

## Interpreter Training at Daito Bunka University

Masaomi Kondo  
omikondo@amber.plala.or.jp

Interviewed by Daniel Gile

Masaomi KONDO(近藤正臣) is a well-known Japanese conference interpreter, one of the first in Japan to join AIIC, the International Association of Conference Interpreters. Born in 1942, he could be classified as one of the younger pioneer conference interpreters in Japan, and probably the first with extensive experience both in Japan and overseas, both in interpreting practice and in academia, as a professor of development economics at Daito Bunka University in Tokyo and an interpreter trainer, the founder of the first Japanese graduate interpreter training program and the founding father of the Japan Association of Interpreting Studies, recently renamed Japan Association for Interpreting and Translation Studies. He is the author of many didactic articles and several books, on economics, language and interpreting, the most recent book having been published in July 2015 (通訳とはなにか – *What is interpreting?* Tokyo: Seikatsushoin).

Qu.: *Prof. Kondo. When I first met you in Japan, in 1985, you were already a well-known interpreter and interpreter educator. Can you tell*

*me how you were trained as an interpreter yourself, and how colleagues of your generation and above in Japan were trained?*

KONDO: This is a big question. Let me try to give you a brief answer. I was first trained in the US Department of State to become an escort interpreter there in 1963. The Department had a program of inviting leaders in various fields of activities in Japan to let them see the country and the people in America. Several training sessions were organized in the Japanese-English combination with an American interpreter who was very proficient in Japanese, as well as three or four sessions with the German interpreter in the same Section, who trained us in English-into-English 'interpreting'. My basic training was done on the road. And in three weeks I was rather comfortable with SI.

How were my colleagues of my generation and above in Japan trained? I have no general picture. My senior colleagues in Washington, D.C. had been there to interpret for those who were sent to the US by Japan Productivity Center to see and study the American management practices. You see, after Japan was defeated by America with the two atomic bombs, America helped Japan in many ways. One was to introduce modern corporate management to Japan. The Productivity Center in Japan sent many Japanese executives and managers of Japanese corporations to the US, and they needed interpreters once in America. My senior colleagues at the State Department had been working there. I have no idea how they had been trained.

International Christian University in Tokyo, a liberal arts college established after the end of the War, had an undergraduate interpreter training course with Prof. Saito as the instructor, although she herself was a communication specialist and had never been a

professional interpreter. She was specifically asked to train interpreters for the Tokyo Olympics in 1964. ICU had a very effective Freshman English course, and close to half of the classes were taught in English with English-speaking instructors and English (mainly American) textbooks. Many ICU students became professional interpreters after graduation. When Simul International was established as a PCO (professional conference organizer), the core of the interpreters there came from the Saito class.

*Qu.: What about the instructors at Simul Academy, the training program set up by and within Simul International?*

KONDO: Simul Academy was established much later, only when the Simul International saw that such an interpreting school would attract enough students to make it a going concern. The Academy had their own training room at Roppongi, a very posh section of Tokyo, not too far from their headquarters. And prior to this Academy, there had been what they called the Simul Classes where I was the only full-time instructor. At Simul Academy I only taught during the initial few months, I think. After that the parent company, Simul International, asked their own active interpreters to teach at the Academy. I am not aware of how they actually taught.

*Qu.: Would it be accurate to say that most of the interpreters in Japan until the late sixties were not trained formally as interpreters and did not intend to become interpreters initially, but had a good mastery of English for whatever reason and learned interpreting on the job, sometimes after short or very ad hoc training such as the three weeks of consecutive training you benefited from when you were hired by the US State Department? And often without any training at all? I am*

*thinking of interpreters who became famous in Japan in the 1970s, including those who became interpreter trainers themselves.*

KONDO: I think you are right in saying that there never had been any formal interpreter training until the late 1960s. And even after that, Japanese trainers themselves did not have a good theoretical foundation, or a model, of interpreting. Of course, no word-for-word correspondence is possible when interpreting between Japanese and English. But people generally assumed that ‘accurate’ interpreting meant exactly that.

