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In this article we explore interpreter ethics in China’s War of Resistance against Japanese Aggression (1937–1945). Interpreter ethics in conflict zones may be divided into professional and situation ethics, and situation ethics is the focus of this study. Apart from professional identity and ideology, interpreters have other identities and ideologies such as national identity and political ideology, especially when they belong to either of the conflicting parties. The concepts of ethics, identity and ideology remain unchanged when they are related to interpreting as a profession. However, they have different connotations when they are associated with a nation, a group or a community. As mediators across languages and cultures, interpreters are more likely to face moral crises in wartime than in peacetime. Therefore, in many cases, they have to violate professional ethics in order to follow situation ethics, and situation ethics varies with their identities and ideologies. The research findings show that during the War of Resistance against Japanese Aggression, interpreters’ national identity remained the same but their moral attitude changed.

1. Introduction

Ethics is an important issue in Translation Studies. A few years ago, Pym (2012) called for a move away from an “ethics of the translator” to “translator ethics” from the perspective of interculturality and proposed the key concepts relating to translator ethics by claiming that translators are in-betweens, messengers, professionals, interveners, missionaries and agents of co-operation. However, his theory focuses on translators’ professional ethics (i.e., the ethics of the position) rather than their situation ethics, which is an issue of great importance in dealing with conflict interpreters’
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Joseph Fletcher’s (1966) situation ethics can be of much help to analysing the moral dilemmas of interpreters in wartime. In the present study, it is assumed that there is an intimate relationship between translators’ situation ethics and their identity and ideology. To our knowledge, there have so far been no systematic and in-depth studies of the ethics, identity and ideology of interpreters in the Second Sino-Japanese War. In China this war is conventionally called “China’s War of Resistance against Japanese Aggression” (1937–1945) (CWRJA for short). The Lugou Bridge Incident launched by Japanese troops near Beijing on 7 July 1937 marks the beginning of the CWRJA. This war was an all-round display of aggression in the political, military, economic, ideological and cultural fields. During the eight-year war, the Kuomingtang (KMT) as the ruling Nationalist Party superficially stopped the civil war against the Communist Party of China (the CPC) and united all the domestic forces to form the national united front against Japanese aggression. On 15 August 1945, Japan surrendered, by which time more than 10 million Chinese had been killed.¹

Focusing on interpreter ethics in the CWRJA, we have formulated the following research questions:

(1) Which form of interpreter ethics can be detected during the CWRJA?
(2) What identity and ideology did the interpreters have during the CWRJA?
(3) Do the concepts of ethics, identity and ideology remain unchanged all the time?
(4) What is the relationship of interpreters’ ethics to their identity and ideology?
(5) What are the implications for studies of conflict interpreter ethics arising from identity and ideology as well as from the interrelationships between parties?

The present study mainly applies Pym’s concept of “translator ethics” and Fletcher’s situation ethics to a tentative analysis of the ethics, identity and ideology of various interpreters during the CWRJA, with illustrative examples from Chinese scholars’ research on the war.

2. Interpreters’ professional and situation ethics

Gile (2000, p. 40) defines interpreting as an oral translation of a spoken text and claims that interpreters have played an important role in history during exploration and invasion campaigns. As one of the most problematic issues in interpreting studies (Angelelli, 2006, p. 175), the role of interpreters is intimately related to ethics, which may be viewed as a set of objective rules or duties that decide ethical behaviour irrespective of
their consequences (Inghilleri, 2009, p. 102). Interpreters are not only professionals in interpreting, but also ordinary people within society. They have their own identities and ideologies, which will influence their ethics, especially their situation ethics in conflict interpreting. For this reason, in this study interpreter ethics is divided into professional and situation ethics.

2.1 Interpreters’ professional ethics

As professionals, interpreters are in a position to interpret for their clients. They have some professional codes to follow, codes that constitute the ethics of their position.

Professional ethics are standards or codes of conduct set by and for the professionals in a specific profession. By setting out expected behaviours in the form of professional ethics, professionals work together to try to uphold the good reputation of the profession. Codes of ethics set guidelines by which the profession can regulate itself and dismiss individuals who by their behaviour would damage the honour, credibility, and effectiveness of the profession. Support and maintenance of the code confer benefits on all members of the profession.

With the rapid development of interpreting services in modern society, interpreting has gradually become a profession. Professional interpreters need to understand the regulations of interpreting services and their professional ethics; their professional ethics are the rules and regulations set by the interpreting community according to the requirements of society. Cooke (2009) points out that “the interpreter code of ethics is the foundation upon which a client’s trust in the integrity, reliability and competence of an interpreting service is built” (p. 87).

Codes of ethics are commonly observed by all the parties in an interpreting interaction, including the interpreter, the speaker, the audience, the commissioner and the client. Different perspectives will lead to different professional ethics for interpreters. From a language perspective, such codes are seen to limit the potential for misunderstanding and guarantee that interpreting is accurate. From an ethical perspective, they are deemed to provide the basis of ethical conduct primarily through the maintenance of “neutrality” and “faithful” reproduction of speech. Interpreters comply with codes of ethics not out of fear of prosecution but out of a sense of duty and professionalism (Inghilleri, 2012, pp. 26–27).

