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ABSTRACT

Language has always been an important consideration in political analysis. This study examines adverbial stance marking in political discourse and posits that this important linguistic component offers new insights into political metadiscourse. The focus of the research is institutional political discourse, more specifically United Nations Security Council discourse. Political institutions are also formed and maintained in discursive practices, and understanding how these discursive practices are produced and disseminated can help us appreciate the extent to which social and linguistic phenomena have political significance. Adverbial stance marking in United Nations Security Council discourse represents one type of linguistic phenomena that deserves further inquiry due to the complexity of the discursive procedures and power repertoires displayed by the United Nations Security Council discourse community.

Using corpus-based methodologies, and working within a critical discourse analysis framework, this study investigates the frequency and function of adverbial stance markers in United Nations Security Council discourse, and the extent to which stance adverbials contribute to power representations. The results demonstrate that adverbial stance markers are relatively frequent in this type of institutional political discourse, that they display various functions based on grammatical, semantic and pragmatic characteristics, and that they contribute, to some extent, to power representations and projections.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The relationship between language and politics is a much debated topic that has attracted attention from linguists and political scientists alike. Politics and language are closely linked: political language can have a substantive role on political thought and understanding how language can produce the effects of authority, legitimacy or consensus is of utmost significance from linguistic and political points of view.

The complexity of the relationship between language and politics has been reflected in two major critical approaches in the literature: the first approach looks at linguistic meaning as being determined in/by political conventions and practices and the other emphasizes that language and political behavior are based on cognitive endowments of the mind rather than on political practices and conventions. For the purposes of this study, the former approach is embraced: often, politics comes up against questions of language and linguistic options for representing the world are central issues in political discourse.

Coming up with a definition of political discourse is not a forthright matter. Some scholars (cf. Shapiro, 1981) define political discourse so broadly that almost any type of social discourse could be labeled political. This thesis is built on a narrower definition of political discourse as a term encompassing discursive utterances that are specifically aimed at producing a certain political effect, i.e. a discourse which is in itself political.

One of the goals of political discourse analysis is to reflect how language choice is manipulated for political purposes. Political discourse in general can be mapped onto various levels of linguistics from semantics to pragmatics, and political discourse analysts use different analytic methods to illustrate the relationship between language and politics. To
some extent, political discourse is also a way to negotiate representations, including representations of social/political actors (e.g. "I", "we", "the country", "the state" etc.).

Political discourse assumes political actors that produce political texts in a political environment for political goals. These actors construct their own discourse and contribute to the discourse of the institution they may belong to by relying on representational language: through language they position themselves vis-a-vis an issue, they engage in social practices that underlie power relations and, through their utterances, they convey their feelings, attitudes towards certain issues, i.e. the ideational meaning of their utterances is stanced.

Therefore, political discourse often includes the expression of political actors' attitudes, feelings, value judgments about the propositional content of their utterances (i.e. stance) and this is where the main focus of this paper is placed.

In political discourse terms, stance is to be found not only at the individual but also at the institutional level. Political bodies are generally characterized by institutional "stance", by the members' shared attitudes towards events, interactions, representations; thus, it is relevant to investigate how/whether individual actors contribute to this institutional discourse. From this perspective, documents produced within political institutions like the United Nations (hereinafter UN) represent challenging data for the analysis of stance because of their general formal neutralism: the institutional doctrine of discursive impartiality implies that, in the case of contentious issues, UN delegates are expected to refrain from explicit approval or disapproval of the issues debated. Nevertheless, this doctrine of impartiality has its limits and, in reality, politicians sometimes overtly, or covertly, convey their feelings, attitudes or value judgments. These expressions of stance may in fact reflect how discourse roles are undertaken and how power relations transform, and are transformed by, linguistic
practices. In UN debates, the formulation and structuring of individual interventions is marked by "an increasing regularity of the behavior of its principal actors and by a discursive ritualisation of their confrontational encounters" (Ilie, 2003, 73). The UN discourse emerges from the various discursive practices and institutional constraints that inform the interventions within the UN bodies, such as the United Nations Security Council (hereinafter UNSC). The structural complexity of global political institutions like the UNSC is rendered by the emergence of written and customary procedural standards and conventionalized norms. Political structures display certain patterns of member interaction and decision-making procedures that, to a certain degree, can "make them resistant to...cultural and discursive change" (Fairclough, 2003, 24).

As a political institution, the UNSC represents an appropriate locus of linguistic and political analysis due to the wide range of manifestations of the interlocutors' communicative acts and power projections. UNSC discourse does not include simple discursive units, but institutionally pre-established patterns of interaction and contextualization conventions that reflect institutional and personal spheres of discourse. UNSC members formally contribute to the institutional discourse through information exchange in the form of statements delivered before the Security Council. Although most speeches remain within the dominant institutional paradigm of formality, deference, and distancing, speakers sometimes employ several linguistic devices in order to convey their feelings towards the propositions, and to project or negotiate their power -- speakers' power projections and power differentials also emerge in discourse. Institutional discursive behavior is closely related to the expectations of participants whose constructions of the 'self' is often dependent on the representations and
power projections of the 'other'. Thus, language is inherently structured to fulfill certain socio-political goals, and political processes are also linguistically constituted.

The relationship between language and politics has been extensively investigated in previous related research, but only a few studies covered institutional political discourse. Some scholars analyzed in general terms how language and politics are intertwined. Chilton (2004) examined the changing landscape of global political language, focusing on self-legitimizing language, whereas Geis (1987) investigated the linguistic meaning of world events in general. More specific analyses were centered on the proliferation of mediated knowledge in the news (Chouliairaki, 2000), on the role that metaphors play in the ideological interpretation of events (Ziken, 2003) or on how participants negotiate meaning in political debates (Shaw, 2000). One of the few researchers who focused on institutional discourse, Ghafele (2004) examined the metaphors of trade and globalization within the World Trade Organization by looking at how metaphors made trade more "speakable". However, none of these studies presented a comprehensive exploration of the linguistic items that political actors employ in order to express their feelings (cf. Biber, 1999) towards the content of their utterances (i.e. stance) and the extent to which the speakers' expression of stance contributes to their projection of power in the discourse.

The majority of previous studies on patterns of stance generally reported on discourses that are not political per se. Despite this caveat, in this thesis, the analysis of patterns of stance in UNSC discourse will be influenced by empirical studies that examined various speech styles of English as marked by stance. Stance patterns in English have been thoroughly investigated in the seminal corpus-based research conducted by Kristen Precht (Precht 2000). Precht's study of patterns of stance is comprehensive in the sense that the
researcher used a multi-dimensional approach in order to identify and analyze the most common elements of cross-register stance use in English. The approach combined computational, qualitative and quantitative techniques that were needed for the identification and interpretation of stance markers. Precht looked at the frequency and function of stance markers in several registers and used a large corpus for data analysis. Other researchers turned to different elements of stance: Biber and Finnegan (1989) provided an overall analysis of the lexical and grammatical marking of stance by considering the distribution of stance markers across 500 spoken and written texts from several registers. Myers (1989) investigated how modality allows writers and speakers to convey stance, and express degrees of certainty as well as degrees of possibility. McKenny (2005) looked at how the degree of dogmatism shown by writers relates to the lexical expression of stance, whereas Biber (2004) explored historical change in the preferred devices used to mark stance. Among these devices adverbial stance markers "are among the most difficult grammatical features to analyze...because they are so pervasive and flexible in their distribution" (Conrad & Biber, 2000, p. 62). Most previous research on stance did not look at adverbial stance markers in political discourse or at the extent to which political knowledge is linguistically constituted and represented, and no study has yet focused precisely on the issue of adverbial patterns of stance in institutional political discourse.

1.1. Purpose of the study

This study comes as a necessary continuation of previous scholastic efforts to illustrate and analyze patterns of adverbial stance marking in several registers and to represent the close relationship between language and politics. To determine more clearly how language and
politics are connected, in this quantitative and qualitative corpus-based study, the researcher will primarily explore how some linguistic elements – in this case, *adverbial stance markers* - are constitutive and reflective of social practices in general and of the institutionalized discourse of political elites in particular.

The focus of the analysis is to see how some politicians, i.e. UNSC delegates, convey their personal feelings, attitudes, value judgments and assessments (*stance*) in addition to the propositional content of their utterances during UNSC meetings. UN meetings generally follow certain rules of linguistic propriety and certain genre conventions in which stance may be more or less overtly expressed; political language is also linked to the institutional culture and prima facie the use of stanced expressions may seem rather problematic due to the fact that the UN institutional discourse is supposed to reflect impartiality and balance. However, political actors are always situated with regards to a particular, time, place and social interaction; through speech acts they agree on, contest or negotiate discourse roles, which makes the expression of stance a sine qua non element that deserves further analysis.

1.2. Research questions

The present thesis will attempt to illustrate patterns of adverbial stance marking in UNSC discourse through the exploration of the following research questions:

1. With what frequency are the most recurrent adverbial stance markers identified by Precht (2000) across registers found in the genre analyzed (UNSC meeting records)?

2. What is the grammatical and functional role of the 10% most frequent adverbial stance markers found in the genre? (The 10% margin was arbitrarily established by the researcher due to the large number of anticipated stance adverbials in the corpus)
3. To what extent do adverbial stance markers reflect/contribute to representations of power relations in the type of discourse investigated?

To address these research questions, Chapter 2 will offer a comprehensive review of the literature regarding language and politics, as well as regarding stance patterns in English and the theoretical background that informs this thesis. Chapter 3 will present in detail the quantitative and qualitative research methods employed for this study. The results and discussion of the three research questions will be illustrated in Chapter 4. Finally, Chapter 5 will provide a summary of the results, will highlight the limitations of the study, and will offer suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents the review of the literature related to this thesis under three main sections. The first section outlines the most important studies that have investigated the linguistic phenomena underlying political discourse in general, and political institutional discourse in particular, as well as the relationship between language and power. The second section reviews previous research on stance marking in English, whereas the third section introduces the theoretical background as well as the rationale on which this study is based.

2.1. Linguistic analyses of political discourse

The analysis of political discourse from a linguistic perspective has attracted a significant amount of scholarly interest from proponents of critical theory (Adorno, 1999; Bourdieu, 2005; Habermas, 2001), critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 2002) to scholars associated with the systemic-functional linguistics school (Halliday, 2002).

Relatedly, the link between language, power and politics has been reflected in two main theoretical traditions that investigated language as a social phenomenon and as a mental phenomenon, respectively. Scholars associated with these two traditions have tended to use linguistics as a tool for explaining the nature of the relationship between language and politics. For example, Foucault (1974; 1977) is interested in the political and social structures created by discourse. For him, discourse - the linguistic construction of certain social practices - represents a social, collective process that is inherently political in the sense that it creates and shapes speaker representations and power projections. Fairclough (1989) also looks at discourse as a social practice, posits that institutional and ideological linguistic
practices legitimize/delegitimize existing power relations and highlights the idea that linguistic “practices which appear to be universal and common-sensical can often be shown to originate in the dominant class or the dominant bloc, and to have been naturalized.” (Fairclough, 1989, p. 33). In the same Foucauldian vein, Shapiro (1981) looks at the politics of linguistic practices, and mentions that political action, which has a constitutive effect on political life, consists of linguistic action, of linguistic habits shaped by social and political relations. For Shapiro, political action and political understanding presume a focus on a multi-level normative discourse whose boundaries emerge from various relationships among various groups and individuals within society. In his understanding, the substance of political behavior is to be found at a linguistic and social level.

That language and politics are intimately commingled is illustrated by Chilton (2004) who points out that “at every stage ... politics comes up against questions of language and these questions range from the choice of words to the choice of language — in other words, from fine detail of phrasing and wording to large-scale issues of ... language policy” (p. 14). According to Chilton, most linguistic structures have a socio-political function and political control involves control of information, i.e. discourse control. This idea is also present in Chilton & Schaeffer (2002) who mention that the doing of politics is predominantly constituted in language — political activity cannot exist without the use of language. The two scholars point out that “language use is inherently ambivalent, and it is this that grounds its relation to the political” (p. 15). Language is structured to fulfill socio-political goals especially in political institutions which “predominantly depend on the transference of customary forms of utterance” (Chilton & Schaeffer, 2002). Political institutional talk contributes to the construction of political actors’ identities. Moreover, institutional
discursive practices play a major role in sustaining or undermining power relations and “analyzing institutions and organizations in terms of power entails understanding and analyzing their discursive practices” (Fairclough, 1993, p.50).

How discursive practices are embedded in political institutional discourse is the focus of several previous studies. Ilie (2003) examines the communicative and interactional linguistic strategies employed by British Members of Parliament (MPs) by specifically investigating how the MPs’ metadiscursive techniques (e.g. explicitness, degree of directness, appropriateness etc.) reflect institutional and personal characteristics of discourse. Ilie explains that “by means of institutional metadiscourse, speakers adjust their discourse to the situation, to their interlocutors and to their audiences, as well as to their own end-goals” (p. 90). Metadiscursive utterances are instrumental in negotiating social positions, since interlocutors are actively involved in the construction and deconstruction of meanings. In another study of institutional discourse, Ghafele (2004) aims to review the conceptual metaphors prevailing in the World Trade Organization (WTO). In Ghafele’s paper, the analysis is centered on the pragmatic force of the metaphor of globalization. This author explores the institutional conceptualization of globalization: within the WTO discourse. Globalization is metaphorically construed as a train traveling a predefined itinerary (i.e. as an irreversible phenomenon) or as salvation - as “the ultimate possibility to bring civilization, structure and order to the poor countries...” (p. 52).

The investigation of the relation between language and politics has been informed by several analytical approaches. For example, working within a systemic-functional framework, Dunmire (2005) demonstrates how linguistic representations of the future are embedded in and projected through United States presidential discourse. Specifically
targeting the Bush Administration’s policy of preemption as articulated in the National Security Strategy (2002), Dunmire argues that presidential speeches play an important role in facilitating the linguistic and political change articulated through the doctrine of preemption. More precisely, the researcher stresses that linguistic elements, such as nominalizations or absolute modality, contribute to the creation of a future-oriented discourse that construes a particular vision of future realities which are articulated as real sites “of change and possibility” (Dunmire, 2005, p. 507). In a corpus-based analysis of United Nations discourse of refugees and asylum seekers, Baker and McEnery (2005) discuss how refugees and asylum seekers are constructed in articles published by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHR). Using two corpora of UNHR texts, Baker & McEnery describe the most frequent metaphors and connotational verbs that construct, linguistically and conceptually, refugees as transported goods, invaders or nuisances.

The linguistic production of institutional discourse and the language of power struggles within political institutional settings represent the focus of several other studies. In one of them, Harris (2001) looks at the politeness and impoliteness strategies present in the British House of Commons, and finds that much of that type of institutional discourse is composed of explicit face-threatening or face-enhancing acts, and that systematic impoliteness represents a constant within the political body analyzed. Much of the political discourse practiced in the House of Commons is of adversarial/confrontational nature which is consistent with the informal and pre-established institutional discursive conventions and expectations. Harris insists that “it is these expectations which enable Members of the House as a community of practice to interpret intentional face-threatening acts as an important component of an adversarial and confrontational political process in such a way that they do
Debates in the British House of Commons are also investigated by Shaw (2000), who analyzes the effects of gender on turn-taking and floor apportionment. Drawing on a corpus of videotaped debates, Shaw combines an ethnographic approach with a conversational analysis tradition in order to identify the role that gender plays in these debates. Shaw finds that “the norms of male MPs discourse styles are pervasive in debates” and that “the culture of the House of Commons…[creates] an environment in which female MPs do not have access to the same interactional repertoire as male MPs” (p. 416). The British parliamentary discourse reemerges in a study by Inigo-Mora (2004), who examines the relationship between the parliamentary community and the linguistic forms used by parliamentarians, with an emphasis on the discursive use of the personal pronoun ‘we’. Inigo-Mora affirms that, due to its inclusion/exclusion functional characteristics, the personal pronoun ‘we’ is employed by MPs in order to frame their intentions and scope of reference, and to create a linguistic territory characterized by an approaching-distancing relationship depending on the speakers’ intentions.

Parliamentary debates presuppose a wide range of discursive processes and informational exchanges. In other words, parliamentary debates involve significant amounts of knowledge regarding procedures, political opponents, the social and political events etc. These various dimensions of parliamentary knowledge are investigated by van Dijk (2003) in a study that examines how parliamentary knowledge influences discourse production and comprehension in general, and of debates in particular. Van Dijk discusses the ways in which shared knowledge is made explicit or implicit, and presents the linguistic forms (mental verbs, epistemic expressions, evidentials etc.) that contribute to the lexicalization of
knowledge in discourse. Van Dijk concludes that knowledge is a “vast complex of representations], ranging from mere beliefs to absolute certainty, depending on the believers, the context and the strategies of their discursive manifestation in debate” (p. 113). Knowledge is not viewed as a unified notion, but as complex system that brings to the fore the expression of participants’ beliefs and attitudes, i.e. the expression of stance (a concept discussed in the section below).

The studies presented above constitute a solid framework for this thesis by indicating that an insight into the linguistic elements underlying political discourse in general, and institutional political discourse in particular, reveals not only the relationship between language and power, but also the social and linguistic constructedness of political discourse.

2.2. Stance marking in English

Stance is defined by Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. & Finegan E. (1999) as the expression of “personal feelings, attitudes, value judgments, or assessments” (p. 966) in discourse. Although sometimes stance and metadiscourse are used interchangeably, stance may be understood to include the concept of metadiscourse (Precht, 2000). For the present thesis study, Precht’s research represents the main resource for analyzing patterns of stance in UN institutional discourse. In her comprehensive work, Precht identifies patterns of stance across registers (news, fiction, prose, technical writing, research articles, conversation) in English and interprets stance patterns on the basis of lexical, grammatical, semantic and pragmatic characteristics. Stance markers belong to different lexical categories – verbs, adjectives, adverbs, nouns – and describe various semantic domains related to, for instance, certainty/doubt or emotion/attitude.
In their turn, adverbial stance markers – the main focus of this thesis - represent an interesting area of inquiry due to their functional characteristics, and may be categorized as follows (the categorizations below are based on Precht, 2000):

1. The first category includes affective adverbial stance markers (1) which exhibit speakers’ attitudes towards the proposition and which have three subcategories: a. stative expressions of affect (e.g. gladly, tragically, happily); b. opinions (e.g. ideally, perfectly, unfortunately); and c. importance (e.g. mainly, primarily, principally).

2. The second category is represented by epistemic adverbial stance markers (2) which express speakers’ judgments about the information in the proposition and which have the following subcategories: a. certainty/doubt markers (e.g. certainly, of course, probably); b. source of information markers (e.g. according to), and c. actuality markers (e.g. actually, in fact).

3. The third category consists of hedges (3) – adverbial approximators (e.g. approximately, extremely, roughly) which perform the function of qualifying commitments.

