On interpreting v. translation

KAYOKO TAKEDA

Rikkyo University, Japan

Conversations with Anthony Pym in Tarragona inspired me to identify differences between interpreting and written translation. Through my research, I have discussed, as features unique to interpreting, interpreters' proximity and visibility to the parties in a communicative event, the need to address various elements of dynamic interaction and the immediate consequences of their renditions. Given the increasingly diversified ways in which interlingual communication is enabled, it may now be more meaningful to examine "human interpreters v. AI."

Keywords: proximity, visibility, interaction, immediacy, accountability

Introduction: Tarragona, 2004

I met Professor Anthony Pym in 2004 as a student in the doctoral program he had launched in Tarragona a year earlier. I was part of the second cohort of students. The flexibility of the hybrid curriculum comprising online courses and onsite intensive seminars offered an unparalleled opportunity to pursue doctoral study for people like me who already had professional commitments in places where no doctoral program in translation and interpreting studies was available at that time. More importantly, Pym's passion, ingenuity and leadership successfully brought a dream team of translation and interpreting scholars together in this charming little town with Roman ruins. How lucky I was to attend seminars and tutorials given by Pym, Andrew Chesterman, Franz Pöchhacker, Gideon Toury, Ian Mason, Michael Cronin, Miriam Shlesinger and other luminaries! I found the experience at Tarragona highly enlightening and stimulating, but sometimes unsettling in the beginning. As a professionally trained conference interpreter, I felt challenged by unfamiliar notions such as interpreting as an act of mediation, untrained interpreters and *translation* as a term inclusive of interpreting. When Pym asked us in one of the weekly assignments of the online introductory course, "Should there be a separate "map" [as in Holmes' Map of Translation Studies] for interpreting studies as an independent discipline from translation studies?", I must confess

that I boldly declared "yes!" Through exchanges with professors and my own doctoral research, I quickly came to embrace the view that translating texts and interpreting are indeed the same in the sense that they are both social acts of mediating communication across languages and cultures, and I also accepted that conference interpreting is a relatively recent and fractional phenomenon from a historical point of view. My horizons were certainly broadened from the narrow conception I had held of what interpreting was about, i.e., a highly professional act performed by individuals who received specialized training via higher education. Pym likes to say his program "converted" me.

There is one point, however, I did not fully settle with Pym. It concerns the use of the term *translation* itself. Like many scholars, Pym generally treats *translation* in English as an umbrella that encompasses interpreting. For clarification, some scholars (e.g., Daniel Gile and Franz Pöchhacker) use *Translation* (with upper-case T) as an overarching term and *translation* (with lower-case t) for written translation, but, to my knowledge, this distinction is not adopted widely. I remember expressing to Pym my resistance to using *translation* to discuss oral (and signed) rendering, which derived from the acts having dedicated terms, with no superior-subordinate relation, in my native Japanese (*honyaku* for written translation and *tsuyaku* for interpreting; i.e., there is no term that encompasses both written translation and interpreting). Whenever we translate the English word *translation* into Japanese, we first have to figure out if it is referring to written translation only or to both written and oral/signed renditions, then translate it as *honyaku* or *honyaku tsuyaku*, respectively. For instance, I used *honyaku* in translating Pym's book *Exploring Translation Theories* (2009) (Pym 2010/2020, translated by Takeda) and *honyaku tsuyaku* in translating "Translation and Intercultural Studies", the name of our doctoral program, since it dealt with interpreting as well.

While it was this technical issue that initially prompted me to question the practical and cross-cultural validity of treating *translation* as inclusive of interpreting, distinct features of interpreting as opposed to written translation have become an underlying interest of my research since then. It has become a habit of mine to ask, "Can this happen in written translation as well?" when I analyze various phenomena involving interpreting. Through my studies of interpreters in the context of war crimes I felt I had developed a stronger basis for arguing the differences between interpreting and written translation. Additionally, recent discussions of whether AI can replace human translators and interpreters have helped me further reflect on the characteristics of interpreting from a different angle.