Pym (2001, p. 67) has explored translator ethics from the perspective of the intercultural identity of the translator. He holds that responsibility is the basis of ethics. In other words, interpreters should be responsible to the matter, the client and the profession. Gouadec (2007, pp. 236–239) believes that any bona fide translator or interpreter will tacitly comply with an ethical code and put forward a professional code of ethics, including basic rules vis-à-vis work providers in the course of a translating or interpreting job, with regard to payment, colleagues or fellow
translators/interpreters and partners. Among them, as for the rule “vis-à-vis work provider”, professional translators must never tolerate or practise any kind of discrimination towards the work provider or translation requester on the grounds of social status, religious convictions, nationality, ethnic group or other factors. Although they may not be fully aware of what motivates their interpretation of the source text or speech, translators and interpreters are supposed to remain impartial and refuse to let their own convictions interfere with the translation being undertaken (or, if need be, use a clause of conscience to withdraw from, or refuse, a contract). They must always protect the work provider’s interests – as long, that is, as the latter remains within the law and ethical – by making sure that the translation will have no adverse effects on such interests. They must perform a true and honest translation in all circumstances and resist any pressure from others. And they must never make a choice of translation that might turn out to be detrimental to the work provider’s interests without consulting the work provider beforehand (Gouadec, 2007, pp. 236–237). Similar to Pym’s (2001, p. 11) viewpoint, Gouadec’s definition of the interpreters’ professional ethics also fails to consider contextual factors such as the interpreters’ identity and ideology in conflict zones.

2.2. Interpreters’ situation ethics

Interpreters in conflict zones, especially in wartime, are more likely to be faced with a situation which requires them to violate their professional codes in order to achieve a morally better result. This phenomenon can find an explanation in situation ethics. Joseph Fletcher, an American professor of social ethics and a famous proponent of situation ethics, formulated his philosophy of morality in his masterpiece *Situation Ethics: The New Morality* (1966). Situation ethics may be labelled the “new morality ethics” on moral decisions. Love is the central concept in Fletcher’s situation ethics in that love is the only law one should follow and love as the purpose of all ends justifies anything. Fletcher holds that there is nothing right or wrong; moral behaviour is relative, not absolute; decisions depend on the situation at hand rather than the law. In essence, situation ethics takes into consideration the particular context of an act when evaluating it ethically rather than judging it according to absolute laws and rules.

Interpreting is a social act which takes place in a certain context. Generally speaking, interpreters are expected to follow the professional rules and regulations universally acknowledged by the interpreting community. In Fletcher’s words, they enter into every decision-making situation fully armed with the ethical maxims of their community and its heritage, and they treat them with respect as illuminators of their problems. However, interpreters may violate the rules and regulations in some contexts if love seems to be better served by doing so. This type of violation may be interpreted as being moral and righteous, according to Fletcher.
Ping Li, Chuanmao Tian and Zhonglian Huang (1966), who claims that “circumstances alter rules and principles” (p. 55). In other words, rules and principles can be violated under some circumstances. Fletcher’s love is neighbourly love and his justice refers to the fair distribution of love among neighbours. In this study “love” is extended to the love of human life, one’s motherland and world peace, which constitutes the core meaning of “justice” in research on interpreter ethics in the CWRJA.

2.3. Interpreters’ ethics, identities and ideologies

The assumed link between duty and neutrality is what permits interpreters to claim, and their interlocutors to demand, that the interpreters should “just translate” even when abuses of power or instances of injustice are in evidence, or when faced with questions of personal conscience. Individuals behave morally responsibly when acting out of a sense of duty to these principles rather than by responding to personal emotions or a concern for the consequences of their behaviour, legal or otherwise (Inghilleri, 2012, p. 27). However, under certain circumstances, interpreters may resort to situation ethics for work tasks rather than professional ethics, due to love’s need.

Situation ethics is relative (Fletcher, 1966). It certainly changes with the times. As the times have changed, there have been sweeping changes in technology, media, communication and other factors that affect human life. People also respond to these changes and adapt accordingly. The total change that transpires has a defining influence on the moral fabric and culture of the nation from which an individual hails. In peacetime, for instance, interpreters strive to be true and faithful to the speaker or the work provider, but in wartime, interpreters may abandon their professional ethics to follow the ethics of the situation, for whatever reasons. Situation ethics is considered relative to culture, to circumstances and to the specific needs of the individual. Such ethics is naturally considered to be different between wartime and peacetime. Even in the same country and in the same war, interpreters with different national identities and political ideologies may have different situation ethics.

Interpreters’ professional and situation ethics are different in nature. Interpreters’ professional ethics is a prescriptive concept that has a certain degree of restricting power over interpreters, and has a close relationship with the social and political background of a specific culture. The core problem of interpreters’ professional ethics is whether interpreters are faithful to the speaker or responsible to the work provider. It can be argued that interpreters’ professional ethics will more or less remain unchanged at a certain time and in a certain culture. It is not influenced by interpreters’ identities and ideologies. But situation ethics is characterized by liberalism, pragmatism, relativism and individualism (Warnock, 1979, p. 328). It varies from person to person, from situation to situation and from culture
to culture. In reality, interpreters’ professional and situation ethics often conflict with each other, for four main reasons.

The first reason is the dual identity of the interpreter. Although some of them are multinationals, interpreters (e.g., Chinese interpreters) tend to acquire their situation ethics in their mother-tongue culture and they are influenced by the mainstream culture of their own society. So interpreters may rely on their national identity as a touchstone for defining professional ethics. Meanwhile, the interpreting work gives a person a second identity as an interpreter, which requires that the interpreter should comply with interpreters’ professional ethics. These two identities are simultaneously present within the interpreter, so they can result in ethical dilemmas.

The second reason is some of the more unrealistic requirements of the interpreting field as well as the combatants in the context of war. Interpreters’ professional ethics requires them to be completely faithful to the speech, the speaker, or the audience, which may sometimes result in a disturbance to the target language, the target language culture, or the audience. In order not to violate professional ethics, interpreters should adopt a faithfulness strategy in order to retain the heterogeneity of the speech, thereby promoting the cultural exchange. However, they may also adopt the adaptation strategy in order to protect the ethical norms of their native culture; as a result, some interpreters inevitably protect the ethics of their culture. This kind of situation ethics may have an influence on the fairness of interpreters’ professional ethics.