4. The last category includes adverbial style markers (4) which illustrate speakers’ impression of the manner of communication (e.g. basically, seriously, technically).

Besides semantic categorizations of adverbial stance markers, Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. & Finegan E. (1999), Biber & Conrad (2000) and Biber, D, Conrad, S. & Leech, G. (2002) explain the role played by the position of stance adverbials in a sentence with respect to their function. Stance adverbials typically have scope (i.e. they modify different elements) over the entire clause or over a phrase, and when they occur in initial position they generally: a) frame the proposition prior to its subsequent presentation; or b) serve as linking devices, marking not just the nature of the upcoming clause but also its
connection to previous clauses. When they appear in final position, stance adverbials usually allow speakers to qualify a proposition after it has been pronounced. The complexity of stance adverbials is also emphasized by Biber & Conrad (2000) who point out the social element involved in the use of stance adverbials: “in analyzing occurrences of stance adverbials, it is clear that they have important social functions beyond simply marking doubt, imprecision and actuality”. For instance, “markers of doubt, such as ‘perhaps’ or ‘maybe’, are used in making suggestions while actuality adverbs, such as ‘really’ and ‘actually’ [ ] serve to soften disagreements” (p. 73).

Other studies employing different research methods have also contributed to the general understanding of stance in English. Using cluster analysis, Biber & Finegan (1989) undertake an overall analysis of the lexical and grammatical marking of affective stance in English, whereas Precht (2003), using factor analysis, investigates stance moods in spoken English. In a study informed by corpus-based methodologies, Biber (2004) attempts to track the patterns for the grammatical marking of stance in English across the past three centuries, while McKenny (2005) combines psychological and phraseological approaches to investigate epistemic stance in student essays. All the above-mentioned research studies suggest that stance marking is an important linguistic phenomenon that has commanded considerable interest from linguists. To some degree, the concept of stance is the “perfect linguistic construct: in looking at stance we are investigating the space in language where the literal, figurative, and functional meanings intersect” (Precht, 2003, p. 239). That stance remains an area of enduring interest is demonstrated by the wide-range of critical concepts and methodologies employed by scholars to study it. The current thesis hopes to contribute to
previous work on stance patterns and is informed by the theoretical framework described in
the following section.

2.3. Theoretical framework for the study: corpus-based linguistic analysis and critical
discourse analysis

This thesis is situated within the larger theoretical framework provided by *discourse
analysis* which implies the study of discourse as texts and talk in social practices. Discourse
analysis looks at language not as “a tool for description and a medium for communication
(conventional view), but as a social practice, as a way of doing things” (Wood & Kroger,
2000, p. 4). In a Foucauldian understanding, *discourse*, composed of particular sets of
utterances and practices, is inseparable from the concept of *power*. This means that,
according to Foucault (1972; 1977) discursive practices incorporate significations that
contribute to the shaping of power relations. Discourse analysis presupposes several
analytical approaches that “take as their starting point the claim of structuralist and post-
structuralist linguistic philosophy, that our access to reality is always through language”
(Phillips & Jorgens, 2002, p.8). Thus, discourse analysis entails a view of language as both
constitutive and reflective of the social realities within which we live.

There are several approaches to discourse analysis, such as conversation analysis,
critical discourse analysis, cognitive discourse analysis, and various methodological
approaches for analyzing texts (e.g. corpus-based, interaction-based methods). The current
study implies a mixed methodology combining a quantitative, *corpus-based* approach with a
qualitative, textual analysis of a certain linguistic feature — adverbial stance marking — present
in UNSC political discourse.
For reasons of relevance and accuracy, the frequency and function analysis of the stance markers investigated (RQ 1 and RQ 2) warrants a corpus-based approach which "can reveal much more about a [feature], enabling investigation in the actual patterns of use in addition to structural descriptions" (Hunston & Thompson, 2002, p. 62). In this study, the corpus-based approach represents the optimal technique for analyzing patterns of stance in political discourse in terms of frequency and function because it enables the researcher to thoroughly identify and investigate the variegated, and sometimes ambivalent, patterns of stanced words in certain contexts. Corpus-based linguistic analysis provides the investigator with several avenues for empirically analyzing actual patterns of language use, and with a solid framework for both quantitative and qualitative examinations. As far as patterns of stance are concerned, the technique facilitates the identification and analysis of the most frequent words and structures associated with stance.

The extent to which adverbial stance markers contribute to power representations in UNSC political discourse (i.e. RQ 3) is analyzed following critical discourse analysis (CDA) principles and blueprints. Critical discourse analysis emphasizes the relations between language and power and the role of discourse analysis in social critique. CDA is concerned with the linguistic character of social processes and structures and looks at discourse as a ‘practice’ of not just representing the world, but also of constituting and constructing the world (Fairclough, 1993). More precisely, CDA is a qualitative approach that attempts to describe discourse structures in terms of properties of social interactions, with an emphasis on political interactions. A central concept in CDA, and in the present study as well, is that of power, and more specifically the ‘political’ power of institutions and groups. However, "critical discourse analysis is concerned not only with power relations in discourse, but also
with how power relations and power struggle shape and transform the discourse practices of a society or institution” (Fairclough, 1993, p. 36). In other words, CDA studies both power in discourse and power over discourse. CDA thus implies a systematic methodology and a close relationship between the text and the social conditions and power projections reflected in it. Under the CDA framework of analysis, the text is not examined in isolation; rather, the language in texts is a communicative event that is both discursive practice and social practice (Philips & Jorgens, 2002). Consequently, CDA is based on the principle that texts cannot be analyzed as static entities— the discourse is intertextual, i.e. the discourse is composed of webs of interrelated texts that emerge in specific social contexts.

Therefore, the degree to which stance markers contribute to power representations in UN political discourse will be investigated under the CDA analytic structure which “offers novel ways to think about the relationship between social structures and political agency” (Howarth et al., 2000, p. 5). Power has multiple locations in discourse and includes multiple manifestations of the participants’ communicative acts. Power imposes its own language and the concept of power is inseparable from the concept of discourse. That is why the analysis of the relationship between power and language requires an inductive spirit of discourse-analytic research, one that “involves moving from the concrete to the abstract, from the particular to the general” (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 34) - a spirit provided by critical discourse analysis.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the main methodological steps that were carried out for the study. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the analytical framework adopted for this thesis suggests that the current research combines a corpus-based approach aimed at producing quantitative results and functional patterns with a critical discourse analysis tradition focused on a qualitative insight into textual and intertextual features of discourse. The chapter presents in detail the criteria underlying the selection of the target linguistic items, the procedure for organizing the selected texts into a corpus, and the methods and principles used for analyzing the data. The methodological features are supplemented with the list of the stance markers to be functionally investigated and with a discussion of the suggested taxonomy of ‘power’ based on which the third research question was addressed.

3.1. Criteria for selecting target stance markers

In the current study, the selection of the target stance markers drew extensively on the seminal work of Precht (2000). In her comprehensive and reliable study, Precht employed a multi-dimensional approach in order to identify and interpret the patterns of stance across registers in English. The research resulted in the identification and analysis of several stance markers that had different frequencies and functions and that fell under different lexical categories (adjectives, adverbs, nouns, verbs). For this thesis, the selection of the target stance markers relied on the frequency results obtained by Precht (2000). However, given the scope of this study, the stance markers to be analyzed fell under only one lexical category: adverbials. Thus, the analysis of stance marking in the corpus of UNSC meeting records
focused only on the most frequent stance adverbials that were identified as being generally recurrent across registers by Precht (2000). Based on the above-mentioned selection criteria, the target adverbial stance markers to be analyzed in terms of frequency in this thesis are presented in Table 1 according to categorical characteristics.

Table 1. List of target adverbial stance markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective markers</th>
<th>Epistemic markers</th>
<th>Hedges</th>
<th>Style markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Certainty/Doubt</td>
<td>Source of Information</td>
<td>Actuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideally</td>
<td>mainly</td>
<td>absolutely according to</td>
<td>actually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfectly</td>
<td>primarily</td>
<td>apparently</td>
<td>in fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fortunately</td>
<td>principally</td>
<td>certainly</td>
<td>generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfortunately</td>
<td>significantly</td>
<td>clearly</td>
<td>hardly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ultimately</td>
<td>of course</td>
<td>nearly</td>
<td>literally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td>normally</td>
<td>personally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely</td>
<td></td>
<td>practically</td>
<td>seriously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maybe</td>
<td></td>
<td>predominantly</td>
<td>simply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obviously</td>
<td></td>
<td>relatively</td>
<td>strictly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perhaps</td>
<td></td>
<td>roughly</td>
<td>technically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possibly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presumably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>typically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>virtually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undoubtedly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. Corpus selection

3.2.1. Selection of texts

The corpus used in the current study consisted of 1,012,509 words from the UNSC meeting records. The UNSC meeting records are public documents made available online at the UN website (www.un.org) by the United Nations Department of Public Information (UNDPI). The meeting records vary in scope and length and illustrate the various matters
discussed within the UNSC, UN’s most powerful organism that has the main responsibility of maintaining the international peace and security. The UNSC is composed of 15 member countries, out of which 5 members are permanent and the remaining 10 are temporary. The UNSC has a rotating presidency and issues several documents, the more important of which are the meeting records and their corresponding press releases.

The meeting records differ in length (from 1 page to 50 pages in the corpus collected for this study) depending on the topic being discussed. Subjects of discussion range from administrative issues to more important matters like measures that need to be taken to contain terrorism or to coordinate humanitarian interventions in restive regions around the world. The UNSC meeting procedure is centered around an opening statement made by the UNSC president followed by statements presented by the representatives of the member countries, who deliver their speeches (which are subsequently translated) in one of UN’s six official languages (English, French, Arabic, Chinese, Spanish and Russian) regarding the issue on the agenda. These institutional procedural characteristics required that the collection of the texts for the corpus should be more principled and should be undertaken as follows:

a. For reasons of relevance and accuracy, the actual data collection was preceded by a micro-analysis of randomly chosen meeting records from 2005 in which the researcher investigated comparatively UN records with English as the medium of communication and UN records translated into English. The purpose of this exercise was to ensure that the translated texts did not present significant differences in the expression of stance (that may have actually reflected the translator’s ‘voice’ or preference for certain linguistic forms) from the original English texts. This also
ensured that the final random selection of the texts to be included in the final corpus was relevant and appropriate for the purpose of the study.

b. Although UNSC meeting records are available from 1946 onwards, only documents from 2003, 2004 and 2005 were considered eligible in order for the study to reflect the contemporary dynamics of UN institutional discourse.

c. In order for the researcher to be able to clearly identify patterns of stance, only texts having 6 pages or more were considered for selection.

3.2.2. Corpus collection mechanics

In compiling the corpus, the above-mentioned criteria were followed and two steps were undertaken. First, the researcher reviewed all the UNSC meeting records corresponding to the years 2003, 2004 and 2005, and downloaded in .pdf format those records having 6 pages or more. The files were subsequently saved in a format (.txt) compatible with the computer software to be used for the frequency and function analysis. The name of each file included: a. the year, month, and day of the meeting; and b. the topic discussed during the meeting. The process resulted in an initial corpus of approximately 3 million words.

The second step was aimed at selecting the final corpus to be used in the study. For this purpose, the researcher randomly selected texts from the initial corpus so that they could make up approximately 1 million words. Thus, the final corpus consisted of 1,012,509 words organized in 63 files, representing various UNSC meeting records from 2003, 2004 and 2005. The largest document in the final corpus (2005-10-26_Terrorism) comprised of 27,637 words, whereas the smallest document (2004-4-2_Cyprus) had 3,450 words. The average length of the documents was of 16,072 words.
3.3. Data analysis procedures

Data analysis was centered on a combination of both quantitative and qualitative methods (see Table 3 at the end of this chapter for a quick overview of the methodological steps undertaken). Corpus-based techniques and qualitative methods were employed to identify the frequency and to evaluate the function of the target stance markers. Moreover, qualitative techniques were the basis for investigating the extent to which the target stance markers are constitutive/reflective of power relations in UN institutional discourse.

3.3.1. Quantitative analysis

In completing the first phase of the analysis (RQ1), a frequency count of the target adverbial stance markers (i.e. those markers listed in Table 1 above) was performed in order to see which of these markers were recurrent in the corpus. Searches were conducted for each target stance marker individually using a concordancing program (see Figure 1 below), MonoConcPro (Barlow, 2002). In the second stage of the quantitative data analysis, the 10% most frequent target stance markers identified in the corpus were analyzed by conducting an examination of the stance marker's collocational patterns using the same concordancer. The 10% margin was arbitrarily established by the researcher due to the large number of the target stance markers identified in the corpus. The collocational patterns helped the researcher perform a grammatical analysis (i.e. an identification of grammatical frames) of the 10% most frequent target stance markers in the corpus. The adverbials identified as the 10% most frequent target stance markers were further labeled as final stance markers.
3.3.2. Qualitative analysis

To complete the **functional analysis** of the 10% most frequent target stance markers (i.e. the final stance markers), a qualitative analysis was conducted. The functional analysis was centered on a textual examination of the final stance markers and was aimed at identifying the **semantic domains** that related to certainty, doubt, emotion, attitude, i.e. to the expression of stance in the discourse. The focus was on a content analysis in which functional aspects of the selected stance markers were investigated. More precisely, the researcher looked at how the selected stance markers produced textual effects and contributed to meaning formation. The identification of functions followed the pattern
suggested by Precht (2000), in the sense that the aim was to explore how stance markers converged in expressing functions like showing solidarity, expressing attitudes of agreeing, disagreeing, or strongly signaling an opinion.

The last research question (RQ3) was also approached from a qualitative perspective. Through an analysis of one text, randomly selected from the corpus, the researcher attempted to determine the extent to which adverbial stance markers present in that particular text were constitutive/reflective of power relations in that type of discourse. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the primary method employed was based on the CDA framework. More specifically, the analysis was centered on three major components: a) the description of the linguistic properties of the text, with an emphasis on adverbial stance marking – *textual analysis*; b) the interpretation of the relationship between the text and the discursive practices embedded in it – *processing analysis*; and c) the explanation of the relationship between adverbial stance marking and discursive and social practices, i.e. the degree to which instances of language use reflected certain power relations – *critical analysis*.

Given that the term ‘power’ has been assigned so many interpretations in linguistic studies (cf. Fairclough, 1992 and van Dijk, 2002), the researcher considered it appropriate to clearly define and articulate the ‘power’ paradigm underlying RQ3.

In linguistic investigations, the concept of power “has been used to refer to a wide range of often disparate phenomena” (Partington, 2003, p. 126). For example, power is regarded as a productive force that emerges in interactions rather than a property of individuals (Foucault, 1977), as manipulation of discourse (van Dijk, 2001), or as a set of relations among people and institutions that may shift from one situation to another (Barrett, 2002). For the purposes of this study, power was viewed “in terms of asymmetries between
participants in discourse events" (Fairclough, 1995; p. 1). The asymmetries between participants in UNSC meetings were analyzed in terms of the power relations emerging in discourse. More precisely, ‘power’ was investigated along three major points that the researcher identified and that underlie the power taxonomy specifically designed for this study:

a. power embedded in social status – participants in UNSC meetings project power differently, based on their status (permanent or temporary members);

b. power reflected in social action – within the UNSC (like in many political bodies), hierarchies are equally observed and challenged mainly through the manipulation of the information delivered - discourse is indeed a form of social action;

c. power projected in a linguistic space characterized by specific linguistic items that relate to directness/indirectness, manipulation/conformity or persuasion, i.e. to powerful and powerless elements of discourse.

The selection of the linguistic items corresponding to a powerful or powerless discourse was based on a wide range of related previous research (cf. Fairclough, 2000; Ng & Bradac, 1993, Partington, 2003; Philips & Jorgens, 2002). Thus, relying on these studies, the researcher devised a set of linguistic elements (presented in Table 2 below) that were considered to be contributing to the projection of power relations in UNSC discourse and that were taken into account for the investigation of RQ3.
Table 2. List of linguistic items that correspond to powerful/powerless discourses (with examples taken from the document analyzed for RQ3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power + (powerful discourse)</th>
<th>Power- (powerless discourse)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active voice/direct address</strong></td>
<td>Passive voice/indirect address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>We will continue to urge UNMIK to make whatever progress that can be made...</em></td>
<td>e.g. <em>A police investigation into the incident was launched...</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certainty stance</strong></td>
<td>Doubt stance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>Forging a mechanism for direct dialogue will undoubtedly depend on progress...</em></td>
<td>e.g. <em>Perhaps it was on the basis of renewed hope for minority protection...</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action verbs</strong></td>
<td>Nominalizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>...Bulgaria wishes to make a few additional comments.</em></td>
<td>e.g. <em>...we would like to see progress on decentralization and on the return process.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemic modality</strong></td>
<td>Deontic modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>UNMIK must consult local government officials and gain their confidence.</em></td>
<td>e.g. <em>...the need for direct dialogue between Pristina and Belgrade about how they can best cooperate on practical issues.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We (generic)-markcr of both authority and solidarity</strong></td>
<td>Hedges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>We must therefore ensure that we know...</em></td>
<td>e.g. <em>...is thankful for the extraordinary results achieved in a relatively short period of time.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illocutionary acts</strong></td>
<td>Locutionary acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>Bulgaria once again categorically condemns the acts of violence....</em></td>
<td>e.g. <em>...the parliamentary declaration said nothing about the interests and needs of the ethnic Albanians.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adversarial talk</strong></td>
<td>Conciliatory talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>...any attempt to prejudice the resolution of this issue would be unacceptable.</em></td>
<td>e.g. <em>We again call on all parties to cooperate...</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexical items (confrontation)</strong></td>
<td>Lexical items (mitigation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>unacceptable, impossible, etc.</em></td>
<td>e.g. <em>cooperation, consensus, etc.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, the power taxonomy devised by the researcher included a social component – *social status* and *social action*, and a linguistic component – *linguistic space/items*. Figure 2 below offers a visual representation of the power taxonomy that underlies the investigation of RQ3.
This taxonomy indicates that in order to address RQ3, the researcher selected (randomly) one text from the corpus and examined how power relations were reflected in the corresponding discourse by looking at: a) the social elements of discourse, i.e. the participants' social status and social actions (which are inherently political) within the scrutinized discursive framework; and b) the linguistic elements (presented above in Table 2) that those participants employed in order to project their power in the discourse, with an emphasis on adverbial stance markers.

