

Resisting Translation: The Control Policy on Translation in the Arab World with Reference to Jordan

Dr. Mohammad Qasem Al-Hamad

Department of Language and Linguistics, Jordan University of Science and Technology, Jordan P.O.Box:4047, Irbid 21110, JORDAN

E-Mail: Mohammadqasem9@hotmail.com

Abstract

This paper investigates the influence of the control policy on translation in the Arab World and in Jordan particularly. It sheds light on the issues of the control policy, the *raison d'être* behind applying it in the Arab world, the translators' role as decision makers (superiority or inferiority towards the language), its forms, and who controls what. Furthermore, this paper is an attempt to reach a better understanding of the circumstances of the influence of covert forms that led to resisting translating.

Keywords: control policy, norms, translation, colonialism, conspiracy theory, the Other

1. Introduction

In the second half of the 20th century, translation studies gained more attention than before and the attitude towards translators and translation studies had changed. The change from a scientific approach into a broader descriptive vision of translation gave way to the interaction between translation and culture. Translation evolved as a necessity following the development in the western society and in the change in the mass communication and multimedia in the 1990s. The huge development in the mass communication and multimedia brought the diverse cultures closer than before. This growth and change turned the world into a global village and established English as the language of communication, knowledge and science. In other words, the way the English language is used became crucial because it denotes the reception of the *other's* language and culture, and shapes the way we think about the speakers of the language.

Translation plays a major role in determining the reception of the *other's* culture by a given society; be it literature, an author or movies. The reception process involves the application of the different religious, political and moral *norms* of the receptors' culture which, needless to say, vary from one culture to another. In addition, receiving the culture, through language, is a process charged with emotions, ideology, politics and concepts of power. The interaction between the source culture and the target culture, however, depends on the *games of power* between these cultures at a given time. Alterations, distortion and modifications are made through translation depending on how strong or weak the culture is (see works by Baker 2006; Suleiman 2004; Katan 1999; Boase-Beier and Holman 1999; Robinson 1996; Hatim 1997). Thus, translation is unlikely to be neutral because it is part of a larger framework of socio-political interaction between cultures; i.e. when language ceases to be neutral, the translation process ceases to be neutral. The strong culture, consciously or unconsciously, is likely to force the norms of its culture and language on the weaker culture. The weaker culture, in return, is expected to *resist* and *reject* the cultural imposition by *controlling* the *dangerous* influence of the *other's* ideological message regardless of the rationale behind the application of the *control* policy.

2. The Translators' Role as Decision Makers: Superiority or Inferiority Towards the Language

The translator can set the reception scene. He, as Alvarez and Carmen-Africa Vidal (1996: 2) argue, "can be the authority who manipulates the culture, politics, literature, and their acceptance (or lack thereof) in the target culture. He may stay behind the language of the original with its local densities, idiomatic variables, and historical-stylistic accident". To translate is to adjust and manipulate a source text (ST) and bring the target text (TT) into line with a particular model and hence a particular correctness notion. The purpose of adjusting and manipulating the ST is to *secure* social acceptance (Herman's 1996: 25-51). In this sense, translators act as self-censors (Manguel 1995; Klíma 1981; O'Higgins 1972; Thomas 1969; Schumach 1964). They decide what to leave out and what to include. Tolstoy summed up the process of the control policy that writers usually apply:

You would not believe how, from the very commencement of my activity, that horrible censor question has tormented me! I wanted to write what I felt; but all the time it occurred to me that what I wrote would not be permitted, and involuntarily I had to abandon the work, I abandoned and went on abandoning, and mean while the years passed away. (Cited in Schumach 1964: opening pages – no page number)