I am fully aware that there are within translation and interpreting a diverse range of practices which take hybrid forms. For instance, even back in my Tarragona days, I used to interpret in high-stakes depositions (out-of-court testimonies by witnesses) in US jurisdictions, in which realtime English

transcription provided by the court reporter would appear on the computer screen in front of me and I would interpret out of the transcription into Japanese (text-to-speech). In other words, I was doing sight translation when interpreting from English. I was also able to check the transcription of my English rendition being produced out of the note I had taken while listening to the Japanese source utterance. Anecdotal evidence indicates that this is basically how it works in deposition interpreting even today, since the use of Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) captioning would pose concerns about security and inaccuracies.

Because of the changing practices mainly influenced by the rapid advancement of various translation technologies, it may not be practical or useful now to distinguish and compare "translation" and "interpreting." Any discussion based on the simplistic notion of "written vs. oral" would be annotated by numerous exceptions. The purpose of the present essay then is not to reinvent the definition of what interpreting is about or what translation is about. (cf., Pöchhacker (2024) proposes a new three-dimensional model featuring agency, embodiment and immediacy to characterize Translation as a graded concept, which would accommodate the use of machine translation tools.) Rather, in gratitude and admiration for Pym's achievements, I would like to discuss the features of interpreting which I believed over the years were not to be found in text-to-text translation by presenting findings of my research on two topics. The first relates to the issues of interpreters' physical proximity and visibility to the parties involved in hostilities in the Japanese military context. And the second topic concerns features of interpreting that AI does not seem fully capable of yet by drawing on my research on the use of automated speech translation systems (with spoken input and spoken output) by local governments in Japan.

Proximity and visibility of interpreters in violent conflict

After the end of the Asia-Pacific War (1931–1945), over 100 interpreters in the Japanese military were prosecuted for war crimes and at least 99 of them were convicted at trials administered by different Allied countries in various locations across Asia. At least 32 of these interpreters were executed (see Takeda (2021) for an overview of these trials). In the case of British trials which convicted the greatest number of interpreters (38) of all the nations, the accused interpreters mostly worked for *Kenpeitai* (military police) and in prisoner of war (POW) camps during the war, and they were "concerned" in situations involving ill-treatment of Allied POWs and local civilians in Japanese-occupied territories. An examination of the nature and circumstances of their acts, which have since been deemed war crimes, can highlight the risks interpreters face in violent conflict due to their physical proximity and visibility to their military employer and its confronting party.

Besides the risk of becoming targeted by the opponent as members of the enemy, embedded interpreters may be exposed to risks connected to possible war crimes: the risk of being compelled to physically participate in an unlawful act, the risk of being viewed by the victim as a participant in an unlawful act even for just interpreting and the risk of being called on to testify as eyewitnesses of war crimes after the war (Takeda 2021).

Physical proximity

Unless working from a booth or remotely, interpreters are immediately present with people using their service. In the context of the Japanese military during the Asia-Pacific War, the records of British war crimes trials (see Takeda (2021) for details on the sources) reveal that interpreters mediated communication when their superiors engaged with local residents and POWs in a range of situations, including arrests, interrogation and torture. In some cases, besides interpreting, interpreters were ordered or prompted by their superiors to physically assist torture during interrogations, such as holding the victim's legs or even jointly assaulting the victim. Being alongside their military superiors under volatile and intense conditions meant that interpreters were never exclusively interpreting and had to follow whatever orders their superiors gave. The trial records indicate that interpreters who hesitated to follow orders to participate in violent acts towards civilians and POWs faced severe corporal punishment or threat of court-martial.

Even if interpreters did not engage in assault, victims and witnesses viewed them as participants in the violence by virtue of having been physically present as members of the units that committed such acts. Since the interpreter was always nearby, directly speaking to POWs and local residents in the language they understood, it was easier for these people to remember the interpreter's face and name. Thus, interpreters were prone to being more recognizable than their superiors when war crimes investigators asked the victims and witnesses to identify the perpetrators.

Lastly, interpreters can be called on to testify as eyewitnesses of war crimes if they were present when the crimes took place. At British trials, a number of interpreters gave evidence against defendants who were their former superiors. They were valued as witnesses because of their linguistic understanding of what was happening on both the perpetrator's and the victim's sides. Incidentally, those accused interpreters who also testified for the prosecution were mostly foreign-born Japanese and Taiwanese as well as local hires in Japanese-occupied territories (see Takeda (2021: 140–141) for loyalty-related analysis).

Visibility and "mistaken impression"

The issue of interpreters' visibility in the context of war crimes is closely connected to their proximity to the victims of Japanese atrocities. As discussed above, because interpreters were regularly in direct contact with POWs and local civilians, they were highly visible and likely to make more lasting impressions on the victims of violence than those who actually ordered the violence or executed the orders. For example, Lomax (1995), a former British POW, shares his view of the Japanese interpreter as the centerpiece of his experience being severely tortured. In particular, if interpreters were locally hired or had a similar or familiar background to the victim, they were even more recognizable and became objects of hatred. For instance, Taiwanese mobilized as interpreters because of their ability to speak Japanese and Hokkien were deeply loathed as traitors by Hokkien-speaking ethnic Chinese living in Southeast Asia. Kanao Inouye, a Canadian-born interpreter, was abhorred by POWs, especially those from Canada. That Taiwanese accounted for 10 out of 31 interpreters executed and that Inouye was the only interpreter who was executed without a conviction involving the death of a victim may reflect the amplified visibility of these individuals as "traitors."

Although interpreters had no rights or authority as civilians to order arrests, interrogation or torture, British trial records contain testimonies and statements by victims and eyewitnesses that accused interpreters of playing the primary or lead role in Japanese wrongdoings. The defense counterargued that it was a "mistaken impression" (Takeda 2021: 13-24) or illusory agency. To the victims, however, the utterances coming from the interpreter led to direct and immediate pain and suffering. It was almost impossible for victims to view interpreters as innocent bystanders who were only delivering the messages of their superiors. To such a victim, the interpreter was fully integrated in the military unit and an enabler of its abuse and cruelties, even if *only interpreting*.

"Proximity of alternative non-linguistic action"

The interpreter's physical proximity to the users of their service is a key feature of non-remote interpreting. Pym (2016: 247) provides a novel angle to understanding its significance by analyzing an interpreter-mediated military encounter in Afghanistan, using the term "proximity of alternative non-linguistic action." Here, attention is paid to interaction and immediate feedback (including feedback of a physical nature), a feature unique to face-to-face communication. Weighing possible outcomes of how to mediate communication between a village elder and a US sergeant asking him about the Taliban, this interpreter chose to mistranslate in order to avoid the risk of immediate physical harm or other undesirable feedback. This example illustrates how little time the interpreter has to manage the risk of

communication failure, which can lead to his own injury or even death in conflict zones.

Although not addressing extreme cases such as war and violent conflict, Alexieva (1997) also emphasizes direct and active interaction, nonverbal communication and immediate feedback as features of liaison interpreting. She argues that interpreters play a prominent role in making communication successful when there are conflicting goals and asymmetric power relations between the parties, and that in-house interpreters have a greater sense of power compared to freelancers and may behave like principal participants in achieving the goal of the organization they belong to. Embedded interpreters in a military unit may also exercise their agency to make interpreter-mediated communication align with the interests of the unit. Within the military hierarchy and power constellation, however, the scope with which civilian interpreters can exercise their agency is likely to be limited.

On interpreter ethics in war

At British war crimes trials, the two main defenses the accused interpreters resorted to were that they were only interpreting, and that they were following superior orders. Neither of these was effective because the judges sided with the prosecution's assertion of their joint responsibility and the invalidity of the superior order defense when the order was patently unlawful or ethically inhumane. Here, rather than discussing different modes of criminal liabilities for interpreters in war crimes (see Takeda (2021: 127–130) for details), I would like to focus on the case of interpreting torture from the viewpoint of interpreter ethics, drawing on Pym's discussion (2012) of translator ethics. Although the accused were ad hoc interpreters at a time when there were no widely acknowledged guidelines for professional conduct or codes of ethics for interpreters, the topic of interpreting torture from an ethical point of view is relevant even today, as it has continued to take place, with prominent examples from the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq (Senate Select Committee on Intelligence 2014).

Interpreting torture

At British trials the prosecution argued that the accused interpreters were willing to facilitate their units' torture of POWs and local civilians and that they were indifferent to the sufferings of these individuals. Interpreters were even accused of having acted as leaders in some torture cases. In response, the accused interpreters insisted that they were mechanically executing the orders given by their superiors. Whether they were just interpreting or actually participating in physical abuse, the accused interpreters tried to conceal their

agency by emphasizing their "neutral" position "like a machine" (Takeda 2021). The view of interpreters as disinterested machines has been used to help them attempt to evade ethical accountability for problematic acts they enabled through interpreting. For instance, Günter Deckert, who interpreted a Holocaust denier's speech, defended himself as just a mouthpiece of the source speaker. Pym (2012: 37) calls this "a clever manipulation" of the generally accepted notion that the interpreter is not responsible for the content of what the speaker says.

In his seminal book *On Translator Ethics*, Pym (2012) suggests that translators do not have ethical responsibility for the content of the text since translators are not the author, but translators are responsible for the decision whether to translate a given text and the possible effects of their translation. In the context of interrogational torture by the Japanese military, it could be understood then that these interpreters were not responsible for the content of what their interrogators said, but they were responsible for deciding if they would agree to interpret torture-inducing interrogations and for the potential effects of their interpreting. These effects were immediate indeed, and the victims' suffering unfolded before the interpreters' eyes. Whether the interpreter could choose not to interpret is questionable, though, given the doctrine of absolute obedience to superior orders in the Japanese military. However, some interpreters, especially those from Taiwan, noted moral dilemmas and personal disgust in their affidavits and in-court testimonies at British trials.

Under today's international law, torture and abusive interrogation techniques are illegal and prohibited in all circumstances. Accordingly, interpreters who serve in interrogational torture risk being held criminally liable. As in the case of war crimes trials against the Japanese, the superior order defense would not work since an order to torture is illegal. What transpires in interpreting torture or enhanced interrogation may be an extreme example of how different interpreting is from written translation in the sense of physical proximity to the perpetrator and the victim as well as the immediacy of the effects of cross-lingual exchanges. When the notion of the legality of war or the rules of engagement seem to be ignored by certain parties around the world, interpreters involved in war and violent conflict should be reminded that they can disobey illegal orders (cf., U.S. lawmakers' call for service members to disobey illegal orders (Jaffs 2025)) and that they could be prosecuted for being involved in manifestly unlawful acts such as the torture and killing of civilians.

Legal consequences aside, the ethics around interpreting torture are articulated in the resolution to condemn torture, adopted in 2007 by the American Translators Association and the National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators in the United States. Against the background of abuse scandals in Iraqi prisons where many interpreters worked, the resolution states that "knowing participation in, facilitation or countenancing of,

cooperation with, or failure to report torture or other mental or physical abuse or degradation of any human being" (ATA/NAJIT 2007) violates the code of ethics. This resolution should be revisited in the discussion of interpreter ethics in training and professional settings from the standpoint of exceptions to professional secrecy as well (see Takeda (2021: 145-149) for detailed discussion).

AI clarifying the work of human interpreters

Beyond the context of interpreters in war and violent conflict, there is another development that has made me think further about characteristics unique to interpreting: the rapid advancement of AI-based technology related to interpreting. This situation has been challenging interpreting scholars to reconsider what is involved in the process of interpreting as well as how future interpreters should be trained. I myself have been asked every so often about the future viability of interpreting as a profession. In response, a decade ago, I took advantage of the invitation to contribute a short Japanese-language essay to the journal of an association of machine translation researchers in Japan. Here, I first present a summary of this small piece, the title of which translates to "Will AI replace interpreters?", and examine how my view of AI and interpreting may have changed over the last ten years, mainly by drawing on the findings of my research on the use of automated speech translation systems by local governments in Japan.

Will AI replace interpreters? (2016)

What follows is an English summary of the essay I wrote in Japanese on AI and interpreting in 2016 (Takeda 2016).

> Communication in spoken language is a dynamic process jointly constructed by participating speakers through their interactions, which are spontaneous and immediate. There are paralinguistic elements such as prosody, nonverbal elements like gestures, and temporal elements including pauses. The meaning of speech is formed through the interplay of all these elements. Further, spoken language involves colloquial expressions, accents, dialects, honorifics and nuances that differ from written language. These issues pose challenges to automated speech translation. Above all, there are ethical concerns as to who would be held accountable for the quality of the renditions. Who would be held liable for errors that could lead to serious consequences? There is no step for humans to correct errors of AI-generated interpretation, like post-editing of translation.
>
> Prior research has demonstrated that interpreters do more than interpret. For instance, they also manage turn-taking among speakers

> and intervene to resolve communication glitches. Interpreters must also pay attention to the power dynamics among the speakers and the characteristics of the audience, selecting appropriate honorifics and registers. To what extent can automated speech translation address these pragmatic aspects of interpreting?
> AI-based interpreting has great potential to be useful for non-critical, short, transaction-based communication. If it supports less-taught languages, it would be socially beneficial. Interpreters could possibly be replaced by automated speech translation if speakers read out prepared scripts faithfully, and audiences are prepared to endure a monotonous synthetic voice for an extended time. The use of AI interpreting in judicial settings would not be appealing due to the complicated issue of evidentiary admissibility and accountability.

A decade later, some of the questions I raised may have been addressed. Almost every day, Google alerts me to news on the latest improved features and the increasing use of "AI-powered speech translation" reported by various developers and technology writers. According to them, there is now technology that can provide realtime speech translation, while preserving the source speaker's tone, emotions and vocal characteristics in the output (Stasimioti 2025), and the use of AI-powered speech translation has been reported in a wider range of settings, including tourism, customer service and dubbing (Certified Languages International *n.d.*). Also, more interpreters seem to be embracing the practice of AI-assisted or AI-supported interpreting (see various announcements of seminars on AI tools for interpreting on the AIIC website, for instance). Incidentally, the AIIC Science Hub released an "AI Interpretation Checklist" in 2025 as a tool for interpreters to use when advising clients whether to use "AI Interpretation (or more precisely, Automated Speech Translation–AST)" (AIIC 2025). Although it is meant to suggest in what context AST may be a feasible option, the list succinctly reveals limitations of AST, which resonate with some of my concerns from a decade ago – namely, the difficulty of handling interactive exchanges between speakers and the issue of accountability. Against the backdrop of this rapid development in AI-based speech translation and the debate on its limitations, I now present an example of how such speech translation systems are used in real life (i.e., discourse that occurs organically, rather than as an experiment or for demonstration purposes).

Government use of automated speech systems for foreign residents in Japan

Collaborating with a colleague in Public Administration, I conducted a survey in 2023 with 115 local governments (hereafter, LGs) and follow-up interviews with 26 LGs in Japan on their use of automated speech translation systems in assisting Ukrainian "evacuees" (the term the Japanese government has

adopted to circumvent highly restrictive refugee policies). For the discussion of this particular case, I also adopt the Japanese government's language of "foreign nationals" and "foreign residents" instead of preferred designations such as "persons with limited Japanese proficiency" or "linguistically and culturally diverse communities." With the increasing number of foreign nationals living in Japan, many LGs have been providing translation and interpreting services in English, Chinese and Korean in various situations, including registrations and disaster preparedness. Some LGs are also staffed with speakers of Portuguese, Spanish, Filipino and Vietnamese. Ukrainian, however, was a new language for these LGs, with very few people available who could provide language assistance. Some Ukrainians did not wish to face Russian nationals as interpreters or speak Russian themselves even when capable. Incidentally, the Japanese central government had been funding programs to develop automated speech translation systems and promoting their use among LGs. Thus, the aim of the survey and interviews was to find out to what extent automated speech translation systems were used by LGs in communicating with Ukrainian evacuees.

The results of the survey and interviews (Takeda and Inagaki 2023) indicated that about 57% of the respondents had used automated speech translation systems mainly because they were free of charge and easy to use. Among that group a little over 50% reported that the system always or almost always served the purpose, but one third shared various problems they encountered: the systems did not work very well with long sentences, complex or culture-based content, administrative terms, proper nouns, idioms and different accents; it was difficult to have smooth communication because of the time lag; and the system struggled to "understand" the input, necessitating speaking in short sentences or repeating oneself. Only two respondents felt assured about security issues. Those who never or hardly used automated speech translation systems pointed to concerns about privacy protection.

Since 2025 we have been conducting interviews with other LGs and their affiliated organizations on how they operate "consultation systems for foreign nationals", focusing on language issues. One of the inquiries concerns the potential use of the "AI simultaneous interpreting (SI) systems", which were recently developed by a government-funded project and promoted by the government as a solution to the language barriers in public settings where foreign nationals are involved (Japanese Ministerial Council on the Acceptance and Coexistence of Foreign Nationals 2025a, 2025b). None of the four organizations we have interviewed so far reported any use of AI-based SI systems at this time (Takeda and Inagaki 2025).

Dehumanized communication in consultation

There is a brochure issued in 2021 by the Advanced Information Systems and Software Division of the Japanese Ministry of Internal Affairs and Telecommunication to promote the use of automated speech translation systems among LGs. Incidentally, this is the same ministry (albeit a different division) that has funded programs to develop MT/AI-based speech translation systems. The brochure claims that one of the benefits of utilizing automated speech translation systems is that they can ease the psychological burden experienced by some foreign residents when seeking consultation on sensitive issues such as domestic violence and welfare. According to the brochure, some such foreigners prefer machines over human interpreters in these situations because they feel uncomfortable if the interpreter comes from their own community. Users' discomfort or distrust towards interpreters has been reported in the context of asylum seekers (e.g., Pokorn and Čibej 2018). In civic service settings the brochure focuses on, however, remote interpreting is a possible solution. The problem with AI-based speech translation systems here is that without a clear understanding of how data is protected and managed as well as the client's consent, it becomes a concern to let sensitive personal information be fed into the systems. Vieira (2026: 79-80) also points to the danger of using MT in an ad hoc manner without being aware of the issue of privacy protection. Besides, a speaker's struggle with talking about complex problems coherently in times of distress can pose a great challenge for AI, especially with low-resource languages, which are often used in community settings. This can result in translation inaccuracies, which may in turn lead to additional undesirable consequences.

As mentioned earlier, interpreting is a complex task that requires constant attention to paralinguistic and nonverbal elements in communication as well as power dynamics among the speakers and their cultural backgrounds. Interpreters exercise their agency, when necessary, for clarification or repair of problems that may arise in the course of spontaneous and immediate exchanges. I am uncertain if AI could ever address every aspect that human interpreters do. Attention should also be paid to how interpreters manage their positionality and account for the choices they make in interpreting (cf. Martin 2025). As in the case of AI and MT in general, how the issue of accountability in AI-based speech translation is settled remains to be seen.

Conclusion: Shift to "human v. machine"?

Looking back, I realize now that I have hardly considered linguistic forms or surface-level characteristics for differences between written translation and interpreting, such as the use of the plain form and the polite form in Japanese.

(The polite form is almost always used in interpreting, while both the plain form and the polite form are used in written translation.) I do not mean that linguistics-focused research is irrelevant or unimportant. As a practicing interpreter, however, I have been keenly aware that interpreting is a socially situated practice. Thus, my attention has always been directed to how interpreter behavior is influenced by social and situational factors, including power relations, visibility and institutional constraints. I have never been formally trained in sociology, but some people tell me that I take a sociology-like approach. I suppose I have indeed been "converted" by the Tarragona program.

In this essay I have discussed some features I believed unique to interpreting, including interpreters' physical proximity and visibility to the parties in a communicative event, their need to handle dynamic exchanges with attention to power relations and to exercise their agency, if necessary, to prevent or fix communication failures, and the immediate consequences of their renditions. Given the increasingly diversified ways in which cross-lingual communication is enabled, I cannot say with absolute certainty that these attributes cannot be found in written translation or translator behavior. We might observe instances, however rare they may be, where translators work on text alongside their clients who need quick output and the translators revise their work immediately in response to their feedback.

Then, can translators who render cross-lingual communication output in text be exposed to the risk of prosecution for war crimes such as killing civilians and torture? Maybe not, because their work would not constitute a direct element of the criminal act. On the other hand, interpreters could be prosecuted for interpreting if they are present and their renditions are directly involved in interrogational torture. It should be noted, however, that translators have also been persecuted, tortured or even killed for translating certain texts (such as the purported *fatwa* killing of Hitoshi Igarashi, who translated *The Satanic Verses* into Japanese (Weisman 1991)).

Ultimately, as suggested earlier, it may not be a productive endeavor to seek unique aspects of interpreting as opposed to written translation at this time. My interest in pursuing differences between interpreting and written translation was certainly inspired by my conversations with Pym in Tarragona. That pursuit now seems to be evolving into the question of what aspects of interpreting will probably not be addressable by AI, which should help me clarify what to focus on in my research into how humans communicate across different languages and cultures. I am hoping I can still pick Professor Pym's brain throughout my efforts. Now, what would happen if AI-based speech translation were used in interrogational torture?

Declaration of AI use

The author did not use any AI-assisted tools in the preparation of this manuscript.