Table 3 below presents an overview of the procedures carried out for the purposes of this study.
Table 3. Research questions and data analysis procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Method of analysis</th>
<th>Methodological steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. With what frequency are the most recurrent adverbial stance markers (identified by Precht, 2000 across registers) found in the genre analyzed (UNSC meeting records)?</td>
<td>Frequency analysis of the 48 target stance markers in the corpus.</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>1. Analysis of the 48 target stance markers using the MonoConcPro concordancer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Selection of the final stance markers (the 10% most frequent target stance markers) to be functionally analyzed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the role (lexical, grammatical and functional) of the 10% most frequent adverbial stance markers found in the genre?</td>
<td>Identification of lexico-grammatical and functional patterns for the final stance markers in the corpus.</td>
<td>Quantitative/Qualitative</td>
<td>1. Examination of each final stance marker’s collocational patterns using the MonoConcPro concordancer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Textual analysis of the occurrences for each final stance marker in order to identify recurrent grammatical frames and semantic domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent do adverbial stance markers reflect/contribute to representations of power relations in the type of discourse investigated?</td>
<td>Investigation of the relation between adverbial stance marking and power representations in UN discourse, using the CDA framework.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>1. Random selection of one text from the corpus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Textual analysis of the selected text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Processing analysis of the selected text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Critical analysis of the selected text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Overview of the chapter

This chapter presents the results of the quantitative and qualitative analyses in four main sections. The first section focuses on the quantitative findings and presents the frequency of adverbial target stance markers in the corpus. This section also introduces the final stance markers (i.e. the 10% most frequent adverbial target stance markers) to be further analyzed grammatically and functionally. The second and third sections address the grammatical and functional analysis, respectively, of the final stance markers. The last section focuses on a qualitative analysis of one of the texts included in the corpus and attempts to investigate the extent to which adverbial stance markers contribute to power representations in the respective discourse.

4.2. Frequency of target stance markers in the corpus

This section presents the frequency of the 48 target stance markers, selected based on Precht (2000), in the corpus. As shown in Table 4, which illustrates the number of occurrences in the corpus for each target stance marker, the frequency of target stance markers varied across and within categories. The 10% (approximately) most frequent target stance markers were the style adverbial indeed (308 occurrences), the epistemic adverbials of certainty of course (201 occurrences) and clearly (151 occurrences), the hedge extremely (144 occurrences), and the affective adverbial unfortunately (123 occurrences). After being determined as the 10% most frequent target stance markers in the corpus, these adverbials represented the object of
comparison for most of the quantitative and qualitative analysis. In other words, the grammatical and functional analysis focused on these 5 final stance markers.

Table 4. Frequency of target stance markers in the corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>adverbial</th>
<th>type of adverbial</th>
<th>freq.</th>
<th>no.</th>
<th>adverbial</th>
<th>type of adverbial</th>
<th>freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>indeed</td>
<td>style</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>absolutely</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>of course</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>26.</td>
<td>mainly</td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>clearly</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td>relatively</td>
<td>hedge</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>hedge</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>strictly</td>
<td>style</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>unfortunately</td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>surely</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>truly</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>perhaps</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>probably</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>certainly</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32.</td>
<td>hardly</td>
<td>hedge</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>in fact</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33.</td>
<td>virtually</td>
<td>hedge</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>simply</td>
<td>style</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>34.</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>hedge</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>according to</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35.</td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>undoubtedly</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36.</td>
<td>practically</td>
<td>hedge</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>seriously</td>
<td>style</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>37.</td>
<td>apparently</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>briefly</td>
<td>style</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38.</td>
<td>fortunately</td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>actually</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39.</td>
<td>perfectly</td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>ultimately</td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40.</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>generally</td>
<td>hedge</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41.</td>
<td>basically</td>
<td>style</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>primarily</td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42.</td>
<td>ideally</td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>approximately</td>
<td>hedge</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43.</td>
<td>normally</td>
<td>hedge</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.</td>
<td>literally</td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>significantly</td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45.</td>
<td>predominantly</td>
<td>hedge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>obviously</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46.</td>
<td>typically</td>
<td>hedge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>personally</td>
<td>style</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47.</td>
<td>honestly</td>
<td>style</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>nearly</td>
<td>hedge</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48.</td>
<td>presumably</td>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total frequency of target stance markers in the corpus – 2604 occurrences

As far as categorial differences were concerned, as Figure 3 indicates, epistemic target stance markers were the most frequent (see Appendix A for a detailed listing of the
frequency of target stance markers by category), representing more than 45% of the total number of adverbial stance marker occurrences in the corpus. The most frequent epistemic stance markers comprised adverbials expressing certainty, such as *of course, clearly, truly, certainly, undoubtedly*. With the exception of *perhaps* (105 occurrences), epistemic adverbials of doubt had a relatively low frequency compared to adverbials of certainty, which indicates that UNSC discourse is generally marked by a high degree of speaker certainty about the propositions advanced.

![Figure 3 Frequency of target stance markers by category](image)

Style adverbials were the second most frequent category (approximately 24%), with markers such as *indeed* (308 occurrences), *simply, seriously, or briefly* highlighting the fact that UNSC members employed these adverbials in order to emphasize the manner in which the information was delivered. Hedges represented the third most frequent category (more than 15%), with adverbials such as *extremely, generally, approximately*, having a relatively high degree of occurrence. The use of hedges, especially approximators, points to speakers' tendency towards adding a qualifying tone to their commitment to the utterances. Adverbials
of affect displayed the lowest frequency (13.68%), with markers such as *ideally* (8 occurrences), *perfectly*, or *ideally* exhibiting a low degree of occurrence, which is indicative of a discourse marked by formality and conventionalized practices that leave little room for the expression of the affective component of the discourse. The most frequent affective stance adverbial was *unfortunately* (123 occurrences) which appeared in the discourse not so much as expressing an emotional state, but as a marker that framed (see the grammatical and functional analyses below) factual or evaluative information.

As mentioned above, the top 10% adverbials to be grammatically and functionally investigated were the following: *indeed, of course, clearly, extremely*, and *unfortunately*. These final stance markers represented (see Table 5 below) more than 35% of the total number of target stance maker occurrences in the corpus.

### Table 5. List of final stance markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adverbial</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>% of total freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>indeed</em></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>11.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>of course</em></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>7.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>clearly</em></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>extremely</em></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>5.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>unfortunately</em></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total freq. of final stance markers</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>35.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final stance markers displayed the following individual frequencies. *Indeed* appeared 308 times in the corpus, which corresponds to more than 10% of the total adverbial stance marker frequencies in the corpus. *Of course*, with 201 hits, was an item that necessitated further insight due to its functional characteristics. In fact, the total number of
hits for *of course* was 204, but there were 3 instances where *of course* postmodified a noun in a noun phrase (i.e. did not function as adverbial), and therefore did not mark stance, as in

"...dimension which we should, as a matter of course, cover in Security Council resolutions..." (2004-1-26_Postconflictbuilding2.txt). These instances were eliminated from the analysis, which led to the final 201 occurrences for this adverbial stance marker. *Clearly* was also a problematic adverbial stance marker. The total number of hits in the corpus for *clearly* was 257. The instances where *clearly* functioned as an adverb denoting stance, that is where *clearly* expressed certainty and had the meaning of *undoubtedly, indubitably, unquestionably* etc., were considered for the analysis (e.g. "*Clearly, there was room for improvement in the draft resolution in that respect*..." - 2003-9-16_MiddleEast.txt). On the other hand, the instances where *clearly* did not illustrate stance, that is where *clearly* functioned as a non-stanced adverbial of manner, synonymous to *in a clear manner, in a clear way* etc., were eliminated (e.g. "*The prime minister of Israel has stated clearly that Israel believes in the vision of two states*..." – 2004-5-19_MiddleEast.txt).

However, there were some cases where the meaning of *clearly* was somewhat ambiguous in the sense that *clearly* could equally reflect both stanced and non-stanced discourse like in the following example: "*Those incidents clearly demonstrate that there is a real risk of escalating violence*..." – 2005-1-28_MiddleEast.txt). Since in these ambiguous contexts *clearly* may be used to express stance to a certain degree, they were taken into consideration for further analysis. The other two final stance markers, *extremely* and *unfortunately* appeared 144 times, and 123 times, respectively.
4.3. Grammatical analysis of final stance markers: *indeed, of course, clearly, extremely, unfortunately*

The grammatical investigation of the final stance markers was based on two methodological steps. First, the collocational patterns (see Appendix B for the most frequent collocates of each adverbial under scrutiny) for each adverbial were examined in order to identify recurrent features. Second, each occurrence was manually investigated in order to determine the grammatical frames that were associated with each final stance marker. The main frames that were identified (including the number of instances and percentage) are presented below with illustrative examples.

4.3.1. Grammatical analysis of *indeed*

The most frequent final stance marker, *indeed (308 instances)*, was employed by the UNSC speakers in several grammatical frames. Table 6 and the subsequent analysis detail the most frequent lexico-grammatical patterns for the stance adverbial *indeed*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Lexico-grammatical pattern</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>indeed</em> + sent.</td>
<td><em>indeed</em> + be + <em>indeed</em></td>
<td><em>indeed</em> + conjunction + <em>indeed</em></td>
<td><em>indeed</em> + auxiliary + <em>indeed</em></td>
<td><em>indeed</em> + <em>indeed</em> + verb phrase</td>
<td><em>indeed</em> + adjective/noun + <em>indeed</em></td>
<td>be (lexical) + <em>indeed</em></td>
<td>which (rel.) + <em>indeed</em></td>
<td>that (compl.) + <em>indeed</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of instances</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of the total number of instances</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
<td>16.88%</td>
<td>16.57%</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most frequent (129 instances) grammatical frame for *indeed* was the structure in which *indeed* appeared in sentence initial position premodifying an entire sentence (1) and framing the manner in which subsequent information was presented.

(1) **Indeed, the international community has already made impressive progress in freezing terrorist assets.** (2003-1-20_Terrorism.txt)

Three other patterns of use for *indeed* were recurrent in the corpus: (2) *indeed* followed a copular verb premodifying a subject predicative (53 instances); (3) *indeed* followed a coordinating or subordinating conjunction (52 instances); (4) *indeed* followed an auxiliary verb (including modal auxiliaries and the dummy ‘do’) and premodified the main verb (MV) of a verb phrase (VP) – (51 instances). In these grammatical frames, the adverbial *indeed* mainly performed an emphatic function, adding focus to the proposition.

(2) **The rise of civil society is indeed one of the landmark events of our time.** (2005-9-20_CivilSociety.txt)

(3) **The United Nations welcomes, and indeed contributes to, those efforts.** (2004-7-27_Stabilization2.txt)

*It is the hope of the African group that any war against Iraq will be sanctioned by a resolution of the Security Council, if indeed war becomes inevitable.* (2003-3-12_Irak.txt)

(4) **I fully agree with those many statements underlining that such a review must indeed be comprehensive, thorough and objective.** (2005-5-27_Kosovo)

...they do indeed have much to report, more than could be easily contained in brief oral presentations to the Security Council. (2003-11-17_HIVandpeacekeeping.txt)

*Indeed* also occurred in other grammatical frames where it highlighted the action, or the quality of the elements it post- or pre-determined: (5) *indeed* premodified an entire verb phrase (VP) - (9 instances); (6) *indeed* postmodified an adjective or a noun (9 instances); (7) *indeed* postmodified the lexical verb ‘be’ (2 instances).
(5) We must therefore see to it that this new approach indeed makes it possible to effectively curb the violence... (2003-11-21_Irak-Kuwait.txt)

(6) The situation in Guinea-Bissau is undoubtedly very difficult indeed, politically, economically and socially, following the coup d'etat in that country. (2003-9-29_GuineaBissau.txt)

The signing ceremony I am referring to not only signaled the end of the war, a very painful period indeed in the history of the nation... (2004-1-26_Postconflictbuilding2.txt)

(7) We are indeed in a situation in which we all have to make critical choices. (2003-3-12_Irak.txt)

The stance marker indeed displayed a low frequency with respect to the following lexico-grammatical patterns: (8) indeed followed the relativizer ‘which’ (2 instances); (9) indeed followed the complementizer ‘that’ (1 instance).

(8) Absolute priorities at this time are participation in the drafting and implementation of a plan of application of the standards for Kosovo, and in particular participation in the direct dialogue between Belgrade and Pristina, which indeed is one of those standards. (2004-1-26_Postconflictbuilding2.txt)

(9) The developments that have taken place...are convincing all of us that, indeed, Cote d'Ivoire is now returning to the path of normalcy... (2003-4-29_IvoryCoast.txt)

As the analyses above show, the most recurrent patterns for the adverbial stance marker indeed (indeed + sentence; copular ‘be’ + indeed; conjunction + indeed; auxiliary + indeed) indicate that UNSC representatives employed this adverbial mainly in order to frame subsequent discourse and to add emphasis to the action displayed by the verb.

4.3.2. Grammatical analysis of of course

The final stance marker of course (201 instances), occurred in various grammatical frames, which are presented in Table 7 and the subsequent analysis.
Table 7. Lexico-grammatical patterns for the final stance marker *of course*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Lexico-grammatical pattern</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>of course</em> + sentence</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of total number of instances</td>
<td>29.86%</td>
<td>21.39%</td>
<td>16.91%</td>
<td>13.93%</td>
<td>6.47%</td>
<td>4.98%</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sentence initial position was the most frequent (60 instances) grammatical frame for the adverbial stance marker *of course*, which the speakers used in order to frame subsequent discourse.

(1) *Of course, I would be happy if a decision by the Secretary-General to appoint a special envoy for Kosovo were coordinated with Brussels and Washington.* (2005-3-4_OSCE.txt)

The stance marker *of course* displayed a high frequency in the following lexico-grammatical patterns in which it indicated the speaker’s level of certainty about the utterances: (2) *of course* followed a coordinating or subordinating conjunction (43 instances); (3) *of course* followed a copular verb premodifying a subject predicative (34 instances); (4) *of course* followed an auxiliary verb (including modal auxiliaries and the dummy ‘do’) and premodified the main verb (MV) of a verb phrase (VP) – (28 instances).

(2) *That is true of all the major agencies of the United Nations and, of course, of the Security Council as it discharges its mandate for peace.* (2004-6-22_Civilsociety+peacebuilding.txt)

...we are financing development activities in Haiti and, of course, we support Haiti through the European Union and World Bank programmes. (2005-1-12_Haiti2.txt)

(3) *The Security Council is of course only one actor in the international response to humanitarian crises...* (2005-7-12_SC_roleinhumanitariancrises.txt)
(4) Fifthly, we must, of course, work relentlessly to eliminate the environment in which terrorism breeds. (2003-1-20_Terrorism.txt)

In other grammatical frames, the adverbial of course marked the speaker’s comment about the propositional content of the utterances: (5) of course premodified a prepositional phrase (PP) — (13 instances); (6) of course postmodified a noun phrase (NP) — (10 instances); (7) of course postmodified an ing-clause (6 instances); (8) of course followed the demonstrative pronoun ‘that’ (4 instances); (9) of course followed the relativizer and complementizer ‘that’ (3 instances).

(5) In the past decade, NATO nations have expanded the geographic scope of alliance operations and activities and have transformed their nature, all without forgetting our core task, of course, of collective defense. (2004-11-11_Bosnia2.txt)

(6) The Presidency of the European Union will be taking the floor later in the meeting, and my delegation of course endorses the statement to be delivered by the representative... (2004-6-22_Civilsociety+peacebuilding.txt)

(7) We welcome those who have joined us, including of course the co-sponsors, and urge all states to review how they might best contribute to Iraqi efforts to forge a better future. (2003-10-16_Irak-Kuwait.txt)

(8) That, of course, will require resolute action to renew the authority of government institutions. (2004-8-25_Afghanistan.txt)

(9) ...because Greece will shortly make a statement on behalf of the European Union that, of course, it will also be making on behalf of the Spanish delegation. (2003-2-6_Kosovo.txt)

I might also take this opportunity to note that, of course, it is not only United Nations international personnel that are involved. (2003-11-21_Irak-Kuwait.txt)

The examples above indicate that the stance adverbial of course emerged more frequently in four patterns (of course + sentence; conjunction + of course; copular verb + of course; auxiliary + of course), and enabled UNSC speakers to indicate their level of certainty regarding subsequent discourse and the propositional content of their utterances.
4.3.3. Grammatical analysis of *clearly*

The final stance marker *clearly* (151 instances), appeared in several grammatical frames, which are illustrated in Table 8 and the analysis presented below.

Table 8. Lexico-grammatical patterns for the final stance marker *clearly*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lexico-grammatical pattern</td>
<td>clearly + verb phrase (VP)</td>
<td>clearly + sentence</td>
<td>copular be + clearly</td>
<td>auxiliary + clearly</td>
<td>clearly + auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of instances</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Percentage of the total number of instances</td>
<td>37.75%</td>
<td>29.14%</td>
<td>22.52%</td>
<td>7.28%</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most frequent grammatical frame (57 instances) for the stance marker *clearly* was the structure in which *clearly* premodified the main verb (MV) of a verb phrase, giving credibility to the proposition expressed by the speaker and emphasizing the action expressed by the verb.

*(1) The report of the mission clearly demonstrates that so much still needs to be done in Kosovo and Metohija.* (2003-2-6_Kosovo.txt)

In other lexico-grammatical patterns, *clearly* added focus to the validity of the proposition: (2) *clearly* appeared in sentence initial position premodifying an entire sentence (44 instances); (3) *clearly* followed a copular verb premodifying a subject predicative (34 instances); (4) *clearly* postmodified an auxiliary verb, including a modal auxiliary (11 instances); (5) *clearly* premodified an auxiliary verb, including a modal auxiliary (4 instances); in these instances, as compared to (4), *clearly* had an extra-emphatic function, premodifying an entire verb phrase; (6) *clearly* premodified an adjective (1 instance).
(2) *Clearly, disarmament can help to prevent non-state actors from acquiring WMD...* (2004-4-22_WMDnonproliferation1.txt)

(3) *There is clearly an increased awareness in the United Nations system, as well as in the Council, that these three issue are closely interrelated...* (2003-11-17_HIVandpeacekeeping.txt)

(4) *The Security Council must clearly reaffirm the unfailing dedication of the international community to the strict implementation of resolution 1244(1999).* (2003-2-6_Kosovo.txt)

(5) *This conflict clearly has stripped some actors of all humanity and fundamental human values.* (2003-7-7_CongoDR.txt)

*We need only to refer to what was stated by the head of UNMOVIC to agree that disarmament clearly cannot not be instantaneous, nor can inspections go on forever.* (2003-3-12_Irak.txt)

(6) *...Mr. Harri Holkeri assumed his responsibilities and clearly difficult tasks against that background.* (2003-9-12_Kosovo.txt)

From these examples, it can be noticed that the stance marker *clearly* occurred more frequently in three patterns (*clearly* + verb phrase; *clearly* + sentence; copular verb + *clearly*) and was generally employed by UNSC representatives as a validation device through which they added credibility to their statements.

