

Comments on the differences between the original letter and its 'translation'.

If you compare the initial translation with mine, it will become very obvious at which points the translator preferred to introduce his own opinion or to impute his own interests to the original author. I will comment the content by paragraph (referring to the order in the 'translation' document):

0. **"Regarding the "Color Standard" of the Weimaraner Club of America"**

The german subject line already is quite different from the translation. The latter insinuates that

- a. in the USA there exists a color standard specific to the american club,
- b. that in the consequence it is called a 'standard' unlawfully - presuming that the german club is the only institution to actually have the right to define the breed's standards, and
- c. that it is a malpractice specific to the american club.

It is important to note that the original subject line is neither implying any of the above, nor is it restricting the topic to the american weimaraner.

My feeling is that doing so, as in the given translation, aims at putting the american audience in a state or feeling of being guilty of mischief against the 'mother of all weimaraner clubs'.

Psychologically this is very helpful to make the american audience accept the sentence and to obey without too much protest.

* * * * *

1. **"[...] also reading your magazine on "blue and gray,"**

The german letter does not specify which edition has been studied. It rather uses the plural 'magazines' in an unspecific way.

"[...] and talking the situation over with your Liaison to our Club,"

This reads as if there was a dialog between the representant of the WCA and the writer and as if the decision was taken based on some sort of an agreement after this 'talking over'.

Please note that a decision by the german club, given its role as the leading organization regarding the standards, is not subject to any agreement.

The Deutscher Weimaraner Klub e.V. is free to decide, period.

Therefore, the original reads different: The representative gave her report, and as a part of the whole of information on the subject it was taken into consideration.

"[...] I come to the conclusion [guess: conclusion],"

At no point the original uses this form of personal involvment. The german letter always uses "The German Weimaraner Klub e.V." or other forms for the institution as a whole.

Another noticeable fact in this context is that the first signatory in the original letter is not identical with the one of the translation.

This is interesting because of the different perception of titles in Europe and in the USA: A club's chairman in Germany is a representative in the first place.

So, the first signatory and therefore 'author' of the original is the so-called Commissary for Breeding and Examination.

Since the topic of Breed Standards is his very own field of work, from a german point of view his signature is even more important then the second signature by the First Chairman.

This second signature is just a sign of approval / confidence, somewhat validating the content as being the official position of the DWK e.V.

I understand that the american understanding of hierarchies would lead to believe the topic not being important to the DWK in the case that it is not the Chairman signing, but just some subordinate.

This leads to the conclusion that besides the subject line and the content even the signa-tures have been altered to work out as desired.

"[...] that in the USA a new colour shade is to be brought into the Weimaraner Breed."

The German original refers to diverse information about the existence of the blue variant only, but does not deal with the quest for approval of it.

Note that the DWK refers to descriptions only - they haven't seen a Blue with their own eyes.

Also, the phrase "new color shade" presumes that some unspecified force tries to infiltrate the old breed with an alien color.

But as we know, this color has been present in the breed way before that date.

* * * * *

2. "[...] would like to"

Analog to the 'talking over' formula discussed above, the translation reads as if the DWK was longing for the sympathy of the AWC members for being unable to approve.

"[...] go on record that it cannot recognize"

(followed by the explanation why it can't in the next paragraph, to be discussed later).

The original reads different again. First, they specify their natural leading role regarding the breed standard, and then they write that in this function they conclude the color cannot be approved.

There is a subtle difference between 'this can't be done' and 'we can't do this':

The first version (original) is absolute and justifies itself by the simple facts, while the second one (translation) implies inability and even points to an address for potential guilt and failure.

This time, it's not the WCA, it's not even the DWK, it's ...

* * * * *

3. "The Institution "Federation Cynologique Internationale" [...] would not give permission"

Now we know what even the Deutscher Weimaraner Klub would have to surrender to - the fateful and irrevocable status quo dictated by the FCI!

The original text says that an application from the side of the German Weimaraner Klub e.V. had not been previewed. Please note that there is absolutely nothing to indicate that the FCI even knew about the topic.

On a side note: It would be interesting to know if the FCI denied the approval of such a supplement or specification to a breed standard once in their history (always presuming that it was the responsible club introducing this alteration).

"[...] to change the color in the standard."

