

scription of one thing in terms applied to another. Dr. King creates a great metaphor of "a bad check" that perfectly shows what he is trying to say. This metaphor is based on a range of financial terms, as *to cash a check, promissory note, fall heir, deflated, insufficient funds*, etc. Allusion is a reference to some striking event or past person in history. The speaker refers directly to the extract from the Bible - the words said by John the Baptist before the coming of Jesus Christ, thus highlighting the importance and truthfulness of his words.

Another thing that draws attention in Dr. King's speaking skill is his ability to cultivate a style that provides variety within the framework of concrete and specific words. A concrete style of talking is one that makes ideas specific and real.

It is obvious that style means a lot on the way to success in speechmaking. It gives force to argument and helps you to build close relations with your listeners. Your style is what merges your mind to the minds of listeners.

В работе анализируются стилистические особенности речи Мартина Лютера Кинга "У меня есть мечта", которая считается вершиной ораторского искусства; приводятся выводы о значении стиля в публичных выступлениях.

*А.И. Никольцева,*  
студентка БГЭУ (Минск)

## **GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS: FOR AND AGAINST (ГЕНЕТИЧЕСКИ МОДИФИЦИРОВАННЫЕ ОРГАНИЗМЫ: ЗА И ПРОТИВ)**

This paper deals with the problem of the usage of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in mass production. The questions over the safety and importance of GMOs are broadly discussed by scientists all over the world. But it is still not easy to give a definite answer whether GMOs are the most highly regulated food in the history of humankind or the most dangerous and unpredictable discovery of modern civilization.

First discovered and produced in America, the GMOs soon spread all over the world thanks to their ability to solve the vital problems of our contemporary life. Based on biotechnology and the elements of genetic engineering the GMOs can be extremely valuable to the farmers and entire economies of developing countries. With 800 million people chronically hungry and the world population expected to hit nine billion people in 50 years, biotech foods can be a good solution since they

can not only increase the quantity but the quality of food. And this is considered to be the first and the main argument for GMOs.

The next thing to mention is the ability of biotechnology to control the processes of altering genes of the crop. If we have a small sample of a rare plant species in contact with another species there is always a high degree of danger it will lose its diversity due to mutual genetic drift. Organic growers cannot control this controversial process and only biotechnology with its latest achievements makes it possible to predict the behavior of any gene.

But GMOs are not only the way of human survival but also the way to save our environment. For example, biotechnology will help to solve the problem of nitrogen fixation in crops, providing the so-called "crops own fertilizer". That would be a huge environmental gain because we know that nitrogen fertilizer when applied separately is one of the most damaging substances.

Nevertheless the public's lack of knowledge has made GMOs "a lightning rod" for public concern over food safety. Now Americans are facing an increasing difficulty in selling farm products in overseas markets because of the use of biotechnology. In previous years questions about the safety of genetically modified soybeans and corn were raised mostly in Europe but as the years wore on concerns began to spread to Asia and North America. Thus some countries began to require warning labels and impose other restrictions on GMOs in foodstuff claiming there has not been enough testing of GM methods and saying science cannot predict what will happen ten years down the road. This argument is the strongest one among the facts against the GMOs. Another objection comes from organic growers who do not want GM pollen blowing in to their crops. The fact that there is not enough known about the effect GMOs will have on other crops is a reason enough to have some concern. Indirect effects may include changes to the foods metabolism which could pose a risk to consumers or the environment.

All these facts show that it is really very difficult to give a definite answer to the question posed at the beginning of this paper whether GMOs are the most highly regulated food in the history of humankind or the most damaging and unpredictable discovery of modern civilization. They also prove the fact that the science of GMOs is very often being unfairly scrutinized and has become a scapegoat for all agricultural problems including those occurring naturally.

In conclusion the following should be emphasized: GMOs can be extremely valuable to farmers and entire economies of developing coun-

tries. They are our chance to make some steps forward to a new better life. Nevertheless commercial introduction must not be allowed before all kind of different research is made.

В работе рассматриваются аргументы “за” и “против” использования генетически модифицированных организмов в коммерческих целях — проблемы, вызывающей жаркие споры среди ученых, практиков и потребителей.

*П.Б. Огоновский,*  
студент БГЭУ (Минск)

### **THE EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK (ЕВРОПЕЙСКИЙ ЦЕНТРАЛЬНЫЙ БАНК)**

Nowadays we live in a time of close relationship between different countries all over the world. States prosperity has become more dependent on integration and cooperation with other countries.

As it may seem the life was at last getting easier for the infant European Central Bank. There are twin threats that hang over its goal of price stability, high oil prices and the weakness of the euro.

Next January will see the introduction of euro notes and coins.

Mr. Duisenberg has promised to retire some time in 2002.

As if all this were not enough, there are at least three difficulties that sooner or later, will have be resolved, either by the ECB itself or by the European Union's politicians. The first is that the ECB has not learned how to communicate the way it executes monetary policy to financial and mass media; or, put other way, outside commentators have not learned to “read” the ECB as clearly as they can American Federal Reserve.

The ECB's task is to maintain stable prices, which it defines as an annual inflation rate of no more than 2 %.

The statement that euro would take currency markets for its first 22 months has not taken place in a real life.

In any case ECB is charged with maintaining the internal value of the euro, not the exchange. Trade no accounts for only some 10 % of euro area GDP, the inflationary impact of any depreciation is smaller than it was for, say, the D-Mark.

The fact remains that financial markets can not understand ECB's actions clearly. It is curious, because the bank makes plans of its work for future and Mr. Duisenberg holds on briefings to explain what the ECB is up to every month.