### 4.3.4. Grammatical analysis of *extremely*

The adverbial stance marker *extremely* (*144 instances*), mainly due to categorial characteristics (adjective premodification), appeared in only 4 grammatical frames, which are listed in Table 9 and illustrated in the subsequent analysis.
Table 9. Lexico-grammatical patterns for the final stance marker *extremely*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Lexico-grammatical pattern</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extremely + adjective (SP or OP)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extremely + noun phrase (NP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extremely + adverb</td>
<td>60.42%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a hedging device, *extremely*, reflected the intensity of the proposition uttered by UNSC members, and appeared in the following grammatical frames: (1) *extremely* premodified an adjective that functioned as subject or object predicative (87 instances); (2) *extremely* was part of a prepositional phrase (PP) - (36 instances); (3) *extremely* was part of a noun phrase (NP), premodifying an adjective (20 instances); (4) *extremely* premodified an adverb (1 instance).

(1) *We feel it extremely important that, from today forward, horizontal relationships be established between countries and relevant international and regional organizations.* (2003-1-20_Terrorism.txt)

(2) *We were not able to do so in spite of the fact that the draft resolution, which was supported by the Non-Aligned Movement, was extremely balanced.* (2003-9-16_MiddleEast.txt)

(3) *The United Kingdom, too, is delighted to see the Spanish Prime Minister here among us in the Security Council, speaking about this extremely important subject.* (2003-5-6_Terrorism.txt)

(4) *Mr. President, allow me to thank you for your leadership of the Council during this rather busy month of October and for having convened this extremely important meeting.* (2005-10-26_Terrorism.txt)

(4) *It is a pleasure to be here, and not just with my colleague Judge Theodor Meron, President of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, with whom we have worked extremely closely.* (2003-10-8_Bosnia.txt)
UNSC speakers mainly resorted to the stance adverbial extremely so as to add intensity and focus to certain characteristics of their discourse, and by using this hedging device they also signaled their emotional involvement regarding their utterances.

4.3.5. Grammatical analysis of unfortunately

The final stance marker unfortunately (123 instances) was used by the UNSC speakers in 9 grammatical frames. Table 10 and the subsequent analysis address the most frequent lexico-grammatical patterns for the stance adverbial unfortunately

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Lexico-grammatical pattern</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unfort. + sentence</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unfort. + main verb</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>auxiliary + unfort.+</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>copula + unfort.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relativ. + unfort.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coord.conj. + unfort.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unfort. + PP</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that (compl.) + unfort.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most frequent (81 instances) grammatical frame for unfortunately was the structure in which unfortunately appeared in sentence initial position premodifying an entire sentence (1) and expressing speaker's overall evaluation of the propositional content of the utterance:

(1) Unfortunately, a number of participants in today's meeting have addressed their criticism primarily to Belgrade. (2005-5-27_Kosovo.txt)

In other lexico-grammatical frames, the adverbial stance marker unfortunately expressed speaker's assessment of past, present and future actions: (2) unfortunately premodified the main verb (MV) of a verb phrase (VP) – (11 instances); (3) unfortunately
followed an auxiliary verb and premodified the main verb (MV) of a verb phrase (VP) – (9 instances); (4) *unfortunately* followed a copular verb premodifying a subject predicative (9 instances); (5) *unfortunately* followed a relativizer (6 instances); (6) *unfortunately* followed a coordinating conjunction (3 instances).

(2) *While certain security measures taken in self-defense and necessitated by terrorist threats unfortunately cause hardships to sectors of the Palestinian population...* (2004-5-19_Middleeast.txt)

(3) *In recent years, there has unfortunately been a sudden surge in peacekeeping operations and an increase in the complexity of their mandates...* (2005-7-12_SC_roleinhumanitariancrises.txt)

(4) *I hope all of that will lead to us being able to meet again in December and next June to have a more positive picture of the situation of civilians in conflict than the one that I was, unfortunately, obliged to present today. (2005-6-21_Civiliansinarmedconflicts.txt)*

(5) *Let me just say that this is a problem that, unfortunately, is affecting some 60,000 people right now, of whom 95 to 97 percent are Kosovo Albanians. (2005-2-24_Kosovo.txt)*

Before closing, *I must underline that the world community should address the root causes of terrorism, not just its symptoms, which, unfortunately, receive more attention and resources. (2003-7-23_Peaceandsecurity.txt)*

(6) *...the city is jammed and, unfortunately, also polluted by heavy traffic. (2003-11-11_Afghanistan.txt)*

*Both exist, but, unfortunately, we have not been able to apply them fully.* (2004-1-20_Childreninandarmedconflicts2.txt)

Speaker evaluation of the proposition was reflected not only with respect to actions denoted by verbs as in most cases above, but also regarding the content denoted with the use of other parts of speech (prepositions, complementizers, adjectives), like in the following examples: (7) *unfortunately* premodified a prepositional phrase (PP) – (2 instances); (8) *unfortunately* followed the complementizer that (1 instance); (9) *unfortunately* premodified an adjective (1 instance).
(7) They are the ones that promote the smuggling of weapons into Gaza, unfortunately through the Sinai. (2004-5-19_Middleeast.txt)

(8) I think we have to recognize that, unfortunately, there is still a general lack of reliable information on HIV rates in conflict and post-conflict countries. (2003-11-17_HIVandpeacekeeping.txt)

(9) For Israel, the past few years have challenged us to identify our place in the global counter-terrorism effort and to find in which our unfortunately extensive experience in combating terrorism can be of benefit to others. (2004-7-19_Peaceandsecurity.txt)

As the grammatical analyses above have indicated, the final stance markers displayed several grammatical functions and appeared in different grammatical frames. Each final stance adverbial occurred in various positions, but there were, however, three types of frames that were generally common among these adverbials – 1. adverbial + sentence; 2. copular verb + adverbial; 3. auxiliary verb + adverbial. First, with the exception of extremely, all other four adverbials – indeed, of course, clearly, unfortunately - exhibited a high degree of occurrence (see Tables 6-10 above) in sentence initial position, premodifying an entire sentence. The second most recurrent frame among the final stance markers was postmodification of a copular verb, a frame displayed by all final stance markers. The third most common grammatical frame was postmodification of an auxiliary (including modal auxiliary) verb, which was found with all target adverbials, except for extremely.

Given the nature and frequency of these target adverbials, the range of grammatical frames differed from one target adverbial to the other. As Tables 6-10 have shown, three target adverbials, indeed, of course, and unfortunately appeared in no less than nine different grammatical frames. The target stance marker clearly occurred in six frames, whereas extremely displayed the lowest variation with only four frames. In examining the grammatical frames for each target adverbial, the researcher also looked at the position of
adverbials in the sentence/clause. One variable that was considered was that of centrality (cf. Precht 2000). Besides taking into account position considerations, the centrality of the target stance adverbials was also determined on the basis of whether the adverbial was followed, or preceded, by a certain morphological or syntactic category. For example, the final stance markers occurring in initial position in a sentence, markers postmodifying a copular verb (thus preceding a subject or object predicative), and markers premodifying a verb phrase were considered central (see some examples in Table 11 below) due to their pragmatic force. Adverbials appearing in any other positions were categorized as non-central. The centrality of adverbs, corroborated with an investigation of associated grammatical frames, was instrumental in performing the functional analysis addressed in the next section of this paper.

Table 11. Examples of adverb centrality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>centrality</th>
<th>example</th>
<th>grammatical frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>central</td>
<td><em>Indeed</em>, we have witnessed the grossest violations of human rights... (2003-7-18 CongoDR.txt)</td>
<td>adverb + clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... a subject that has received considerable attention in recent days and was, <em>of course</em>, the subject of commentary ....(2003-10-28 Irak-Kuwait.txt)</td>
<td>copular verb + adverb + subject predicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That <em>clearly</em> demonstrates the determination of the Afghan people to fully engage in the process of rebuilding the country. (2004-8-25 Afghanistan.txt)</td>
<td>adverb + main verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. Functional analysis of final stance markers

The functional analysis of the final stance markers was embedded within a larger framework that included the *position*, or centrality of target adverbials, the grammatical *frames* they belonged to, and the *semantic* and *pragmatic domains* that were related to the expression of stance in the discourse.

As indicated above, a large number of target stance adverbials appeared in initial position, premodifying an entire sentence. Placing adverbials in initial position not only adds to the cohesion of the discourse, by smoothing the transition from one utterance to another, it also abides by the information flow principle (cf. Biber et al. 2002) which stipulates that the given information in the discourse must come prior to the introduction of new information. For instance, in the example provided below, *indeed* refers back to previously introduced information and also frames the subsequent discourse:

1. However, that means that international instruments of arms control, disarmament and nonproliferation must not, under any circumstances be weakened. Indeed, quite the reverse should be the case: they must be strengthened. (2003-1-20_Terrorism.txt)

In an initial (i.e. central – see Table 11) position, stance adverbials usually have *scope* over the entire sentence – what Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., & Hamilton, H.E. (2001) call global scope (i.e. relationships across wider structures of discourse) - and establish a certain frame for the entire proposition that follows them:

2. Clearly, the redefinition of this mandate and the expansion of the force have obvious financial implications. (2003-4-29_IvoryCoast.txt).

Moreover, stance adverbials in initial position may introduce a new scenario, set up a new stage for discussions and, thus, have scope over the subsequent clauses. In the next example, *of course* makes the transition from a descriptive discussion, focused on a particular state's
actions, to more prescriptive, generally applicable rules of state behavior vis-à-vis the issue debated.

3. Preventing terrorism is a priority challenge for my government, particularly in this period of the consolidation of peace and democracy in Angola. Of course, an effective defense against terrorism requires, first and foremost, a strong state that is politically stable and able to fulfill its responsibilities as a member of the international community. (2003-1-20_Terrorism.txt)

Adverbial centrality enhances the pragmatic force of utterances and, besides sentence initial position, the researcher proposed in Table 11 two other experimental frames that might reflect centrality: adverbial postmodification of a copular verb and adverbial premodification of a lexical verb. In the first case, it is considered that the interposition of the adverbial between the copular verb and the subject or object predicative adds an enhanced local scope (relationships between adjacent structures) to the utterance (cf. Schriffrin et al. 2001). In other words, in this position, the adverbial has extra qualifying properties, completing the meaning of the copular verb as well as adding focus to the subject or object predicative it modifies, like in the following example:

4. We have the duty to continually reaffirm the right to humanitarian access in the texts we adopt. However, such a necessary standard reminder is clearly not enough. (2004-12-14_Civiliansandarmedconflicts2.txt)

In the second case, the adverbial premodifying a lexical verb also conveys an enhanced local scope by highlighting the action represented by the verb and by adding emphasis and relevance to the utterance.

5. At this stage, the success of this process clearly depends basically on the will and commitment of the parties. (2003-12-15_PapuaNewGuinea.txt)

Although a stance marker's orientation towards locality or globality may sometimes be difficult to establish due to the pragmatics of adjacency relations, an investigation of the
global/local scope of adverbials is instrumental in analyzing the degree to which the target stance markers add meaning to the discourse or reflect meaning that is already accessible. Besides referential meaning, i.e. what an adverbial denotes, the pragmatic meaning, i.e. what the adverbial connotes (the speaker's comments on the message) illustrates the extent to which a certain discourse is stanced or not. In the example below, the target stance marker extremely functions not only as an amplifier/intensifier modifying a gradable adjective, but also represents a hedging device employed by the speaker with a view to making a personal qualifying commitment to the utterance (Hyland, 1998). Therefore, the utterance invariably communicates two messages: a basic message underlying referential meaning (adverbial=amplifier/intensifier), and a meta-message encoded in a pragmatic meaning (adverbial=hedging device expressing speaker's attitude towards the propositional content of the utterance).

6. This action was obviously made possible, above all, by the extremely courageous decision of the French authorities. (2003-7-18_CongoDR.txt)

Overall, the final stance adverbials investigated underlie stanced semantic domains characterized by the overt expression of the speaker's attitudes and feeling towards the utterance (Biber et al. 2002):

a. The affective stance marker unfortunately conveys the speaker's evaluation or comment of the proposition, like in the example below in which the speaker's evaluative remark is anticipated by a string of nouns (most of which are abstract), which create a negative semantic domain that somehow requires an evaluative remark from the part of a speaker committed to the propositional content of the utterance.

7. Violence, crime, intolerance, arms, drugs and trafficking in human beings are, unfortunately, abundant in the province. (2003-2-6_Kosovo.txt)
b. The use of the hedging adverbial extremely indicates the speaker’s assessment of the extent of a certain characteristic. In the corpus for this study, the hedging device extremely collocates with gradable adjectives, such as important, useful, valuable, helpful, difficult or grave, which make up semantic domains that are appropriate for evaluative remarks.

8. The role of the international community, the Quartet in particular, remains extremely important in that it has to be actively involved and engaged in supporting the parties in their efforts to realize and implement their respective commitments. (2005-7-21_Middle_East.txt)

c. The epistemic stance markers of course and clearly are used to express the speaker’s level of certainty about the proposition and occur in semantic domains that reflect irrefutable statements (sometimes even truisms) like the one below.

9. Of course, there are no textbook cases and every situation has its own specificities. (2005-9-20_CivilSociety.txt)

d. The style adverbial indeed is employed by speakers to emphasize the manner of conveying the message and signal speakers’ awareness of the effect their utterances may have on the listener.

10. The holding of elections later this year constitutes, indeed, the most pressing and visible challenge for Haitians and the international community in the short term. (2005-5-13_Haiti.txt)

All in all, the various functions displayed by the final stance markers show that adverbial stance markers are indices of both textual and metatextual organization of different types of discourses that appear in different contexts. The multifunctionality of target stance adverbials is thus indicative of discourses constructed both linguistically and socially.
4.5. Adverbial stance marking and power representations in UNSC discourse – a case study

As explained in Chapter 3, the investigation of the relation between adverbial stance marking and the power representation in UNSC discourse followed a three-tier process: a. a description of the linguistic properties of the text, with an emphasis on the linguistic items (presented in Table 2) that corresponded to powerful/powerless discourses – *textual analysis*; b. an analysis of the relationship between the text and the underlying discursive practices – *processing analysis*; c. an insight into the social elements of discourse and an explanation of the relationship between stance marking and discursive and social practices – *critical analysis*.

The processing analysis (4.5.1.) enabled the researcher to identify general paradigms regarding UNSC discursive practices and power projections, whereas the textual and critical analyses (4.5.2.) were instrumental in demonstrating the extent to which adverbial stance markers contributed to specific power representations in one instance of UNSC discourse.

4.5.1. UNSC discursive practices – general considerations

The UNSC provides an appropriate context for exploring notions of power representations in institutional discourse. Within the UNSC, discussions are subject to formal and informal, or customary, rules of procedure which have greatly evolved over the 60 years of UN’s existence. Some of the formal rules of interaction regard time allotment (each speaker is granted a certain timeframe for delivering the speech), conventionalized forms of address (UNSC members address interlocutors indirectly; the third person is preferred due to
conventional procedures), or turn-taking (the order of speaking is fixed and pre-established).

Informal rules of address mainly fall within the intrinsic element of formality and are substantiated in the general avoidance of face-threatening acts by most participants who are expected, given the deep-rooted institutional discursive practices, to employ face-enhancing acts and to generally adopt a conciliatory 'voice'.

UNSC proceedings are usually opened and closed by the president of the Council (the Council is composed of 15 member countries – 5 permanent with veto-power and 10 temporary, and has a rotating presidency with one country holding the presidency for one month) who formally announces the topic of the agenda, allocates time, manages turn-taking, and oversees the length of speeches. The president of the Council is the authority who announces guest speakers and who can impose restrictions on the length, but not the content, of members' interventions. Depending on the nature of the debate, the speeches within the meetings come from the Council representatives of the countries directly or indirectly affected by the issue on the agenda, from the representatives of the 5 permanent members (United States, Britain, France, Russia and China), and, seldom, from guest speakers outside the Security Council framework. In most cases, the end result of the discussions is a press statement or, in some instances, a resolution through which Security Council members make recommendations for future policies. The order and scope of interactants' interventions is predictable: during the meetings, participants do not interact directly with each other like in a conversational exchange, but simply deliver their speech on the issue discussed; the president or other members hardly ever intervene or interrupt the delivery of the information; the conventional features of institutional discourse are generally observed. Therefore, at the interactional level, there is a low degree of spontaneity which is replaced by a high level of
conformity – interlocutors are expected to abide by the customary rules. However, members’ interventions sometimes reveal a tension between complying with the position within the institution (*social status*) and the imperative of issue-oriented power projections (*social action*).

Two tendencies are recurrent during these meetings: a) the observance of conventional characteristics of institutional discourse, and b) the struggle for power (challenging positions of power). The debates reflect both a spirit of cooperativeness (mutual consultations, systematic deliberations, joint decision-making) and one of adversality (opposing views, antagonistic standpoints, arguments against or in favor of available alternatives, and exercises by the 5 permanent members of their veto-power).

Due to procedural and customary discursive and non-discursive elements, as well as to the historical positions adopted by countries within UNSC (vis-à-vis various issues) and the knowledge schemata that politicians use, certain common knowledge properties regarding UNSC discourse emerge. Overall, cooperation ensues when there is a convergence of expectations and positions due to commonly shared beliefs and goals, and to common interests and concerns. Consensus is likely to occur regarding matters of general interest that transcend national priorities, such as the protection of civilians in armed conflicts, terrorism, genocide and other humanitarian issues, conflict prevention and management, or the status of refugees. Adversality emerges predominantly with more specific items under consideration when some members’ positions are to a great extent prescriptive (i.e. some actors exhibit consistent behavior vis-à-vis certain issues), which reduces the likelihood of reaching common ground. For example, during discussions regarding the status of the autonomous Serbian province of Kosovo, the positions of the parties directly involved, Serbia and
Montenegro, Albania, are pre-determined: Serbia and Montenegro systematically rejects any proposal that would alter the status-quo and that would violate the state sovereignty principle, whereas Albania specifically welcomes calls for Kosovo's independence. Relatedly, the stance consistently adopted by Russia (a permanent UNSC member) with regards to Kosovo is explicitly or implicitly prescriptive in the sense that, due to strategic considerations concerning regional influence, and legal considerations regarding precedent setting, Russia is also adamantly opposed to the creation of an independent and sovereign state in Kosovo. Thus, while most issues of UNSC discourse are conducive to cordial agreements and conciliatory dialogue, others underlie an overt, or covert, confrontational style of debate characterized by competing discursive processes, power-based interactions, pre-determined participant roles, meaning constructions, deconstructions or reconstructions.

Although the United Nations represents an organization distinguished by bottom-up governance, whereby the emphasis is placed on networking, dialogue, cooperation, and multilateral deliberations, it still displays, as a political institutional construct, an inherent hierarchical role distribution which means that power projections follow a Foucauldian paradigm – power is not a monolithic, one-way process, but is exercised and employed through a myriad of network-like discursive practices (practices by which meanings are produced in a certain context). According to Foucault (1977), analyzing institutions in terms of power entails looking at how discursive practices contribute to reproducing, sustaining, challenging, or restructuring power relations. In UNSC discourse, competing discursive processes convey conciliatory or adversarial attitudes through which interactants project their power. Participants are engaged in a perpetual process of positioning themselves along a
hierarchical scale, negotiating representations, and legitimizing or delegitimizing institutional processes.

Consistently employing a wide range of discursive practices is itself a power resource. The interlocutors often abide by some pre-established, non-negotiable institutional discourse features, but what they negotiate, however, is the content of their explicit and implicit discursive representations and evaluations (Ilie, 2001). UNSC discussants may have a central or peripheral participative role in the discussion depending on the content and form of their messages, but their power manifestation is contingent upon three main variables - social status, social action, context - and is substantiated through several linguistic devices that create powerful or powerless discursive frameworks.

4.5.2. Power and adverbial stance marking in UNSC discourse – the case of the Kosovo debate

In this paper, the document randomly selected from the corpus for further analysis - 2003-9-12_Kosovo.txt (see Appendix C) of stance marking and power representations in UNSC discourse illustrates, among other things, the extent of the interplay between powerful and powerless discursive frameworks. This document (named the Kosovo debate for the purposes of this research) represents the official record of the UNSC security meeting held on September, 12, 2003. Before investigating more closely how language use in the selected text produces the effects of authority, consensus, or legitimacy, indexing the discourse, i.e. looking at the relationship among interlocutors, the place and time of utterances, and the interactants’ roles and identities, seems to be a necessary first step.
The UNSC meeting analyzed took place on September, 12, 2003 at the UN headquarters in New York. The item on the agenda was the problematic situation in the restive Serbian province of Kosovo; more precisely, the discussions were focused on the efficiency of the ‘standards before status’ policy framework, according to which a final resolution of Kosovo’s status (independent or autonomous region) is contingent upon the implementation of certain political, economic, and social standards of self-government. The item on the agenda was discussed by all UNSC members. In addition to the statements made by the 15 Council members (in the order of statements, the representatives of Pakistan, Russia, Bulgaria, USA, France, Mexico, Guinea, Chile, Spain, Angola, Germany, Cameroon, Syria, China, and Great Britain), and in accordance with the Council’s rules of procedure, 4 guest speakers were invited to deliver their speeches on the issue, namely the representatives of Serbia and Montenegro, Italy, Albania, plus the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. The statements varied in length and scope, and reflected the multiple manifestations of participants’ cognitive and inter-communicative acts. By means of analyzing the debate textually and critically, the researcher was able to identify recurrent linguistic elements (the powerless/powerful linguistic items presented in Table 2 and adverbial stance markers) and discursive patterns that pointed to the projection of certain power relations.

Within the Kosovo debate selected for analysis, interventions often revealed a latent tension between institutional and interpersonal metadiscourse, like in example (1) in which the first guest speaker, the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, assesses the severity of the situation in the province and inserts indirectly - the majority (but not all) of
local politicians ...have made statements condemning the incidents - his personal stance on
the state of affairs in Kosovo.

(1) Property used by the police and the judiciary, including an UNMIK police station,
UNMIK vehicles and the Pristina district court, were damaged in explosions and other
attacks. No one has claimed responsibility for any of these attacks. The majority of local
politicians and representatives of the Provisional Institutions have made statements
condemning the incidents.

In some instances, personal statements reinforce, or challenge institutional messages.
For instance, the representative of Russia adopts a powerful discursive framework by openly
and adamantly criticizing the lack of progress in the region:

(2) Implementation is lacking with regard to key requirements of Security Council
Resolution 1244 (1999), particularly with respect to the situation in Kosovo. There is
neither reliable nor equitable safety for all in the province. There is an absence of
fundamental freedoms and rights and inter-ethnic tolerance.

The powerful, overt expression of criticism is emphasized by the use of existential
there and by the negative discursive framework created through the adverbs neither...nor and
the abstract noun with negative connotations the absence. Moreover, the adverbial stance
marker particularly mediates the powerful rhetoric and marks the transition from a general to
a more specific message. Another adverbial stance marker, regrettably, is employed with a
view to adding emphasis to the powerful critical, and rather non-nuanced, references:

(3) Regrettably, over the last month Kosovo has once again been engulfed by a crime
wave that has clear ethnic underpinnings.

To some extent, the speech of the Russian representative underlies a somewhat
adversarial style which is linguistically substantiated in the frequent use of adjectival and
predicative stance markers (the most blatant of those acts, only weak efforts are under way,
we are certain) and epistemic modality (4).
Of key importance are the implementation of the principle of standards before status, which seeks to ensure the essential basic democratic conditions in Kosovo and the establishment of appropriate mechanisms to that end. The implementation of these obligations must be under continuous international oversight.

Most of the assertions made by the Russian member are evaluative rather than merely factual which renders his discourse more powerful. Furthermore, the emphasis is placed on performative and not just on referential functions of communication - power is also mirrored in the pragmatic force of the illocutionary speech acts that appear frequently in the discourse and in the recurrent expressions underlying epistemic certainty which are, in their turn, evidentialized by adverbial stance markers.

We urge UNMIK to assume a more active and consistent position in countering manifestations of inter-ethnic intolerance and crime, to stem the growth of radical movements in the province and to consolidate legality there. (indirect illocutionary speech act)

With regard to Kosovo, there is no doubt that this has to do with yet another manifestation of terrorism that, given the realities in Kosovo, is particularly dangerous, as it increases tensions in an already complex inter-ethnic relationship. Such incidents could provoke a chain reaction with extremely negative consequences for a settlement in the province.

Power projections in the discourse delivered by the Russian representative point to a deep-rooted commitment to the preservation of the status-quo (the implementation of standards before status) in Kosovo. The speech is not aimed at negotiating representations and is not reduced to factual information. On the contrary, the evaluative assertions legitimize future political decisions and actions. Therefore, power, in this case, emerges interdependently from social status (Russia as a permanent UNSC member has the power to veto any proposal on Kosovo that is not commensurate with its interests), social action (status power is projected during interactions), and a discourse of contestation which is reinforced by epistemic and attitudinal stance marking. In other words, in the UNSC
institutional sphere, power perceptions are not only cognitively based, but also linguistically based.

Language is a powerful resource for achieving political goals and the dominant discursive paradigm in UNSC talk is, mainly, one of cooperative interactions. Events are discursively constructed, which means that there is a shift from an objective recount of what really happened to a more subjective report of the event (e.g. *Mexico has viewed as positive measures the recent suspension of seven members from the Kosovo Protection Corps and the disciplinary action against eight others on suspicions of links to organized crime and extremist groups.*)

A primary concern for consensus and cooperative interactions is indicative of a less powerful discourse, and it is under this paradigm that the statement delivered by the Pakistani representative during the Kosovo debate falls. In this case, the discourse is mainly characterized by deontic modality, which is concerned with future action and policy rather than the expression of evaluative remarks, and is strengthened by adverbial stance marking (7), and the use of mitigating devices (for example mental verbs in example 8) that tone down the pragmatic force of the utterances and that are accompanied by adjectival stance markers.

(7) *In the long run, all political achievements in Kosovo can easily be undermined by inadequate economic recovery.*

(8) *We hope that, in due course, those and other measures will create the necessary environment to begin progress on the difficult, yet important, issue of status.*

A powerful social status does not necessarily translate into a powerful discourse; that is, not all UNSC veto-power members adopt a powerful language when delivering their
statements. Relatedly, a powerless social status does not invariably result into a powerless discourse; that is, some temporary members do engage in a more adversarial talk. As far the Kosovo debate was concerned, the discourse of three permanent members (France, Great Britain, China) was generally characterized by conciliatory remarks. Several linguistic devices were employed with a view to softening down the force of some utterances: abstract/process nouns (9) and nominalizations (10), which distance the speaker from the utterance; mental verbs (11); and indirect reference (12).

(9) We believe that direct dialogue should help to specifically improve daily lives in Kosovo for all its inhabitants. (France)

(10) The firm commitment of the self-governing provisional authorities of Kosovo is crucial to thwart the power of that type of crime. (France)

(11) China believes that the fundamental resolution of the question of Kosovo will require consultation and dialogue between Belgrade and Pristina. (China)

(12) Unilateral attempts (the agents are not specifically mentioned) to preempt the status issue are not helpful. (Great Britain)

The position adopted by the United States (permanent UNSC member) representative deserves further analysis due to the interplay of several linguistic devices that express directness and epistemic certainty. In most of the speakers' interventions, besides action verbs and transitivity, directness was also reflected in the use of the personal pronoun of solidarity and authority we. However, the statements delivered by the United States' representative on Kosovo before the UNSC exhibited a strong speaker presence which, besides we, was evident in the way in which the first person pronoun I was frequently employed (13 and 14). I generally indicates not only personal commitment to the utterance, but also authority (cf. Partington, 2003) which was sometimes highlighted by the emphatic auxiliary verb do (14).
I would also like to note that unilateral comments or declarations by neighboring governments or parties inside Kosovo about Kosovo’s future are premature and unhelpful.

I will be brief...but I do want to make a couple of points.

The powerful discursive projections are further accentuated by epistemic modality (15), affective and epistemic adverbial stance marking (15, 16 and 17), and by performative speech acts (16), which create a state of affairs by the fact of being uttered under appropriate circumstances, and which, therefore, exhibit strong pragmatic force.

These talks should be held primarily at the level of technical experts and deal with practical issues of mutual concern, such as energy and transportation.

First, obviously, we deplore and condemn the violence and attacks that have taken place in the last couple of months.

That certainly is the intent of my Government.

Strong and powerful speaker presence was also evident with some temporary UNSC members (the representative of Bulgaria, for instance) who relied on categorical assertions, epistemic modality and affective stance markers of importance (18) to project their power. Other interlocutors (the representative of Germany) resorted to specific and overt criticism (19) and epistemic adverbials (20) as means of asserting their power during the social process of institutional interaction.

The international presence in Kosovo, especially that of the United Nations, must categorically demonstrate to all local actors, regardless of their ethnic origin, that such behavior and the inspiration of violence are unacceptable and will not be tolerated by the international community.

The leaders in the region...have so far failed to take many of the difficult steps necessary to realize their ambitions...

Clearly, both sides have failed to meet their obligations.
As the analysis above suggests, the UNSC public political discourse is a major site for the construction, discussion and transmission of important political ideas. Shared and conflicting ideas are negotiated and constructed by UNSC members within a discursive framework characterized by multiple manifestations of power. As the following examples indicate, UNSC meanings and power projections are not entirely fixed but undergo perpetual redefinition and/or contestation with each speaker. Moreover, the construction of meanings is intertextual, in the sense that the meaning of the texts emerges from the text’s metareferential characteristics; in other words, texts are connected to numberless other texts to which they implicitly and explicitly relate. By making repeated references to multiple sources (21, 22 and 23), the statement of the Serbian UNSC representative with respect to Kosovo constructs a powerful semantic domain dominated by factual referentiality.

(21) In July, the Kosovo Force (KFOR) reported an increased number of incidents, stating that the Serbian population was the primary target of intimidation.

(22) ...neither the perpetrators of the Gorazdevac atrocity of 13 August, the killers of the Serb fisherman Dragan Tonic, who was killed on 11 August in Skulanovo, nor the Cernica bombers, have been apprehended.

(23) ...those responsible for the 3 August murder of UNMIK police officer Satish Menon have not been found.

In this instance, power in discourse does not necessarily stem from overt adversarial talk or frequent epistemic content, but from the inherent force of factual information that originates with several reliable sources – KFOR (21), the Serbian government (22), and the UN (23) and that serves as a powerful catalyst for making recommendations which display considerable epistemic load (24).

(24) ...the international community must be resolute in its stand that it will not be intimidated from fulfilling the mandate of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999).
In the speech delivered by the UNSC Serbian representative, the intertextual reference and factuality is often mediated by adverbial stance markers of affect and hedges (25 and 26, respectively) which contribute to enhancing the 'power' of facts, and which reflect the relative power position of the interlocutor.

(25) Regrettably, we witnessed even worse crimes in August...

(26) ...decisiveness with regard to improving the situation will boost the thus far highly unsatisfactory pace of return of refugees and internally displaced persons.

Discussions on the future status (autonomy or independence) of Kosovo, which is an autonomous province of Serbia that has a majority of Albanian Muslim population (roughly 90% of the total population in the province), elicited varied responses and power projections depending on the role and power of participants. Another party genuinely interested and involved in the statutory outcome for Kosovo is Albania, which, mainly due to ethnic and political considerations, supports Kosovo’s independence. The speech of the Albanian ambassador to the UN delivered before the UNSC followed the statement made by the Serbian ambassador and functioned as a balancing discursive act to the former. In other words, the ‘power’ of presenting negative facts which necessitates changed policies and a more aggressive involvement in solving the crisis is counterweighted by the ‘power’ of highlighting successes of current actions (27) and expressing satisfaction with the status-quo (28) that is, for Albania, conducive to a favorable resolution of the conflict.

(27) While evaluating the current situation in Kosovo, as a result of considerable transformations due to the commendable work of the United Nations and the United Nations Interim Administration in Kosovo, we are confident in saying that substantial progress has been achieved.

(28) There is an improved inter-ethnic environment as well, as has been demonstrated, for instance, by the appeal of the Kosovar leaders to all displaced persons to return to Kosovo
and to participate in the democratic processes and in the responsibility to rebuild together a new, multi-ethnic, free and democratic society.

In the case of the Albanian ambassador to the UN, strong speaker presence is evident not only in statements that indirectly refute previously uttered thoughts, but also in stanced utterances that code key elements - solidarity (29) consensus (30), disagreement (31) - of the power relationships between interlocutors.

(29) This conclusion has been realistically highlighted by the members of the Security Council and reflected in the reports of the Secretary-General as well.

(30) My government strongly believes that this mission will be carried out successfully and contribute to the further development of Kosovo and the implementation of the necessary standards before status.

(31) The latest incidents in Kosovo are tragic and intolerable. They should be explicitly condemned....However, these incidents cannot be condemned either by denying the substantial progress in Kosovo or by using it for political, electoral and nationalist interests.

Therefore, the expression of stance in UNSC discourse does provide insight into power relations, but, at the same time, the interpretation of stance needs to take context into account. Depending on the degree of the speakers' involvement in the issues discussed, the expression of stance often appears in the foreground, as some of the examples above have shown. UNSC representatives adopt multifarious political strategies and tactics that are reflected in their statements which highlight commitment to either substantive political change or the preservation of the status-quo, i.e. either to an adversarial or conciliatory talk. Interlocutors employ disparate argumentation and representational strategies and engage in various factual and evaluative assertions. Thus, power projections emerge as a result of the interplay of two major elements: the social (status and action) and the linguistic (specific linguistic items employed by interlocutors). The social and the linguistic spheres are inextricably linked, in the sense that language use reinforces or challenges structures of
power, which are political at the core. As the analysis above indicated, linguistic devices, such as epistemic or deontic modality, *adverbial stance marking*, action verbs to name but a few, contributed to the construction of a powerful or powerless linguistic space that specifies and facilitates power projections in discourse, and that looks at language as the “initiator and interpreter of power relations” (Lakoff, 1990, 13).
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to identify the frequency and function of adverbial stance markers in United Nations Security Council discourse and to explore the extent to which adverbial stance markers contributed to power representations in the United Nations Security Council discursive practices. At a more general level, this thesis contributed to the present understanding of the relation between language and politics and to the scholarly discussions on the role played by certain linguistic elements in the social and discursive expression of power projections. This concluding chapter revisits the research questions that guided this study, provides a brief summary of the findings presented in Chapter 4, discusses some limitations of the study, and offers suggestions for future research.

5.1. Research questions and overview of the results

In light of the results and discussion presented in Chapter 4, the research questions are reviewed and the results are summarized below.

5.1.1. Research Question 1

1. With what frequency are the most recurrent adverbial stance markers identified by Precht (2000) across registers found in the genre analyzed (UNSC meeting records)?

The most recurrent adverbial stance markers identified by Precht (2000) across registers displayed a relatively high frequency (compared to frequencies identified by Precht) in the UNSC discourse. In the UNSC meeting records corpus of more than 1,000,000 words, the target stance markers appeared 2604 times. Epistemic target stance markers were the most
frequent category, which indicates that UNSC discourse is characterized by a high degree of speaker certainty about the propositional content of utterances. Style adverbials were the second most frequent category, which shows that UNSC representatives often used these adverbials in order to stress the manner in which the information was delivered. Hedges accounted for the third most frequent category and were employed by discussants in order to add a qualifying tone to their commitment to the utterances. Affective stance adverbials represented the least frequent category, which is indicative of the fact that, due to institutional, conventionalized discursive practices, UNSC interlocutors often refrained from overtly emphasizing the affective component of their discourse.

5.1.2. Research Question 2

2. What is the role (grammatical and functional) of the 10% most frequent adverbial stance markers found in the genre?

The 10% (approximately) most frequent target stance markers identified in the corpus were the style adverbial indeed (308 occurrences), the epistemic adverbials of certainty of course (201 occurrences) and clearly (151 occurrences), the hedge extremely (144 occurrences), and the affective adverbial unfortunately (123 occurrences). After being determined as the 10% most frequent target stance markers in the corpus, these adverbials represented the object of comparison for most of the quantitative and qualitative analysis underlying the second research question.

The 10% most frequent adverbial stance markers found in the genre (i.e. the final stance markers indeed, of course, clearly, extremely, and unfortunately) appeared in various grammatical frames and displayed several functions. Three types of grammatical frames were
generally common among these adverbials: a. adverbial + sentence; b. copular verb +
adverbial, and c. auxiliary verb + adverbial, and general functional characteristics were
recurrent. Final stance markers in sentence initial position (adverbial + sentence) added
cohesion to the discourse and framed subsequent propositions/clauses. Adverbials
postmodifying a copular verb copular verb + adverbial) brought emphasis and relevance to
the utterances, whereas stance markers postmodifying an auxiliary verb (auxiliary verb +
adverbial) highlighted the action represented by the main verb. According to semantic and
pragmatic characteristics, the final stance markers displayed the following functions: the
epistemic stance markers of course and clearly expressed the speaker’s level of certainty
about the proposition and occurred frequently in semantic domains that reflected irrefutable
statements; the style adverbial indeed signaled speakers’ awareness of the effect their
utterances might have on the listeners; interlocutors used the hedge extremely in order to
stress and assess the extent of a certain characteristic mentioned in the discourse; the
affective stance marker unfortunately conveyed the speakers’ evaluation or comment of the
proposition.

5.1.3. Research Question 3

3. To what extent do adverbial stance markers reflect/contribute to representations of
power relations in the type of discourse investigated?