The third reason is that not all interpreters are willing to comply with professional ethics. Whether interpreters do so or not will depend on their personal understanding of the ethical dilemma and the requirements of their clients or the public. Sometimes there are no rules or principles regarding how to discipline those interpreters doing immoral or illegal activities; this makes it relatively painless for interpreters to violate their professional ethics.

The last reason is that interpreters’ choice of situation ethics is informed by their subjectivity biases, and interpreters have some autonomy in defining their ethical guidelines. In interpreting practice, some interpreters may, according to their own morality, choose interpreting strategies to protect their cultural values. Therefore, interpreters’ professional ethics can balance interpreter ethics in a more objective and fair way. On the other hand, cultures of the original and target languages remain deeply rooted in social ethical systems and may prevent interpreters from complying with their professional ethics.

3. Identity, ideology and interpreter ethics in the CWRJA

We have already discussed professional and situation ethics and interpreters’ dilemmas in choosing and complying with such ethical codes. As mediators across languages and cultures, interpreters in conflict
situations are more likely to face moral–ethical conflicts than those at peace due to their stronger focus on national identity and political ideology from both a client and an interpreter perspective (Inghilleri, 2012).

3.1 Identities and ideologies of interpreters in the CWRJA

Interpreters’ social status has not been high in many cases and the interpreting profession is even regarded as a profession of second choice (Robinson, 1997, p. 27). It is a fact that the social status of interpreters, especially Chinese interpreters serving in the Japanese army during the CWRJA, was even lower than expected when it came to working conditions, frequent ethical dilemmas, and physical and emotional pressures. Interpreters’ personal and professional identity and ideology naturally informs their discourse, but besides their professional identity, interpreters often have a national identity and a political ideology, especially when they are a member of either of the conflicting parties. Their audiences have their own identities and ideologies. Consequently, interpreters in the CWRJA had to navigate complex paths through the conflicts between these identities and ideologies.

Identity may be seen as the qualities, beliefs and other traits which make a person or group different from others, according to the online Merriam-Webster Dictionary.5 Interpreters’ identities in the CWRJA could at least be divided into professional identity, national identity and political identity. Their professional identity embraced all interpreters serving either the Japanese or the Chinese; in the CWRJA, interpreters’ national identity mainly covered the Chinese, the Japanese, the Korean and the Taiwanese. Their political identities comprised the CPC, the KMT and the Japanese militarism. The interpreters’ professional identity corresponded to their professional ethics, and their national and political identities to their situation ethics in some sense.

Ideology can be perceived as a “conceptual grid that consists of opinions and attitudes deemed acceptable in a certain society at a certain time” (Lefevere, 1998, p. 48). Interpreters’ ideologies in the CWRJA could be divided into cultural ideology, political ideology, and so on. As for the Japanese interpreters, there were two kinds of ideology: the Japanese militarist ideology and the anti-war ideology. As for the Chinese interpreters, there were mainly two kinds of ideology: the Nationalist (i.e., semi-feudal and semi-colonial) ideology embraced by the KMT members and the Communist (i.e., anti-Japanese) ideology championed by the CPC members. Then there was another kind of ideology pursued by the Korean and Taiwanese interpreters: it strove for a peaceful world on human justice grounds.

In a word, the national identities and political ideologies of interpreters in the CWRJA are determining factors in making their moral choices and decisions. In other words, these factors made them violate the
professional ethics and follow the situation ethics in some contexts in the war.

3.1.1 Interpreters serving the Japanese army

Interpreters in the army have a very high status for their important roles of making and keeping allies, determining the enemy’s positions and plans, overseeing conquered territories and negotiating with the enemy (Delisle & Woodsworth, 1995, p. 263). However, the interpreters serving the Japanese military forces did not have a high status and undertook interpreting tasks related to the trial of CPC-led soldiers, the mopping up operations and other activities. They had different national identities. Some of them were Chinese interpreters who received their Japanese-language learning in mainland China; some were Taiwanese and Korean interpreters who had strong proficiency in speaking and writing in Japanese; some were Japanese interpreters whose language education was received in Japan; some others were overseas Chinese interpreters who received their education in Japan. These interpreters can be categorized into the following groups according to their ideologies.

Some Chinese interpreters took refuge in the Japanese military forces and they were forced to engage in interpreting. They used to be called “Hanjian” (“汉奸”), a derogatory term for a traitor to the Han nationality, whereas the Japanese military forces were called “Japanese Devils” or “Riben Guizi” (“日本鬼子”). Many Chinese interpreters who served the Japanese army believed in the Nationalist ideology of the KMT or turned a deaf ear to the inhuman war and put the pursuit of money above everything.

Some Chinese interpreters were by chance forced to engage in interpreting. If they had refused to serve the Japanese military forces, they would have been killed. They served the Japanese military forces, but they showed their sympathy for the Chinese people. They displayed a diversity of ideologies, including the Nationalist ideology, the Communist ideology, and human justice.

Some Japanese interpreters were forced to leave their hometown in Japan and engage in interpreting for their army. Most of them worked for their military forces and had not realized that Japan had launched a war of aggression against China. Instead, under the influence of the Japanese militarist ideology, some of them regarded their interpreting activities as the embodiment of patriotism.

Some other interpreters usually had a weak sense of national identity and political ideology and did their work for material gain. Some of these translators showed sympathy for the Chinese from the bottom of their hearts (Wen & Yu, 2005).
3.1.2 Interpreters serving the Chinese army

The national identities and political ideologies of the interpreters serving the Chinese army were also complicated. The CPC members and some progressive intellectuals generally worked as interpreters serving the Chinese army. They engaged in interpreting the interrogation of Japanese war criminals, gathering Japanese intelligence and helping the Chinese army to destroy the Japanese and pro-Japanese KMT troops.

The interpreters serving the Chinese military forces can be divided into three groups. The first was the Chinese interpreters who received Japanese language learning in China or in Japan, and most of them were members of the CPC or progressive intellectuals who embraced the Communist ideology. The second was some Korean or Taiwanese interpreters serving the Chinese army with an anti-war ideology. The third group consisted of the Chinese and Japanese interpreters who initially believed in the Nationalist ideology or Japanese militarist ideology but who modified their ideologies or their national identity due to the education of the CPC, and then rose against the Japanese invaders. These three kinds of interpreter were all willing to serve the Chinese military forces and the Chinese people.

3.1.3 Characteristics of identities and ideologies of interpreters in the CWRJA

Interpreters in the war had complex national identities and political ideologies. However, they had to choose to be for one party and against the other, which is different from the conduct of interpreters during peacetime. Interpreters in the war generally had a distinct political ideology, supporting either the Japanese or the Chinese military forces. It was rare for interpreters to be able to maintain a neutral stance in conflict zones. Some Chinese and Japanese interpreters serving the Japanese army were able to maintain a neutral political stance, though. They were often faced with a dilemma because of their conscience and inability to save the Chinese people from being killed by the Japanese military forces.

Moreover, some interpreters might have changed their political beliefs, especially when they were captured by the other party in the CWRJA. And some interpreters serving the Japanese at the beginning altered their political stance or national identity because of the complex situations in which they became involved. For example, Feng Xiangcheng, a Chinese interpreter serving the Japanese army, changed his “side” and began to serve the Chinese army after being captured (Wang & Ma, 1991, pp. 198–205). Ima Hirono, a Japanese interpreter serving the Japanese army, also altered his national and political beliefs after being captured (Cui et al., 2005, p. 529).
3.2 Interpreter ethics in the CWRJA

There are many situations in which interpreters experience conflict and uncertainty over what constitutes their primary duty and what counts as ethical behaviour. In such instances, they must determine, sometimes in a matter of seconds, whether their obligation should be oriented to their profession, to the person or institution paying their fee, to a member of their own culture, religion, gender or ethnic group, or to a particular country or set of principles. Any one of these factors may make an interpreter decide that it is ethically permissible to break with professional ethics. This raises several relevant questions: What would motivate an interpreter to break with their duty to remain impartial? Under what circumstances might such a decision become ethically acceptable? (Inghilleri, 2012, pp. 28–29). Interpreter ethics varies with interpreters’ identity and ideology (Chesterman, 2001; Nord, 1997; Simon, 1996; Venuti, 1995). The concepts of ethics, identity and ideology basically remain the same when they are related to interpreting as a profession, but they are dynamic when associated with a nation, a group or a community that calls for interpreters’ allegiances. The concept “allegiance” may be understood as loyalty to or love of a nation, a group or a community and therefore it falls within the scope of situation ethics.

3.2.1 Choices between interpreters’ professional ethics and situation ethics in the CWRJA

The primary and key issue of translator ethics is not how to translate, but whether the translator should translate, because if interpreters know why they should translate, they will also know how to translate, and even know what should be translated in different situations (Pym, 1997, p. 16). The question of whether the translator should translate actually refers to the responsibilities of the interpreter, and it is concerned with the choices between the interpreter’s professional and situation ethics in the war.

In conflict zones, the choices between professional and situation ethics usually also conflict: it is rare for interpreters to choose both of them at the same time; instead, it is common for them to choose either of them, that is, they may choose either professional ethics or situation ethics (Wang, 2005, p. 46). Fletcher’s situation ethics (1966) can explain this kind of choice.

First, the moral tradition or commonly held orthodoxy of a nation where interpreters live may also influence the interpreters’ choice. Since interpreters cannot live in a vacuum, they generally belong to a certain epoch and society; therefore, their interpreting will be influenced by the prevailing social morality.

As a Chinese national, the interpreter in the CWRJA would inevitably be influenced by Chinese morality, since moral culture was a
primary foundation of China. Moreover, the culture of filial piety is the core of the Chinese ethical and moral culture. It defines the relationship between family members such as that between the parent and children, meaning that children should support, worship and love their parents. Later on, filial piety extends from the family to the national level, meaning that a person should be loyal to his or her country (Wang, 2005, p. 45).

The moral tradition of the Chinese nation is saturated with a spirit of sacrificing personal desires, happiness and demands in the name of social progress and national security. Fan Zhongyan, a famous statesman and scholar in the Song Dynasty, wrote in his poem, “One should be the first to worry for the future of the state and the last to claim his share of happiness” (“先天下之忧而忧, 后天下之乐而乐”). Gu Yanwu, a great thinker in the Qing Dynasty, once said, “Everybody is responsible for the rise and fall of the country” (“天下兴亡，匹夫有责”). Lin Zexu, in the Qing Dynasty, once said, “If it is good for the country, even if one must sacrifice one’s life, they must do it, and cannot hold back due to individual fortunes” (“苟利国家生死以, 岂因祸福避趋之”).

Confucian humanism emphasizes that the reason why people are worthy of respect is that people have morals. Many current celebrities in China claim the realization of the moral ideal as one of the highest needs of the people, which becomes the pillar of their belief: that through performing they can engender a spirit of selfless dedication and patriotic spirit. As Mencius said, “I love my life, but I also love the righteousness. If I cannot keep them both, I will give up my life and choose the righteousness.”

Deeply influenced by the “filial piety” ethics put forward by Chinese Confucianism, Japanese families believe that filial piety means that family members should be absolutely obedient to the head of the household. When children make a choice of career or marriage, they must also obey the head of the household. This filial piety of family members extends to the loyalty to the emperor at the state level, which is regarded as patriotism. The Japanese emperor is the representative of the state; therefore all the Japanese people should maintain absolute loyalty and unconditional obedience to the Mikado.

Since modern times, Japan’s ruling class has tried to implement a national programme of integrating loyalty and filial piety; therefore, loyalty and filial piety have become the highest standard of Japanese national morality (Cui et al., 2005). In a series of wars of aggression, fascist militarism transformed filial piety into absolute “patriotic and loyal service to the emperor”. Japanese citizens were required to abandon their personal interests and desires completely and obey unconditionally the requirements set by the emperor and the state. This kind of Japanese national morality allowed the militaristic regime to implement aggressive policies and launch aggressive wars.

Therefore, when interpreters made their ethical choices, they would consider their national morality (Wang, 2005, p. 47). As a result, as for
Chinese or Japanese interpreters, their national morality defined them as a loyal person to their own nation rather than to their profession. In fact, filial piety helped to cultivate national loyalty in both Japanese and Chinese people (Wen & Yu, 2005). In other words, a love of their motherland was an important reason for some interpreters to engage in interpreting during the war.

Second, interpreters’ national identity and political ideology may influence their choices. Their choice of professional and situation ethics begins with intrinsic motivations of their own. At the moment when interpreters in the CWRJA chose their political ideologies, they began to assume their responsibilities in interpreting.

Interpreting activities had already become commercialized by the time of the CWRJA: interpreters are engaged in their trade for material gain. According to Pym (2001, p. 6), translator labour is exchanged for something: for money, in a very narrow view of professionalism, or for social relations, prestige or a learning process, in the wider vision that we accept. Besides economic motivations, an important reason for interpreters to do interpreting during the CWRJA was to protect themselves or their country and people. The security of personal life or one nation was the decisive factor for interpreters to engage in interpreting during the war (Cui et al., 2005). As far as Fletcher’s situation ethics is concerned, love of their own life or their native country leads to their choice of interpreting.

Moreover, the choice between an interpreter’s professional and situation ethics is in some cases made by interpreters according to their sympathy, namely their love of neighbours. The Scottish moral philosopher and political economist Adam Smith interprets sympathy as: “Of this kind is pity or compassion, the emotion we feel for the misery of others, when we either see it, or are made to conceive it in a very lively manner” (Quoted in Camayd-Freixas, 2013, p. 24). For example, some Korean and Taiwanese interpreters were sympathetic with the Chinese people because they or their family members had also experienced being insulted by the Japanese. They could not only understand the feelings of the Chinese people, but also sympathize with them. When they engaged in interpreting, therefore, they were sympathetic to the Chinese people’s misery and helped them. Their love of neighbours became a source of morality. Here it can be seen that the interpreters’ compassion and experiences determined their choices between their professional and their situation ethics.

### 3.2.2 Interpreters’ professional and situation ethics in the CWRJA

The complexity of the national identities and political ideologies of interpreters in the war makes it very difficult for interpreters to keep a neutral stance. If the interpreters’ ethics does not conflict with their national interests, they will choose to comply with their professional and situation ethics. If their ethics conflicts with their national interests, identity or
ideology, though some interpreters will choose to comply with their professional ethics, while others will choose to follow their situation ethics.

3.2.2.1 Complying with professional and situation ethics

The interpreters in the CWRJA made their moral decision for the following reasons: the decision would bring them pleasing or satisfying results; it would protect their own security as well as that of their family members; it would safeguard the national interests. From the perspective of Fletcher’s situation ethics, all the above moral decisions are based on love, such as love of one’s own life, love of one’s neighbours’ life and love of one’s motherland. Moreover, some interpreters were willing to sacrifice their life in order to achieve greater love, namely the protection of their national interests.

The ideology of interpreters might change in the different periods of the war. It was reported that some Japanese and Chinese interpreters modified their ideologies as a result of the education of the CPC and rose against the Japanese invaders. For example, some interpreters of Japanese origin joined the CPC army and helped the Chinese people in order to express their regret at the Japanese launching a full-scale invasion of China and the disasters the Japanese army brought to the Chinese people. In this case, their national identity remained the same but their moral attitude changed.

Some Japanese interpreters received an ideological education from the CPC and realized that the Japanese launched the “Shina seisen”, which was actually of an aggressive nature. The CPC informed them that Japan would definitely be defeated and China and Japan would eventually become peaceful neighbours. Later on, these interpreters joined the Chinese army. A case in point is Ima Hirono. Ima recognized that the Japanese had launched the “Cina Jihad” which was aggressive, that Japan would definitely be defeated sooner or later, and that China and Japan would be friendly neighbours in the end. In June 1941, the Shandong branch of the Japanese anti-war alliance was established in Yinan County, and Ima became the branch member and the minister of the organization. On 1 July of the same year, some of the branch members, including Ima, joined the Eighth Route Army under the leadership of the CPC (Cui et al., 2005, p. 529).

In summary, some interpreters complied with both professional and situation ethics in the war. On the one hand, they followed the professional codes in interpreting; on the other, they did the interpreting work based on their love. For example, some Chinese interpreters serving the CPC and KMT armies interpreted faithfully for their work providers, and their interpreting motive was the survival of the Chinese nation, namely the noble love of their motherland. For some Taiwanese and Korean interpreters serving the Chinese armies, they came to China to do
interpreting due to their sense of justice, their love of neighbours and world peace, and their interpreting strictly followed the professional codes. Even for those Japanese interpreters serving the CPC army, they interpreted faithfully for their clients in order to achieve the greater amount of love: love of the victims in a foreign country was morally greater than that of their compatriots who were invading China.

### 3.2.2.2 Complying with professional ethics

In the CWRJA, those Japanese interpreters serving the Japanese army who embraced Japanese militarism believed that the war was a just one because they thought that it would help the Chinese to get rid of ignorance and oppression through the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere (Kagawo & Maeda, 1985, p. 97). They usually made the choice to comply with their professional ethics. But from the moment they made this choice, they did harm to China and the Chinese people. In fact, many Japanese interpreters were not aware of the issues with morality, such as the love of human life and world peace.

