

# LANGUAGE **Inc.**

28 April 2027

## SHAREHOLDER ADVISORY PRESENTATION

My name is Alex Parole, VP of communications at LANGUAGE Inc. and, on behalf the board, I would like to welcome you to our quarterly shareholders' presentation.

In the last year, we have taken great strides to secure our position in a highly competitive environment and challenging global economy. Formerly English Text, LANGUAGE Inc. has transformed itself from a new entry in the field of linguistic licensing to a dominant force in the marketplace. We are now strategizing our entry into the international market, with the goal of establishing ourselves as a truly multilingual corporation operating in some twelve languages and markets around the world by the year 2035.

It has been evident for some time that the global use of American English is in a state of permanent decline. International usage has stagnated, with the majority of contracts, legalese, advertising, education, and entertainment now no longer conducted in American English. The perceived political and economic failures of the United States have led to the rapid waning of its language. It is estimated that there has been a 35% decline in the use of American English this year alone, with the international use of American Spanish surpassing that of American English for the first time. This international decline also has ramifications for the domestic market, with a correlating decline in domestic usage across both business and cultural sectors—for example, only 62% of cultural product in the United States is currently created in American English.

With that in mind, we are targeting politically stable, resource-rich countries. Broadly speaking, our concentration lies on Brazil and Africa, with an emphasis on sub-Saharan countries. While industry continues to boom, and established trade relations between China, India, and Africa have led to unprecedented wealth in the region, the commodity of language itself remains relatively undervalued. This market is ripe for exploitation as these regional economies continue their ascent.

---

# LANGUAGE Inc.

In response to a report filed by our Analytics Lab last quarter, LANGUAGE Inc. acquired CLPB (Corporação Língua Português do Brasil) last month—an acquisition that was received enthusiastically by the marketplace. Drawing on the same report, I am happy to announce that we are also in the final stages of acquiring Sudanese Arabic Text, a company specializing in the licensing of print language. This move has been made in anticipation of contracts between the Chinese and Sudanese governments prompted by the establishment of Chinese mineral extraction companies in the Sudan.

The success of these acquisitions is only the beginning of what we hope will be a game-changing year for LANGUAGE Inc. It is our expectation that nations around the globe will continue to privatize their linguistic resources. Central governments in Asia, South America, and Africa are in the midst of selling their national languages. This, in turn, has the potential to usher in a golden period in the international language sector, unmatched since the United States, the United Kingdom, and Russia first sold their languages to private corporations in 2028.

To return to the domestic market: Today, I'm pleased to make a major announcement concerning a legal case that we've been fighting for well over a year. The ramifications of this case are far-reaching and have the potential to redefine the sector both domestically and internationally.

As you know, when the United States government declared language a national asset in 2019, the scope of the legislation was limited, applying only to the use of American English in business and legal contracts and the use of American English in advertising, including, but not limited to, print, digital, and televisual campaigns. Since privatization, the language license has expanded to include, among other sectors, televisual entertainment, music, journalism, and book publishing.

When LANGUAGE Inc. (then English Text) won the bid for 65% of American English licenses, we were in essence purchasing a poorly monitored field of assets. We moved rapidly to extract maximum value from the market as it was then defined. We also sought to expand the breadth of the language license, arguing for the expansion of language assets into the areas of education, public signage, instruction manuals, business communications, political speech, and public addresses, including social media.

---

# LANGUAGE Inc.

We have developed language into a market as established as that of telecommunications, gas and electricity, or water. Our product has become truly integral to the daily life of millions of consumers both in America and around the world. We have made language a necessity for all Americans, with private individuals as well as corporations and institutions purchasing our product.

Today, I'm happy to announce that we have successfully further extended the reach of our license. The suit we brought against United Food and Beverage (LANGUAGE Inc. v. United Food and Beverage) is currently being deliberated in the Supreme Court of the United States. In the suit, we argue that the company's use of American English in speech-based viral campaigns should be subject to the same tariffs applied to print, digital, and moving image advertising.

The use of speech in viral marketing has long been a source of contention. Although it does not appear to fall into the traditional categories of either tariffed advertising or public address as it is currently defined, it is evidently language for the purpose of business. At the heart of the suit is the question of what constitutes public speech. The majority of what is considered public speech is already heavily tariffed, as in the case of public lectures and addresses, radio broadcasts, etc.

But the line between public and private speech is not fixed. Take, for example, a so-called private conversation between two individuals in a bar: This conversation has all the attributes of public speech if one of these two individuals is speaking on behalf of a corporation, and doing so with the expectation that, through the second—and might I add, unwitting—individual, an audience of many multiples will be "virally" addressed.

Ideas—political, cultural, economic—flow through the conduit of speech. The traffic of those ideas must be tariffed. They are ideas that individuals, groups and corporations can convert into profit. Why are contracts tariffed but not business meetings, lunches, conferences? These are some of the questions that form a part of LANGUAGE Inc. v. United Food and Beverage, and I am pleased to say that we have been given assurances that when the Supreme Court announces its decision later today, it will throw its weight firmly behind the language sector.