We have a word ‘iyaku’ (意訳), meaning ‘non-literal, loose, broad, free translation, and that was generally looked upon as something to be avoided as much as possible. The opposite was ‘chokuyaku’ (直訳), meaning ‘literal translation,’ which was viewed as more accurate and faithful.

*Qu.: You founded the first graduate interpreter training program in Japan, at Daito Bunka University in Tokyo. What other training programs were there at that time in Japan? I understand that some were operated by PCOs. How many were there and how did they operate? Who were the trainees, and what can you tell us about the teachers, the duration of the courses, the teaching methods? Did they use theory? If so, which, and how did they use it in training? How many people did they train and what became of the graduates?*

KONDO: I have mentioned the Saito class at ICU. There might have been a few other colleges where similar programs were offered. And, as you say, there were quite a few programs operated by PCOs and others. One book published in 2010 lists even today as many as 46 ‘interpreter schools’ operated by PCOs, and YMCAs at places

throughout the archipelago, among other organizations. They mostly had their own facilities, and the trainees attended the classes two to four days a week. These were taught mainly by practicing interpreters with little background in interpreting studies. The courses usually have several levels from introductory to more advanced.

*Qu.: Would you say that introductory levels in such courses are more like English enhancement courses than like interpreting courses? Would you also say that a sizable proportion of the students that enroll aim at improving their English rather than at becoming interpreters?*

KONDO: Well, that is rather difficult to say. Interpreting was a dream job for female college students after the manned-Apollo landing on the moon, which was broadcast live with simultaneous interpreting on TV. Even though all the students in these courses eventually or ultimately wanted to become interpreters, some of them had to start low, maybe repeating these classes a few times, which discouraged them from going all the way up. Many probably just learned English.

*Qu.: Would you also say that many so-called interpreting schools in Japan are actually language schools with little or no interpreting content?*

KONDO: Many of these schools may have attracted more students by just setting up an interpreting level at the very top, without expecting anyone really to go that high. But I can only guess on this.

These courses usually last half a year, and can be repeated. The instructors were practitioners, but mostly had little theory to rely on. Some, thus, emphasized word-for-word correspondence. PCOs

searched for the best graduates from their own school, and gladly welcomed them into their fold.

Qu.: *Would you say that those who graduate from advanced level classes are competent conference interpreters? Or are they rather escort interpreters with basic knowledge in consecutive and simultaneous techniques who then get trained on the job? Is it true that those Japanese PCOs have defined three levels of interpreters, beginners, who do liaison interpreting on their own and are assigned to some conference interpreting jobs with more experienced interpreters (of a higher level) who mentor them, that these mentors recommend to the PCOs that an interpreter be moved up one level when s/he has acquired sufficient solid skills?*

KONDO: As far as I know, this depended on the particular PCO. Some only took the really competent ones whom they could assign to meetings from the first. Others tried these novices first only as the receptionist at a big conference, and moved them up as they proved their competence. Some PCOs gave regular testing to the beginners to promote them up. Others just counted how many years they have been doing interpreting. In some PCOs it all depended on the 'whims' of the leaders. There were or are no formal or more authentic testing bodies which all the Japanese PCOs accepted or accept now as really trustworthy. In Australia there is NAATI, but not in Japan. Except to say that the sign language interpreters can be accredited by a national testing body.

Qu.: *Why did you think it would be a good idea to set up a graduate training program at Daito Bunka University? Did you think this would be necessary because other programs were not good enough? Or is it*

*because, as you wrote in one of your publications, that there were graduate programs elsewhere and thought Japan should have some as well?*

KONDO: Both, I would say. On one hand, I had learned that the ICU program did not really provide rigorous training in simultaneous interpreting, with sufficient explanations and sufficient guidance, in particular regarding interpreting strategies for SI between Japanese and English, which are very different. For example, as regards sentence structure, verbs come at the end of Japanese sentences, and may turn out to be in the negative form without prior indication, whereas in English, the verb comes early on in the sentence. One other difficulty is associated with the fact that there is no indication in the form of most Japanese nouns about whether they refer to a plural or a singular. Teaching strategies to deal with such differences is therefore important.

