of these professions during the European Day of Languages, celebrated on 26 September each year;
 11. Asserts that it is vital to safeguard multilingualism in countries or regions in which two or more official languages coexist;

Tuesday 24 March 2009

12. Stresses the need, in Member States with more than one official language, to ensure full mutual intelligibility between those languages, especially in relation to senior citizens and to the legal system, health, administration and employment;
13. Encourages the learning of a second European Union language by officials who come into contact with the citizens of other Member States in their work;
14. Believes it necessary and appropriate to create opportunities for foreign language learning in adulthood and, through vocational and lifelong learning programmes, with a view to personal and professional development;
15. Emphasises the vital need to provide special attention and support at school to pupils who cannot be educated in their mother tongue, and warmly welcomes the Commission proposal to promote 'mother tongue plus two' in education;
16. Regrets that the Commission has not as yet instituted either a multi-annual programme on linguistic diversity and language learning or a European Agency on linguistic diversity and language learning, as called for in the abovementioned resolution adopted by Parliament by a large majority on 4 September 2003;
17. Stresses, further, the importance of a full knowledge of the host state's official languages for the full integration of immigrants and their families and emphasises that national governments must effectively promote special language courses, particularly for women and older people; calls on Member States to act responsibly vis-à-vis immigrants, providing immigrants with the necessary means to learn the language and culture of the host country, while allowing and encouraging them to maintain their own language;
18. Recalls that for these reasons it is vital to ensure quality in this context, including relevant teacher training;
19. Stresses the need to give sufficient importance at pre-school level to learning languages, and above all the national language of the country where the children attend school;
20. Takes the view that children should, in their own interest, be able to speak the language of the country in which they live to ensure that they are not subject to discrimination in the course of their education or subsequent training and are capable of taking part in all activities on an equal basis;
21. Suggests to the Member States that they examine the possibility of exchanges of teaching staff at different educational levels, with the aim of teaching different school subjects in different languages, and believes that this possibility could be exploited, in particular, in border regions and thus improve worker mobility and citizens' knowledge of languages;
22. Believes it is vital to promote mobility and exchanges of language teachers and students; recalls that the fluid movement of language teachers in the European Union will help ensure effective contact for as many of those professionals as possible with the native environment of the languages they teach;
23. Urges the Commission and the Member States to encourage professional mobility for teachers and cooperation between schools and different countries in carrying out technologically and culturally innovative teaching projects;
24. Encourages and supports the introduction of mother-tongue minority, local and foreign languages on a non-compulsory basis within school programmes and/or in the context of extracurricular activities open to the community;
25. Calls on the Council to produce an annual progress report on multilingualism in formal and informal education systems, vocational training and adult education in the Member States, paying attention to the relationship between the prevalence of national, regional and minority languages and immigration;

Tuesday 24 March 2009

26. Reiterates its longstanding commitment to the promotion of language learning, multilingualism and linguistic diversity in the European Union, including regional and minority languages, as these are cultural assets that must be safeguarded and nurtured; considers that multilingualism is essential for effective communication and represents a means of facilitating comprehension between individuals and hence acceptance of diversity and of minorities;
27. Recommends that Member States' academic curricula include optional study of a third foreign language, starting at secondary school level;
28. Stresses the importance of studying the languages of neighbouring countries as a way of facilitating communications, enhancing mutual understanding in and strengthening the European Union;
29. Recommends support for learning the languages of neighbouring countries and regions, especially in the border regions;
30. Reiterates the importance of promoting and supporting the development of innovative pedagogical models and approaches for language teaching in order to encourage the acquisition of language skills and to raise awareness and motivation among citizens;
31. Proposes that at every level of education, and regardless of geographical environment, there should be qualified foreign language teachers;
32. Recommends consultation of the European federations and associations of modern language teachers on the programmes and methodologies to be applied;
33. Insists on the need for policies to stimulate reading and encourage creative writing with a view to achieving these objectives;
34. Welcomes plans by the Commission to launch information and awareness campaigns regarding the benefits of language learning through the mass media and new technologies; urges the Commission to draw on the conclusions of the consultations regarding language learning for migrant children and the teaching in the host Member State of the language and culture of the country of origin;
35. Recommends and encourages the use of ICTs as an indispensable tool in language teaching;
36. Reiterates its political priority of the acquisition of language skills through the learning of other EU languages, one of which should be the language of a neighbouring country and another an international 'lingua franca'; considers that this would give citizens competences and qualifications for participating in democratic society in terms of active citizenship, employability and knowledge of other cultures;
37. Suggests that an adequate degree of multilingualism should also be ensured in the media and in Internet content, and most particularly in the language policy of European and other European Union-linked sites and portals, where European multilingualism must be fully respected, at least as far as the 23 official European Union languages are concerned;
38. Notes that the use of subtitles in television programmes will facilitate the learning and practice of EU languages and better understanding of the cultural background to audiovisual productions;
39. Encourages the EU to reap the potential dividends offered by European languages in its external relations, and calls for further development of this asset in cultural, economic and social dialogue with the rest of the world with a view to strengthening and adding value to the EU's role on the international scene and to benefiting third countries, in the spirit of the development policy promoted by the EU;