From the analysis provided in Chapter 4, it may be speculated that adverbial stance markers
do contribute, to some degree, to power representations and negotiations in United Nations
Security Council discourse. The Results and Discussion Chapter has shown that UNSC
representatives project their power both socially (through political participation) and
linguistically (through the use of specific linguistic items). Among the linguistic items (such as nominalizations, action verbs, epistemic modality, intensifiers etc.) that played a role in the expression of powerful or powerless discourses, adverbial stance markers emerged as useful discursive tools in the construction of certain power repertoires. On the one hand, stance adverbials were employed by interlocutors in order to enhance powerful rhetoric, to add emphasis to powerful, critical references, to reinforce discourses of contestation, or to highlight the inherent force of factual information that originated in reliable sources. On the other hand, adverbial stance markers were also used by UNSC speakers in order to tone down powerful rhetoric; these devices represented useful discursive tools that, sometimes, interlocutors appealed to in order to project conciliatory talk that fitted more with the dominant institutional paradigm characterized by deference and formality.

5.2. Limitations

The present study examined the relationship between language and politics in a certain type of institutional discourse – UNSC discourse. While the findings provided useful data for the analysis of this specific type of political discourse, they have a narrow scope in the sense that they are not generalizable over the entire landscape of political discourse. Moreover, since the UN itself is a political institution with several bodies that display competing discourses, no claim for generalizability over the entire UN discourse can be made. The results and the analyses included in this paper apply solely to the limited spectrum of UNSC discourse.

The investigation of the frequency and function of adverbial stance markers in UNSC discourse revealed that many properties that distinguish discursive practices were in fact contextual. Contextual features were also pivotal in the definition of the dominant discursive
practices and power projections that were addressed in light of the third research question. In other words, many of the functions displayed by adverbial stance markers as well as their role in the discursive expression of power are context-bound and, therefore, generalizable only in the scope of the corresponding contexts.

UNSC discourse, like most type of discourses, is ongoingly constituted and reconstituted along paradigmatic lines. The dominant discursive paradigm underlying UNSC remains formal and deferential, with few critical inserts. However, the neutral discursive formalism is sometimes replaced by adversarial talk since interactions between participants take place within certain power frameworks. While analyzing how power frameworks are reflected or constituted in language use, the researcher focused on two main variables: one social and one linguistic (as shown in Chapter 4). Nevertheless, due to the scope of this research, two other important variables were purposefully set aside: the cultural aspect of discourse and the gender of the participants. First, the culture of participants may play a significant role in the shaping of discourse (cf. Scollon & Scollon, 2001), even within international institutions with deep-rooted conventionalized practices such as the United Nations. To some extent, discursive practices are culturally-laden and this aspect may be conducive to certain interactive experiences and power projections. Second, as Shaw (2000) pointed out, the gender of participants may affect their construction as more or less powerful participants in the debate.

5.3. Suggestions for further research

Future research based on the structure of this paper may take several forms. First, further studies could look at the larger spectrum of UN discourse by investigating comparatively
other discourses within the UN and by expanding the focus of the research so as to cover the above-mentioned cultural and gender variables. In addition, the expression of stance in UN political discourse might include a more in-depth analysis of stance markers belonging to several lexical categories (e.g. adjectives, nouns, verbs).

Second, further inquiry may address the larger framework of political discourse in a comparative study of stance marking in the discourses of various political institutions, such as the United States Congress, the British Parliament, or the European Union Parliament. This type of research would involve both cross-institutional and cross-cultural perspectives. Third, it is hoped that the findings of this study open new avenues for inquiry into the discursive practices underlying institutional and personal talk. For instance, it could be very useful to conduct a deeper analysis to understand the extent to which speakers express their feelings and attitudes and adjust their discourses to their interlocutors, the situation, as well as to their own end-goals as personal selves, as well as institutional actors.

Fourth, it might be beneficial to take into consideration the cognitive aspects involved in the expression of stance and the projection of power as well. Power representations and perceptions are also cognitively-based, and an inquiry into both the mental and discursive processes that construct and reconstruct political practices and structures would provide a fuller specification of institutional political language and behavior.
APPENDIX A. FREQUENCIES OF TARGET STANCE MARKERS BY CATEGORY

1. Affective stance markers

a. Frequency of affective target stance markers of opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>adverbial</th>
<th>freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>unfortunately</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>fortunately</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>perfectly</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>ideally</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Frequency of affective target stance markers of importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>adverbial</th>
<th>freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ultimately</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>primarily</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>significantly</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>mainly</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Epistemic stance markers

a. Frequency of epistemic target stance markers expressing certainty/doubt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>adverbial</th>
<th>freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>of course</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>clearly</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>truly</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>perhaps</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>certainly</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>undoubtedly</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>obviously</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>absolutely</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>surely</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>probably</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>apparently</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. The frequency of the other epistemic target stance markers, expressing source of information and actuality, was the following: source of information: according to: 75 hits; actuality: actually: 66 hits; in fact: 95 hits.

3. **Hedges**

Frequency of target hedges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>adverbial</th>
<th>freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>generally</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>approximately</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>nearly</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>relatively</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>hardly</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>virtually</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>practically</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>normally</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>predominantly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>typically</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Style adverbials**

Frequency of style target stance markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>adverbial</th>
<th>freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>indeed</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>simply</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>seriously</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>briefly</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>personally</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>strictly</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>basically</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>literally</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>honestly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B. COLLOCATE FREQUENCIES FOR THE FINAL STANCE MARKERS

1. **indeed**

Collocate frequency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-left</th>
<th>1-left</th>
<th>1-right</th>
<th>2-right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>council</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>did</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **of course**

Collocate frequency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-left</th>
<th>1-left</th>
<th>1-right</th>
<th>2-right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>council</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>including</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>matter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **clearly**

Collocate frequency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-left</th>
<th>1-left</th>
<th>1-right</th>
<th>2-right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **extremely**

Collocate frequency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-left</th>
<th>1-left</th>
<th>1-right</th>
<th>2-right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>for</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>are</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **unfortunately**

Collocate frequency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-left</th>
<th>1-left</th>
<th>1-right</th>
<th>2-right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>And</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Palestinian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>That</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>There</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Which</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Terrorist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>It</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C. THE KOSOVO DEBATE

The complete UNSC document analyzed for RQ3 is reproduced below.
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The meeting was called to order at 11.35 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.


The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Albania, Italy and Serbia and Montenegro, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sahovic (Serbia and Montenegro) took a seat at the Council table. Mr. Nesho (Albania) and Mr. Spatafora (Italy) took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: In order to optimize the use of our time, I will not individually invite speakers to take seats at the Council table. When a speaker is taking the floor, the Conference Officer will seat the next speaker on the list at the table.

In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations and in the absence of objection, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Hedi Annabi, Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations.

There being no objection, it is so decided. I invite Mr. Annabi to take a seat at the Council table.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations. I would like to appeal to all those who intend to speak...and it is a very formidable list for as much brevity as possible, please. And if colleagues have already made points, it would be hugely appreciated, not just by the Chair but by other colleagues, if we could show agreement with what has been said and forego the urge to repeat it. I say that because it is the intention of the presidency, in response to a formal request that we have received, to convene this afternoon at 3 p.m. at the ambassadorial level in formal consultations on the situation in the Middle East. Given the agenda we have today this is no disrespect whatever to this item. I think a measure of brevity would help us all.
I now invite Mr. Annabi, Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, to brief the Council on the current situation with respect to the item on the agenda.

Mr. Annabi: Thank you, Mr. President, for giving us the opportunity to brief the Council on developments in Kosovo over the past two months. During this period, Mr. Holkeri took up his responsibilities as the new Special Representative of the Secretary-General. Upon his arrival in Pristina, Mr. Holkeri held a first round of meetings with representatives of the Kosovo Provisional Institutions and local political leaders from all communities. Mr. Holkeri also had meetings with the political leadership in Belgrade.

The Special Representative has reaffirmed the commitment of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) to the standards before status policy framework and its focus on progress towards achieving the benchmarks for implementation of this policy. Mr. Holkeri is also preparing an operational plan for the implementation of the benchmarks, which is being drawn up jointly by UNMIK and the Kosovo Provisional Institutions.

Mr. Holkeri has strongly emphasized the importance of initiating direct and constructive dialogue on practical matters of mutual interest between Pristina and Belgrade. During his meetings with representatives of the Kosovo Provisional Institutions and the political leadership in Belgrade, Mr. Holkeri sought their respective views on issues relating to the proposed dialogue. He consistently underlined during those discussions that the dialogue should focus on concrete issues which serve the needs of the people and are in the interests of all sides. Preparations for this dialogue are under way, and Mr. Holkeri is planning to propose modalities for the dialogue in the coming weeks.

With regard to the security situation, the period since July has been characterized by a number of violent attacks and shootings, which have occurred throughout Kosovo, primarily targeting the Kosovo Serb community, as well as UNMIK law enforcement authorities.

As we informed the Council on 13 August, two Kosovo Serb youths were killed and four injured in a shooting incident aimed at those youths, who were swimming in a river near the village of Gorazdevac in the Pec region. On 18 August, a Kosovo Serb male, who had been shot in the head on 11 August, died of his wounds. Two Kosovo Serbs were also injured in a shooting on 26 August at the returns site of Bica, near Klina in the Pec region. On 31 August, four Kosovo Serbs were injured and one killed in an explosive attack in the village of Cemica in the Gnjilane region. UNMIK Police and KFOR have increased security in these areas following the incidents and are continuing to investigate those crimes.

All Kosovo political leaders made statements condemning the attacks and inviting the public to help find the perpetrators. The Special Representative, Mr. Holkeri, called upon them to show greater resolve in calling for an end to violence and in using their authority to support all efforts to bring the perpetrators to justice. The Special Representative has also appealed to the general public to do all it can to assist the law enforcement authorities in efforts to apprehend those responsible for the incidents.
Those violent incidents have further raised feelings of insecurity among Kosovo Serbs, and there have been signs of an increase in inter-ethnic tension. Although protests against the incidents in Kosovo Serb communities have largely been peaceful, there have been instances of intimidation and harassment in both Kosovo Albanian and Kosovo Serb communities. In addition, many regular inter-ethnic meetings and multi-ethnic events have been cancelled or boycotted by Kosovo Serb and/or Kosovo Albanian representatives out of fear for their security. The past two months have also seen an increase in violent incidents directed against UNMIK law enforcement personnel and property. On 3 August, an UNMIK international police officer was murdered in a sniper attack in the northern part of Kosovo. On 6 September, an off-duty Kosovo Police Service (KPS) officer was also murdered near Djakovica. On 10 September, another KPS officer was shot and injured in Pristina, and a person who was with him was killed.

Property used by the police and judiciary, including an UNMIK police station, UNMIK vehicles and the Pristina district court, were damaged in explosions and other attacks. No one has claimed responsibility for any of these attacks. The majority of local politicians and representatives of the Provisional Institutions have made statements condemning the incidents.

Some of those attacks came after the conviction, on 16 July, of four former Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) members for war crimes committed primarily against fellow Kosovo Albanians during 1998 and 1999. The decision was the first conviction of former KLA members for war crimes. The initial negative reaction among the general public and local media coverage subsided quickly. On 4 September, inmates of the Dubrava Prison, which is Kosovo’s largest detention facility, occupied a prison block in protest against living conditions, and refused to return to their cells, despite reassurances from UNMIK officials that their complaints would be addressed and that no disciplinary action would be taken against them. Following the prison guards’ attempt to enter the occupied block, the prisoners set fire to their mattresses. Five prisoners died and a further 16 were injured in the ensuing fire. A police investigation into the incident was launched immediately, and an independent inquiry will look into its causes and provide recommendations.

As regards political developments, owing to the summer recess the period has seen a lull in legislative and Government activity in Pristina. The Kosovo Assembly reconvened on 4 September. Since July, the Government has focused on legislative development and the security situation. It has not taken up the initiation of direct dialogue with Belgrade. On 27 August, the Serbian Parliament endorsed a declaration on Kosovo and Metohija, and on 5 September the Parliament of Serbia and Montenegro adopted a resolution on Kosovo and Metohija. Kosovo Albanian leaders were critical of these documents, particularly the references to Kosovo’s status. Kosovo Albanian leaders have also stated that such moves have strained chances of direct dialogue with Belgrade. On 3 September the Kosovo Government publicly expressed its concern over the adoption of the Serbian declaration, and stated its intention to build an independent State.
With regard to returns and inter-ethnic relations, although the level of returns remains low, minority returns continue to exceed those in 2002. In the past two months, some promised funding from several major donors was received, and work on returns projects began. In addition, almost 150 cases have been referred to the Rapid Response Returns Facility, which is a joint project by UNMIK and the United Nations Development Programme providing housing reconstruction assistance for individual returnees. The security situation has, however, heightened the level of fear within the Serb community leading to delays in returns efforts and the possibility that more returns might be postponed until next spring.

Kosovo’s political leaders have expressed support for returns, including, as previously reported, through an open letter published on 2 July in Kosovo’s major dailies in which they encouraged displaced persons of all ethnicities to return. On 10 July, the Kosovo Assembly also held a session dedicated to minority returns and adopted a resolution backing returns and emphasizing the need for Kosovo’s Government to support return and reintegration activities. On 21 August, Kosovo Prime Minister Rexhepi committed to funding 7 million euros for return activities from the 2002 Kosovo Consolidated Budget surplus funds, and emphasized that this contribution by the Provisional Institutions was intended to demonstrate the Government’s commitment to minority communities in the wake of the recent security incidents.

Kosovo President Rugova and Prime Minister Rexhepi have also traveled to returns sites to show their public support for the returns process. However, statements and concrete support for returns at the central level have not, by and large, been replicated at the municipal level. Cooperation on returns projects has been productive in a number of municipalities, but the actions of some municipal officials in the areas affected by violence against Kosovo Serbs have not been conducive to reconciliation.

Turning to local self-government, political infighting, primarily between Kosovo Albanian parties in a number of municipalities, continued to negatively affect the ability of local authorities to deliver effective local government. Also, financing for minority communities from municipal budgets remains poor and, as of the end of June, only six of Kosovo’s 26 mixed municipalities had met their required fair-share financing levels in the areas of municipal administration, health and education. UNMIK is working with the Kosovo Ministry of Finance and Economy on developing modalities to address this outstanding problem.

In Mitrovica UNMIK has focused on promoting inter-ethnic activities and dialogue. However, Kosovo Serb members of the northern Mitrovica advisory board have not yet started participating officially in the meetings. With regard to the economy, bids for the two successive sets of tenders for the privatization of socially owned enterprises were opened by the Kosovo Trust Agency on 14 July and 2 September. A total of 24 enterprises have now been tendered for privatization, and the amount in bids received has reached over 29 million euros. On 6 September, the first three contracts for the privatization of socially owned enterprises were signed. On 1 July, the second meeting of the Kosovo stabilization and association process tracking mechanism took place in Pristina. During the meeting, European
Commission experts, UNMIK and the Provisional Institutions discussed aspects of justice and home affairs, media policy, telecommunications and transport policy, and made recommendations to ensure conformity with established European Union norms and standards.

UNMIK and KFOR have continued to take action against suspected extremist elements in the Kosovo Protection Corps (KPC). An enquiry is ongoing in order to identify those members of the KPC with possible links to extremist organizations and criminal groups. Following interviews with 50 members of the KPC, a total of 18 officers have been recommended for dismissal. One of the 18 has already resigned and a second has been dismissed for a separate disciplinary offence. The head of the KPC has suspended a further seven of those on the list, referring the cases to UNMIK police for further investigation.

In conclusion, I wish to say that, under Mr. Holkeri’s leadership, UNMIK will remain committed to fully implementing Security Council resolution 1244 (1999) and to working with all interlocutors to achieve progress on the benchmarks within the standards before status policy framework. A priority at this time is to initiate the dialogue on practical matters of mutual concern between Pristina and Belgrade. Through that dialogue practical benefits can be realized for the people of Kosovo, with a view to developing an atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence. Mr. Holkeri is actively engaged in pursuing this matter in consultation with all parties concerned. At the same time, he is trying to manage the competing interests and unilateral pronouncements of parties concerned, which are not always conducive to the initiation of that dialogue. We also remain concerned about the security situation in Kosovo. In that connection, we shall continue to emphasize the need for everyone to do their part in stopping the violence. The Council’s continued and active support has been, and will continue to be, crucial in realizing those objectives.

The President: I have 18 speakers on my list. I would like to suggest to colleagues to aim to conclude by 1 p.m. That would actually be quite a sensible objective. If that were acceptable, the logical consequence would allow three minutes, on average, per intervention. I state those two facts, and I will now go through the list. But I shall live in hope.

Mr. Khalid (Pakistan): I will start right away. First of all, I thank Mr. Annabi for his briefing. During last month’s meeting on this subject we welcomed Mr. Holkeri’s assumption of the post of Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Kosovo. He has taken over his responsibilities at what no doubt is a difficult and crucial time, given the recent murders in Gorazdevac and increasing ethnic tensions in Kosovo.

In the interest of time, I shall just confine my comments to the mandate of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and the role that it should play in Kosovo. UNMIK is a unique mission in many respects. While it is a peacekeeping mission, administration, capacity-building and development are among the vital components of its mandate. Given those responsibilities and its finite resources and capacities, UNMIK therefore needs to develop a clearly focused, but realistic, policy agenda. In developing any
policy initiative, UNMIK must consult local government officials and gain their confidence. No such initiatives are likely to succeed fully without the ownership of Kosovar officials.

In that regard, some of the issues UNMIK must urgently address include security and the rule of law. There is also a need to reinvigorate the Transfer Council and to utilize it to incorporate officials from the Provisional Institutions in areas of UNMIK’s reserved authority. UNMIK should also allow Kosovo Government officials to manage some of the budgetary and financial responsibilities, in line with chapter 5 of the Constitutional Framework. In addition to giving greater autonomy to the Provisional Institutions, UNMIK must also work proactively to promote the socio-economic development and reconstruction of Kosovo. In the long run, all political achievements in Kosovo can easily be undermined by inadequate economic recovery.

The comments I have just made are aimed at enabling UNMIK to improve its performance. At the same time, we will continue to urge UNMIK to make whatever progress that can be made in terms of building confidence between different communities, the return of refugees and the protection of minorities. We also encourage UNMIK to continue to work for greater dialogue, at least initially on administrative matters between Belgrade and Pristina. We hope that, in due course, those and other measures will create the necessary environment to begin progress on the difficult, yet important, issue of status.

Mr. Gatilov (Russian Federation) (spoke in Russian): We are grateful to Assistant Secretary-General Hedi Annabi for his substantive briefing on the situation in Kosovo. Russia’s views on the processes under way in the province are well known, and very much agree with the assessments voiced by Mr. Annabi.

We believe that, despite certain advances that have, to a great extent, been achieved by virtue of international efforts, the situation in the province continues to be a complex one. Implementation is lacking with regard to key requirements of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999), particularly with respect to the situation of Kosovo’s non-Albanian inhabitants and the return of refugees and internally displaced persons. There is neither reliable nor equitable safety for all of the province’s population. There is an absence of fundamental freedoms and rights and inter-ethnic tolerance. Only weak efforts are under way to combat local and cross-border crime and corruption.