In December, 1989, I attended a symposium at MIIS (then Monterey Institute of International Studies, currently Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey) that was held in commemoration of the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of their interpreting program. And I got two ‘shocks’ there listening to presentations and interacting with the other participants. One was that there had been solid interpreting studies going on mainly in Europe since the 1950s. And the second was that many Asia-Pacific countries had graduate conference interpreter training programs with Japanese as one of the working languages. So, while we mostly had private schools like Simul Academy, countries like Australia, Thailand, and the US had been training their nationals to become competent interpreters who can interpret between Japanese and their own language in academic programs.

I felt very strongly I just had to do something on these two fronts. I had written a few papers on interpreting at my university, but only in Japanese, and some Japanese interpreters had published books in which they talked about their personal experience. If Japanese interpreters were to really join the global community of interpreters, we should also join them in studying what we do in the booth or on the podium next to the speaker. On this front I initiated a small private study group almost immediately, which by now has grown up to be the Japan Association for Interpreting and Translation Studies, an academic body recognized by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, which is the Japanese equivalent of what is called the Academy of Science in some other countries.

Establishing graduate interpreter training programs embracing Asian as well as major world languages was much more difficult. It involved a university, an establishment with rather conservative traits, and how the concerned faculty felt about this project. Initially I thought a national university with a faculty of foreign languages should host this program: then there would be interpreters training between Japanese and all other languages they were teaching, specifically including Asian languages as well as major world languages. But it was beyond my widest imagination to influence a national university. When I happened to meet a Japanese language professor of a major national university in Brisbane, Australia, I talked about it, and this professor kindly listened to me. But no actual initiative emerged from him. As to myself, I had no political clout to move such a national university to set it up. And Japanese academics had this idea that interpreting is not a subject worth teaching at university, although female students looked at it as one of their two dream professions (the other being airlines stewardesses). Thus, I felt compelled to look at DBU. I belonged to the faculty of

economics, and was in charge of development economics plus systems analysis at the Graduate School of Economics. One advantage in trying to open this program in the framework of this Graduate School was that it was over ten years old and had 'autonomy', meaning that it did not have to consult the Ministry of Education when establishing a new program. Also, I learned that the Aarhus business school in Denmark had a reputed interpreting program. Why not the Graduate School of Economics at DBU then?

Qu.: *In what way did your program differ from existing programs in Japan? With respect to content, teaching methods, examination system? If you use theory, what kind of theory do you use, and in what way?*

KONDO: Since my program was a graduate program, students had to take the entrance examination, in the initial years, including basic economics. Few of the examinees had their undergraduate major in economics. So, they studied Samuelson's *Principles of Economics*, and other economics textbooks as a preparation for the entrance exam.

And I also tested applicants' general English more severely than DBU tested high school graduates. The most important part of the interview in particular was this: I would read out an article from a most recent issue of the *Daily Yomiuri*. Of course, I could have done this from any daily newspaper, but I had a subscription to that particular newspaper at the time. Applicants were allowed to take notes if they wished while listening. Then I would ask several questions in English on the content of that article, and they were required to reply in English. I used a wording different from the article, and they had to give a substantive answer, not repeat part of the article verbatim. If they did that, I would pursue them further to

see if they really got the sense of the article and they could say it in their own words.

Qu.: *In your program, did you train directly for conference interpreting? Or did you also train for liaison interpreting or business interpreting?*

KONDO: Mostly I trained directly for conference interpreting. I assumed that liaison interpreting would be handled sufficiently well once skills acquired allowed students to work in full-fledged international conferences. As to business interpreting, our students had to take about half their required credits in economics, economic affairs and business affairs. And since I always had studied economics, in particularly development economics, I took most of the materials from international economics and economics of developing countries. This, I thought, would be sufficient to deal with business affairs (if provided with necessary briefing materials).

Another specific feature of this program was that while most other graduate school classes in Japan usually met only once a week, which was not enough to learn how to actually interpret consecutively or simultaneously, this was not enough, so I proposed practicum classes. Firstly, I set up four practicum classes A to D, each to meet once a week, and secondly, I strongly recommended that the students take these classes twice, in their first and second years. They did not get academic credits for attending them in their second year, but they did get to actually practice interpreting three or four days a week. I myself could not teach all these classes, so the school had to hire other instructors on a part-time basis.

I also held what I called 'interpreting marathon' classes at the end of each academic year. You know that in Japan the academic year for all the schools was from April to March, April being the time when

cherry blossoms bloom from down south and gradually moving to north. For these 'interpreting marathons', I took a conference where I myself had interpreted and repeated the whole thing in my class. When I interpreted at what looked like an appropriate event, I asked the organizer to allow me to make use of that conference in my interpreting class, pledging to them naturally that it would never get out of the class. They usually were very cooperative. Then, I recorded everything that was uttered and collected all the materials that were distributed to the interpreters prior to and during the conference.

I gave my students all the materials that I had received before the conference. On the day of the interpreting marathon, they had to be in the booth about 30 minutes before the conference started. When the time came, I started re-playing everything I heard some time before in the real conference, and the students in the booths had to interpret simultaneously. If it was a three-day meeting, then the class met over three consecutive days. Each day we lunched together informally in a restaurant nearby and discussed their performance, problems they faced, etc.

*Qu.: Are these methods you thought of on your own, or did you get inspiration from existing programs somewhere?*

KONDO: Of course, I took inspiration from the programs I had had the chance to observe elsewhere. But at the same time, I had realized myself that to be able to work as a pro from 'Day One' after they would get out of DBU, students needed to have had sufficient amount of hands-on experience. And I was quite active in interpreting these days, in addition to teaching full-time at DBU. So, I had enough actual conferences from which to choose the best materials at that particularly point in time.

Yet another point is that in my (economics) program, the students had to submit a Master's dissertation, which was evaluated by a group of faculty members. I gladly applied the same principle to my interpreting students. First of all, writing a full-length paper on any topic would require the writer to consider the overall structure of the paper, collect materials (including some English), organize them and actually write up the result. This would train their mind to think logically and write a lot of English or Japanese (either was allowed). If they chose to write on some aspects of interpreting, they would learn more about interpreting itself. If they chose some economic issues to investigate, they would gain some solid knowledge of economics and/or economic affairs, which I realized had a synergic effect with interpreting. That was indeed my case. One student chose to study the history of European Community. Another chose to study the Far Eastern Tribunal after the end of the Pacific War (the equivalent of the Nuremberg Trial in Europe), where Japanese-English were used, mostly interpreted simultaneously, and monitored<sup>1</sup>

Thirdly, I also made it a policy to have one practicing interpreter with an English A (or near A) and no Japanese in his/her language combination. There were a few European AIIC members living in Tokyo (on their own or because of family circumstances). Students would do English-into-English interpreting with them. This is what they do in countries such as Thailand and Vietnam where they had to rely initially on European instructors for interpreting classes (in Vietnam they did French-into-French interpreting). This was one way for the students to learn how European interpreters were trained in Europe. I encouraged these instructors to be quite strict (Japanese students' English must be substantially improved). The students would hear their instructor read (or spontaneously speak) the original speech in English, and then give the sense of that English utterance

back in English but they were not allowed to use the same wording and expressions: they were asked to paraphrase. It is possible to repeat sentences without understanding what they mean, but paraphrasing requires comprehension. And this exercise forced them to increase their vocabulary. They also were taught how European interpreters take notes, and there were a few things they did which we did not do in Japan. For instance, one European instructor told the students very specifically to draw a vertical line on the left side of the pad to make room to show changes in the flow or logic of the speaker's argument. In the margin, they would only write words as 'But', 'Therefore', 'Despite' and so forth.

Fourthly, I wanted to give as much real-life interpreting experience as possible (including actually interpreting lecturers from overseas giving special lectures to the whole DBU student body, visiting the real venues of international conference taking place, such as the United Nations University in Tokyo, and the Kyoto International Conference Center.)

As to the progression, I always started with consecutive. First, I had my students produce consecutive interpreting without taking notes. I told them to listen to me very carefully, and tell themselves to organize my speech and quietly note: "Point Nr. 1 is this. Point Nr. 2 is that.", or look at the ceiling and assign these points to the spots on the ceiling.

When I noted that most of the students were able to organize what they heard into some coherent pattern, I started to tell them about note-taking. I first told them that they were not to write down individual words unless they were specific terms or main ideas. Even when they did this, they should invent their own abbreviations. I also taught them various symbols, like an upward-pointing arrow meaning (prices) going up, (production) increasing, prestige rising and a

downward-pointing arrow meaning the opposite. If you drew two arrows or a long arrow, it would mean the increase occurred rapidly or a large increase occurred. An arrow slowly rising to your right would signify it is occurring slowly. 'A<<B' would mean 'A is smaller (in some sense)'. '○' would indicate something is correct, right, appropriate, and so forth, while ' ' would indicate the opposite. An arrow used to signify 'A to B' (A→B) would mean A is the cause and B the result. Of course, they could utilize mathematical signs, like '∴', '≠' and '≐', if they still remembered them from school.

I divided the blackboard into three sections, and assigned two students to each, while I took the third, and the three of us took notes on the same utterance, or a paragraph read out by another student. This, of course, had a demonstration effect. And, of course, I gave my own rendition, too. This was to show the students how spontaneously or freely we can deliver end product.

When going into the simultaneous, I usually gave my own version first. I entered one of the booths, reproduced a speech by an English speaker, had all the students tune into my channel, and let them listen. The point I wanted to show was that I was not going for word-for-word correspondence, and that I could speak at a rather slow and constant speed to give all of the sense of the speech.

Q11.: *Did you teach any theory? If so, were there separate theory classes, or was the theory embedded in practical classes? I mean by that that when you gave students some recommendations, you also explained why using some theory. Did you recommend any reading material on interpreting theory?*

KONDO: Yes, I did teach theory, but only after de-emphasizing word-for-word transposition in enough actual cases. I then had them

read the English translation of Seleskovitch's classic work: *Interpreting for International Conferences — Problems of Languages and Communication*, and had a session to discuss it. Some who had been to private interpreting schools in town said it was an eye-opening theory, the Japanese expression being 'the scales fell from my eyes.'

The examination system was simple. I had taken part in the graduation examination of the students at MAJIT (Master of Arts in Japanese Interpretation and Translation) at the University of Queensland, and essentially I did the same thing. Examiners had a sheet on which to mark various aspects of the performance, like the accuracy in content reproduction, delivery in such aspects as appropriate register, pronunciation and prosody. These items were graded from one to five, and the total became the student's score. I tried to ask a part-time instructor to join me to evaluate together.

Both the consecutive and simultaneous interpreting examinations were done for each student at one time. I naturally made sure that I recorded everything.

Qu: *What has been the institutional development in interpreter training over the years? More schools within academia? I know of a program at Kobe College and of a program at Tokyo Foreign Language University. I am not sure the MA program at Rikkyo actually trains interpreters. I assume there are still private training programs such as Simul s. How many more? Do they maintain any contact with each other? With academic programs?*

KONDO: DBU had the first graduate-level interpreter training course in Japan. An interesting development was that the Ministry of Education thereafter encouraged interpreter training to be taken up by newly applying graduate schools of foreign languages. The very

Faculty of Foreign Languages at DBU soon applied to the Ministry to get their graduate school approved by the Ministry, and they were specifically told to include interpreter training in their curriculum. Apparently so were other newly applying graduate schools.

And because of the new attitude of the Ministry of Education to interpreter education, the number of graduate-level interpreter training courses jumped up to over 20 in a few years between 1998 and 2000. You mention Kobe College, Tokyo Foreign Language University, and Rikkyo (St. Paul). They naturally have flowering interpreter training programs.

However, since most universities had no full-time members of their faculty who were qualified to teach interpreters at the new graduate schools, they had to rely on part-time lecturers from outside. I myself was asked to teach the DBU graduate school for a few years probably in order to get approval from the Ministry. I also taught at Rikkyo (or St. Paul) University when they established the Graduate School of Cross-Cultural Communication. Other graduate schools had to rely on practicing interpreters with little experience in teaching or knowledge of the prevailing interpreting models in Europe.