Tuesday 24 March 2009

40. Proposes that the Council co-organise, with civil society, a first European Conference on language diversity in order to discuss this matter thoroughly, in the framework of the recommendation of the United Nations international expert group on indigenous languages, adopted in the Report of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues at its Seventh Session in May 2008 (E/2008/43);
41. Believes that in the context of life-long learning, sufficient support should be provided to help citizens of all age groups to develop and improve their language skills on an ongoing basis by giving them access to suitable language learning or other facilities for easier communication, including language learning at an early age, with a view to improving their social inclusion, employment prospects and welfare;
42. Invites the Commission and the Member States to promote measures facilitating language learning by people in disadvantaged situations, persons belonging to national minorities and migrants, in order to enable these persons to learn the language(s) of the host country and/or region in order to achieve social integration and combat social exclusion; stresses that it is necessary for migrants to be able to use their main language in developing their language skills; urges the Member States, accordingly, to encourage the use of a person's main language as well as the learning of the national language(s);
43. Advocates greater support for the international projection of European languages worldwide, with these constituting an asset for the European project, in the light of the key importance of the linguistic, historical and cultural ties between the EU and third countries and in the spirit of promoting democratic values in those countries;
44. Believes that companies in the EU, and especially SMEs, should be provided with proper support for language instruction and use, thus facilitating their access to world markets and especially to emerging markets;
45. Underlines the right of consumers to receive information about products sold on the market of their place of residence in the official language or languages of that place of residence;
46. Draws particular attention to possible dangers in the communication gap between individuals with different cultural backgrounds and the social divide between multilingual and monolingual people; draws attention to the fact that the lack of language skills continues to be a serious obstacle to the social and labour market integration of non-national workers in many Member States; urges the Commission and the Member States, therefore, to take measures to narrow the gap between multilingual people, who have more opportunities in the European Union and monolingual people who are excluded from many opportunities;
47. Believes that support should be provided for learning third country languages, including within the EU;
48. Demands that the coverage of the language competence indicators should be extended as soon as possible to all the official EU languages, without prejudice to their also being extended to other languages spoken in the European Union;
49. Considers that the collection of data should include testing the four language skills, that is, understanding of the written and spoken language and written and oral expression;
50. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to strengthen their efforts in enhancing cooperation between the Member States by making use of the open method of coordination, in order to facilitate the exchange of experiences and good practices in the area of multilingualism, taking account of the economic benefits, for example in multilingual undertakings;
51. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission and the Governments and Parliaments of the Member States.
-

Spanish version:

6.5.2010

ES

Diario Oficial de la Unión Europea

C 117 E/59

Martes, 24 de marzo de 2009

29. Pide a los Estados miembros que pongan en marcha una estrategia preventiva de acción social dirigida a la protección de los menores que no estigmatice a las comunidades inmigrantes, por medio de programas públicos y servicios sociales dirigidos tanto a prevenir estas prácticas mediante la formación, educación y concienciación de las comunidades de riesgo, como a asistir a las víctimas que las han sufrido, con apoyo psicológico y médico que, si fuera posible, incluya un tratamiento médico reparador gratuito; les pide igualmente que consideren que la amenaza o el riesgo de que una menor sufra una mutilación genital puede justificar la intervención de la administración pública tal como prevén las normas de protección de la infancia;