Regrettably, over the last month Kosovo has once again been engulfed by a crime wave that has clear ethnic underpinnings. The most blatant of those acts was the armed attack of 13 August against Serbian school children in Gorazdevac. Participants in the meeting of the Contact Group held in Moscow on 4 September issued a statement condemning that barbaric act as well as other incidents in Kosovo that have produced victims among the civilian population. Such acts of violence have no justification under any circumstances. Murder is the instrument of terrorism, and those who perpetrate such crimes are murderers. That must be said straight out.
We cannot stand by idly as terrorists attempt to destabilize the situation in individual countries and entire regions. With regard to Kosovo, there is no doubt that this has to do with yet another manifestation of terrorism that, given the realities in Kosovo, is particularly dangerous, as it increases tensions in an already complex inter-ethnic relationship. Such incidents could provoke a chain reaction with extremely negative consequences for a settlement in the province.

We note the steps taken by the international presences aimed at apprehending the criminals and bringing them to trial. We are grateful to the head of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), Mr. Holkeri, for his prompt reactions to events. We are certain that the leaders of the Provisional Institutions of Self-Government and leading Kosovo politicians will provide active assistance to the investigations and reaffirm in practice their commitment to their declared goal of building a multi-ethnic, democratic society in the province.

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General faces complex challenges in restoring the multi-ethnic nature of the province. We support the priorities he has identified, including normalizing the situation in the province, ensuring the rule of law, resolving problems related to the return of refugees and internally displaced persons, and economic recovery. Of key importance are the implementation of the principle of standards before status, which seeks to ensure the essential basic democratic conditions in Kosovo and the establishment of appropriate mechanisms to that end. The implementation of these obligations must be under continuous international oversight.

The achievement of these goals will be furthered by the prompt launching, with constructive international assistance, of a direct dialogue between Belgrade and Pristina on technical issues of mutual interest. We believe that the primary mediation role in this process must be played by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, in close cooperation with the Contact Group and the European Union.

We urge UNMIK to assume a more active and consistent position in countering any manifestations of inter-ethnic intolerance and crime, to stem the growth of radical movements in the province and to consolidate legality there. The meeting in Moscow of the Contact Group, with the involvement of Mr. Holkeri, confirmed the convergence of approaches of all the essential international participants in the settlement towards the order and substance of measures to be taken in this field. We note in particular the clearly established consensus view that any discussion on the future status of Kosovo would be premature at this juncture and that any attempt to prejudice the resolution of this issue would be unacceptable.

For its part, Russia intends actively to continue participating in overall efforts to seek a just, balanced and lasting solution to the Kosovo problem.
Mr. Tafrov (Bulgaria) (spoke in French): I wish to thank Mr. Annabi for his very factual and comprehensive briefing and to reiterate my country’s full support for the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Holkeri. We again call on all parties to cooperate with him in his extremely complex and difficult task.

As a country associated with the European Union, Bulgaria fully supports the statement to be made shortly on behalf of the Union by the Ambassador of Italy. As a country of the region, located in close proximity to Kosovo, Bulgaria wishes to make a few additional comments. Bulgaria once again categorically condemns the acts of violence referred to earlier by Mr. Annabi, in which innocent people, including a police officer, were killed. Bulgaria believes that all such acts are acts of ethnic violence and that attacks on the representatives of international institutions in the province merely undermine the efforts of local and international actors working for Kosovo’s future and to normalize life for all its inhabitants. Bulgaria again recalls that such acts can in no way improve the positions of parties to negotiations, merely delay the normalization process and serve the interests only of the very few who thrive on disorder and organized crime. Violence is surely not in the interests of the legitimate political representatives in Kosovo, much less those of ordinary people.

That is why we believe that the full cooperation of the Kosovo Provisional Institutions of Self-Government with police investigations and the prosecution of the perpetrators of these acts of violence will provide evidence of their readiness to shoulder the burden of the genuine management of the province’s affairs. In this respect, we would recall that Bulgaria remains very interested in the investigation of the murder of Valentin Krumov, a Bulgarian international civil servant killed in Pristina in 1999.

Bulgaria continues to follow with interest and concern these acts of ethnic intolerance, which hamper reconciliation among the ethnic communities and the return of refugees to their homes. We believe that the international presence in Kosovo, especially that of the United Nations, must categorically demonstrate to all local actors, regardless of their ethnic origin, that such behavior and the inspiration of violence are unacceptable and will not be tolerated by the international community.

Mr. Cunningham (United States of America): I will be brief, as you requested, Sir, but I do want to make a couple of points.

First, obviously we deplore and condemn the violence and attacks that have taken place in the last couple of months. I am afraid that this reminds all of us again of the primacy of establishing the rule of law in Kosovo. This is something that the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) is working hard to achieve and which I hope we all will support.

We believe that the way forward in general is to focus on proceeding with the standards before status approach. This appears to us to be well poised to go ahead. We encourage UNMIK and those involved to move ahead with it. The achievement of the standards that
have been set out is essential to a better life for all Kosovars as we move forward and the United States, for its part, will continue to offer technical expertise to support that process.

We also urge the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to convene officials from Belgrade and Pristina as soon as possible in order to begin a dialogue on practical matters. We think this is important. These talks should be held primarily at the level of technical experts and deal with practical issues of mutual concern, such as energy and transportation.

I would also like to note that unilateral comments or declarations by neighboring Governments or parties inside Kosovo about Kosovo’s future are premature and unhelpful. Attempts to prejudge final status only distract from the important work at hand of implementing the standards and beginning the direct dialogue on practical matters. That is where the focus should be, we believe. We hope that all leaders of the region will focus on helping Mr. Holkeri as he sets about his very important and complicated new tasks. That certainly is the intention of my Government.

Mrs. D.Achon (France) (spoke in French): I also thank Mr. Hedi Annabi for his very thorough briefing. France renews its firm condemnation of the acts of violence carried out in Kosovo this past month. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General and certain delegations have categorized those acts as terrorist and their perpetrators as terrorists. Those crimes must not erode our determination to make progress in implementing Security Council resolution 1244 (1999), with the assistance of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), the Kosovo Force (KFOR) and all concerned parties.

We must also continue the fight against organized crime. It is becoming a major scourge, and it constitutes a threat not only to the security of all the inhabitants of Kosovo, but also to regional stability and Europe as a whole.

The firm commitment of the self-governing provisional authorities of Kosovo is crucial to thwart the power of that type of crime. We will judge their ability to exercise their entrusted responsibilities in keeping with specific results.

The renewed violence also means that we need to remain vigilant in terms of the amount of international force for security deployed in Kosovo. KFOR must continue to have sufficient means to meet its mission. I would recall here that France continues to be one of the leading troop contributors in Kosovo and that its soldiers are deployed in very exposed areas.

In that tense context, we reaffirm our full trust in and support for the new Special Representative of the Secretary-General to continue implementation of resolution 1244 (1999). We are convinced that the standards before status formula continues to be fully valid. As Mr. Annabi has stated, Mr. Holkeri will shortly make proposals to make those standards more operational. We have full confidence in him to define, together with the self-governing provisional authorities of Kosovo, the best way to advance, without delay, in areas such as
the rule of law, public order, respect for minorities and the return of refugees and displaced persons.

Finally, we have full confidence in Mr. Holkeri to define the modalities by which there will at long last be established between Pristina and Belgrade a direct, sustained dialogue on practical issues of common interests. We believe that that direct dialogue should help to specifically improve daily lives in Kosovo for all its inhabitants.

Mr. Zinser (Mexico) (spoke in Spanish): My delegation does not want to miss this opportunity to address members of the Council to express our deepest sorrow at the death of a great friend of Mexico, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sweden, Mrs. Anna Lindh. It is a deplorable loss, and we join in what other members of the Council have said.

We also thank Mr. Hedi Annabi for his briefing, analyzing the latest developments in and prospects for consolidating peace in Kosovo.

Scarcely three weeks ago, the Council examined the topic that we are addressing today. On that occasion, we met as the result of a criminal act aimed against the principle establishing multi-ethnicity as the formula for coexistence within the province. On 26 August, near Klina in the Pec region, another armed attack was carried out against the Serbian minority. On 31 August, there were two explosions in the town of Cernica, leaving one person dead and three wounded. My delegation condemns once again those types of acts and wishes to share its deep concern that those atrocities are recurring themes that we encounter every time that we discuss Kosovo.

For that reason, we wish to say that, in Mexico’s opinion, the road to a prosperous and tolerant Kosovo, where law and respect for human rights prevail, is the road that the extremist groups do not want to take. Therefore, those types of acts that promote hatred and anarchy must be stopped.

The international community formed an outstanding strategic alliance with respect to Kosovo. Substantial human and financial resources and political will have been invested in the effort of reconstruction and reconciliation. That effort must be maintained, and we must achieve the objective set by the Security Council.

Therefore, the Council must not confine itself to condemning acts of violence. We must confront the causes that bring them about, as a first step, in order to implement later concrete strategies to prevent their recurrence in the future. Mexico considers that the strategy must be comprehensive, addressing simultaneously questions of education, security, development and the administration of justice.

In the area of education, activities and programmes must be promoted at all levels that foster mutual understanding of cultures, religions and customs and mutual feedback between ethnic groups as a basis for cultural understanding and coexistence. The normalization of life in the
province is the responsibility of all Kosovars. There cannot be genuine coexistence while there is mistrust.

Regardless of ethnic origin or religious beliefs, all Kosovars are jointly responsible for forging that inclusive future. Accordingly, we must even more decisively support the promotion of the return of refugees and internally displaced persons to their homes under secure and normal conditions.

It is also necessary that the self-governing provisional institutions earn the trust and respect of the entire population, and the only way to do that is to work in accordance with the law, with transparency and a sense of equity and justice. In that context, Mexico has viewed as positive measures the recent suspension of seven members from the Kosovo Protection Corps and the disciplinary action against eight others on suspicions of links to organized crime and extremist groups.

Mexico notes with satisfaction the efforts undertaken by Mr. Harri Holkeri, Head of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), to initiate soon the Belgrade-Pristina dialogue on practical issues. Forging a mechanism for direct dialogue will undoubtedly depend on progress being made in political, social and economic items for mutual understanding among all inhabitants of the province.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the illicit traffic in weapons and the volume of such weapons among the population of Kosovo is a source of concern and should become a cause of major attention by the Council. Mexico believes that the traffic in and the possession of weapons should be restricted to the full extent possible, since their very existence can promote social violence. We therefore welcome the third programme of arms amnesty, organized by the United Nations, which will be held in September.

In Mexico’s view, to the extent that there exists in Kosovo a will for dialogue, there will be a future and irrational acts will be relegated to the past.

Mr. Sow (Guinea) (spoke in French): I should like to thank Mr. Annabi, whose detailed and comprehensive briefing will help us in our exchange of views on the development of the situation in Kosovo.

Four years after the temporary freezing of Kosovo’s status, the record of the activities of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) in that province appears mixed, despite Mr. Holkeri’s praiseworthy dedication. We must welcome the progress made at the political and administrative levels, but the recovery of the economy, the return of refugees and the restitution of property, as well as the establishment of the rule of law and the problem of security, remain sources of concern.

At the economic level, despite the improvement of the legislative and administrative framework, greater attention must be devoted to job creation and to promoting regional
exchanges. With regard to the return of refugees, the restitution of property and the issue of disappeared persons, we call for a strengthening of ongoing efforts aimed at the proper functioning of established mechanisms. In addition, the absence of dialogue among communities and the increase in inter-ethnic violence, crime and insecurity affect the long-sought restoration of the rule of law. The murders of civilians this summer, which we condemn and deplore, indicate to us that the situation is still not stable. Measures such as strengthening police and judicial structures are a priority. The reorganization and transformation of the Kosovo Protection Corps into a multi-ethnic body specializing in emergency interventions is also in keeping with that obligation.

Furthermore, my delegation notes that, in the framework of improving the current situation prevailing in Kosovo, other elements of key importance must be taken into consideration. Those are, inter alia, the dialogue between Pristina and Belgrade; the regional approach; cooperation among UNMIK, Kosovo’s elected officials and the Serbia and Montenegro authorities; extending UNMIK’s authority throughout the province and, finally, mobilizing the resources essential for Kosovo’s harmonious development.

We urge the parties to do their utmost to facilitate the opening of the negotiations planned for this fall between Belgrade and Pristina. Direct dialogue between the Serbian and Albanian communities must not remain wishful thinking; it must become a reality on the ground and be the driving force for peaceful development of the Balkans region.

I cannot conclude without emphasizing the paramount role that the various Kosovar components must play in the quest for solutions to the problems of the province. The effectiveness of the international community’s support, which remains necessary, depends on that.

Mr. Maquieira (Chile) (spoke in Spanish): Like previous speakers, I shall be brief. At the outset, I thank Mr. Annabi for his briefing, which informed us of Mr. Holkeri’s activities in Kosovo. At our last meeting on this item we expressed our satisfaction at the assignment of Mr. Holkeri, who had an outstanding term as President of the General Assembly a number of years ago. We trust that the contacts Mr. Holkeri has established with a broad range of local political officials in Kosovo will bear the fruit wished for by everyone, in conformity with resolution 1244 (1999).

We believe that Kosovo today is at a crucial stage. On the one hand, we note significant progress in achieving a substantial degree of autonomy, especially the gradual transfer of authority and of non-reserved responsibilities, in keeping with chapter 5 of the Constitutional Framework. That process must continue. However, a series of deplorable acts of violence, all occurring during the period in question, resulting in deaths and injuries would seem to continue to tarnish the process. We condemn those acts of violence in the most emphatic terms.
In addition to voicing our concern at those violent incidents and at crimes against minorities, we should like to say that in our view they must not and cannot derail the peace process. All manifestations of ethnically motivated violence, harassment and discrimination run counter to the achievement of a multi-ethnic Kosovo and violate the spirit of resolution 1244 (1999). We acknowledge the measures undertaken by the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) to find and bring to justice the perpetrators of those acts. We firmly believe that without the significant and sustainable return of internally displaced persons and refugees, the building of a multi-ethnic democratic society capable of integrating all of Kosovo’s inhabitants is impossible.

We agree with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the implementation of a plan to operationalize the points of reference within the framework of the standards before status policy, and, in relation to Kosovo’s final status, we call on the parties to avoid any implicit or explicit form of provocation.

Finally, we urge the parties to deepen and broaden the dialogue. We welcome Mr. Holkeri’s statements concerning closer dialogue between Belgrade and Pristina. Without that dialogue, or without dialogue between UNMIK and the Kosovo Assembly, the achievement of concrete results with respect to the major challenges is a distant prospect. I hope I have kept within three minutes, Mr. President.

Ms. Menendez (Spain) (spoke in Spanish): Many thanks to Mr. Annabi. Italy will speak shortly on behalf of the European Union, so I shall confine myself to making three points.

First, less than a month ago, we met here and condemned the terrorist crime against Kosovo Serb children. Regrettably, we note that ethnic and political acts of violence have not ceased. We hope that the perpetrators will be prosecuted and convicted. The crimes committed cannot go unpunished. Kosovo’s future depends on the establishment of security. Security is important for economic recovery, but it is also essential for building a democratic and tolerant society and for the process of the return of Kosovo’s citizens of non-Albanian origin. In that connection, we hope that the open letter inviting displaced persons to return to Kosovo will translate into a reality.

Secondly, we hope that Mr. Holkeri enjoys success at the head of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK). He has our full support, but obviously he must also have the support and cooperation of the Pristina and Belgrade authorities. We reiterate once again that we fully agree with the policy promoted by UNMIK, in conformity with the standards before status principle.

Thirdly and finally, we find the public statements of the political leaders to be very disturbing. Positions that are contrary to resolution 1244 (1999) cannot in any way be allowed to be publicly and constantly promoted. We condemn any attempt to create mono-ethnic institutions, and we call for the dismantling of any still-functioning parallel
administrative structures. We must actively encourage participation in the Assembly and the Transfer Council by Kosovars of non-Albanian origin.

Spain hopes to see the appeal made in Thessaloniki for dialogue between Belgrade and Pristina become a reality. The leaders of both parties must stop placing preconditions on that dialogue and must begin it as soon as possible.

Mr. Gaspar Martins (Angola): First of all, I should like to thank you, Mr. President, for convening this meeting and to thank Mr. Annabi for his briefing, which provided us with an update on the situation in Kosovo.

We regret that the meaningful progress achieved at the institutional level by the political process in Kosovo, with the gradual transfer of competencies to the Provisional Institutions of Self-Government, is not matched by similar progress in the security sphere. The complex situation still faced by Kosovo is a matter of some concern.

My delegation strongly condemns the recent acts of violence. As briefed by Mr. Annabi this morning, the murder of children and the daily intimidation of vulnerable persons are an attack against the crucial process of democratic reforms. Those acts must not be allowed to undermine the peace process and the efforts to build a multi-ethnic and democratic society in Kosovo. We appeal for an immediate end to violence.

We would like to underline that it is the responsibility of Kosovo leaders to decisively curb ethnic violence. We urge them to work with the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) with a view to improving the security situation in Kosovo, particularly through the strengthening of local police and by adopting measures to fight organized crime.

We welcome the efforts undertaken by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the Contact Group to stop the cycle of violence. In that regard, we deem it very important to push forward the disarmament of the population, taking advantage of the synergies provided by the amnesty programme recently started by UNMIK, which allows the citizens of Kosovo who possess illegal weapons to surrender them to law enforcement authorities. It is clear that the proliferation of weapons fosters violence, organized crime and terrorism.

It is important to continue to strengthen the rule of law, to support the return of refugees, to push forward on respect for minority rights and to press on with economic development. Those goals should continue to serve as priorities and should be promoted by all parties in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999) and the Constitutional Framework in order to build a multi-ethnic and tolerant community with a solid economic foundation and functioning democratic institutions.
My delegation also expresses its hope that the parties will deepen their commitment to
democratic values and the rule of law; that the meaningful, constructive dialogue between
Belgrade and Pristina on practical matters of mutual interest takes place and will be further
expanded to include political issues; and that concrete results are achieved without much
delay.

To conclude, we wish to reiterate our full support for the standards before status policy. Its
postulated targets are essential to the political process designed to determine Kosovo’s future
in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999), establishing a multi-ethnic and democratic
society.

Mr. Pleuger (Germany): First, let me thank Assistant Secretary-General Hedi Annabi for his
concise and very useful briefing. I should also like to point out that I associate myself with
the statement that will be made by the Italian presidency of the European Union at a later
stage in this meeting.

The series of violent incidents over the past weeks highlights the urgency of dialogue and
reconciliation in Kosovo. We should not allow the actions of a few extremists and criminals
to divert us from the task of creating a stable, peaceful and democratic Kosovo.

The leaders in the region have condemned the violence and say that they want to be
responsible partners of the international community and join the European institutions as
soon as possible. But they have so far failed to take many of the difficult steps necessary to
realize their ambitions, above all the full implementation of the provisions of Security
Council resolution 1244 (1999).