Translators' self-control may take overt forms – such as the translator's notes – or covert forms – such as the manipulation and editing or the *filtration* of foreign elements that are not acceptable in the target culture (Al-Hamad 2001). It is important, to know how the control policy influenced the translator's work because "behind every one of his selection there is a voluntary act that reveals his history and the socio-political milieu that surrounds him; in other words, his own culture" (Alvarez and Carmen-Africa Vidal 1996: 5). Consequently, the translators' demeanor can be anything but innocent because they seem to work under an enormous pressure of restrictions/constraints that characterize the culture they belong to: "Their own ideology; by their feeling of superiority or inferiority towards the language in which they are writing the text being translated; by the prevailing poetical rules at that time; by the very language in which the texts they are translating is written; by what the dominant institutions and ideology expect of them; by the public for whom the translation is intended." (ibid.: 4) Hence, having all these factors in mind, the translations are also unlikely to be innocent because the text created is likely to be different from the original.

3. Who Controls What?

3.1.1 Overt Control Policies

The control policy might be applied overtly or covertly. It is carried out overtly by a dictator, one-party regimes, governments, institutions (governmental or non-governmental), publishers, booksellers, minority groups, members of the community. The procedures applied are, in most cases, set of rules, and articles in charters, constitutions, bylaws legislated and known to the people, though they might not be agreed upon by them. Governments, institutions, publishers and bookstore managers can control the social expression before and after publication. Governments, for example, through the ministries of Culture and Media or Departments of Press and Publication (DPP) legislates regulations that prohibit the publication/translation of what is deemed dangerous, unacceptable, inadmissible or undesirable texts. Violations of the governments' regulations lead to punishment ranging from rewriting certain pages, expurgation of passages and banning the work altogether to confiscation, burning texts, banishing or in a more extreme form assassinating the author/ translator (see Webb and Bell 1997; Bassnett 1996; Dworkin 1994; Knightley 1991; Havel 1985; De Grazia and Newman 1985;). The control policy is exercised by publishers and booksellers as well. They use different methods such as, using their authority to select particular (translated) texts, limiting access to texts and interfering to rewrite disseminate, ban texts, or reject others. The commercial purposes and the standards of the community (taboos, and concepts of community) play a major role in how successful or not the control policy is. Although these factors are expected to be of equal importance, it is likely, however, that the commercial factor dominates over the standards of the community. This means that banned texts could be found in *certain* bookstores for *particular* customers. Dryden (1631-1700) recognized the dominance of commerce over the literary merits in the booksellers' profession:

Booksellers are...more devoted to their own gain than the public honor. They are very parsimonious in rewarding the wretched scribblers they employ and care not how the business is done, so that it be but done. They live by selling titles, not books, and if that carry off one impression they have their ends, and values not the curses they and their authors meet with from the bubbled chapmen. While translations are thus at the disposal of booksellers and have no better judges or rewards of the performance, it is impossible that we should make any progress. (Cited in Bassnett 1996: 19)

The covert control policies stem from the culture of the society. In certain societies where the conventions of the society are governing – the Arab and Muslim societies as an example – the covert policies are the invisible process that takes place in the author's (translator) mind and *allow, restrict, guide, control, change* or *prohibit* the translatability of texts into the recipient culture depending on how tolerant or intolerant the society is. It is the unspoken, but agreed upon, cultural aspects, traditions, taboos, norms, habits, accusation/fear of translation as a project of the conspiracy theory, orientalism, and the Insignia colonialism.

3.2.1.1 Covert Control Policies

3.2.1.1.1 Norms

Translation and norms, from a linguistic and cultural aspects perspectives, has been recurrent subject of discussion (for more details see Martin 2001; Baker 2001, Routti 2001; Toury 1998, 1980, 1981, 1977; Schäffner 1999; Robinson 1996; Chesterman 1993; Hermans 1991; Even-Zohar 1990; Harris 1990; Shlesinger 1989; Holmes 1988; Levy 1969). Norms of a given society play an important role in the translation process and in the way the public receives translations. Controlling the message could be done by modifying (editing, deleting and adding) what contradicts the recipients' cultural *norms*. Norms decide the choice of the foreign text to be translated and whether it should be translated or not in the first place. Then, once the decision is taken to translate the foreign text, the norms

