

What is happening within Nato is - if commentary be permitted - something quite different to what Nato until even recently signified from outside, in opposition to the Warsaw Pact. Why the government does not plainly state this, clearly and simply, is truly a puzzle. After all the centuries of European wars, which not only embroiled the old continent, but which Europe also exported to other continents - thus entangling with itself the whole world - now at last France will no longer come to blows with Germany; their intelinkage began long ago with the coal and steel union, and is now such that neither can manage being apart. Likewise for Germany and Poland: the border on the Oder - Neisse is a harsh reality for the Germans, but one which they accepted with clenched teeth; Poland will not take hold of the Slovakian provinces, as it did in 1938; and so on to the Italians, who must finally swallow back any potential longings for the eastern shores of the Adriatic. Such longings Nato does not permit. All members are under one cover, beneath which the use of force is not permitted. This, today, is Nato's chief characteristic: the cover of peace over Europe.

Miloš Mikeln, *Natophiles, Natophobes, the Media, Wars*
(*Natofili, natofobi, mediji, vojne*)

This nation is about to embark upon the first test of a revolutionary doctrine applied in an extraordinary way at an unfortunate time. The doctrine of preemption - the idea that the United States or any other nation can legitimately attack a nation that is not imminently threatening but may be threatening in the future - is a radical new twist on the traditional idea of self-defense. It appears to be in contravention of international law and the UN Charter. And it is being tested at a time of worldwide terrorism, making many countries around the globe wonder if they will soon be on our - or some other nation's - hit list. High level Administration figures recently refused to take nuclear weapons off the table when discussing a possible attack against Iraq. What could be more destabilizing and unwise than this type of uncertainty, particularly in a world where globalism has tied the vital economic and security interests of many nations so closely together?

Senator Robert Byrd, *Sleepwalking through history*
(*Skozi zgodovino kot v snu*)

What kind of god did Heidegger have in mind? If he was thinking of Jesus Christ, why didn't he say so straight out? If he was thinking of 'just any god', then it seems to me that his declaration is the expression of a deep hopelessness or of an illusory hope that some deus ex machina will emerge from his absence and restore order to all that is here going awry. In such a god who might happen anew, i. e. now, on the threshold of the third millenium after Christ, I do not believe and also will not believe, for such a re-turning of 'happening' would mean merely some feeble renewal of what has already happened, that is - His First Coming. Besides, I also do not care for speaking about the 'last possibility', although I do agree that poetry and thinking can invoke the presence of an absent god or gods. Yet why should this be the ultimate possibility? Are we really right in face of the apocalypse, the end of the world?

Marko Uršič, *Discussions (Pogovori)*

It is clear that all translation criticism is merely interpretation, just as all translation is interpretation. Consequently, the assessment of quality simply cannot hold in general. The force of arguments is proportional to the social status of the proponent. Also because there is one further, essential presupposition: the critic and the translator are two aspects of the same competencies, harmonised by their diverse knowledge, priorities and risks. Dissatisfaction generated by translation criticism may also occur because there is little translation criticism. There are examples of translation critics who are concerned for the possible distress given to the translator, with an attentiveness not shown by any of the literary critics I know - for otherwise they would be considered as over-polite. In the field of translation criticism, however, quite different approaches prevail. Possibly because the translator and the critic are one, or else because of the special nature of the Slovene literary system.

Urška P. Černe, *The Slippery Ground of Translation Criticism*
(*Drsljiva tla prevodne kritike*)

Sodobnost

ISSN 0038-0482



9 770038 048008