30. Pide a los Estados miembros que elaboren guías y directrices para los profesionales de la salud, educadores y asistentes sociales con el objetivo de informar e intervenir a los padres y las madres, de forma respetuosa y con asistencia de intérpretes si es necesario, acerca de los enormes riesgos de las mutilaciones genitales femeninas y del hecho de que tales prácticas constituyen delito en los Estados miembros; pide igualmente que colaboren y financien las actividades de las redes y organizaciones no gubernamentales que llevan a cabo una tarea de educación, concienciación y mediación sobre mutilaciones genitales femeninas en estrecho contacto con las familias y comunidades;

31. Pide a los Estados miembros que difundan información precisa y comprensible para una población no alfabetizada, en particular por medio de los consulados de los Estados miembros con ocasión de la entrega de visados; considera que los servicios de inmigración deben comunicar también a la llegada al país de acogida la información sobre las razones de la prohibición legal, con el fin de que las familias comprendan que la prohibición del acto tradicional no se concibe en modo alguno como una agresión cultural, sino que constituye una protección jurídica de las mujeres y las niñas; considera que debe informarse a las familias de las consecuencias penales, que pueden suponer una pena de prisión, si se comprueba la mutilación;

32. Reclama una mejora de la situación jurídica de las mujeres, jóvenes y niñas en los países en los que se practican mutilaciones genitales para fortalecer la confianza de las mujeres en sí mismas, su iniciativa independiente y su responsabilidad;

33. Encarga a su Presidente que transmita la presente Resolución al Consejo, a la Comisión y a los Gobiernos y Parlamentos de los Estados miembros.

Multilingüismo: una ventaja para Europa y un compromiso compartido

P6_TA(2009)0162

Resolución del Parlamento Europeo, de 24 de marzo de 2009, sobre el multilingüismo: una ventaja para Europa y un compromiso compartido (2008/2225(INI))

(2010/C 117 E/10)

El Parlamento Europeo,

- Vistos los artículos 149 y 151 del Tratado CE,
- Vistos los artículos 21 y 22 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea,
- Vista la Convención de la UNESCO para la Salvaguardia del Patrimonio Cultural Inmaterial de 2003,
- Vistos la Comunicación de la Comisión, de 18 de septiembre de 2008, titulada «Multilingüismo: una ventaja para Europa y un compromiso compartido» (COM(2008)0566), y el documento de trabajo de los servicios de la Comisión que la acompaña (SEC(2008)2443, SEC(2008)2444 y SEC(2008)2445),
- Vista la Comunicación de la Comisión, de 13 de abril de 2007, titulada «Marco para la encuesta europea sobre los conocimientos lingüísticos» (COM(2007)0184),