Moreover, some Chinese interpreters who served the Japanese army believed in the Nationalist ideology of the KMT, turned a deaf ear to the inhuman war and put the pursuit of money above everything (Wen & Yu, 2005). They were willing to comply with professional ethics and violate situation ethics. As for Japanese atrocities in the war, a Chinese interpreter named Wu Jiang witnessed the notorious 1937 Nanjing Massacre due to the KMT’s non-resistance policy in which more than 300,000 Chinese were killed.

Some Korean or Taiwanese interpreters serving the Japanese army chose to comply with their professional ethics without considering their love of human life and world peace. As a third party, they were not concerned about the interests of Japan or China, only caring about their own life and interests. They might regard interpreting as a profession and feel a need to provide a neutral voice in interpreting for the Japanese. If they had lived in peacetime, it would have been right for them to comply with their professional ethics. However, the fact is that they worked during wartime and they helped the aggressors. This kind of blind pursuit of professional ethics is totally undesirable.

In addition, the national identities and political ideologies of interpreters were very complex. Some clerks, teachers or soldiers who knew Japanese and Chinese became interpreters by chance, thus influencing their ideology in their interpreting work. These amateur interpreters as language intermediaries did not identify with the interpreting profession and its codes of professional ethics, which led to the usefulness of the concept of “professional ethics” being called into question within the context of interpreting during a conflict.
3.2.2.3 Complying with situation ethics

Apart from some professional interpreters in the CWRJA, there were some temporary interpreters, which is a popular phenomenon, especially in conflict zones. These temporary interpreters had their own professions, such as a language teacher or an employee in a company. As a result, interpreters serving the Japanese military forces, especially some Korean and Taiwanese interpreters and some Japanese interpreters working for the Chinese people, were more probably in a position to face more moral dilemmas than interpreters who operate in peacetime.

The interpreter should behave in a “neutral” and non-intrusive way. However, this is a difficult stance to maintain in wartime. As Gouadec (2007) and Inghilleri (2012) have discussed, professional ethics will not be completely obeyed by interpreters in conflict zones. In line with this, interpreters in the CWRJA did not always obey the code of being faithful to the speaker. In fact, sometimes interpreters might intentionally interpret in an incorrect way, their choice of ethics in conflict zones being determined by their national identity and political ideology.

The role of the work provider during the war was also complicated. On the one hand, interpreters during the CWRJA served the Japanese and Chinese armies, which were their work providers. However, since the armies of Japan and China had a strong link with the needs of the nations themselves, from a global perspective, the biggest work provider was the nation state. During the war, interpreters made different moral choices since they had different national identities and ideologies, and served different work providers.

As a result, interpreters in the CWRJA might not always protect the work provider’s interests. For example, they might: fail to comply with their instructions and specifications; fail to indicate clearly whatever grounds there might be for disagreement and why; feel pressure from other parties to colour the true and honest circumstances, and so on. Furthermore, interpreters in the war might tolerate or practise discrimination towards their work provider or requester of interpreting services on the grounds of social status, religious convictions, nationality, or other factors; or they might make the choice to interpret that might turn out to be detrimental to the work provider’s interests without consulting the work provider beforehand.

There are also some special cases where interpreters cannot fulfil the principle of being faithful to the speaker or loyal to the work provider. When professional interpreters work for those in power or in opposition, they can define the requirements and purpose of the interpreting task based on their work provider’s position. However, interpreters who have their own moral values, cultural values and worldviews may not be necessarily loyal to their work provider.

Some Chinese interpreters serving the Japanese army took the interests of China into consideration. Although they interpreted for the
Japanese, they complied with their situation ethics to avoid more damage to their nation. For example, Xia Wenyun worked as an interpreter for the Japanese leader named Kyō Hiroya. He was highly respected by his superior and maintained a good relationship with other army leaders. He had been studying in Japan and graduated from Tokyo Imperial University. Later on, he was appointed as an interpreter for the KMT President Li Zongren, realizing that the Japanese actual intent with its “Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere” was to destroy China and to rule and enslave the Chinese people. He worked for Li Zongren as an intelligence agent, providing secrets of the Japanese army and in that way making a contribution to the war (Wen & Yu, 2005).

Sometimes interpreters will intentionally interpret wrongly if the speech conflicts with their national interests. Qin Banghuai was born of a landlord family and graduated from the Department of Textile of Waseda University in Japan. At the very beginning of his interpreting career, he was an interpreter with a strong sense of patriotism and did not want to work for the Japanese invaders. But he was forced to work for them for the sake of his own security. One day, he set out with the Japanese invaders to mop up the Chinese villages and met a child on the Dongyang bridge. A Japanese soldier played with the child, but the latter yelled out “Cao Ni Niang!” (“操你娘!”, “Fuck you!”). The Japanese soldier asked Qin what the child said. Qin said to him that the child wanted to “say hello” to the imperial Japanese army. The Japanese soldier thought it was a greeting, and later he learned it and said hello to other soldiers with “Cao Ni Niang!” (Zhang & Qiang, 1995, p. 108). In this case, the interpreter intentionally interpreted incorrectly and did not offer any explanation to his work provider. This example powerfully illustrates Inghilleri’s view that “[i]nterpreters must be permitted to exercise their agency to voice their concerns, to make what they deem to be the right ethical choice in the moment, even if their professional duty suggests otherwise” (2012, p. 48). Judging by Fletcher’s situation ethics, the interpreter entered into the decision-making situation based on his love for his compatriots. He had to violate the professional ethics in this special context, otherwise the child would have been killed by the cruel Japanese soldier. As Fletcher (1966) claims, “circumstances alter cases” and “circumstances alter rules and principles” (p. 11). Interpreters are therefore entitled to make moral decisions of their own on special occasions, even though their professional norms might be violated.

4. Discussion and implications

It can be seen from the above analysis that interpreters’ identities and ideologies have a great impact on their moral choices and decisions in wartime. The co-existence of professional and situation ethics for conflict
interpreters deserves further exploration in pursuit of research on interpreter ethics.

4.1 Interpreters’ ethical dilemmas and pressures in conflict zones

Pym (1995, p. 93) thinks that the translator is the subject of translation, so the translator’s right should be respected. Accordingly, any appraisal of the interpreter’s choice of ethics should be discussed with regard to specific contextual factors. Studies on interpreter ethics, identity and ideology in conflict zones can, to some extent, help to determine the reasons for their dilemmas, their choice of situation ethics as well as their physical and mental pressures.

4.1.1 Interpreters’ dilemmas and pressures

In some sense, for interpreters in conflict zones, especially in wartime, moral problems, moral choices and moral decisions seem to be more important than how and what to interpret.

4.1.1.1 To interpret or not to interpret, that’s the question

For interpreters in conflict zones, in many cases, there is no room for neutrality, no intermediate position, and no possibility for sitting on the fence. Schleiermacher (1813/2004) states it explicitly as follows: “One must be loyal to one language or another, as to one nation …” (p. 58). Translators must therefore choose to belong to one side or the other (Pym, 1997, p. 27). This applies to interpreters in conflict zones when it comes to two nations, cultures and ideologies. The above discussion of the interpreter ethics in the CWRJA shows that interpreters’ dilemmas are associated with the question “whether we should interpret or not”. This question has been put forward by Pym (1997) and his concise answer is that interpreters or translators should interpret or translate in order to promote co-operation between two parties. However, not all interpreters have the ability to decide whether they should interpret or not, especially when it is concerned with the national identity and ideology in conflict zones. In other words, conflict interpreter ethics goes beyond Pym’s concept of ethics and therefore requires further exploration.

The first factor to consider is interpreters’ personal security. In conflict zones, personal security becomes a determining factor for interpreters when making choices between their professional and situation ethics. Interpreters in conflict zones often impose on themselves the dangers to which they are exposed. Therefore, interpreters’ virtues are very important, which in most cases can help them to seek either their own
security or national interests. Some Chinese interpreters with good language skills and interpreting competence had no morality in the CWRJA: they betrayed their native country and people. In China they have since been regarded as national traitors. This kind of interpreter in conflict zones cared only for their own security or financial gain, which is undesirable from the perspective of national survival.

As far as situation ethics is concerned, Fletcher’s love includes love of others and love of oneself. Therefore, it is the right of every interpreter to protect their life in conflict zones. The key point is that the interpreter is obliged to consider the interests of the weak or the just side.

The second factor to consider is the security of one’s native country. Interpreters in conflict zones are expected to care for the security and interests of their nation. If they are on the weak or the just side, then interpreters may not be faithful to the speaker or the work provider but may make a decision based on their moral attitude or security concerns. If interpreters are on the strong or the unjust side and they care for the security and interests of their nation, there may be pressures for them to maintain their job security, which may impair the situation ethics. Therefore, interpreters’ national identity and political ideology determine whether in conflict zones they first serve their national interests.

The third factor is the future of human beings. Because of their subjectivity, when interpreters in conflict zones assume their responsibilities, they are expected to make better choices to create a peaceful society. Therefore, interpreters’ mission with respect to the future of the human society is based on their responsibilities and is also influenced by their national identity and political ideology. All human actions are supposed to pursue the happy and good life of other human beings as the final purpose of their profession. As a member of society, the interpreter plays an active role in the construction of a peaceful world. In particular, as a bridge between different nations and cultures, interpreters should take it as their responsibility to build bridges between nations to help people to live in harmony, although government decisions often play a decisive role, either positive or negative, in human welfare.

4.1.1.2 The proper way for interpreters to act

(a) Responsible to the speaker?
Chesterman (1997, p. 147) holds that traditional discussions of ethics in Translation Studies have dealt with a rather motley set of questions. These have generally been concerned either with the duties of translators or with their rights. And he has summarized six typical issues. Among them, the second issue is “the acceptable degree of freedom in the translating process, plus the issue of whether translators have the right or duty to change or correct or improve the original” (Chesterman, 1997, p. 147). And the last issue is:
There has been some discussion of the translation commissioner’s power and ideology in initiating the selection of texts to be translated: see, for example, Lefevere (1992) on patronage. Issues have also been raised concerning the relation between translators and the various authoritative bodies who legislate or otherwise determine the positions to be taken within a given culture concerning the above questions (e.g., 1992) (Chesterman, 1997).

Chesterman has mentioned two key points: the attitude towards the original and the power and ideology of the translation. If we connect these points with interpreter ethics in the CWRJA, we can conclude that interpreters’ national identity and ideology determine their attitude towards the original spoken text. That is to say, different interpreters’ identity and ideology will result in different choices in professional and situation ethics.

(b) Responsible to the work provider?
Translation is considered as a kind of business service, and it requires translators to carry out translation practice according to the requirements of the client and to realize the objective determined by the client. Accordingly, translators should show their loyalty and sense of responsibility to their client (Chesterman, 2001). Pym (1997, pp. 71–72) regards translation as a service and holds that interpreters are paid by their clients. They therefore need to interpret according to the requirements of the target language, in the target situation, for the person who asks and who pays – or so we are told. Every relationship between translator/interpreter and client is regulated by a certain asymmetry: one translates, the other pays, in one way or another. This asymmetry could also be the basis for a power relationship: in a case of conflict or doubt; translators tend to submit themselves to the client (Pym, 1997, p. 79).

Interpreters’ work is full of challenges in conflict zones. Some of them have to comply with their professional ethics for fear of losing their lives. Some others choose to follow situation ethics and therefore they are not loyal to their clients, audiences or interpreting users in their caring for the security and interests of the weak or the just side if their own nation launches an aggressive war.

