

Et oversettelsevalg henger alltid tett sammen med vurderinger knyttet til det konkrete oversettelsesoppdraget (translation brief). Derfor følger her beskrivelsen av et tenkt oppdrag for oversettelsen av nedenforstående tekst, tatt fra The Guardian 25.09.14, <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/sep/25/britain-new-iraq-war-doomed-token-gesture>

Oversettelsen tenkes brukt i en artikkelserie i en dagsavis om forskjellige lands engasjement i spørsmålet om krig i Irak.

Britain's involvement in the new Iraq war is a doomed and dangerous gesture

[...]

With no proper strategy, the return to conflict will only reinforce the politics of fear that is the grimmest legacy of the Blair era.

This is the moment in any war when peace goes dumb. The cause is just. The enemy is in our sights, and the provocation is extreme. Blood races through tabloid veins. It is white feathers for dissenters. The British government's evident eagerness to bomb Iraq will be put by David Cameron to the House of Commons [...]. With an election in the offing, Labour's Ed Miliband dares not disagree.

The prime minister's case, made to the United Nations [...], is that the Islamic State (Isis) rebellion is "an evil against which the whole world must unite". No one would quarrel with that. Unlike Cameron's abortive bid to bomb Syria last year, legality is covered by an invitation from Iraq's hapless rulers in Baghdad and a refusal to bomb Syria. Past mistakes in Iraq, says Cameron, should not be an excuse for inaction. "We must not be so frozen with fear that we do not do anything at all."

Nor should we be so intoxicated by war fever as to do the wrong thing. Iraq has been chief bomb target for western electoral machismo since Bill Clinton's "Monica Lewinsky" air strikes in 1998. They initiated a decade of mendacity. Saddam Hussein's weapons arsenal was declared eliminated, then it was not. After killing hundreds of civilians, Tony Blair and his cabinet declared that Iraq still posed "an imminent threat to Britain". The subsequent war was said to have installed freedom and democracy in that country, another untruth. As the Royal United Services Institute concluded in a recent survey, far "from reducing international terrorism ... the 2003 invasion [of Iraq] had the effect of promoting it".

Those demanding a resumption of the bombing should explain how things are different this time – or be guilty of willing mission creep. So far they could hardly be less convincing. An indication is their resort to adjectival hysteria, Isis being variously repulsive, genocidal, atrocious, monstrous, unspeakable, satanic. Everyone seems to accept that air strikes "alone" cannot win. Yet everyone also asserts that there is no question of following them with ground attacks, which is the essence of coordinated war. They are merely to "degrade Isis assets",

mostly by demolishing empty buildings at vast expense. They are sending “a message” to someone or other.

Cameron’s strategy is apparently to leave local Iraqi forces to deliver victory. That might be reasonable, given that they are the most expensively trained troops on earth. But they have shown themselves useless. They have been given intensive bombing cover by the Americans for seven weeks, and Isis is firmly in place. Meanwhile, Cameron refuses to hold his nose and form a tactically vital alliance with Assad of Syria and with the Iranians. He appears not to want to win.

[...]

Islam’s wars are not Britain’s business. We owe their human victims all the aid we can to relieve suffering. We do not owe them our incompetence in trying to recast their politics. That is a task for the Arabs and their neighbours, not for Britain’s soldiers and taxpayers.