decide the approach of the translation process. In other words, the receivers establish “*expectancy norms*” – to use Chesterman’s 1993: 9) term – of the translation, “their expectations of what a translation (of a given type) should be like, and what a native text (of a given type) in the target language should be like”. The other type of norms is *preliminary norms* which determine the overall translation policy regulating the choice of text types or individual texts that are to be introduced to the target literary system through translations (Toury’s 1995: 54). It is the cultural bound terms and expression of norms that produce the challenge to the translator. However, norms operating in a given society differ from one society into another. Norms differ, even within the same society, depending on the age they are applied in, the conventions that are applied by and who is applying them at a given time. Norms take many forms that “challenge the primacy of free expression itself: religious extremism, relative values and cultural difference, the rise of nationalism, the rewriting of history, words that kill...” (Owen 1997: 15). The rejection of a text, regardless of being a masterpiece, is influenced by reader responses that may decide the norm-violation attempts of translators. This rejection, in most of the Arab and Muslim world – Jordan for example – “norms stem from three main overlapping fields: religion, the ethics and morals of the society and politics” (Al-Hamad 2001: 185).

3.2.1.2 *The Conspiracy Theory: Translation as the Trojan Horse*

Globalization boosted the universality of the English language, which “served to emphasize the significance of translation, as questions of cultural politics appear on the agenda, as post-colonial theory shows so clearly, language and power are intimately linked” (Bassnett 1996: 21). The theorists of the post-colonial theory, such as the Canadian Sherry Simon, the Brazilian Haraldo de Campos and the Indian Harish Trivedi “insist that the study of translation is inevitably an exploration of power relationships within textual practice that reflect power structures within the wider cultural context” (Bassnett 1996: 20). Thus, the notions of translation as a transparent copy of the ST and the innocence of the translator never existed. “Like all (re)writing is never innocent”, as Bassnet and Lefever (1990: 11) maintain, “there is always a context in which the translation takes place, always a history from which a text emerges and into which a text is transposed”. Furthermore, Niranjana (1992: 3) views translation as the reason of containment. She also argues that “translation as a practice shapes, and takes shape within, the asymmetrical relations of power that operate under colonialism”. The relationship between translation and colonialism was emphasized by Bassnett (1996: 20), who regarded translation a reflection of the colonial experience: “the source/original holds the power; the colony/copy is disempowered but placated through the myth of transparency and objectivity of the translation.” The discussions about associating translation to colonialism created a sense of fear and led to the clash of ideologies, the clash of tradition and change, modernity, and the heritage (see Suleiman 2004: 38-42). There was a time when translation and the role of the translator were viewed suspiciously even in the heydays of translation in the Abbasid era (750-1258). Out of the fear of the harm, dangers and evils that translations could cause to the culture of the society, the control policy is applied scrupulously. Translation was viewed, by some Arab intellectuals and opinion formers, as part of a well-planned plot to *poison* the Arab thought, literature, language, and religion of the nation (Umma), (see Suleiman 2004, Al-Jundi 1982, Said 1978). The reason behind the plot is believed to be to demolish the possibilities of any chance to revive the great civilization that existed in the Middle Ages. This fact could sound excessive nevertheless it is beheld by a considerable number of intellectuals and the public alike. The beholders of this view believe, , that the plot against the Arabic-Islamic culture took the forms of the transplantation of the philosophers and secularists views; the carrier was translation, as Al-Jundi (1985: 7) states, “The translated books – particularly books of philosophy – which were translated into Arabic from diverse cultures had caused great damage to the Arabic-Islamic culture and, over the years, complicated the task of rectifying the damage by those who called for restoring the originality movement in the Arab world”. The major drive for beholding such an extreme opinion against translation could be due to the long years of wars against the colonizer to gain independence in the Arab region. Resisting translation gained more ground in the 1950s and 1960s when the passion of pan-Arab nationalism was paramount. In the following decades pan-Arab nationalism was replaced by Islamic nationalism. The main argument against translation is directed to the notion that most of the translations set the foundation to the westernization movement and the cultural invasion. Moreover, it is widely believed that the translated books brought with them different ideologies and materialistic beliefs, some of which were idolatry. It is strongly believed that the first translators transplanted by introducing un-Islamic sciences into the Arabic culture (Dalal’s 1999; Abbasah 1999). This reading of translation as an act of violence-resistance relationship resulted in the intellectuals’ and the public’s *rejection* of the translations. The Arabs view of translation, however, was not different from the view of other nations. Victor Hugo (Cited in Venuti 2005: 177), expressed the same opinion:

When you offer a translation to a nation, that nation will almost always look on the translation as an act of violence against itself...if a foreign idiom is transplanted into a language [through translation] that language will do all it can

to reject that foreign idiom. This kind of taste is repugnant to it. These unusual locutions, these unexpected turns of phrase, that savage corruption of well-known figures of speech, they all amount to an invasion. What, then, will become of one's own literature? Who could ever dare think of infusing the substance of another people into its own very life-blood? This kind of poetry is excessive. There is an abuse of images, a profusion of metaphors, a violation of frontiers, a forced introduction of the cosmopolitan into local taste.

The "invasion" is believed to be carried out through the introduction, promotion and translation of different subjects, secularists' writings and books on philosophy, modernization/westernization of education and through the establishment of missionary schools. Therefore, the Arabs attitude towards translation appears to be part of the way the Arabs had perceived the West; an opinion that many Arabs carried with them over time and they seem to pass to the new generations.

3.2.1.3 *Philosophy*

The believers of the conspiracy theory target the translations and publications of Philosophy in particular because they feared that philosophical views might cause harm to the religion and language. It might also arouse the feelings of cultural inferiority, which led to more skepticism about the overall role of translation itself. There were many reasons behind this fear. First, before translating the Greek philosophy, the Arabs did not have publications of their own, not to say interests or theories, in the field of philosophy. Thus, through translation the Arabs knew Aristotle and Plato, and from their many books of the non-religious views, from an Islamic standpoint, were transplanted in the Arabic society. Secondly, translating philosophy into Arabic might be regarded as an expression of weakness. In other words, fearing that the Arabs had translated philosophy out of a philosophical-lack feeling, they admit, implicitly, the superiority of the *Other*. Thirdly, the translators' of the western philosophy were accused of being *trumpeters of their masters* (foreign philosophers) to introduce all that could misconstrue the religious concepts or good values of the Arabic traditions and lead astray its generation. (For more details on the subject see Abdul Rahman's 1996). The main argument against the translations of philosophy was the belief that it might lead to adopting certain ideologies. These ideologies might, over time, change into new religions/faiths where the philosophers are the prophets, the translators are their disciples and the creed of certain philosophy is the text of the religion. Within this category falls Abdul Rahman Badwai's translations of Sartre's (1905-1980) *Existentialism*, Farah Anton's translations of Nietzsche's (1844-1900) *Rationalism in Thus Spake Zarathustra*, Elias Morqos translations of Marx's (1818-1883) *Marxism* or the translations of Descartes's (1596-1650) *Modern Philosophy*, and Hegel's (1770-1831) *Dialectic Logic*.

3.2.1.4 *Language*

The act of resistance against the translated philosophy was not only out of religious fear but also out of a linguistic fear as well. Arab Linguists were suspicious about philosophy because it requires producing new concepts that become not just added words into the language but means of thought. These new concepts needed new terms to be infused into the Arabic language. Consequently, the Arab Linguists had to come up with equivalent philosophical terms in Arabic that resemble the foreign terms. But their problem was in making these new Arabic philosophical terms approved by the users of the language, which is not usually the case. Perceptibly, the problem stems from the difference between the nature of the Arabic and western languages, namely the English, French and Russian. These languages accept, for example, amalgamation between two words, such as socio-economics for social and economics. Whereas the users of the Arabic language would not approve the fusion of the same two words, social and economics, as *Ijtissadi* (اجتصادي) for example. In some other examples, the ST words could not be expressed by one word in the TT, such as pantheism, which was translated into *madhab wehdat el-wojūd* (مذهب وحدة الوجود) (Abbasah's 1999: 60). Most of the translated works in the beginning of the 20th century were in the field of literature. The main literary translations were novel translations as well as few attempts in poetic and dramatic translations. Scientific translations were very rare except for a short period of time, in Muhammad Ali's reign in Egypt, which was done for military purposes mainly. In the first stage, most of the translations, were "limited to technological and military books...but in the course of time included literary and historical writings" (Badawi 1992: 9). The most important translations of this era were Jalal's translation of La Fontaine (1621-1695) *Fables: العيون البواقظ في الأمثال والمواعظ* (1857) and Tahtawi's translation of Francois Fenelon's (1651-1715) *Les Aventures de Telemaque* into: *وقائع الأفلاك في مواقع تليماك* (1867). In other words, additions, deletion or editing were imposed on the translated works before they were available in the market. Thus, the translations were expected to be in harmony with the politics of the Ottoman Sultanate and to comply with the social norms of the *conservative* nature of the Arabic society. (Abbod 1999: 72).

3.2.1.5 *Novels*

The translations of novels were dealt with untrustworthily. Thus, the control policy was applied for different reasons. First, because the Novel is not indigenous in the Arabic genre as it is in the west. Secondly, and most importantly, the novel in the post-colonial era, was linked with concepts, such as western nationalism and both the novel and nationalism, which contradict the Arabic views and definition of nationalism and modernity. Thirdly, the publications of literature in the west are 'Novel Imperative', whereas, in the Arab world, they were and still are, to a great extent, 'Poetry Imperative'. In the Arabic culture, poetry is regarded as 'The Record of History' of the Arabs lives and deeds, as one Arabic proverb reads: *ash'iru diwaan al'arab* (الشعر ديوان العرب). The influence of the poets in the socio-political lives of people in the Arab worlds is huge. One example of this is: the influence of the poetry of Bayram el-Tunisi (1893-1961) in moving the feelings of the Egyptian people to demonstrate against the British occupation. Another example is the great impact of the poetry of Mahmud Darwish (1941-2008), Samih al-Qasim (1939-) and Ma'in Bsiso (1926-1984) in the Palestinian resistance movement against Israeli occupation.

Even when the novel became a popular form of arts in the Arab world, it was, however, bound by many restrictions that developed, over time, into norms. Thus, most (translated) novels or short stories promoted honor, gallantry, honesty, chivalry, chastity, and the victory of well deeds over evil and turpitude. Defoe's (c1660-1731) *The Fortunes and Misfortunes of Moll Flanders*, and Miguel de Cervantes' (1547-1616) *The History of Don Quixote' de La Mancha*, for example, were unlikely to be translated into Arabic. Moll Flanders is, by the Arabic norms, barefaced prostitute and she had no place in the Arabic society, whereas Don Quixote de La Mancha misrepresented the Arabic model of chivalry. Contrary to *Moll Flanders*, Alexander Dumas' (1824-1895) *La Dame aux Camelias (Camille)*, Tolstoy's (1828-1910) *Anna Karenina* were translated into Arabic. Both of the heroines in these novels were condemned to suffering and suicide for their transgression of moral and social laws, which is in harmony with the Arabic norms.