We are disappointed that the recent declaration on Kosovo passed by the Parliament of
Serbia laid the blame for the failure to implement resolution 1244 (1999) solely on the side of
the ethnic Albanians. Clearly, both sides have failed to meet their obligations. For example,
the creation of illegal parallel structures in northern Kosovo and in Serbian enclaves
elsewhere has been a major impediment to implementing resolution 1244 (1999). Moreover,
it was disappointing that the parliamentary declaration said nothing about the interests and
needs of the ethnic Albanians, who make up the overwhelming majority of the residents of
Kosovo.

On the other hand, we urge the representatives of the Provisional Institutions of Self-
Government in Kosovo to continue to speak out against violence, to do more to promote
ethnic tolerance and to encourage the acceptance of the rule of law. That is the only way to
create a more favorable climate for refugee returns. Ending violence and ethnic intimidation
is the most important element of progress. Another critical element is the need for direct
dialogue between Pristina and Belgrade about how they can best cooperate on practical
issues. We hope that this dialogue will begin soon. This does not mean the talks about the
final status of Kosovo, which can take place only when standards of democratic practice and
ethnic tolerance have been achieved.
We have high expectations for the programme of action of the new Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and we fully support his priorities. In that connection, we are eager to receive the operationalized benchmarks and work plan, which will lay out the concrete tasks to be achieved over the coming months.

Mr. Tidjani (Cameroon) (spoke in French): My delegation would also like to thank Mr. Annabi for his briefing containing up-to-date and very useful information. On 18 August 2003, the Security Council, in complete unanimity, condemned the unjustifiable and often lethal incidents described by Mr. Annabi. The Council firmly called for finding the perpetrators and bringing them to justice so that they can be held accountable for their crimes. I welcome the mobilization that seems to be growing among the population today, to help the police in their investigations.

I also recall that on 3 July 2003, Mr. Steiner presented to the Council the most recent report of the Secretary-General on Kosovo (S/2003/675). It was an exhaustive assessment of the efforts of the United Nations to normalize the situation in the province. That assessment, although largely positive, did include some reasons for concern due to certain problems that Mr. Steiner underlined in his introductory briefing on that day. Those problems have grown since then, as we noted in Mr. Annabi’s statement today. My delegation believes that those problems stem from the persistence of intolerance, hatred and instinctual reactions based on identity, which fuel partisan rivalry, injustice, violence and, as a result, insecurity.

The population of Kosovo dreams of peace and a reconciled society of solidarity that shares a common vision of happiness. As well, as the Council observed on the ground last month, the population is aware of the international community’s firm commitment and of the enormous sacrifices its men and women make out of goodwill. Those men and women work with the population day by day with determination to ensure the stabilization and reconstruction of Kosovo and the reconciliation of the entire population. Establishing a safe environment that has been disarmed and demined, ensuring protection and freedom of movement, facilitating the return of refugees and displaced persons, creating conditions for a lasting settlement of the problem. I could go on, but Council members are well aware that these issues are the tasks set forth in resolution 1244 (1999). All of those objectives disturb the extremists on all sides, who are pleased only when the situation is confused and out of control.

It is the United Nations that has established conditions that have given rise to, or strengthened, the hopes and dreams of the Kosovars. Over and above the duties imposed on it by the Charter, the Organization has a specific moral commitment to successfully conclude its mission in Kosovo. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Harri Holkeri, has stated that the incidents in question will only strengthen our resolve to establish the rule of law for the people of Kosovo.

In this regard, the Special Representative needs the firm support of the United Nations if he is to be successful in addressing the priorities for 2003 that his predecessor, Mr. Steiner, set out and that the Council welcomed. Kosovo is at a delicate stage and the Security Council,
with the customary support of Secretary-General Kofi Annan and his Special Representative, must tailor its strategy and the modalities of its implementation by ensuring that its activities in the province are focused on the long term. We must therefore ensure that we know what the people of Kosovo truly want and find appropriate solutions that will enable us, without acting hastily, to resolve the problem of the final status of Kosovo.

My delegation would like to reaffirm its commitment to the principle of standards before status and to the virtues of direct dialogue among all the parties concerned. In this regard, we agree with Mr. Holkeri that such dialogue should be focused on specific issues, and we look forward to the proposals for modalities for that dialogue. My delegation also reaffirms its commitment to a multi-ethnic and multicultural Kosovo nourished by the human values of tolerance and harmony and watered by the source of democratic values and respect for human rights.

My delegation appeals to all the elements of Kosovo society and all other political actors in the subregion to pool their efforts with those of UNMIK so as to prevent the further stirring up of negative emotions and to work to restore peace, security and prosperity for all.

In conclusion, I would like to say how much my country appreciates the impressive job being done on the ground by Mr. Holkeri and his entire team. I reaffirm the support of Cameroon for their efforts to implement resolution 1244 (1999).

Mr. Atieh (Syrian Arab Republic) (spoke in Arabic): My delegation would like to thank Mr. Hedi Annabi, Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, for his detailed and useful briefing on the most recent developments in the situation in Kosovo. My delegation believes that, despite the relative stability of the situation in Kosovo, the security situation must be further strengthened if we are to prevent a repetition of the events of last month that led to the killing of a number of Serbs in Kosovo. Such events could, in turn, lead to ethnically motivated acts of violence, which would undermine all the progress made thus far.

My delegation reiterates the importance of the rule of law and the protection of the rights of ethnic minorities in Kosovo, as well as the need to combat organized crime and smuggling and to prevent illicit trafficking in arms and drugs.

My delegation also reiterates the importance of the safe return of refugees and internally displaced persons to their homes and property in Kosovo so that they can contribute to the economic reconstruction of the province. The concerted efforts of all of the people of Kosovo will be required if they are to leave their problems behind.

My delegation encourages continued dialogue between Belgrade and Pristina with a view to dealing with the practical matters pertaining to the stabilization of the situation in Kosovo and the facilitation of the political process. We welcome the efforts of Mr. Holkeri in this regard.
We support the principle of standards before status. We welcome Mr. Holkeri’s reaffirmation that he will pursue his work in accordance with that principle with a view to building in Kosovo a multi-ethnic society that is capable of coping with future challenges.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to express its support for Mr. Harri Holkeri, Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Kosovo. We express our readiness to cooperate with him and with the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo in order to achieve security and stability in the province.

Mr. Zhang Yishan (China) (spoke in Chinese):
The Chinese delegation would like to thank Assistant Secretary-General Annabi for his briefing. The Chinese delegation has been closely observing the development of the situation in Kosovo. We are deeply concerned about the frequent occurrence of incidents of terrorism and violence recently, which have caused a serious deterioration in the security situation. We urge the parties concerned to find out the truth as soon as possible and bring to justice the perpetrators of those acts.

We call on the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo, KFOR and the Kosovo Provisional Institutions to make further efforts to strengthen law and order, combat organized crime and ensure the security of all ethnic groups in Kosovo, especially the Serbs. That is the only way to create the necessary conditions for the achievement of such goals as the return of refugees and economic development.

China believes that the fundamental resolution of the question of Kosovo will require consultation and dialogue between Belgrade and Pristina with a view to reaching agreement on practical matters, such as the return of refugees and the rights of minorities and missing persons, and thereby establishing a foundation for the ultimate settlement of the question of the status of Kosovo. Such achievements would also be conducive to the peace and stability of the entire Balkan region.

To that end, we hope that the two parties concerned will, on the basis of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999), initiate constructive dialogue as soon as possible on those questions and, with the help of the international community, achieve concrete results.

The President: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of the United Kingdom.

I should like to make six points. First, I associate myself with the comments to be made soon by the Italian presidency of the European Union. Secondly, we encourage the very early launch of the Belgrade-Pristina dialogue and look forward to practical proposals from the Special Representative, who enjoys our full support. Thirdly, normalization is the best way forward. There is too much political rhetoric on both sides. Unilateral attempts to pre-empt the status issue are not helpful; resolution 1244 (1999) is the way forward.
Fourthly, the immediate priority is standards. I associate myself with those who say that it must very clearly be standards before status. It is important in that respect to establish benchmarks. Fifthly, as we gear up for those discussions between Pristina and Belgrade, the security situation must be a priority. Strengthening the rule of law and building the indigenous capacity of the Kosovo Police Service are vital if we are going to increase the role of, and enforce, law and order.

My last point is simply to say that tackling corruption, extremism and organized crime is a crucial element in building up the multi-ethnic, prosperous Kosovo that we seek. The United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo has got a lot of work in hand on that issue, but it is quite striking that the internal market in organized crime in that part of the world is much more effective than is the internal market in legitimate goods and services. That situation has to be reversed if the region is to attain its goal of approaching Euro-Atlantic standards.

I now resume my function as President of the Council.

I have three speakers still on my list. The next speaker is the representative of Serbia and Montenegro, to whom I give the floor.

Mr. Sahovic (Serbia and Montenegro): At the outset, I wish to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of September, as well as to thank you for convening this meeting. I would also like to thank Mr. Annabi for his briefing.

In recent months the Security Council has held a series of discussions that have mostly been devoted to the escalation of violence and ethnically motivated crimes in Kosovo and Metohija. The need for that was obvious. In July, the Kosovo Force (KFOR) reported an increased number of incidents, stating that the Serbian population was the primary target of intimidation. Regrettably, we witnessed even worse crimes in August, including a bomb attack in the village of Cemica on 31 August that killed Milomir Stakic and wounded four other civilians. We view the further deterioration of the security situation with extreme concern, particularly bearing in mind the fact that neither the perpetrators of the Gorazdevac atrocity of 13 August, the killers of the Serb fisherman Dragan Tonic, who was killed on 11 August in Skulanovo, nor the Cemica bombers, have been apprehended. We also regret that those responsible for the 3 August murder of UNMIK police officer Satish Menon have not been found.

The new Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Harri Holkeri, assumed his responsibilities and clearly difficult tasks against that background. He has yet to settle in Pristina, but we can already discern his resolve to confront the existing problems. We welcome Mr. Holkeri’s priorities to establish the rule of law, ensure basic rights and freedoms, fight organized crime, build multi-ethnic institutions and enhance economic development as basic preconditions for lasting stability in the province. In particular, my Government welcomes the new Special Representative’s commitment to promptly address
the security situation, especially violence against the Serb community. We share his view that the motive for the latest attacks was to send the message that multi-ethnicity would not be allowed to take hold in the province. We support Mr. Holkeri's position that the international community must be resolute in its stand that it will not be intimated from fulfilling the mandate of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999).

It is encouraging that the international community has demonstrated, at several high-level meetings during the last few days, a common dedication to ending the cycle of violence and extremism. In that regard, we are looking forward to concrete measures against the Albanian National Army (ANA), which in April was proclaimed by UNMIK to be a terrorist organization, as well as to the findings of the special UNMIK/KFOR board set up last spring to coordinate action against suspected extremist infiltration in the Kosovo Protection Corps (KPC).

It is our sincere hope that that decisiveness with regard to improving the security situation will boost the thus far highly unsatisfactory pace in the return of refugees and internally displaced persons. Perhaps it was on the basis of renewed hope for minority protection that the 200 remaining Serbs in Cernica, the venue of the aforementioned attack on 31 August, decided to stay in the province. However, we fear that, if crimes and terrorist acts continue with impunity, any future decision by the Serb community to leave Kosovo and Metohija permanently may be irreversible.

My Government welcomes the renewed engagement of the Contact Group on the issue of Kosovo and Metohija. We find particularly important the Contact Group's confirmation in Moscow of the relevance of the principle of standards before status and of the need to make the benchmarks concept operational, as well as the emphasis on continuous international control of the implementation of related requirements. Serbia and Montenegro is looking forward to the Contact Group's further activities. In that context, we wish to establish regular dialogue with the Group in order to continue to contribute to the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999) as well as, more broadly, to the stabilization of the region.

The Security Council, the Contact Group and Special Representative Holkeri are calling for an early start of dialogue between Belgrade and Pristina. Serbia and Montenegro stands fully ready to engage constructively in all discussions of importance to the daily lives of all citizens of Kosovo and Metohija, regardless of their ethnicity. We expect that the talks, within the framework of resolution 1244 (1999), will help to improve the security situation in the province, enhance human and minority rights and, consequently, step up the returns process. Mr. Holkeri's role in those talks is extremely important, as is the support of the Contact Group and the European Union in this process.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that Serbia and Montenegro has recently reaffirmed at the highest parliamentary level its commitment to the implementation of resolution 1244 (1999) and its fundamental aim of building a multi-ethnic society in Kosovo and Metohija, one in which all inhabitants can have a peaceful and normal life based on substantial autonomy and meaningful self-government.
The President: The next speaker under rule 37 is the representative of Italy and of the Italian presidency. I give him the floor.

Mr. Spatafora (Italy): I have the honor to speak on behalf of the European Union. The acceding countries Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia, the associated countries Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey, and the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Iceland, have declared that they align themselves with this statement.

The European Union reiterates its strong condemnation of the brutal killings and violence that took place in Kosovo during August and September against a United Nations police officer and against Kosovars of both Serbian and Albanian ethnicity. In expressing our deepest condolences to the families of the victims and to the Government of Serbia, we are also confident that no efforts are being spared to arrest the perpetrators and bring them to justice. The European Union believes that everybody in Kosovo must understand that the time for violence is over and that such deplorable incidents can only undermine the image of Kosovo in Europe and in the international community.

We therefore welcome the arrival in Kosovo of the new Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Harri Holkeri. We would like to reaffirm our strong support for him in the challenging task of ensuring full implementation of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999), which continues to be the cornerstone of the international community’s commitment to Kosovo. In that regard, we very much appreciate the briefing given to the Council by Assistant Secretary-General Hedi Annabi. He has given us a very clear-cut picture of where we stand and of the way forward.

We also would like to urge all concerned in Kosovo and in the region to cooperate in a constructive manner with the new Special Representative of the Secretary-General on fully implementing resolution 1244 (1999) while refraining from unilateral acts and statements that risk jeopardizing the goal of a stable, multi-ethnic and democratic Kosovo.

The European Union fully supports the United Nations weapons amnesty programme launched on 1 September by Mr. Holkeri and shares his views that the people of Kosovo should seize this opportunity to help themselves while helping Kosovo and that the values of tolerance and democracy are the foundation of a free society.

Kosovo must comply with international and European standards as soon as possible. That goal can be achieved only through the active cooperation of all the stakeholders in Kosovo and the region. We therefore urge the leadership in Belgrade and Pristina to launch without further delay a direct dialogue on practical issues of mutual interest. That is a prerequisite to building mutual confidence, as was announced at the European Union’s Western Balkans summit held at Thessaloniki on 21 June.

The European Union will ensure that Kosovo’s European prospects are not held back by the final status issue. Before addressing that issue, however, a democratic, multi-ethnic and
multicultural Kosovo guaranteeing full respect for the rule of law and for human and minority rights will have to be built. To that end, the European Union reiterates its support for the standards before status strategy, which now needs to become operational.

The European Union is also firmly committed to supporting Kosovo’s economic recovery and development, including the privatization process, as an indispensable measure for ensuring the normalization and development of society. At the same time, we would like to see progress on decentralization and on the return process, where there is still an urgent need for concrete measures to be taken by the competent authorities, both at the central and local levels.

The President: I call on the representative of Albania.

Mr. Nesho (Albania): At the outset, Sir, allow me to express our delegation’s appreciation for your commitment to the problems of our region and to commend your work as the President of the Security Council for the month of September.

Let me also thank Assistant Secretary-General Annabi for his comprehensive briefing today.

The issue of Kosovo has been broadly discussed in the Security Council. This reflects the commitment and the seriousness of the international community in implementing Security Council resolution 1244 (1999) and ensuring a sustainable democratic future for Kosovo.

The attention that the Kosovo issue has attracted constitutes a positive factor that has accelerated the rhythm of significant transformations towards a multi-ethnic, democratic society. While evaluating the current situation in Kosovo, as a result of considerable transformations due to the commendable work of the United Nations and the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo, we are confident in saying that substantial progress has been achieved. This conclusion has been realistically highlighted by the members of the Security Council and reflected in the reports of the Secretary-General as well.

It is important to put special emphasis on the establishment and functioning of the new Provisional Institutions of Self-Government, which are a clear indication of growing political maturity and responsibility. There is an improved inter-ethnic environment as well, as has been demonstrated, for instance, by the appeal of the Kosovar leaders to all displaced persons to return to Kosovo and to participate in the democratic processes and in the responsibility to rebuild together a new, multi-ethnic, free and democratic society.

The latest incidents in Kosovo are tragic and intolerable. They should be explicitly condemned and considered to be acts of an agonizing violent past that cannot halt the democratic processes and the irreversible new realities. However, these incidents cannot be condemned either by denying the substantial progress in Kosovo or by using it for political, electoral and nationalist interests. That would impede the beginning of the necessary
dialogue between Pristina and Belgrade, to the accomplishment of which the whole international community is committed.

Today, Kosovo needs confidence-building measures and not a conflict-feeding process. Finding itself between opportunities and difficulties, problems and solutions, Kosovo requires all of us to become part of the solution and the progress. The far-sighted policy of the European Union to include Kosovo as an inseparable part of the regional reality, drawn up at the Thessaloniki summit, creates real grounds for its rapid integration, first, into the regional community, and then into the European family.

The improvement of stability and progress suggests the need for the Kosovar leadership to take part in the discussions of this body on Kosovo so that it may share responsibilities and be fully committed to the implementation of Security Council decisions.

The Albanian Government has always appreciated the important work of the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General for Kosovo and is thankful for the extraordinary results achieved in a relatively short period of time. The Albanian Government commends the appointment of Mr. Harri Holkeri as Special Representative and will support his activity. My Government strongly believes that his mission will be carried out successfully and contribute to the further development of Kosovo and the implementation of the necessary standards before status.

Albania has encouraged the political leaders in Kosovo and Belgrade to give concrete expression to their commitment to initiate a dialogue on technical issues. My Government considers unacceptable and unhelpful every effort that goes beyond the stabilizing framework of the dialogue and increases the spirit of conflict in the region. The dialogue between the two parties and the collaboration of mutual interests towards economic development and regional integration will bring an understanding of new realities. People can be ruled not by the mentality of territories, but by that of respect for their right to self-determination, freedom and democracy, ideas that shape modern Europe today.

The President: There are no more speakers on my list.

I thank my colleagues for their contributions, especially Assistant Secretary-General Annabi, not just for his contribution, but also for what it represents in terms of the work that the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo does. We have all shown today, I think, our clear support for the Special Representative. Resolution 1244 (1999) remains the basis of policy and there has been a clear emphasis on standards before status. As for dialogue, most speakers have endorsed what is taking place and expressed the imperative of tackling the security situation and of stabilizing things. The recent attacks have been condemned by just about everybody.

We have thus concluded the Security Council's consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.
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