This might be right instead - but then, at no point the discussion was about changing "the" color of the Weimaraner, and this is what this phrase suggests after all!

* * * * *

4. "We consider the Weimaraner Club of America our friend, and we beg you to breed our Weimaraner as it was breed [guess: bred] now for nearly 200 years, namely "Gray"."

The style of the interpretation is getting 'slightly' melodramatic here ...

Also, the period of time for which the breed is in existence is not a quote from the original, neither is the specification of respecting the standard color gray.

Furthermore, it is inexplicable that the DWK chairman signed this translation since the breed is registered since 1895 only.

Making the count from the release of this translation (1971) back to the registration of the Weimaraner Breed (1895), this does not even make *one* century.

"Picture No. 4 [...] This color and its shades will not be recognized in our standard."

The original specifies with german precision that (only) in the case of the picture being an authentic representation of the dog's color shade, this specific dog should not be recognized.

Please note that this confinement seems to be (relatively) fair under the given circumstances, which, again, are that the author has not seen a dog called by the term 'Blue' before.

The translation instead derives a common statement about *all* dogs somewhat resembling the *photography* - not even the real dog.

It is also remarkable that the order of the paragraphs has been altered.

In contrast to the original which deals with the standard in a more general way, the translation focusses on the specific issue of the blue coat color.

The re-sorting of the paragraphs seems to be made to provide a more fluent reading regarding the now altered content.

* * * * *

5. **"At that time I did not consider [guess: consider] it worthwhile to mention. As it did not confirm with our color standards."**

The original reads different again: It says that at the time there reasonable doubts regarding the authenticity of the color representation, and that these doubts have now been dispelled by the (oral) declarations.

"If the "Blue" color variation is taken in the standard, we have to close our Import for the Weimaraner from the USA.

We also will advice our Weimaraner Clubs all over the World to do the same. We have to do this to guard our Breed."

This paragraph is relatively close to the original regarding the content. The concluding justification has been added though. Please refer to my translation.

* * * * *

7. **"May I also say. Taking in the "Blue" color, will also change the "Amber" color of the eyes and automatically the color of the nails. Both characteristics of our Breed."**

The original refers to the general relation between coat, eye and claw color and specifies the recognizable eye color shades.

However, it does not deduct the automatism of a faulty eye or claw color from the blue coat directly.

* * * * *

Some strange facts about the formal aspects of the letter

Regarding the formal aspects of the original documents, I was wondering about quite a couple of details:

1. The style of the language used in the original document indicates that it has not been proof-read and corrected. Some of the grammar is not correct, leave alone very unusual, and there are quite a few typos;
2. the note paper had not been inserted correctly into the typewriter which lead to this very noticeable misalignment of the text in respect to the imprinted letterhead.

The content, for its generally bureaucratic style, seems to have been (at least vaguely) pre-formulated to sound official. On the other hand, the formal aspects tell a different story: We are talking about a *german* document, and since there is some truth in most prejudices - shouldn't it be executed in a way pretty close to perfection? Instead, it looks as if it was never meant to be

the final official document, but rather as if the author was aware of a translation to follow which would constitute the 'document' to rule the behaviour of the american breeders.

Strange enough, the 'translation' published in the american Weim mag seems to be printed on a note paper from the Deutscher Weimaraner Klub e.V., since it includes its letterhead and is signed by the DWK chairman.

I think that there is a noticable shift in style and lingual correctness from the paragraphs 1-4 to the later parts of the translation. The latter lag the fluent writing and make use of punctuation in a strange way.

The translation doesn't seem to come from one writer. It seems as if the first part had been 'optimized' for a stronger impact, while the second part reads authentic enough to be the smattering of some german - namely as the signatory, chairman of the DWK. The phrases are extremely short, actually much too short - a bit like what one would suppose to be german commando style.

I would say that the english version should not be considered as the translation of the german one - it is just too much an interpretation.

It was supposed to be understood as the translation, and therefore it has the same date as the original. But then, how come that it does not use the same address data for the addressee? How come that it is not signed the same way as the original?

The 'problem' is that it is a complete and valid document just the same, as it has been signed by the chairman of the DWK - always presuming it hasn't been made up in its entirety. However, there are all these questions remaining unanswered.

All the Best,
/Thomas