---

# LANGUAGE Inc.

According to the forthcoming Supreme Court decision, all corporations, at the outset of a viral marketing campaign, must purchase a license from a language provider at a rate determined by the market. Furthermore, all language utilized by groups of ten and larger will be tariffed at rates determined by the market, regardless of content or context. Language utilized by groups of between five and nine people pertaining to the distribution of products, ideas, and capital will also be tariffed at rates determined by the market.

As you can imagine, this ruling will have a transformative effect on the domestic market. It is our estimate that the revenue from speech tariffs—which will be effective as soon as the Supreme Court decision is announced—will surpass projected losses from the continued diminution of domestic American English usage in business, science, and culture. Furthermore, we expect the usage of speech to continue at a more or less steady rate, regardless of the status of the American economy. This landmark ruling takes linguistic licensing out of the realm of pure commerce, providing our revenue streams with greater protection from the volatility of the current economic climate.

In anticipation of this decision, we at LANGUAGE Inc. have been taking steps to ensure that we will be in a position to enforce the new speech tariffs swiftly and efficiently. I am therefore very proud to announce a new partnership with the National Security Agency. This partnership will give us access to certain metadata that will allow us to extract the full value of our language license. In fact, our agreement has been in place for some time, allowing us to customize how this data is captured and create models for future revenue.

It is our aim to reach an 80% subscription rate by the end of the first year. And in anticipation of the Supreme Court announcement, we have made information regarding the pricing structures available on our digital store. However, our ambitions in the area of speech tariffs do not end there: We are currently exploring ways in which we might take this national ruling to an international level, positioning ourselves to be the first company to enter the international spoken language market. Moving aggressively will give us the advantage, allowing us to set the terms for this nascent market.

Spoken language has the potential to become the most profitable sector of language tariffing today. May I just close by adding that we have created a tariff system that will ensure language remains accessible to all sectors and classes of society. It is a human necessity in the way that water is, and it

---

# LANGUAGE Inc.

gives all of us at LANGUAGE Inc. great pride to bring this resource to people around the world.

\* Ping. \*

And I've just been informed that the Supreme Court decision has been announced! From this moment forward, language has been infinitely enriched and must be counted amongst our most valuable resources. Thank you again for attending today's presentation. I'm now happy to take questions, but please be aware that, as this is a public gathering, your words will be subject to the applicable tariffs.

MOLLY KLEIMAN (CFO of LANGUAGE Inc.): I would like to add that we'll be working on a preferential rate during today's gathering. The event is being documented, and our micropayment system will allow entirely accurate pricing to take place.

SHAREHOLDER 1: Can you give us an update on the accent removal devices that you have been developing in anticipation of the Supreme Court decision? Have there been any updates on the prototyping of the technology, and do you have a possible date for when we might see these devices released on the mass market?

PAROLE: Yes, the accent removal devices are central to our mission—standardization is of utmost important. We don't want questions of slang or, indeed, "accent" muddying tariff rates. So, it's our aim to provide absolute international verbal standards of all kinds. Unfortunately, I don't have the technology here for demonstration, but we expect a third-quarter release date.

SHAREHOLDER 2: What type of policing will you implement for such things as language misuse or slang in order to, shall we say, shape the standard you're trying to reach?

PAROLE: We have an unprecedented, widespread data collection project underway. Through our partnership with the NSA—which, I must add, is strictly confidential information, and is not to leave this room—we are now able, with a 95% degree of accuracy, to identify deviant forms and stamp them out. As you know, in certain sorts of urban areas, populations will likely attempt to evade language tariffing by use of a supposedly "creative" slang, but we feel we can force them back to standard English.

---

# LANGUAGE Inc.

SHAREHOLDER 3: And in the case of acronymization, are you charging consumers for all the words, or just one?

PAROLE: It depends on if you're a premium user or not. We have various rates for various people. For those who think they can swan in at a retail rate and start using acronyms willy-nilly—they will be disappointed. But, of course, a number of our corporate users have special arrangements. For example, military usage of acronyms is very well established, and it would feel unpatriotic to charge them high rates for their acronym-heavy communications.

SHAREHOLDER 4: Are the deaf exempt, or are they charged when reading closed captioning?

PAROLE: We've seen an opportunity in the privatization of American Sign Language. Furthermore, we feel that it's really an expression of our egalitarian, anti-discriminatory spirit that the deaf be charged at the same rate as everybody else. Sir, at the back.

SHAREHOLDER 5: Have you considered the possibility of selling off private languages? Philosophically speaking, is this possible—and if so, can you imagine a market for such use and customization? On the other hand, if I can draw on an old example—

\* Beeping noise. \*

PAROLE: I'm sorry. Someone's credit has just run out. Excuse me, sir, we will have to ask you to leave.

\* Pause. \*

PAROLE: My apologies for the interruption. Please, continue.

SHAREHOLDER 5: Yes, on the other hand, I can imagine some kind of open-source Esperanto—

PAROLE: Oh, that old granola language. The idea of open-source is a sort of pipe dream. In reality, it's very difficult to install. The interface is poor and, apart from a few fringe chatters in the Pacific Northwest, we don't anticipate open source Esperanto making any kind of dent into the mainstream languages.