Martes, 24 de marzo de 2009

- Vistos el Documento de trabajo de la Comisión, de 15 de noviembre de 2007, titulado Informe sobre la aplicación del Plan de Acción «Promover el aprendizaje de idiomas y la diversidad lingüística» (COM(2007)0554), así como el documento de trabajo de los servicios de la Comisión que lo acompaña (SEC(2007)1222),
 - Vista su Resolución, de 10 de abril de 2008, sobre una Agenda Europea para la cultura en un Mundo en vías de Globalización (*),
 - Vista su Resolución, de 15 de noviembre de 2006, sobre una nueva estrategia marco para el multilingüismo (**),
 - Vista su Resolución, de 27 de abril de 2006, sobre fomento del multilingüismo y del aprendizaje de idiomas en la Unión Europea: indicador europeo de competencia lingüística (**),
 - Vista su Resolución, de 4 de septiembre de 2003, con recomendaciones destinadas a la Comisión sobre las lenguas europeas regionales y menos difundidas — las lenguas de las minorías en la Unión Europea en el contexto de la ampliación y la diversidad cultural (*),
 - Vista la Decisión nº 1934/2000/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 17 de julio de 2000, por la que se establece el Año Europeo de las Lenguas 2001 (*),
 - Vistas las conclusiones de la Presidencia del Consejo Europeo de Barcelona de los días 15 y 16 de marzo de 2002,
 - Vistas las conclusiones del Consejo de Educación, Juventud y Cultura, de los días 21 y 22 de mayo de 2008, en particular por lo que respecta al multilingüismo,
 - Vistas las Conclusiones, de 20 noviembre de 2008, del Consejo y de los Representantes de los Gobiernos de los Estados miembros, reunidos en el seno del Consejo, sobre la promoción de la diversidad cultural y del diálogo intercultural en las relaciones exteriores de la Unión y de sus Estados miembros (*),
 - Vistos el Dictamen del Comité de las Regiones sobre multilingüismo, de los días 18 y 19 de junio de 2008 (**), y el Dictamen del Comité Económico y Social Europeo, de 18 de septiembre de 2008, sobre multilingüismo,
 - Visto el artículo 45 de su Reglamento,
 - Vistos el informe de la Comisión de Cultura y Educación y la opinión de la Comisión de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales (A6-0092/2009),
- A. Considerando que la diversidad lingüística y cultural marca de forma significativa la vida cotidiana de los ciudadanos de la Unión Europea, debido al alcance de los medios de comunicación, a la creciente movilidad, a las migraciones y al avance de la globalización,
- B. Considerando que la adquisición de conocimientos lingüísticos diversos se considera de la máxima importancia para que todos los ciudadanos de la UE puedan disfrutar plenamente de las ventajas económicas, sociales y culturales que ofrece la libre circulación dentro de la Unión y las relaciones de ésta con terceros países,

(*) Textos Aprobados, P6_TA(2008)0124.

(**) DO C 314 E de 21.12.2006, p. 207.

(*) DO C 296 E de 6.12.2006, p. 271.

(*) DO C 76 E de 25.3.2004, p. 374.

(*) DO L 232 de 14.9.2000, p. 1.

(*) DO C 320 de 16.12.2008, p. 10.

(*) DO C 257 de 9.10.2008, p. 30.

Martes, 24 de marzo de 2009

- C. Considerando que el multilingüismo va cobrando importancia en el contexto de las relaciones entre Estados miembros, en el ámbito de la convivencia en nuestras sociedades multiculturales y en las políticas comunes de la Unión Europea,
- D. Considerando que es necesario validar la evaluación del multilingüismo sobre la base de instrumentos reconocidos, como el Marco común europeo de referencia para las lenguas y otros,
- E. Considerando que algunas lenguas europeas constituyen un puente fundamental en las relaciones con terceros países, y también entre pueblos y naciones de las más diversas regiones del mundo,
- F. Considerando que la diversidad lingüística es un derecho reconocido a los ciudadanos en los artículos 21 y 22 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales, y que el multilingüismo también debería tener la finalidad de favorecer el respeto de la diversidad y la tolerancia, con el fin de evitar la aparición de posibles conflictos activos o pasivos entre las diferentes comunidades lingüísticas de los Estados miembros,
1. Acoge con agrado la publicación de la Comunicación de la Comisión sobre el multilingüismo y la atención que le ha dedicado el Consejo;
 2. Reitera las posiciones que ha adoptado en el transcurso del tiempo sobre el multilingüismo y la diversidad cultural;
 3. Insiste en la necesidad de reconocer la igualdad entre las lenguas oficiales de la UE en todos los aspectos de la actividad pública;
 4. Considera que la diversidad lingüística de Europa constituye un activo cultural importante y que sería inapropiado que la Unión Europea se restringiera a una sola lengua principal;
 5. Considera fundamental el papel de las instituciones de la UE por lo que se refiere al respeto de este principio de igualdad lingüística, tanto en las relaciones entre Estados miembros y en las propias instituciones de la UE, como en las relaciones de los ciudadanos de la UE con las administraciones nacionales y las instituciones y los organismos comunitarios e internacionales;
 6. Recuerda que la importancia del multilingüismo no se agota en los aspectos económicos y sociales, sino que también deben tenerse en cuenta la creación y la transmisión en el ámbito cultural y científico, así como la importancia de la traducción, tanto literaria como técnica, en la vida de los ciudadanos y para el desarrollo a largo plazo de la UE; recuerda asimismo que es igualmente importante el papel que desempeñan las lenguas en la formación y la consolidación de la identidad;
 7. Subraya que el multilingüismo es una cuestión transversal que tiene un profundo impacto en las vidas de los ciudadanos europeos; pide, por tanto, a los Estados miembros que integren el multilingüismo en políticas distintas de la educación, como el aprendizaje permanente, la inclusión social, el empleo, los medios de comunicación y la investigación;
 8. Considera muy importante crear programas específicos de apoyo a la traducción y de redes de bases terminológicas multilingües;
 9. Recuerda que las tecnologías de la información y la comunicación han de utilizarse para fomentar el multilingüismo, por lo que destaca el papel y el uso de la norma internacional pertinente –ISO 10646, norma que permite la representación de los alfabetos de todas las lenguas– en los sistemas administrativos y los medios de comunicación europeos y de los Estados miembros;
 10. Propone que se establezca un día europeo del traductor y el intérprete o se tomen en consideración y se valoricen estas profesiones en el marco del Día Europeo de las Lenguas, que se celebra cada año el 26 de septiembre;
 11. Afirma que es esencial salvaguardar el multilingüismo en los países o regiones en que coexisten dos o más lenguas oficiales;

Martes, 24 de marzo de 2009

12. Destaca la necesidad de que, en los Estados miembros con más de una lengua oficial, se garantice la plena inteligibilidad interlingüística, en especial respecto de las personas de edad avanzada y en los sectores de la justicia, la sanidad, la administración y el empleo;
13. Anima a que los funcionarios que están en contacto con ciudadanos de otros Estados miembros en su trabajo aprendan una segunda lengua de la Unión Europea;
14. Considera necesario y apropiado crear oportunidades para el aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras en la edad adulta, a través de programas de formación profesional y continua, con vistas al desarrollo personal y profesional;
15. Destaca la necesidad fundamental de que en las escuelas se preste una atención y un apoyo especiales a los alumnos que no pueden recibir educación en su lengua materna, y acoge muy favorablemente la propuesta de la Comisión de fomentar la «lengua materna más dos» en las escuelas;
16. Lamenta que la Comisión no haya instituido hasta ahora un programa plurianual en el ámbito de la diversidad lingüística y el aprendizaje de lenguas o una agencia europea para la diversidad lingüística y el aprendizaje de lenguas, tal como se pedía en la resolución anteriormente mencionada adoptada por el Parlamento Europeo por amplia mayoría el 4 de septiembre de 2003;
17. Resalta asimismo la importancia que reviste el dominio de las lenguas oficiales del país de acogida para la plena integración de los inmigrantes y sus familias, y subraya que los Gobiernos nacionales deben promover eficazmente cursos especiales de lenguas, particularmente para las mujeres y las personas de edad avanzada; pide a los Estados miembros que actúen de modo responsable con respecto a los inmigrantes, proporcionándoles los medios necesarios para aprender la lengua y la cultura del país de acogida, aunque permitiendo y fomentando que mantengan su propia lengua;
18. Recuerda que, por estas razones, es esencial garantizar la calidad de la enseñanza en ese contexto, incluida la pertinente formación del profesorado;
19. Considera que se debe revalorizar en grado suficiente el aprendizaje de idiomas en la educación preescolar, y sobre todo de la lengua nacional del país en el que los niños estén escolarizados;
20. Considera que, en su propio interés, los niños deberían poder hablar la lengua del país en el que viven para garantizar que no sufran discriminación en el curso de su educación o formación subsiguientes, y que sean capaces de participar en todas las actividades en pie de igualdad;
21. Sugiere a los Estados miembros que examinen la posibilidad de mantener intercambios de personal docente a distintos niveles educativos, con objeto de enseñar diferentes materias escolares en diferentes lenguas, y considera que esta posibilidad podría aprovecharse, en especial, en las regiones fronterizas para mejorar con ello la movilidad de los trabajadores y el conocimiento de las lenguas entre los ciudadanos;
22. Considera indispensable promover la movilidad y los intercambios de estudiantes y profesores de idiomas; recuerda que el movimiento fluido de profesores de idiomas dentro de la Unión Europea contribuirá a garantizar un contacto efectivo del mayor número posible de ellos con el entorno nativo de las lenguas que enseñan;
23. Insta a la Comisión y a los Estados miembros a que favorezcan la movilidad laboral de los profesores y la cooperación entre centros escolares de distintos países con miras a la realización de proyectos pedagógicos innovadores desde el punto de vista tecnológico y cultural;
24. Alienta y apoya la introducción de las lenguas maternas minoritarias, autóctonas y extranjeras con carácter no obligatorio en los programas escolares o en el marco de actividades extracurriculares abiertas a la comunidad;
25. Pide al Consejo que elabore un informe anual de progresos sobre el multilingüismo en los sistemas educativos formales e informales, la formación profesional y la educación para adultos en los Estados miembros, prestando atención a la relación entre la prevalencia de las lenguas nacionales, regionales y minoritarias, por un lado, y la inmigración, por otro;

Martes, 24 de marzo de 2009

26. Reitera su compromiso permanente de promover el aprendizaje de idiomas, el multilingüismo y la diversidad lingüística en la Unión Europea, incluidas las lenguas regionales y minoritarias, ya que son bienes culturales que se deben proteger y mantener; considera que el multilingüismo es fundamental para una comunicación efectiva y constituye un instrumento que facilita la comprensión entre las personas y, por ende, la aceptación de la diversidad y de las minorías;
27. Recomienda que los planes de estudios académicos de los Estados miembros incluyan el estudio opcional de un tercer idioma extranjero, empezando a nivel de la escuela secundaria;
28. Subraya la importancia de estudiar las lenguas de los países vecinos como manera de facilitar las comunicaciones y de aumentar la comprensión mutua en la Unión Europea, reforzándola al mismo tiempo;
29. Recomienda que se preste apoyo al aprendizaje de las lenguas de los países y regiones vecinos, especialmente en las regiones fronterizas;
30. Reitera la importancia de promover y apoyar el desarrollo de modelos y planteamientos pedagógicos innovadores para la enseñanza de lenguas con el fin de fomentar la adquisición de conocimientos lingüísticos así como la sensibilización y la motivación de los ciudadanos;
31. Propone que en todos los niveles de la educación, e independientemente del entorno geográfico, haya profesores cualificados de lenguas extranjeras;
32. Recomienda que se consulte a las federaciones y asociaciones europeas de profesores de lenguas vivas en relación con los programas y metodologías que deben aplicarse;
33. Insiste en la necesidad de políticas de estímulo de la lectura y de difusión de la creación literaria para alcanzar esos objetivos;
34. Acoge favorablemente la intención de la Comisión de lanzar campañas de información y sensibilización sobre las ventajas del aprendizaje de lenguas a través de los medios de comunicación y las nuevas tecnologías; insta a la Comisión a que se base en las conclusiones de las consultas sobre el aprendizaje de lenguas por los niños migrantes y la enseñanza en el Estado miembro de acogida de la lengua y la cultura del país de origen;
35. Recomienda y alienta el uso de las tecnologías de la información y la comunicación como herramienta indispensable para la enseñanza de idiomas;
36. Reitera su prioridad política consistente en la adquisición de conocimientos lingüísticos aprendiendo otras lenguas de la UE, de las cuales una debe ser la lengua de un país vecino y otra una «lingua franca» internacional; opina que ello proporcionaría competencias y cualificaciones a los ciudadanos para participar en la sociedad democrática en términos de ciudadanía, empleabilidad y conocimiento activo de otras culturas;
37. Sugiere que se garantice también un grado adecuado de multilingüismo en los medios de comunicación social y en los contenidos ofrecidos en internet, y más particularmente en la política lingüística de sitios y portales europeos relacionados con la Unión Europea, en los que debe respetarse plenamente el multilingüismo europeo, por lo menos en lo que respecta a las 23 lenguas oficiales de la Unión Europea;
38. Observa que el uso de subtítulos en los programas de televisión facilitará el aprendizaje y la práctica de las lenguas de la UE y mejorará la comprensión del contexto cultural de las producciones audiovisuales;
39. Insta a la UE a aprovechar los beneficios inherentes a las lenguas europeas en sus relaciones exteriores, y pide que se cuide ese valor añadido en el marco del diálogo cultural, económico y social con el resto del mundo, a fin de reforzar y valorizar la presencia de la UE en la escena internacional y de beneficiar a terceros países, en el espíritu de la política de desarrollo promovida por la UE;