Another difficulty they have is this: although the overall interpreting market is growing, with such categories of interpreting as community interpreting, broadcast interpreting, and medical interpreting (sometimes included in the community interpreting, often called 'public service interpreting' in Japan), this growing market cannot absorb all the graduates of these twenty or so graduate interpreting programs. Many of the entrants only wish to improve their English skills, or obtain an MA degree, to go back to their former job, now better equipped.

You are right in assuming that there still are plenty of private interpreting schools such as Simul Academy. I see as many as 46

such schools listed in a book (the Editorial Committee of the Tsuyaku-honyaku Jaanaru (Interpreting-Translation Journal), 2010, *Tsuyaku no Shigoto: Hajimekata-Kasegikata (Interpreting as professional occupation: how to begin and how to earn good salary* by Ikaros Publishing, pp. 172-176). 通訳翻訳ジャーナル編集部・編『通訳の仕事—始め方稼ぎ方』(イカロス出版)

Qu.: *I know you have taught at Monterey and have visited the University of Queensland many times. You have probably visited other training programs overseas as well. What are specific features of Japanese interpreting students, compared to those of students in other countries where you have taught or visited interpreting institutions?*

KONDO: There is one thing that bothers me about our attitude to English, or to English studying, in Japan. Today more Japanese are learning English, but they are not taught basic features of that language. When I taught interpreting at the Graduate School of Cross-Cultural Studies at Rikkyo (St. Paul) for two years or so, I saw that about half of the graduate students there wrote English with no definite or indefinite articles, i.e., they wrote “I had book...” and NOT “I had *a* book,” for instance. Nor did they have a good command of the uses of English tenses. For instance, they nonchalantly write: “I realized I *did not study* English very hard in my high school.” You would have to say: “I realized I *had not studied* English hard in my high school”, right?

And this is a very common feature today in Japan. I can easily give you more examples of this kind. So, they can prattle, they can speak broken, baby English. The same thing can be said about comprehension: they can see what is being talked about in a very rough way, but they fail to catch subtle but decisive differences

between, for instance, 'I have *a few good friends*' and 'I have few good friends.' When I was at high school, we were taught a lot of English grammar. But the trend in English education went through a drastic change a few decades ago. People said: "We Japanese cannot speak English because we were taught so much grammar and only grammar." If you talk of grammatical aspects of English, you are cautioned and chided.

This is a very sad phenomenon when you start talking about interpreter education. If you are to become a professional conference interpreter and your English output to be used as pivot in relay interpreting, something must be done about such weaknesses. Since this is related to a far bigger issue, interpreter educators have little to do with it, but maybe trainers can emphasize that such students be at the very least strongly advised to go through basic English grammar once again, or for the first time.

Oftentimes students that have entered a graduate interpreting course instantly become confident of their English including their English pronunciation. Sometimes when you point out rather basic features of the English language, they are not even willing to listen.

Many rely on instant knowledge you can get by manipulating an iPhone or some other similar gadget and underestimate the value of background knowledge that is essential in understanding the English utterances. This is related to their probably unconscious acceptance of word-for-word correspondence being the essence of interpretation. If they just have to change Japanese words into 'lexicographically corresponding words', they have no need for background knowledge or a real understanding of the content of the utterance. I am not sure if this applies to interpreting students in other countries, but I feel this is a very distinctive characteristic of many of the Japanese interpreting students today.

Qu.: *Is there any trainer training program in Japan?*

KONDO: Not that I know of. No. At one time there was a small project within the Japan Association for Interpreting and Translation Studies (JAITS) on 'Interpreter Training and Education – Theory and Practice –', and it came out with the first issue of the *Journal of Interpreter Training and Education Research Project*. But I have recently learned that this project was terminated after one issue of this journal was published.

