



Translation and manipulation: a critical discourse analysis case study

Forough Rahimi and Mohammad Javad Riasati

Department of Foreign Languages, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 20 September 2011;

Received in revised form:

16 November 2011;

Accepted: 28 November 2011;

Keywords

Translation,
Censorship,
Ideological manipulation.

ABSTRACT

This paper seeks to delineate the constraints imposed on translators of movie dialogues in the context of Iran. The movie "Platoon" is selected for this purpose. In this situation a myriad of external constraints, that is, cultural, religious, and political, lead to rewriting or manipulation of movie texts. This is an effective means for creating and naturalizing ideologies, through expurgation, derogation, etc. The movie translations in Iran are scenes of ideological incursions in translation, that is, suppression of dialectal features. They are sites of ideological clashes in which certain realities are constructed and challenged and xenophobic attitudes are propagated. The translators counterfeit realities and inculcate them in the innocent audience. This paper explores the ideological and socio-political factors which determine the strategies applied in the translation of western movies.

© 2011 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

During the past decade educational researchers increasingly have turned to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a set of approaches to answer questions about the relationships between language and society. Critical discourse studies have been defined as a new cross-discipline that comprises the analysis of text and talk in virtually all discipline of the humanities and social sciences [1]. CDA examines practices and customs in society both to discover and describe how they work and also to provide a critique of those practices, with the primary aim of CDA disclosing the underlying and often implicit ideological and power relations in spoken and written discourse.

Rewriting of the movies texts in Iran, is a practice which is the repercussion of the government's censorship policies adopted by the conservative clerics who hold sway in the Iranian media and sound continuous warnings about a trespassing tide of "godlessness" and worry about the "west-struck" mass. Hence, they bend themselves over backwards to create barriers against western influence by eliminating the supposedly morally contaminating elements of the western movies. This way they want to postpone Iran's assimilation into a global culture. This is what Jalal Ale Ahamad, an influential thinker, would call at the time of Shah "Gharbzadegi" ("Weststruckness"). The authorities in Iran try to remove the stigma of "Westoxification". They want to "immunize" the Iranian people against the unhealthy western culture by the backlash of censorship and control of the content of the movies and other cultural imports. In the same line of activities, the conservatives now specify political and religious norms which must be followed in translational activities. Toury [2] has dealt with the issue of censorship in translation. They have shown that cultural and political institutions construct and direct the ideologies of different communities, a condition dramatically observed in the translational policies in Iran.

Basic CDA frameworks and practices: Fairclough, Hodge and Kress and Van Dijk

Fairclough's model may be considered as the cornerstone of the entire field of CDA, because he was the first to create a theoretical framework, which provided guidelines for future CDA research. His model is based on the assumption that

language is an irreducible part of social life. The dialectic relation between language and social reality is realized through social events (texts), social practices (orders of discourse) and social structures (languages) [3].

In his research, Fairclough attempts to uncover ideological and power patterns in texts. Furthermore, he is the only CDA scholar who defines the relationship between power and language (social power and ideology) in his research [4]. Fairclough's [5] analysis has moved from focusing on the "whatness" of the text description towards the "how" and "whyness" of the text interpretation and explanation. There are certain underlying assumptions behind these selections and these assumptions are never innocent, rather they are ideologically driven. By studying the forms of the language, we can explore the social processes and then ideology embedded in them. This leads to the exploration of power relations, existing in the social institution or community. He believes in a "hidden agenda".

According to Hodge and Kress [6], the main focus of a particular vocabulary item will be on its origin of classification, schemes, and ideologically significant relations such as synonymy, antonymy, and hyponymy, relational values and expressive values. The dichotomous categorization of "euphemism" and "derogatory" is the milestone of the explanations provided in this framework.

To come up with the detection devices for manipulation of realities and ideologies in text by the application of euphemistic and derogatory terms, Hodge and Kress's [6] model treating "language and ideology" has been the main criterion.

It is a "syntagmatic model" made up of the assumptions regarding the interaction of the language, thought, ideology and the classification system which consists of "actionals" and "relationals".

In this framework, actional models represent the perceived relationships in the physical world. Actionals are divided more specifically into "transactive" and "non-transactive". Relational models encompass "equative" and "attributive" sections. They are concerned with the classificatory and evaluative systems of the language.

Equative models create the relations between nouns while attributive models bring about relations between nouns and qualities.

Relationals indicate the consequence of mental activities, suggest judgments, comments, etc. Euphemistic and derogatory words belong to the relational part of this framework and are used as detection devices for recognizing the manipulation of realities and ideas. Ideology, according to Hodge and Kress [6] involves a systematically organized presentation of reality. The application of different euphemistic or derogatory terms leads to different presentations of realities and therefore ideologies.

Van Dijk's [1] framework has provided some illustrations of the categories that he believes to be important in doing CDA studies. He asserts that the main point of the analysis is to show how various ideologies are expressed in various kinds of structures. There are hundreds of such categories such as: Actor description, Authority, Categorization, Euphemism, Evidentiality, Generalization, Hyperbole, Irony (rhetoric), Presupposition, Vagueness, etc.

Theories and practices in translation:

Vermeer's Skopos Theory

Vermeer's [7] Skopos theory manifests an influential way through which translators approach texts. Providing an explanation, Vermeer maintains that each text is produced for a given purpose and should serve this purpose. The Skopos rule thus states that translators/writers translate/interpret/speak/write in a way that enables their text/translation to function in the situation in which it is used and with the people who want to use it and precisely in the way they want it to function. This theory stresses concepts of "equivalence and adequacy" and tries to preserve invariance of function between source and target text - functional equivalence - what Reiss calls communicative translation.

Ideology and translation

Translation as a communicative event can never be studied without taking its situational and socio-cultural context into account. With the spread of deconstruction and cultural studies in the academy, the subject of ideology became an important area of study and claim about ideology increase in many fields. The field of translation studies shows no exception to this general trend and, thereby, ideology finds its clearest articulation in language.

Behind every one of the translator's selection, as what to add, what to leave out, which word to choose, and how to place them, there is a voluntary act that reveals his culture and ideology [8]. In other words, the translator produces ideological, aesthetic and political meaning rather than semantic meaning. In addition sometimes it becomes extremely difficult for a translation scholars to justify whether ideological differences observed between the ST (source text) and the TT (target text) are results of the translator's subconscious ideological interpretation or his /her intentional ideological intervention (how and to what extent such ideological traits may be located, portrayed, classified and analyzed within the framework of critical discourse analysis).

The concept of ideology has been broadening and its introduction to translation studies has shifted the attention from subjectivity, the notion of originality and absolute equivalence and enabled researchers to probe to some translational phenomena, which might have been neglected. Translation is one important form of rewriting and a decision process which influenced by certain linguistic, ideological and poetic factors.

A translator who has communist ideology may translate a relevant text positively and convey the positive notion, but a translator with capitalistic viewpoint may translate it differently.

Because of the complexity of translation, however translators must be careful. "The translators are said to be the victims of their ideology as inevitably as the literary critic. They follow or occasionally challenge the *translation norms* of the time, by which they are in any event measured"[9]. Therefore, it is concluded that, translation, as a relation between two languages, can never be considered without ideological intervention and it is always a site for ideological encounters.

Censorship

Translation in the shadow of censorship means investigating the manipulatory mechanism used as an assault on original text in order to alter their meaning and exclude the reader from the choices made in the source language. Ban and censorship in translation may have different reasons (political, religious, cultural etc.). In some countries translation of especial texts is not so free or even not allowed, because it may provoke subvertive ideas, and also sometimes because of misinterpretation of religious texts there is a ban on translation. Translators must be faithful toward the source text, but because of the above mentioned reasons, sometimes manipulation is needed. Translators can change the form and convey the same meaning (if the problem is with the form). Regarding cultural, political and religious factors even manipulation of the content might be necessary or helpful.

If manipulation does not sufficiently transform the form or the content of the text, it may still considered as unacceptable, or subversive. In this case, the work itself may simply be banned. It was mentioned above that any translation strategy is likely to have ideological results in the socio-cultural context. Seem from such a perspective, translation is not neutral, rather, in ideological activity [10] and ideological approach to translation can be found in some of the earliest examples of translation known to us, leading to censorship of texts of various types. They applied their particular beliefs in translation without addressing the concept of ideology through years of their existence. Here are some examples:

Part 1 - Translation and censorship in fascist Italy

Mussolini tried to lead Italians into the era of cultural prosperity and national achievement and he attempted to avoid any kind of criticism from his people or from abroad concerning his government's tactics. To do so, he established control over all forms of mass communication, such as radio, press and books. For example, a two volume anthology of contemporary American literature translation was not allowed to be published and after the government's permission, several parts of it were removed. Another act against Americanization concerned the removing of the children's comics and adventure stories characters. In spite of all those censorship and control, the regime did not succeed and people were so receptive to foreign influences.

Part 2 – Translation and Censorship in Nazi Germany

In Nazi Germany, translations were referred as a threat to the authenticity and integrity of German society and a danger to its cultural production. Thus the regime wished to reduce the invasion of foreign elements by promoting pro-Nazi literature and banning all productions that were against the Nazi ideology. So censorship was essential in order to preserve all elements of Nazi ideology and protect people from the influences of

"insidious" nature. So in Nazi Germany, translations that did not conform to the regime's norms were expurgated or blacked out.

Part 3 – translation and censorship in Franco's Spain

Cultural censorship played a vital role in Franco's regime because without it Franco would not have been able to control the Spanish society and preserve his regime's ideology and isolate Spanish culture from foreign influences. In order to achieve that, his censorship had to be concerted and it was thus carried out by three departments: the Book Censorship Section, the Cinema and Theater Department and Information and Censorship Section.

Only works that viewed the Spanish political situation positively were authorized and this practice led most Spanish republican writers to become exiles for rejecting François tactics. Also, only translations of minor foreign author were authorized for publication. Thus translation in post-war Spain was more than a mere linguistic task.

The above discussion is the case of translation in the nationalistic environments explored, where translation was viewed as a threat and censorship was supposed to provide guidance and protection from invasion and 'pollution' by foreign elements.

Bowdlerization:

Bowdlerization is the attempt to change or chop out passages or sections in a larger work while still letting the work be published--a sort of mini-censorship. A text altered in this way is "bowdlerized." This term comes from the name of Thomas Bowdler [11], the man who edited *The Family Shakespeare* (1815). In his edition, Bowdler removed whatever he considered "unfit to be read by a gentleman in the company of ladies." The questions of censorship and bowdlerization have continued through many centuries. In some centuries, politically unpopular ideas have been censored. In others, various religious works have been censored. In others, literature and essays dealing with sex or violence have been censored.

Visibility

In functionalism the translator inevitably has to be visible, since functional approaches do not establish rules but support decision-making strategies and the translator has to make critical decisions as to how define the translation skopos and which strategies can best meet the target recipient's requirement; s/he should be visible, making his /her decisions transparent to his/her client and accepting the responsibility of his/her choices. Almost any decision in translation is- consciously or unconsciously –guided by ideological criteria. Ideological factors are so decisive in defining the translation skopos (target-text intended purpose) and selecting the functionary appropriate strategies by the translator, based on the expectation of translation clients.

Norms

There is a socially shared knowledge between members of every community as to what is considered correct or appropriate as communicative behavior. This knowledge exists in form of norms. Norms can be understood as ideological realization of the concept of appropriateness and correctness. Decision-making is a key concept in the discussion of norms. Toury [12] argues that the acquisition of a set of norms for determining the suitability of translational behavior, and for maneuvering between all factors which may constrain it, is a prerequisite for becoming a translator within a cultural environment. We have three kind of norm, namely initial norm, preliminary norms and operational norms. Initial norm governs the translator's overall

decision to adhere 'either to the original text, with the norms it has realized, or to the norms active in the target culture, or in that section of it which would host the end product'.

Preliminary norms govern the decision to be made concerning translation policy and directness. According to Toury [12] 'translation policy refers to those factors that govern the choice of the text type; or individual text, to be imported through translation into a particular culture /language at a particular point in time'. He explain 'directness of translation involve the threshold of tolerance for translating from language other than the ultimate source language'.

Domestication and foreignization

Translating a text from one culture to another usually requires that a choice is first made between two basic translation strategies, domestication and foreignization. Domestication means making the text recognizable and familiar and thus bringing the foreign culture closer to the reader in the target culture, while foreignization means the opposite, taking the reader over to the foreign culture and making him or her feel the cultural and linguistic differences. This choice between domestication and foreignization is linked to questions of ethics, too: should the translator be accountable to the source or target culture, and to what extent? If target-cultural conventions are followed in the translation process, the text will be readily acceptable in the target culture, but it will inevitably lose some of the characteristics that would have given it a foreign or even exotic feeling.

A more serious aspect of having domestication as a dominant translation strategy is, according to Venuti [13], the fact that translations wield considerable power in the construction of national identities for foreign cultures. Translations can change domestic representations and create stereotypes for foreign cultures, which may have such consequences as ethnic discrimination, colonialism and geopolitical confrontations. It is thus important to consider whether the resulting representations of foreign cultures in translated texts are ethical.

The analysis of the movie texts

The last phase of the work was to watch the movie, and transcribe some parts of the source text (English), along with their target form equivalences (Farsi), and then to match them against each other, to see what translation techniques and strategies have been applied by translators, and if these translated forms can be representative of hidden ideological manipulations and constraints. The results have been summarized below.

Conclusion:

In this study, the manifestations of censorship in the translated movie texts have been brought into spotlight. The translation analysis of a selected movie text in terms of such features as addition, deletion, censorship, euphemism, derogation, and other features clearly indicate a sort of ideological manipulation and constraint manifested by translators of movie texts. They demystify the government's strategies against the onslaught of the "corrupt" western influence which is presumably intended to pollute the pure and sacred minds of the Muslim community. Here, the researchers have taken into account the ideas offered by Bourdieu [14], Lefereve [15] and Darwish [16] regarding the pressures on the translators. This censorship is indicative of the state's vulnerability and instability which manifests it in the rigorous control of the discourse of the translators. Through the

overly blatant movie censorship, the supposedly non-normative discourse is systematically bowdlerized by the authorized elite. This is an effort at the perpetuation of the social order, as well as religious and moral codes. In the bargain, these translated dialogues flout the *felicity conditions* and *conversational maxims* instilling a whole gamut of reactions such as abomination, fury, and laughter, etc in the movie viewers.

This research was an attempt at determining the discursive, ideologically manipulative structures used by dominant agents and offering some guidelines that aim at raising consciousness and creating awareness to resist and modify them. In this case, Venuti's [17] visibility/invisibility dichotomy, no doubt, creates the awareness necessary in this enterprise. In Iran, "purification" or "other censorial mechanisms" of the original text is exercised based on the socio-cultural norms. In this respect, the ideology imposed on the translators is detectable in the movie subtitles and translations analyzed critically. This goes against the criterion of an acceptable translation which is supposed to give readers access to a cross-section of the values in a foreign culture. The government removes some dialogues in the movies; this deletion is an ideological move under the guise of morality. Hence these translations turn out to be ideologically motivated and political ideologies interfere with the original idea (adaptation). In this context, translation is used in the battle lines of ideologies and religions as well as political gains seize the translational output. The movie translations in Iran are scenes of ideological incursions in translation, that is, suppression of dialectal features. They are sites of ideological clashes in which certain realities are constructed and challenged and xenophobic attitudes are propagated. The translators counterfeit realities and inculcate them in the innocent audience. This paper explores the ideological and socio-political factors which determine the strategies applied in the translation of western movies.

References

1. Van Dijk, T. A. 1996. Discourse, opinions and ideologies. In C.schaffner & H.Kelly-Holmes (Ed.) *Discourse and ideologies*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
2. Toury, G. 2005. Enhancing cultural changes by means of fictitious translation. Eva Hung (ed). *Translation and cultural change*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 3-18.
3. Fairclough, N. 2003. *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
4. Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and power*. London and New York: Longman.
5. Fairclough, N. 1995. *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. London and New York: Longman.
6. Hodge, R. and G. Kress. 1993. *Language as ideology* (2nd ed.). London and New York : Routledge.
7. Vermeer, Hans. J. 1989. "Skopos and commission in translational action", trans. Andrew Chesterman in Andrew Chesterman, ed. *Readings in Translation Theory*. Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura, 173-187.
8. Alvarez, R. and M. Vidal. 1996. *Translating: A political act*. In R-Alvarez & M.C. Vidal (Ed.) *Translation/Power/Subversion* (PP.1-9). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
9. Newmark, P. 1996. *About translation*. Cromwell Prell Ltd.
10. Hatim, B. & I. Mason. 1990. *Discourse and the translator*. Longman.
11. Bowdler, T. 1754. *Family Shakespear*. Longman.
12. Toury, G. 2000. The nature and role of norms in translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.) *the Translation studies reader* (PP.198-211). London: Routledge.
13. Venuti, L. 1998. *The scandals of translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
14. Bourdieu, P. 1982. "Censure et mise en forme," in *Ce que parler veut dire*, Paris, Librairie Arthème Fayard, pp. 167-205.
15. Lefevre, A. 1983. "Report" in translation in foreign language teaching/La traduction dans l'enseignement des langues, Round Table FIT-UNESCO, Paris, 17-19 mars 1983, *Fédération internationale des traducteurs*, pp. 18-28.
16. Darwish, A. 1999. "Towards a theory of constants in translation" (p. 20), at-turjuman Online: <http://www.surf.net.au/writescope/translation/index.html>
17. Venuti, L. 1995. *The translator's invisibility*. London and New York: Routledge.

Table 1. An ideological analysis of the movie "platoon"