(c) Responsible to all human beings?
Although the primary duty of interpreters in remaining impartial is intended to protect the rights of all the parties in an interpreting interaction, there are cases where interpreters must weigh the rights of one individual against another to ensure that the communicative objectives of all the participants are given equal or adequate space within an interaction. Interpreters’ decisions to break with their professional codes of ethics in these circumstances are usually not arbitrary or irresponsible attempts to undermine their interlocutors’ rights or the settings aside of professional duties: they are attempts to balance one ethical obligation against another,
moments of genuine ethical insight, not violations of duty (Inghilleri, 2012, p. 29).

Pym (2001, p. 9) has pointed out that translators tend to be intercultural in the sense that they mostly work in the intersections woven between two or more cultures, rather than wholly within any single primary culture. Therefore, interpreters should not care about their national interests and should be objective.

But in many cases there is no neutral position for interpreters to take in conflict zones. They do have a preference for their national interests, which reflects their identities and ideologies. However, a love of human life and world peace seems to be of great importance to conflict interpreters. If interpreters in conflict zones assume responsibility for the happiness of all human beings, they will make the correct choices between professional and situation ethics (Koskinen, 2000, p. 71).

4.1.2 Strategies for dealing with interpreters’ dilemmas and pressures

As illustrated by the evidence in this article, in conflict zones there are three strategies that will help interpreters to choose between professional ethics and situation ethics.

First of all, when an interpreter’s professional and situation ethics conflict, interpreters should follow the principle of “producing the largest benefits and the smallest harm”, which is Fletcher’s so-called love (Fletcher, 1966, pp. 73–75). The benefit and harm are not judged on the basis of interpreters’ requests, but on the basis of a comparison of the benefits and harms to the related parties made by interpreters in accordance with their own actions. Interpreters should not make judgements according to the benefits likely to accrue to them; instead, they are supposed to go beyond the interests of the parties concerned. When their native country is at the point of life and death, it is the duty of interpreters to safeguard their national interests and follow situation ethics as their first consideration.

Secondly, interpreters should follow the principle of priority of justice in the choice of interpreter ethics. If an interpreter’s native country launches a war which is not just and his or her interpreting will bring about a disaster to the victim of the war, the interpreter should opt for the situation ethics and safeguard the interests of human beings as a whole rather than the interests of their own country. In such a case, the interpreter should give up some professional ethics to help to achieve a greater benefit for society. In other words, a love of world peace allows interpreters to violate professional codes.

Thirdly, the above choice depends on the interpreter’s virtue, which is bound to be restricted by complex social factors. Interpreters make their
choices of interpreter ethics, which is sometimes not determined by the interpreter’s inner requirements but by social politics, history, culture and other factors.

4.2 Enriching theories of interpreter ethics

Chesterman (2001) has crystallized the multiplicity of ideas about translation ethics into four basic models. In the model “Ethics of representation”, he explains that this model of translation ethics goes back to the ideal of the faithful interpreter, and to the translation of sacred texts. The ethical imperative is to represent the source text, or the source author’s intention, accurately, without adding, omitting or changing anything (Chesterman, 2001, p. 139). In the model “Ethics of service”, a translator is deemed to act ethically if the translation complies with the instructions set by the client and fulfils the aim of the translation as set by the client and accepted or negotiated by the translator (Chesterman, 2001, p. 140).

Chesterman (2001, p. 153) has also proposed an “Ethics of responsibility”. Among the nine requirements for responsibility, four of them are:

- I swear to be a loyal member of the translators’ profession, respecting its history. I am willing to share my expertise with colleagues and to pass it on to trainee translators. I will not work for unreasonable fees. I will always translate to the best of my ability. (Loyalty to the profession)
- I swear that my translation will not represent their source texts in unfair ways. (Truth)
- I undertake to respect the professional secrets of my clients and not to exploit clients’ information for personal gain. I promise to respect deadlines and to follow clients’ instructions. (Trustworthiness)
- I will inform clients of unresolved problems, and agree to arbitration in cases of dispute. (Justice)

Pym (2001, p. 130) believes that the purpose of translator ethics is to explain how and why the translator should do the right thing.

The interpreter ethics in the CWRJA shows that these models of ethics in peacetime are inapplicable to the interpreter ethics in conflict zones. However, Fletcher’s situation ethics helps us to analyse conflict interpreters’ moral dilemmas and moral decisions. Moreover, the discussion of interpreter ethics in wartime can enrich the theories of interpreter ethics generally. The implications for interpreter ethics in conflict zones can be summarized as follows:

- Interpreters may not be faithful to the speaker or loyal to the work provider. In the process of interpreting, interpreters have the
imperative to change, correct or amend speech according to situation ethics when it is concerned with national and identity issues.

- Interpreters can be visible, since they have the right to modify speech.
- Interpreters have the right to accept or refuse an interpreting job for their native country, neutral parties or aggressive parties when they are confronted with personal security.

5. Conclusion

As mediators across languages and cultures, interpreters in the CWRJA are in a position to face greater ethical quandaries than those in peacetime. Situation ethics varies with interpreters’ national identities and political ideas. In the CWRJA, those Japanese interpreters who embraced militarism believed that the war was a just one because they thought that it would help to bring prosperity to the ignorant and oppressed Chinese (Wang, 2005). Many Chinese interpreters who served the Japanese army believed in different ideologies such as the Nationalist ideology of the KMT or the Communist ideology of the CPC. Many interpreters turned a deaf ear to both the inhuman war and the parties for whom they translated in pursuit of money. The CPC was instrumental in educating Japanese and Chinese interpreters with respect to their moral deficiencies in aiding the Japanese invaders. In this case, their national identity remained the same but their moral attitude changed. In a word, the boundaries of the ethics, identity and ideology of interpreters in wartime offer fertile ground for us to study the professional and situation ethics of interpreters under duress and also the historical changes in the ethical responsibilities of the interpreting profession.
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