---

# LANGUAGE Inc.

Your first question—now, that's very interesting and brings us to our Analytics Lab's recent findings. Professor Wittgenstein, who has been leading the lab for some time, believes that a purely private language is an impossibility, but customizing languages for small elite groups is a huge potential area for growth. For example, if a member's club wanted to have a small language for use by their elite members, that would be something we could provide. We have been running several pilot programs, exploring what you might call the "luxury sector" of the language market. At the moment, that's a niche product, but we feel that soon these bespoke languages will be a growth area. To that end, we've been quietly purchasing multiple dead languages. We are looking into repurposing Inuit, for example, for the use of small elites in certain cities in the urbanized West. Today, at Soho House, there's a small Inuit-speaking gathering. I believe !kung will be the language of this year's Frieze Art Fair.

KLEIMAN: Perhaps now would be the time to announce our newest subsidiary, DIACRITIC. Now that we hold such a large market share of both written and spoken text, we have developed an arm of the company to oversee the acquisition of diacritical marks and scripts. As a consequence of the crisis leading to the extinction of the French language—

PAROLE: It was only a crisis for the French really, wasn't it?

\* Laughter. \*

KLEIMAN: Quite. However there was a loss to the market as well: As the French language disappears, what happens to the cedilla, the breve? Certain diacritical marks are currently in the public domain, and we view this as an opportunity. They are not being policed at all. At the moment, you could write a whole series of grave accents and not be charged a penny by anyone. Our initial goal is to bring this area under greater control, and then perhaps to repurpose these marks for the luxury market. I mean, the Spanish tilde, for example. I see great value in the tilde.

SHAREHOLDER 6: Do you anticipate similar opportunities in the area of interesting regional dialects?

PAROLE: Well, Europe is wide open. Let's take the French example. Provençal has certain value in areas of courtly love, romance, and for people who are nostalgic for the Golden Age of the Marseille port. There's a lot of value to

be extracted from those, but at the moment this area remains unexploited. In the future, especially as we work toward highly standardized forms of all mainstream global languages, we could make standardized versions of regional American dialects for the use of those people who want to perform, for example, Western reenactments. There's a thriving scene of people reenacting car factories in Detroit and various other places. Standard regional dialects could be very useful in this niche market, although at the moment it does not feel like a luxury commodity. I could be convinced otherwise.

SHAREHOLDER 7: Can you review some of the recent controversy over the attempt to purchase Latin? If a language is derived from Latin, can copyright infringement occur?

PAROLE: It's the position of the Supreme Court that ownership of language stems does not give users rights over the various languages that issue from those stems. I understand that there is still some confusion in the international courts: EU courts ruled in the opposite direction, but most people don't bother with EU jurisdiction anymore. As a dead language, Latin was a very cheap license to acquire, and I'm afraid certain opportunistic parties hoped to thereby corner Italian, Spanish, French, and so on. However, one of the areas that our Analytics Lab is looking into is the possibility of Sanskrit licensing. If we can prove a certain originating quality in Sanskrit, we might reverse our position on this. It's a floating area.

SHAREHOLDER 5: Some of your recent acquisitions were not met unopposed. Certain political parties—for example, in the Sudan—advocate for a return to the nationalization of language. Is it your expectation that this might pose a future threat to the language market?

PAROLE: Well, of course, there are extremists and fringe groups in every nation. Even here in the United States, certain people do occasionally attempt to break tariffing. But it's our expectation that around the world the massive drive toward privatization will continue. These people's position is more rhetorical than anything else. And, because of our surveillance arrangements, even though some will insist on making these gestures of "free speech," after the fact, we're able to prove these speeches were made and charge individuals accordingly. So, in effect, each use of language that our critics put together actually generates more money for us.



---

# LANGUAGE **Inc.**

SHAREHOLDER 8: Are there additions to Standard American English that we might expect this season, for example, opportunities for more efficient or colorful vocabulary?

PAROLE: Yes, you've touched upon a key concern for us. As you know, tariffing is partly dependent on word length, so we at LANGUAGE Inc. are using various campaigns to encourage the use of longer words, more complex orthography, because it provides greater revenue for our shareholders. I understand arguments about standardized orthography and "simplification," as some people call it. But there's simply no commercial imperative for that. The convenience of a few users is, of course, important to us, but maximizing shareholder value is our first priority, so we won't see "gotten" reduced to "got" in Standard American English any time soon.

SHAREHOLDER 9: Are you implying that you have some kind of plan to increase the use of German?

PAROLE: Well, German is another language that has collapsed over recent years, but yes—the agglomerative nature of German is a model we feel could be very usefully adopted in English. In the future, if we could force words to thirteen, fourteen, maybe even fifteen syllables, then there would be huge financial gains to be made.

KLEIMAN: I'm afraid we're out of time. Thank you very much for your questions, and for attending today.

\* Rhythmic applause. \*

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK