

Decoding Ideology: Simultaneous Interpreting in Political Speeches

فك شفرة الايديولوجية: الترجمة الفورية في الخطب السياسية

هبة عيدان داوود البياتي أ.م.د. زينب عليوي سلومي

Asst. Prof. Zayneb Elaiwi Sallumi (PhD)

Hiba Edan Dawood Albayati

Department of Translation, University of Mustansiriyah

قسم الترجمة، الجامعة المستنصرية

heba_edan@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq zaynebsallumi@uomstansiriyah.edu.iq

Abstract

This paper examines the influence of ideology on simultaneous interpreting, specifically in speeches that are politically loaded. It delves into the difficulties interpreters encounter when the political context of the original speech interacts with their personal or institutional ideology. It deals with the elusive relationship between ideologies in the present and the contemporary understanding of them, which will be demonstrated through examples from US president Donald Trump political appearance against Qatar. Based on the concepts of ideology and language, ideology and politics, and interpretation methods, this paper conveys how ideological elements

affect the perception of political discourse and justifies by means of close investigation the methods utilized by Al-Jazeera TV interpreter. Generalization is one of the strategies that are used, others are approximation, substitution, incomplete sentences and summarizing. On the one hand, the study offers a glimpse as to what difficulties the translators will likely encounter when interpreting speeches of political figures with opposing views by identifying the intricate relationship between the translators' own ideological history, the institution that they are working for, and the political context of the speech. The research problem emerges from the challenges the interpreter face when trying to achieve neutrality in simultaneous interpreting giving the fact that ideological factors embody the interpretation task as well as the resulting political text.

Keywords: ideology, simultaneous interpreting, interpreting strategies, political discourse, Donald Trump, Qatar

الخلاصة

تتناول هذه الورقة البحثية تأثير الأيديولوجية على الترجمة الفورية، وخاصة في الخطب المشحونة سياسياً. وتدرس الصعوبات التي يواجهها المترجمون عندما يتفاعل السياق السياسي للخطاب الأصلي مع أيديولوجيتهم الشخصية أو المؤسسية، حيث تتناول العلاقة الغامضة بين الأيديولوجيات في الوقت الحاضر والفهم المعاصر لها، والتي يتم توضيحها من خلال أمثلة من الموقف السياسي للرئيس الأمريكي دونالد ترامب ضد قطر. واستناداً إلى مفاهيم الأيديولوجية واللغة والأيديولوجية والسياسة وطرق الترجمة، تنقل هذه الورقة البحثية كيف تؤثر العناصر الأيديولوجية على إدراك الخطاب السياسي وتبرر من خلال التحقيق الدقيق الأساليب التي يستخدمها مترجم قناة الجزيرة. التعميم هو أحد الاستراتيجيات المستخدمة، ومن بين الاستراتيجيات الأخرى التقريب والاستبدال والجمل غير المكتملة والتلخيص. من ناحية أخرى، تقدم الدراسة لمحة عن الصعوبات التي من المرجح أن يواجهها المترجمون عند ترجمة خطابات الشخصيات السياسية ذات الآراء المعارضة من خلال تحديد العلاقة المعقدة بين التاريخ الأيديولوجي للمترجمين، والمؤسسة التي يعملون بها، والسياق السياسي للخطاب. تنشأ مشكلة البحث من التحديات التي يواجهها المترجم عند محاولته تحقيق الحياد في الترجمة الفورية نظراً لحقيقة أن العوامل الأيديولوجية تجسد مهمة الترجمة وكذلك النص السياسي الناتج.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الإيديولوجية، الترجمة الفورية، استراتيجيات الترجمة، الخطاب السياسي، دونالد ترامب، قطر

Introduction

It is often thought that translators bring their own traditions, beliefs, institutional goals, religion, etc., into the transmission of ideas during the translation process. Since translation facilitates understanding across diverse cultural groups, (Schäffner, (2003)) argues that translators may engage in ideological manipulation of the source text (ST) in order to sway readers. The translators' attitude towards the subject they are interpreting is reflected in this act of manipulation. As a result, the translator may resort to tactics like selective wording or deletion, altering the meaning of words, generating passive voice, and foregrounding or backgrounding, etc. However, translation is not a simple process; rather, it is a lengthy one in which the translator endeavors to convey not just the code units themselves but also the associated ideological and cultural elements. "Throughout the centuries, individuals and institutions applied their particular beliefs to the production of certain effect in translation," argues (Fawcett, 1997). Because people's beliefs and actions are products of the social, political, and cultural systems in which they find themselves, it follows that humans do not have free will.

When looking at political discourse via the lens of translation, (Schäffner, "Translation in global news." , (2004)) argues that readers of the target text (TT) can get access to politics as information. Although not usually acknowledged, in TT culture, the reaction to translated information is the response to particular information. This is because political signals go through so many hands and institutions that their origins are often lost in translation, and because the general public tends to see translation in a mechanical light. Power and cultural background can sometimes be completely ignored in favor of the political action and function that these factors express and serve, in this case rendering the author's point of view is entirely

meaningless. The attention has been shifting to translators who are politically attentive and even politically involved, as noted by (Von Flotow, (1997)). Some may argue that the translator is distorting the original content by using translation as a political weapon to advance their own political agenda.

Translation, like all other parts of human existence, is controlled by ideology. Because of how deeply entwined ideology is with the text, it is hard to separate the two. Ideology is described by (Raymond, (1981)) as a systematized collection of ideas that center on human culture and life. Ideology, then, is the manner of thinking or collections of ideas held by an individual, a community, or a society. Ideologies, as stated by (Van Dijk, (2001)), form the bedrock upon which a society's norms and values are built. Unfortunately, the core of translation is largely predicated from the linguistic idea of translation because language-oriented methodologies are commonly used in translation. Translating one language into another is considered a linguistic act since it involves replacing one text with another that is grammatical and syntactically comparable while adhering to the rules of both languages. That is why the problem of ideology in translation remains unaddressed. "They are still hesitant to admit the social values and beliefs that go into both translating and studying it," remarks (Venuti, (1998)) in reference to this matter. The authors (Hatim, B., & Mason, I., (1997)) further differentiate between ideology translation and translation ideology. The former considers how the translator's worldview or ideology influences the ST's processing of texts, with different outcomes, and the latter evaluates the translator's level of mediation when dealing with sensitive texts. One way that translators mediate is by bringing their own beliefs and knowledge into their interpretation of a text. This is defined by (Hatim, "The translator as communicator.", (1997)).

As Kirchhoff puts it, "a multi-phase process that takes place sequentially while sender output, except in the case of pauses, is being produced and must be processed continuously" (Kirchhoff, (1976)). It is unclear how exactly simultaneous interpretation works. According to (Seleskovitch, (1978)), a booth is used for simultaneous interpreting, because they are speaking at the same place as the speaker, interpreters do not have to commit anything to memory or take notes. In addition, they magnify the analysis-comprehension and reconstruction-expression processes. Part by part, the interpreter works on the message, relaying what he has comprehended as he analyses and absorbs the next notion. This explanation elucidates how simultaneous interpretation is a process that demands intense focus because it involves multiple tasks at once. It was common for interpreters to spend thirty minutes at a time in the past, but "interpreters nowadays do not usually interpret for more than fifteen minutes," as stated by (Phelan, (2001)). Note that the most difficult kind of interpreting is simultaneous interpreting, which requires the interpreter to constantly translate between the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) even as the speaker of the SL speaks. There will always be some overlap between different parts of a sequence when an interpreter is required to interact and react from one statement to the next in simultaneous interpreting.

Mental overload, the impact of an increased input rate, and the working conditions of simultaneous interpreters have all been the focus of research on this type of interpretation. But there has not been much research into how ideologies affect simultaneous interpretation of political speech or how interpreters cope with challenges on the job. Political speech interpretation was the primary area of emphasis. This study's overarching goal is to learn how simultaneous interpreters make sense of the ideological components of political speeches and how ideology influences their strategy choices.

Ideology and Language

At its core, ideology is "a set of suppositions which indicate the ideas and benefits of a person, group, social institution, etc., which is finally presented in the form of language" (Hatim, B., & Mason, I., (2007)). A way of thinking, speaking, and experiencing, ideology according to (Belsey, (1980)) is "inscribed in discourse... it is not a separate element which exists independently in some free-floating domain of ideas,"

Despite appearances to the contrary, post structuralists argue that all discourse in its structure or content contains the biases, assumptions, and evaluations of particular ideological or cultural groups. None are neutral; all discourses are ideologically positioned (Macdonell, (1986)). Because of the inseparable nature of ideology with language, (Joseph, J. E., & Taylor, T., (1990)) contend that ideologies form the basis of linguistic theory. It is believed that ideological groups use language as a tool to forward their agenda. According to (Heberman, (1973)), language has the potential to justify established power structures. (Schäffner, "Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies", (2003)) argues that the subject, genre, and communication goals of a book determine how easily ideological elements can be identified.

Ideology permeates nearly every facet of human civilization. The formation of a theoretical framework that individuals use to ground their social opinions and actions is one manifestation of this ideological impact. However, there are other purposes for language besides communication. Language serves as a means of communication, but it is also an important pragmatic instrument for interacting with others, allowing us to form and maintain social connections and affiliations. A person's political beliefs

and ideology are revealed through their language use (Joseph, (2004)). It provides context for social and geographical categorizations as well as political affiliations, and it reflects the social structure. Language features like accent, dialect, and expressions in vocabulary and syntax can reflect this. Language is not inherently politically or socially biased; rather, it is the speakers' choice of language that typically reveals their thoughts and beliefs.

According to (Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. , (1997).), you cannot have one without the other when it comes to politics and language. "The art of rhetoric and verbal persuasion is to be employed in political practice," said the ancient Greek philosophers. Thomas Hobbes, the 17th-century founder of modern political science, first proposed the idea that politics and language are inseparable. Later researchers, such as (Orwell, (1946)) and (Searle, (1969)), expanded on this idea by showing that language can exert an active influence.

One of the best places to convince someone of an ideology is through their language. The ideology of the speaker has an immediate effect on the structure, tone, and language of the message. Moreover, ideology seeks to establish particular inner qualities and values by reflecting precisely the features and ideological values of the linguistic signals. It affects the criteria for accepting certain linguistic forms and the forms themselves that are chosen. This is where meta-pragmatic manifestations begin. Politicians use language to shape the world in accordance with their political views and opinions; language is an integral aspect of politics. According to (Simpson, (1993)), "It is the language that strives to recall and form ideology". (Fairclough, (1989)) argues that language is more than simply a means of communication; it is a "social practice" that mirrors the ideology and socio-political aspirations of the individuals or communities who employ it.

Ideology and Politics

Since ideologies are inherently political and the political arena serves as a platform for the manifestation, interaction, and violent competition of several ideologies, it is clear that the two are inseparable. (Van Dijk T. A., (2002)). It is common practice in politics to exploit ideologies for the advancement of ideological agendas, and vice versa. Depending on the context and intended listeners, the ideology included inside any particular political speech issued by a political actor, party, or even a government can change. A politician may express liberal views on economic issues while addressing corporations, yet stress Islamist principles when addressing conservative Muslim audiences. It is not uncommon for beliefs to be utilized in politics to further a political objective, and vice versa. Politicians masquerade as many political factions, including Islamists, pan-Arabists, communists, and socialists (Van Dijk T. A., "Political discourse and political cognition." , (2002)).

Scholars of translation that lean toward ideological politics tend to hold the view that translation is inherently political. For example, according to (Baker, M., & Gabriela, S. , (2009)), institutions and people have used their own political beliefs to influence translation in a certain way. Dominance and power dynamics are central to contemporary conceptions of ideology. A governing class's interest can be "legitimized" through the use of "ideology," according to (Calzada-Pérez, (2003)). At the micro level, there are translators, writers, critics, publishers, editors, and readers. At the macro level, translation is a process of negotiation among various agents; this makes translation a political task (Gurcaglar, (2003)).

The fact that ideology and politics are so closely related presents difficulties for simultaneous interpreters when it comes to interpreting political statements. Interpreters face a significant dilemma when deciding which ideology belongs to the speaker and which belongs to the audience due to the ideological clash that occurs

between the two groups. Unsavory societal and political outcomes may result from manipulating the substance or interpretation of political discourse.

Ideology and Simultaneous Interpreting

(Schäffner, Translation in global news, (2004)) argues that there is a complicated relationship between ideology and translation. The goals and objectives of social agents determine certain elements, such the choice of a ST and the intended use of the TT. Therefore, any translation can be seen as ideological. Political texts are characterized by their ideological components. Depending on the field, type, and aim of the text, these features are either more or less apparent in it. Lexical (the use or omission of a word) and grammatical (the use of passive structures to downplay the agent's importance) factors can also reveal ideological features inside a text. All of the translator's decisions—what to include, what to omit, which words to use, and where to put them—are based on his or her own history and the sociopolitical context in which he or she operates, as stated by (Alvarez, R., & Vidal, M. ., (1996)).

The preceding quotation exemplifies how organizations and individuals utilize their personal perspectives to accomplish a certain goal in translation (Fawcett, Translation and language: Linguistic theories explained, (1997)). The extent to which translators intervene in the transfer process, feeding their knowledge and beliefs into processing the text, is that ideologies can lead to the translator becoming a mediator. Nevertheless, due to their exclusive focus on scientific study models and experimental data, linguistically oriented approaches to translation studies have consistently ignored the concept of ideology. This leads "them to persist in avoiding consideration of the

social values and ideologies that factor into both studying it and interpreting it" (Venuti, "The scandals of translation: Towards an ethics of difference.", (1998)).

Word and grammatical choices influenced by the source text's intended audience and intended purpose are inherent to the translation process, as they are in all forms of text production. So, a more authoritative translation will win out and inspire some readers to follow. Texts do not usually spew ideology; rather, they position the interpreter to bring their own ideologies to bear on the texts' interpretation, which results in the reproduction of those ideologies (Fairclough, "Language and power." , (2001)).

Lexical priming is defined by (Hoey, (2005)) as the loading of a word with its context and co-texts through repeated exposure. Words, after all, tend to have predictable semantic and grammatical uses that shape the situations in which they appear. People, though, have their own special ways of putting that kind of language to use. Differences of this kind are due to cognitive ideologies, individual differences in language use, exposure, and rewriting, and the possibility of a word's immersion in context and co-text being out of sync (Hoey, "Lexical priming: A new theory of words and language.", (2005)).

(Hatim, B., & Mason, I., (1997)) distinguish between translation of ideology and ideology of translation in an effort to demonstrate the connection between the two. The former looks at how much of a mediator the translator is when dealing with delicate texts, while the later considers how the translator's worldview or ideology filters the ST as a text processor, leading to different results. Furthermore, (Hatim, B., & Mason, I. , (1997)) demonstrate the impact of ideology on translation by noting that "the meaning potential of items within the language system is exploited by a variety of users, each within their context and for their purpose" (i.e., by considering the various stages of processing that the translated text undergoes). Differing texts and

discourses arise from competing worldviews and histories of speech. Lexical choices, cohesive relations, syntactic organization, text structures, and text genres can all contribute to ideological shifts, which in turn can impact how texts are understood.

Interpreting Strategies Analytical Framework

Theoretically, translation can likewise articulate ideology since, as (Van Dijk T. A., "Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction." , (1997)) argues ideology is expressed in discourse. Various translators with various ideologies can provide varied interpretations of political texts because ideologies are personal convictions. Translators with vested interests in opposing political parties may bring new perspectives to the table when they tackle political speech and the underlying ideology presented in the original language. To rephrase, translators' views and personal biases make it nearly difficult to create a target text that is word-for-word identical to the source language. As a means of expressing their stance on an issue, translators use translation methods. From this vantage point, (Baker, (2006)) put forward the idea that different types of omissions, changes, and additions reveal the ideological impact on the translation process.

Like any kind of translation, the primary objective of simultaneous interpreting is to render the source text (ST) in the target language with the utmost accuracy. While it is true that words serve to transfer power or ideologies in political discourse (Fairclough, Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language , (1995)), simultaneous interpreters from asymmetric backgrounds often encounter obstacles that hinder their ability to accomplish this goal. In order to conquer these obstacles, simultaneous interpreters turn to strategic approaches. The interpreters' strategy decisions, however, may have an impact on the final product. In light of this, the

purpose of this paper is to investigate the ideological backgrounds of simultaneous interpreters and the interpreting tactics they employ. An analytical framework is developed to study how simultaneous interpreters handle the ideological components of political speeches.

The strategies offered by (Al-Salman, M., & Al-Khanji, A., (2002)) and (Pochhacker, (2004)) were combined to form this framework. These strategies include: skipping, anticipating, summarizing, approximation, literal interpretation, incomplete sentences, and message abandonment. Other strategies included reformulation, the salami technique (used when the interpreter breaks the complex source text into smaller parts in order to get more control over the resulted interpretation and avoid the pressure that is caused by long and intricate sentences), simplification, generalization, omission, summarizing, anticipation, error correction techniques, metaphors and sayings techniques, intonation, stress and pause, transcoding, and code-switching. The research methodology used in this study includes nine different approaches: expanding, contracting, omitting, paraphrasing, summarizing, approximating, repeating, and generalizing.

Data and Analysis

The data of this paper consist of a political speech and its simultaneous interpretation, delivered by the US President Donald Trump in a conference that was held at the White House on June 9th, 2017 with the Romanian President. Al-Jazeera TV channel provided simultaneous Arabic interpretation of this speech. The source data are collected from <https://youtu.be/N4qxKYQS6ws?feature=shared>, and the target data are extracted from <https://youtu.be/jSgHL3sS8UI?feature=shared>.

Source text	Time	Target text	Time	Strategy
"a funder of terrorism"	0:05	"لديها علاقات جيدة بهذا الأمر"	0:26	Omission, addition
"confronting Qatar over its behavior"	0:18	"مواجهة الدول بخصوص مواقفها"	0:37	substitution, generalization
"supporting terrorism"	1:11	"التصدي للإرهاب"		Substitution
"to end its funding, they have to end that funding and its extremist ideology in terms of funding"	0:53	"لوقف هذه العمليات وضرورة التعاطي الجديد مع سياسة اخرى"	1:14	Omission, addition
"stop teaching people to kill other people", "hate and intolerance"	1:13, 1:18	"معايير متطرفة"	1:38	Summarizing

The analysis:

a. Omission, addition Strategies

During the process of interpreting, an omission and addition methods were discovered. For example, Trump accuses Qatar of being "a funder of terrorism" in the original text, but the Al-Jazeera interpreter has chosen not to translate the speaker's offensive words and phrases against the patron's ideology. Instead, he has chosen to omit Trump's accusations and add the phrase) "لديها علاقات جيدة بهذا الأمر" (has good relations in this regard) in the target language. Moreover, the omission of "to end its funding, they have to end that funding and its extremist ideology in terms of funding" in the original speech and the addition of "لوقف هذه العمليات وضرورة التعاطي الجديد مع سياسة" (to stop these operations and the necessity of a new approach to another policy) in the target, that shows how the simultaneous interpreter kept defending the ideology of the agency (Al Jazeera) he works for and how he manipulated the original speech causing lack of accuracy in favor of his agency agenda .

b. Substitution strategy

A substitution method is also discovered in the interpretation where the interpreter said) "مواجهة الدول بخصوص مواقفها" (states should be confronted over their behaviors) instead of saying "confronting Qatar over its behavior", so the interpreter substituted the word "Qatar". with the expression "الدول" Furthermore, the change from "supporting terrorism" in the original speech to) "التصدي للإرهاب" (confronting terrorism) in the interpreted version shows how much the interpreter from Al Jazeera manipulated Trump's speech to paint a positive picture of Qatar.

So many interpreters' heavy reliance on substitute strategy furthers the interpreter's vulnerability to ideological pressure while making strategy selections. Simultaneous interpreters mostly employ this tactic to tailor their speeches to the political and ideological beliefs of their intended listeners.

c. Incomplete Sentence Strategy

Three times throughout Trump's address, the simultaneous interpreter employed the incomplete sentence approach. All three segments revolve around the speaker's unfiltered claims that Qatar is a terrorist financier and supporter. The interpreter for Al-Jazeera TV seemed perplexed by the complex interpretation challenges posed by the speaker. As soon as Trump accused Qatar of funding terrorism, the interpreter would say unfinished sentences such as "ولهذا نقوم..." and "لديها علاقات..." "إلى وقف..." before switching to other tactics, influenced by the patron's ideological goals.

d. Summarizing strategy

Using this tactic, Trump's address against Qatar was interpreted simultaneously. The interpretation from Al-Jazeera significantly altered the original meaning of Trump's speech by using summary to explain his remarks. The speaker's strong demand, which included the elimination of instruction on "how to kill other people" and the indoctrination of individuals with "hate and intolerance," was summarized in the target language as) "معايير متطرفة" (extreme views). There was no miscommunication or need to cut corners in order to meet the deadline. The speaker's intended meaning was intentionally distorted when it was constructed. This method parallels the interpreter's censorship practices at his associated organization, Al Jazeera News Channel, and clearly displays its political and ideological leanings.

e. Approximation, Repetition and Generalization strategies

The translator from Al-Jazeera utilized a combination of approximation, repetition, and generalization tactics to convey Trump's remarks, in order to demonstrate, the process of approximation followed the creation of an unfinished sentence. This time around, the translator seemed bewildered while translating Trump's demand that Qatar "to stop supporting terrorism", which carries with it an implied allegation of its sponsor. In his interpretation of this statement as) "إلى وقف وتصدي الإرهاب" (to stop and face terrorism), the interpreter was reluctant to present an unfavorable view of Qatar.

The interpreter's apparent or implicit bias toward his patron's ideology is shown in the ambiguity and vagueness of the meaning conveyed by his interpretation. The interpreter's tactic of repeatedly saying) "يجب أن نعمل سوياً" (we must work together) was an example of repetition. The interpreter was able to make a persuasive statement regarding the partnership's role in fighting terrorism through the use of such repetition. To rephrase, the interpreter's goal was to portray Qatar as a state that actively fights terrorism while also emphasizing that this is an international obligation.

Simultaneous interpretation of Trump's speech about Qatar also revealed a generalization method. The interpreter from Al-Jazeera TV implemented this method in order to translate the original speech "confronting Qatar over its behavior" into the target language, which is) "مواجهة الدول بخصوص مواقفها" (states should be confronted over their behaviors). The interpreter chose to generalize the speaker's position more than the source language, which mostly refers to Qatar. The interpreter and his patron's position that non-Arab and non-Islamic states should also be held responsible for aiding terrorism was revealed when the target interpretation generalized the culpability. This included Qatar.

Conclusion

Certain ideological considerations are among key factors determining the pattern in which political speeches are carried out as for simultaneous translation and interpretation. In order to send the speaker's intentions in the message, translators often adopt strategies such as generalization, approximation, incomplete sentences, summarizing, and replacement. Nonetheless, it is also important to notice that these methods are not entirely impassive; they carry the interpreter's own ideological standpoint or the ideological inclinations of the side which she/he is representing. The exhibited cases demonstrate that interpreters can serve as political manipulators and instrumentalize the language for purposes of theirs or their organization's ideological objectives. Interpreters can therefore access to real manipulation processes so the initial message is unlikely to be transferred in authentic sense. On top of this, the research makes obvious that interpreters are attempting to bridge the ideological divide that exists between language of the speaker, language of the audience and the language of the interpreter. These obstructions confirm how complex it is to interpret the political speech and events while working simultaneously. Proper, equitable and unbiased communication across language barriers can only be assured when such channels as ruining and translation of ideologically charged political statements are assessed accordingly.

References

- Al-Salman, M., & Al-Khanji, A. ((2002)). Simultaneous interpretation strategies: A comparative study . *Meta*, 47(2), 241-260.
- Alvarez, R., & Vidal, M. . ((1996)). Translation, power, subversion. "Clevedon, Multilingual Matters".
- Baker, M. ((2006)). Translation and conflict: A narrative account. *Routledge*.

- Baker, M., & Gabriela, S. . ((2009)). Interpreting ideologies, legitimizing regimes: An introduction. In M. Baker & Gabriela S. (Eds.), "Interpreting ideologies in political discourse" . *Continuum*, (pp. 1-21).
- Belsey, C. ((1980)). "Critical practice". *Routledge*.
- Calzada-Pérez, M. ((2003)). Ideology in "Translation Studies": A political perspective. *The Translator*, 9(1), 1-22.
- Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. . ((1997).). "Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse." . *John Benjamins Publishing*.
- Fairclough, N. ((1989)). "Language and power." . *Longman*.
- Fairclough, N. ((1995)). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language . *"Language in Society"*, 20(2), 231-237.
- Fairclough, N. ((2001)). "Language and power." . *Pearson Education*.
- Fawcett, P. ((1997)). Translation and language: Linguistic theories explained. *"Manchester University Press"*.
- Fawcett, P. (1997). Translation and language: Linguistic theories explained. *Manchester University Press*, 107.
- Gurcaglar, S. T. ((2003)). Ideology, shifts of register and translation: A case study of politically sensitive translations in Turkey. . *"Perspectives: Studies in Translatology"*, 11(2), 129-141.
- Hatim, B. & ((1997)). "The translator as communicator." . *Routledge*.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. . ((1997)). "The translator as communicator." . *Routledge*.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. ((1997)). "The translator as communicator." . *Routledge*.

- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. ((1997)). "The translator as communicator.". *Routledge*.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. ((2007)). "The translator as communicator.". *Routledge*.
- Heberman, R. ((1973)). Language and political systems. In R. E. Lamb (Ed.).
"Language and politics" Academic Press, (pp. 3–20).
- Hoey, M. ((2005)). "Lexical priming: A new theory of words and language.". *Routledge*.
- Hoey, M. ((2005)). "Lexical priming: A new theory of words and language.". *Routledge*.
- Joseph, J. E. ((2004)). "Language and politics." . *Edinburgh University Press*.
- Joseph, J. E., & Taylor, T. ((1990)). Ideologies of language. *Routledge*.
- Kirchhoff, H. ((1976)). "Semantics.". *Routledge*.
- Macdonell, D. ((1986)). Ideology in linguistics. *Language in Society*, 15(1), 59–75.
- Orwell, G. ((1946)). "Politics and the English language.". *Horizon*.
- Phelan, M. ((2001)). "Interpreting in the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities.". *John Benjamins Publishing*.
- Pochhacker, F. ((2004)). "Introducing interpreting studies.". *Routledge*.
- Raymond, A. ((1981)). "The social bases of language and thought.". *John Wiley & Sons*.
- Schäffner, C. ((2003)). "Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies". *Journal of Language and Politics*.
- Schäffner, C. ((2003)). "Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies.". *Journal of Language and Politics*, 2(2), 233–257.

- Schäffner, C. ((2004)). *"Translation in global news."* . Routledge.
- Schäffner, C. ((2004)). *Translation in global news.* Routledge.
- Searle, J. ((1969)). *"Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language."*.
Cambridge University Press.
- Seleskovitch, D. ((1978)). *"Interpreting for international conferences."* Translated by
Stuart Campbell and William Brown. *Pen and Sword.*
- Simpson, P. ((1993)). *"Language, ideology and point of view."* . Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. A. ((2001)). *"Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity."* *"Methods of
critical discourse analysis"*. Sage, (pp. 95–120).
- Van Dijk, T. A. ((2002)). *"Political discourse and political cognition."* . Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. A. ((2002)). *"Political discourse and political cognition."* . Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. A. ((1997)). *"Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction."* . Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. ((2001)). *"Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity."* In R. Wodak &
M. Meyer (Eds.), *"Methods of critical discourse analysis"*. Sage, (pp. 95–120).
- Venuti, L. ((1998)). *"The scandals of translation: Towards an ethics of difference."*.
Routledge., page. 4.
- Venuti, L. ((1998)). *"The scandals of translation: Towards an ethics of difference."*.
Routledge.
- Von Flotow, L. ((1997)). *"Translation and gender: Translating in the 'Era of
Feminism'."*. Manchester University Press.