Qu.: *How do you see further developments in interpreter training in Japan? What special needs are there? What would your recommendations be?*

KONDO: I have already pointed out some weaknesses of Japanese interpreting students. When you are serious about educating conference interpreters to man the booths in Geneva, New York, Singapore, you would have to correct these features. And as I understand it, language competency with at least three languages near native-speaker level is a prerequisite in Europe for interpreter training to begin. With Japanese as a very different language from Indo-European languages, we may not be able to deal with this problem in the same way as you would in Europe, but basic skills in handling English should indeed be a prerequisite in this country, too.

Other than this, I can only say that Seleskovitch's basic interpreting model should be adopted, particularly between our two languages, Japanese and English, which are much further apart than English and French, for instance.

Qu.: *I suppose you mean the model which says you understand first and then reformulate without worrying about the form of the source*

*speech? As you know, this model was proposed for all language pairs, even when the languages concerned are very close to each other, precisely because when they are close, one is tempted to translate word-for-word, hence many false friends and many sentences in the target language that are grammatically correct, but idiomatically off, and sometimes semantically as well.*

KONDO: You are right. Between Japanese and Chinese, there is an interesting story of a false friend. When a Chinese trade union delegation was in Japan and visited a Japanese factory, they found a sign posted on the wall saying: 「首切り反対 kubikiri hantai」. And they all thought, “Oh, we all knew that Japanese management was bad, but I never realized they would ‘cut off the head of their workers.’” In Japanese ‘kubikiri’, “beheading”, only meant firing or discharging some of the workers.

Certain terms have been translated into Japanese by creating new words for those English (French, German…) terms whose equivalents did not exist in Japanese simply because Japan at the time of the initial introduction of Western thought had no parliament, law delivered and decided by parliament, democracy, automobiles, telephones, or even concepts such as ‘modern society’. Therefore, the early Meiji intellectuals had to coin new words by combining two or four Chinese ideograms to express these concepts and things. And they have since become very much part of the Japanese vocabulary, so that we just have to use them.

The ensuing issue, which Japanese linguist Akira YANABU (柳父章) raised, is that these coined words were easily identified as having been developed in Europe and therefore were automatically assumed to have great value. They just had to be accepted without really having been ‘digested’ first — otherwise, people would be looked upon

as old-fashioned and non-enlightened. But when those who encountered them at university graduated and started to work in the real world, they immediately realized that things they had learned in college just did not explain what they saw and experienced, which led them to instantly discard everything they had learned. Akira YANABU called this phenomenon the crumbling of the paper castle (カルタの城が崩れる). (See Kondo 1992, “Cassette Effect” in Japanese Translation Words’, *The Interpreters Newsletter*, Special Issue No. 1, pp. 24-34).

Qu.: *I think you also wrote a textbook for interpreter training, with a CD. Could you tell me how you decided to write it, how you went about it and where it is used?*

KONDO: Thank you for this question. Yes, I did, but only because I was asked to by a magazine. In the CD, I reproduced my own interpretation of an English speech on world energy situation. I did not have to use it in my classes because I was on site and could demonstrate in front of the students’ very eyes. But I did recommend them to have a look — or have a hearing?

Qu.: *Is the DBU graduate interpreter training program still alive? Who teaches it now?*

KONDO: Oh, it is very much alive and kicking. It is now taught by Ass. Prof. Miyuki TANAKA (田中深雪), and, there are a good number of students who are enjoying the classes in both interpreting and economics. One recent trend is that there are more students from abroad, meaning the interpreting classes are rife with Japanese, English, and the mother tongues of these students from abroad. I am sure it will further develop.

## NOTES

1. WATANABE, Tomie (1998). *Tokyo Saiban no Tsuyaku Kenkyu: Tojo Hideki Shogen wo Tsujite* 東京裁判の通訳研究－東条英機証言を通じて (A Study of Interpretation at the Tokyo War Crimes trial: the Case of Tojo's Session). Master Thesis, Program of Interpreting, Graduate School of Economics, Daito Bunka University, Tokyo, Japan) and WATANABE, Tomie (2009). "Interpretation at Tokyo War Crimes Tribunal : Overview and Tojo's Cross Examination". *TIR - Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction: études sur le texte et ses transformations*. Canadian Association for Translation Studies, 22(1): 51-91.