English	Persian	Distortion
1. Don't gimme that morbid bullshit!	Mozakhrif nagoo!	Coalescence Syntactic change, mitigation of the presumptuousness of the statement
2. You got the fresh meat buddy!	Gooshte taze ha ba to.	Cultural gap Wrong translation Literal translation Verbatim equivalence
3. You have to break your ass for the white men!	bayad khodeto vase sefid poosta jer bedi.	Euphemism Observing moral codes Linguistic sterilizations Taboo, a case of linguistic fig leaves
4. It's your shift mother fucker	Nobate toe mard!	Euphemism, taboo Maintaining people chastity, protecting them from moral pollution
5. They are at the bottom of the barrel.	Anha tahe boshke hastand .	Cultural gap, word for word translation blasphemy and hereditary remarks, expurgation, Avoiding Westoxification, ideological inculcation, avoiding the non-normative discourse
6. Jesus fucking Christ.	No translation	Censorship deletion
7. Tell that dip shit to get fucked.	Be oon kesafat begoo khafe she!	Euphemism, taboo Maintaining politeness, courtesy,
8. Dipped in shit, new meat!	Ma tooye kesafat foroo mirim gooshte taze.	Cultural gap, no exact equivalent, literal translation
9. The cocksucker, fell asleep.	Folan folan shode khabesh bord.	Euphemism, Taboo linguistic amoufflage is practiced , dramatic visibility of the translator
10. Assholes, you keep your shit wired tight.	Avaziha inja hamishe khodetoono bepaeen.	Euphemism Reference, reducing the offensiveness of the word
11. Doc...tag him and bag him.	No translation	Deletion, avoidance strategy
12. Excuses are like asshole, everybody got one.	Har kasi vase khodesh ye bahoone dare.	Similie, analogy, deletion, shunning questionable issues, reducing the coarseness of the analogy
13. Dont baby-talk him.	Bahash mesle bacheha harf nazan.	Wrong translation, Literal translation
14. The poor always being fucked by the rich.	Pooldarha hamishe tartibe bipoolharo midan.	Taboo, euphemism mitigation of a repulsive idea
15. Are you OK?	To divoone ee!	Wrong translation, coalescence
16. He can get his beauty sleep.	Mitoone kapeye margesho bezare.	Reinterpretation derogation, negative other representation, denigration
17. They ain't no bread for beer.	Dige nooni nadaran ke tooye abjoshoon tilit konan.	Cultural and lexical gap lacunae in the two cultures
18. Play?	Bazi chetor pish mire?	ellipsis
19. Wouldn't gonna be raped by you, motherfucker.	Nemikham shoma ha tartibamo bedin.	Taboo, euphemism moderate the disgusting act
20. Deep inside, I'm blue.	Doroonam por az ghame.	ellipsis
21. Just another day.	Inam ye roozie mese roozaye dige.	Split, ellipsis
22. Booby trap, get down.	No translation	Censorship, deletion avoidance, bowdlerization, ideological manipulation through removing a part, an instance of censorial mechanisms
23. Hey Piggy, piggy, hey pig!	Hey khuki khuki.Khook!	Cultural gap taboo, ideological incursion, religious constraint imposed on the translator
24. they got enough rice to feed a whole fucking regiment.	Inja inghadr berenj hast ke mishe bahash ye hango sir kard.	Euphemism, alleviate the vulgarity of the statement made
25. Holly shit!	Ya Isa Masih!	Reinterpretation, Ward off this desecration, profanation, translator is influenced by the, avoiding the non-normative discourse institutionalized power of religion
26. Torch this place.	Inja ro Atish bezanido monfajer konid.	split
27. It's necessary for me to give your orders.	Bayad etaat konam.	Reference, coalescence

28. Do them	Tartibeshoono bedin.	No exact equivalent, ellipsis
29. He thinks he is Jesus fucking Christ?	Fek karde raese ghabileas!	Wrong translation Avoiding sacrilege, moral constraints imposed on the translator, a discursive structure to avoid the non-normative unacceptable discourse
30. You wanna kick ass	No translation	Censorship, deletion
31. I never asked you for a fucking thing.	No translation	Reinterpretation
32. Move your fucking ass	No translation	Reinterpretation, taboo
33. It's fucking beautiful.	No translation	Censorship, Deletion, taboo
34. Tell those assholes to get up here.	No translation	Euphemism, deletion, censorship, taboo
35. You're an asshole, Barnes!	No translation	Censorship, taboo
36. Where the hell are you going?	No translation	Euphemism, censorship
37. Kiss my ass!	No translation	Censorship, deletion, taboo
38. A bunch of gooks came through there.	No translation	Euphemism, deletion
39. Ten years climbing the fucking walls.	No translation	No exact equivalent
40. Fucking Monkey!	No translation	Reinterpretation
41. No sentence		
42. Get back in your fox hole.		Literal translation
43. Doc. Doc		Formal translation, Politeness
44. They're right on my ass.		Euphemism. taboo
45. No sentence		Addition
46. No sentence		Addition
47. Where the fuck is Red platoon?	In kesafata koja hasten?	Reinterpretation , wrong translation
48. Mad dog, we got live gooks at 3 o'clock.	No translation	No exact equivalent.