3.2.1.6 Poetry and Dramatic Texts

The translation of poetry and dramatic texts into Arabic were either unpopular or overlooked. The translators ignored poetry, for example, for three reasons. First, it was very difficult to translate. Secondly, translating western poetry would introduce new forms or parameters that would blemish the originality of the Arabic poetry. Thirdly, the attempts of translating western poetry were considered wasted efforts because of the expected negative response of the Arab readers who reserved a special place for Arabic poetry in their culture. However, few numbers of translators who attempted the translation of poetry had to abide by the religious and social norms of the society. The translations of theatre were more popular, compared to poetry and novels. One of the reasons for the success of the translated dramatic texts was the music and songs, which were added to the translated plays to make them applicable to the Arabic society and to make them sound more local. The important role of the chorus scenes in Greek plays, for example, was changed into musical intervals or scenes of dancing and singing. Needless to say, however, that the translated plays were to blend in the socio-religious system of the Arabic culture. But the question that arises here is why was not the dramatic translation refused? Why not considered part of a plot against the Arabic culture, as were the translated novels? It could be because the translated plays were seen as forms of entertainment rather than serious literature. Or it could be that the popularity of drama was only in performance and the majority of the spectators overlooked the written manuscripts, i.e., may be because the play texts themselves were not available or, if available, of no significance to the audience without being performed (Daher 1989). That is to say that the main attraction was the performance, which included singing and dancing, a fact that could be supported by the closure of theatres when the singer of the troupe died or because of the unpopularity of the play if it did not include any songs. Nonetheless, the major reason for not considering (translated) theatre, part of a plot against the Arabs, their culture and their language, could be the correlation between politics and theatre. In other words, theatre was exploited to resist the influence of the western culture (Najim 1966: 20-35).

3.2.1.7 Transnational Writings (1980s and 1990s)

The resistant movement (the meaning of movement is used loosely here) against translation took serious attempts to highlight the threat of translation to the Arabic culture and literary identity. In the past the main concern was the translations that come into Arabic form the foreign languages. But the new challenge was the translations of Arabic works into foreign languages. Their fear was enhanced in the 1980s and 1990s by the phenomenon of transnational writings, which meant advocating a global culture and calling for the openness of the national culture for the sake of a more national or international cultural management system (Dalal 1999). This phenomenon was represented by the increasing interests of the western publishing places in the translations from Arabic into foreign language, mainly French and English. It was until the 1970s when the West started to recognize women writings. "Arab women were thought not to write", Cooke (2007) states, "courses in European and U.S. Universities covered Arab men's

writings... the exceptional women were the Lebanese Laila Baalbaki and the Syrian Colette Khuri and sometimes the Egyptian Nawal el-Saadawi". The mid-eighties book fairs in England helped in the rise of (women) writers, in addition to the above-mentioned, such as the Egyptian Alifa Rifat, the Moroccan Tahar ben Jeloun, the Syrian Salim Barakat, the Egypt Sulaiman Fayyadh, and Hanan al-Shaykh among others helped in attracting the West to the Arab (women) writers (Ibid.). Probably Baalbaki gained more fame compared to others, not only because of her first highly acclaimed novel, *Ana ahya (I Am Alive)*, published in 1958, but also because a volume of her short stories, *Safinat hanan ila al-qaamar (A Spaceship of Tenderness to the Moon)*, published in 1963, landed her in court on charges of obscenity and harming public morality. The result of the control policy and the resistance of translated works on the grounds of violating the socio-religious, socio-political systems had serious consequences on the authors' creative careers. Although Baalbaki was acquitted, she stopped publishing works of fiction after 1964, and turned to writing articles (mostly) for newspapers (Cohen Mor 2005).