References

Advanced Information Systems and Software Division of the Japanese Ministry of Internal Affairs and Telecommunication. 2021. "Guide to implementing 'multilingual speech translation service' at local governments" (in Japanese). https://www.soumu.go.jp/main_content/000745491.pdf. Visited May 2026.

AIIC Science Hub. 2025. *AI Interpretation Checklist*. https://aiic.org/company/roster/companyRosterDetails.html?companyId=14022&companyRosterId=120. Visited May 2026.

Alexieva, Bistra. 1997. "A typology of interpreter-mediated events". *The Translator* 3(2): 153‑174.

American Translators Association. 2007. "Resolution of American Translators Association". *ATA Chronicle*, November/December 2007: 11.

Certified Languages International. *n.d.* "AI Speech Translation". https://certifiedlanguages.com/blog/ai-speech-translation/. Visited May 2026.

Jaffe, Greg. 2025. "Democratic lawmakers tell military to refuse illegal orders". *The New York Times*, 18 November 2025. https://www.nytimes.com/2025/11/18/us/politics/democratic-lawmakers-illegal-orders.html.

Japanese Ministerial Council on the Acceptance and Coexistence of Foreign Nationals. 2025a. "Comprehensive Measures for Acceptance and Coexistence of Foreign Nationals (revised in 2025)". https://www.moj.go.jp/isa/support/coexistence/nyuukokuKanri01_00140.html. Visited May 2026.

Japanese Ministerial Council on the Acceptance and Coexistence of Foreign Nationals. 2025b. "Roadmap for the Realization of a Society with Harmonious Coexistence with Foreign Nationals (revised in 2025)". https://www.moj.go.jp/isa/support/coexistence/04_00033.html. Visited May 2026.

Martin, Conor. 2025. "Understanding the complexity of interpreter positionality of interpreters and positionality management in armed conflict and beyond". In M. Todorova and L. Ruiz Rosend (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Translating and Interpreting Conflict*. London: Routledge. 198-220.

National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators. 2007. "Resolution Condemning and Deploring Torture adopted by the membership of the National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators at the 2007 NAJIT Annual Meeting May 19, 2007 – Portland, Oregon". *Proteus*, Fall 2007: 16.

Pokorn, Nike. K. and Čibej, Jaka. 2018. "Interpreting and linguistic inclusions – Friends or foes?". *The Translator*, 24(2): 111-127.

Pöchhacker, Franz. 2024. "Is machine interpreting interpreting?". *Translation Spaces.* https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.23028.poc

Pym, Anthony. 2010/2020. *Honyaku riron no tankyu* [Exploring Translation Theories]. Translated by Kayoko Takeda. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobo.

Pym, Anthony. 2012. *On Translator Ethics: Principles for Mediation Between Cultures*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pym, Anthony. 2016. "Risk analysis as a heuristic tool in the historiography of interpreters: For an understanding of worst practices". In K. Takeda and J. Baigorri-Jalón (eds.) *New Insights in the History of Interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 247-268.

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. 2014. *The Senate Intelligence Committee Report on Torture*. Brooklyn, New York: Melville House.

Stasimioti, Maria. 2025. "Uni and startup explore how to preserve voice, emotion in AI speech translation". *Slator*, 16 October 2025. https://slator.com/uni-startup-explore-how-preserve-voice-emotion-ai-speech-translation/. Visited May 2026.

Takeda, Kayoko. 2016. "Will AI replace interpreters?" (in Japanese). *The AAMT Journal*, 67:1-2.

Takeda, Kayoko. 2021. *Interpreters and War Crimes*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Takeda, Kayoko and Inagaki, Hiroshi. 2023. "Local governments' use of speech machine translation with Ukrainian evacuees in Japan" (in Japanese). *Interpreting and Translation Studies*, 23: 37-59.

Takeda, Kayoko and Inagaki, Hiroshi. 2025. "Multilingual consultation systems in Japan: Local governments' practices and the central government's 'measures on foreign nationals'" (in Japanese). *Interpreting and Translation Studies*, 25: 83-102.

Vieira, Lucas Nunes. 2026. *Translate: Multilingual Access to Critical Services in the Age of AI*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Weisman, Steven R. 1991. "Japanese translator of Rushdie book found slain". *The New York Times*. 13 July 1991. ProQuest.