Martes, 24 de marzo de 2009

40. Propone al Consejo que organice, junto con la sociedad civil, una primera conferencia europea sobre la diversidad lingüística para examinar este tema en profundidad, y ello de acuerdo con la Recomendación del Grupo internacional de expertos en lenguas indígenas de las Naciones Unidas, adoptada en el Informe del Foro Permanente para las Cuestiones Indígenas en su séptima sesión de mayo de 2008 (Informe E/2008/43);
41. Cree que, en el marco del aprendizaje permanente, se deberían proporcionar medios suficientes para ayudar a los ciudadanos de todas las categorías de edad a desarrollar y mejorar sus competencias lingüísticas, sobre una base permanente, permitiéndoles acceder a un aprendizaje de lenguas adecuado y a otras herramientas destinadas a facilitar la comunicación, incluyendo el aprendizaje precoz de lenguas, con el objetivo de mejorar su integración social, sus perspectivas laborales y su bienestar;
42. Pide a la Comisión y a los Estados miembros que fomenten medidas que faciliten el aprendizaje de idiomas a personas en situación desfavorecida o que sean migrantes o pertenezcan a minorías nacionales, para que puedan aprender la(s) lengua(s) del país o de la región de acogida, con objeto de lograr la integración social y de luchar contra la exclusión social; observa la necesidad de que los inmigrantes utilicen su lengua materna para desarrollar su capacidad lingüística; pide por tanto a los Estados miembros que fomenten tanto la utilización de la lengua principal de cada persona como el aprendizaje de la(s) lengua(s) nacional(es);
43. Aboga por un mayor apoyo a la proyección internacional de las lenguas europeas, ya que representan un valor añadido del proyecto europeo, pues son fundamentales para los lazos lingüísticos, históricos y culturales que existen entre la UE y terceros países, en consonancia con el espíritu de promoción de los valores democráticos en esos países;
44. Considera que se debe prestar a las empresas europeas, y en particular a las PYME, un apoyo efectivo para la enseñanza y el uso de las lenguas, a fin de fomentar su acceso a los mercados mundiales y, en especial, a los mercados emergentes;
45. Subraya el derecho de los consumidores a recibir información sobre los productos vendidos en el mercado de su lugar de residencia en la lengua o lenguas que son oficiales en dicho lugar;
46. Hace especial hincapié en los peligros que puede acarrear la falta de comunicación entre personas de distintos orígenes culturales y la brecha social entre personas multilingües y monolingües; señala en particular que la carencia de competencias lingüísticas sigue siendo un importante obstáculo a la integración de los trabajadores extranjeros en el mercado social y laboral en numerosos Estados miembros; insta, por ello, a la Comisión y a los Estados miembros a que adopten medidas orientadas a reducir la brecha entre las personas multilingües, que tienen mejores oportunidades en la Unión Europea, y las personas monolingües, que quedan excluidas de muchas oportunidades;
47. Considera que debe apoyarse el aprendizaje de las lenguas de terceros países, también en la UE;
48. Pide que los indicadores de competencia lingüística abarquen, lo antes posible, todas las lenguas oficiales de la UE, sin perjuicio de que también se amplíen a otras lenguas habladas en la Unión Europea;
49. Considera que la recogida de datos debe incluir pruebas sobre las cuatro competencias lingüísticas, a saber, comprensión de la lengua escrita, comprensión de la lengua oral, expresión escrita y expresión oral;
50. Insta a la Comisión y a los Estados miembros a que intensifiquen sus esfuerzos para mejorar la cooperación entre los Estados miembros a través del método abierto de coordinación, con el fin de facilitar el intercambio de experiencias y buenas prácticas en el ámbito del multilingüismo, teniendo en cuenta los efectos económicos positivos, por ejemplo en las empresas multilingües;
51. Encarga a su Presidente que transmita la presente Resolución al Consejo, a la Comisión y a los Gobiernos y Parlamentos de los Estados miembros.