The resistance of this trend of literature stems from three overlapping factors. Firstly, the inkling about the true aims of the increasing interest in translating these particular writers into foreign languages, especially that some of them, although popular in the west, were not known in their local academic or literary circles. Secondly, most of these writers either over-highlighted or re-emphasized some of the dark corners or the negative behavior of the Arabic-Muslim society and generalized them in their writings, which matched the pre-view about the east. Thirdly, the literary policies of publications applied by the foreign publishing houses helped to establish and to promote certain problematic (from an Arab-Muslim perspective) forms of the Arabic culture, i.e., the content of these translated literary works was the source of severe criticism because it violated the Arabic taboos. The increasing interest in translating the works of particular Arab writers into foreign languages not only made the doubts about the real aims behind the translations loom large but also posed many questions as well. Was it because the west had finally realized the artistic beauty of the Arabic language and literature? Did the western publishers, readers and writers/translators do this cultural traverse to the east out of this realization? And did their perception of the Arabic language change from being a local, undemocratic language into a liberal language, as Said's (1991) states? If we examine the policy by which the Arabic novels are translated and published, we will realize that the cultural traverse is not from the west to the east but from the Arab writers to the west. The interest in an Arabic literature in the west did not change even after Mahfouz's Nobel Prize. Neither the Arab nation nor the Arabic language is respected, as one publisher expressed in Said's (1991) article "Embargoed literature" in the west; usually, the Arabic literature is unknown and unread in the west either. The only exceptions are the works that include the stereotype clichés about Islam, terrorism, the poor situation of the Arab woman, the veil, Clitoridectomy (the term is used loosely here, it is not the medical term; the word (خَتَانُ) is worse than the word might sound in English), the haughtiness and superiority of the Arab man in the society of men, and publications that include abuse to the Prophet(s), and his/their companions, Arab heroes and historical idols. This very fact is the backbone of the second factor.

Most of the literature chosen for translation into foreign language is read as part of cultural representative novels that follow stereotyped styles and contents, and that could be subject to social criticism. The second factor that led to the doubts about the real aims of the translations from Arabic into the foreign languages is the emphasis on certain stereotype clichés about the Arabs (men and women), their language and Islam. In this category falls, Mahfouz's *Al-Jabalawi Sons*, Bin Jaloos's *L'enfant de sable*, Hanan Al-Sheikh's *Women of Sand and Myrrh*, most of el-Saadawi's works such as *The Hidden face of Eve*, *The Circling Song*, *Fall of the Imam*, *The Innocence of the Devil* and *God Dies by the Nile* or Fayyadh's *Voices*. The third factor stems from the policies that the western Publishing Houses apply in choosing the Arabic literature for translation, which help in establishing certain forms of Arabic literature that meets the western view about the Arab world and impose the *other's* concepts of modernity and democracy. This fact resulted in the emergence of Arab writers who write in Arabic for western readers in order to be translated. They have written novels they knew would suit the policies of the western publishers. This can be understood from the fact that the western translators'/publishers' choice of certain works does not depend on the popularity of the Arabic literary work among the Arab readers nor they depend on the Arab readers/publishers to decide what work to be translated. In fact the Arab readers/publishers have no say in the translations into foreign languages. Moreover, most translators give themselves the right to edit, change, delete or add to the original work. One example of this could be the translation of el-Saadawi's *Hidden Face of Eve*. The translator added two chapters about the (الخَتَانُ) Clitoridectomy and the "Mutilated Half", which are not in the Source Text (ST). Let alone the deletions of many other parts from the ST, some of which, as Dalal (1999) states, could have changed the view of the Arab women in the west. Not objecting the misrepresentation of her works in the translations was taken as a deliberate collusion between el-Saadawi and her publishers or translators. She, as it seemed, did not mind her foreign publishers' policies

and her translators' changes, though they could result in defamation of her culture and religion. The policies of the Publishing Houses had two consequences. Firstly, the birth of Arab writers who write to the western readers or to be translated into foreign languages to gain more fame and won academic prizes regardless of the denouncement of their own culture and religion. Secondly, these policies helped in establishing and imposing the western forms of culture on the Arab culture, which is meant to introduce certain western concepts of modernity and democracy that might not be applicable in the Arab world. The imposition of a foreign cultural dichotomy led to momentous psychological consequences that Islam, the language and the whole culture is in grave danger of being replaced by a new secularist education. The concern for the cultural identity helped to enhance the calls, to use Badawi's words (1992: 12-13) puts it:

[T]o reinterpret Islam so as to make it compatible with the living in the modern world...many writers and litterateurs [, such as Muhammad Abduh, Jamal Ad-din Al-Afghani, Abbas Mahmoud al-'aqqad and Sayyed Qutb,] tried to defend Islam or to make it more relevant to the problems of contemporary Egyptian [and Arab society], by treating themes from Islamic history from certain angles or by writing a large number of Biographies, including that of the Prophet Muhammad, or else by pointing out that Classical Arabic, the language of the Koran is no obstacle to progress.

But if the translation movement was a serious threat to the Arabic-Muslim culture from its early stages, the Abbasid era, why did it thrive in the early stages where it should have been deteriorated? In other words, how could the Arabs not been aware to the dangers of translation, in its early stages, when they were the civilization with power and could have easily abolished it or find other means? It could be possible that because the Arabic-Islamic Civilization was strong, translation was not considered a threat because its dangers were not felt. In addition, these dangers were not of a direct effect on the culture but of long-term ones. When new empires dominated the political scene and invaded the Arab world, the ground was paved for them to easily control the people's minds because the invaders' ideology was long established in the culture through translation. Nonetheless, other anti-conspiracy groups challenged this argument. The devotees of the conspiracy theory found much resistant from other groups in the same society who accused them of isolationism. In other words, the supporters of the conspiracy theory, from their opponents' perspective, had put restrictions on the people's minds by their wholeheartedness to protect the society, as well as themselves from what, they thought, might contradict the principles of religion or the morals. They accused the believers of the conspiracy theory of giving themselves the right to decide for fellow citizens what is right and what is wrong, what to translate and what not to translate, which stood between the Arabs and the western modern technology of today. They argue that the fear from translating the culture of the *other* deprived the Arabic culture from many great achievements in other cultures in the name of fighting imperialism (the western culture) or liberalism (Latin American culture). The act of resisting the translation movement in the modern ages had survived over time because of the belief of those who apply it that their duty is to protect their culture and identity from the hidden agendas of the *other*. Translation, to them, is the Trojan horse by which the evils are transplanted in the Arabic culture. Thus, the act of resistance, in its utmost degree and from a conservative view, is looked at as a divine mission that aims at protecting the Arabic language and culture, which means protecting the word of Allah Almighty (the Holy Qur'an) and His religion on earth (interview with Saleh 2012). The method to achieve this mission took different forms. Sometimes it took the form of MP calls for political regulations or action against the publication or the distribution of controversial translations and publications. The example here could be Haider's *A Feast for the Sea Weeds*. It led to a cultural-political clash in Egypt between the Minister of Culture supported by some of the *enlightened* writers, as they are referred to in Egypt, on one side and members of the Islamic Brotherhood Party supported by the *conservative* writers on the other side. The heated discussions on the novel were taken to newspapers, led to "political violence" (demonstrations in front of Al-Azhar Mosque) and were transformed into a clash between modernity and originality. Later, both parties took the case to the court. At other times, the method to protect the Arabic language and culture took more violent forms. It led to the assassination of the writer, publisher or translator. The palpable examples here are Khomeini's death penalty on Salman Rushdie because of the latter's *Satanic Verses* and the attempt to assassinate Najib Mahfouz in 1994. The references that decide the Arab decency are the Holy Qur'an, the Prophetic Tradition (Hadith) and the norms of the Arab moral code. Violations, such as the sexual expression, descriptions or inter course, indecent presentation of the Prophet(s) or the religious figures and misrepresentation of the Holy Books or the violation of the principles of true Islam are strictly prohibited and condemned.

4. Conclusion

The debate on translation brings constant conflicting ideas on the freedom/censorship of expression. Questions will always be raised in this part of the world on the importance of protecting the heritage, language and the culture, where to draw the line, and do lines need to be drawn in the first place. Resisting translation, in most of the Arab countries in general, and in Jordan in particular, is gaining ground and it is usually justified on the grounds of safeguarding the society and shaped by censorial laws. Applying these laws is confusing at times and perplexing at the same time. It all depends on the government of the day or (in a more comprehensive way) it depends on the *system* applied at a particular time and moment. Mainly, the control policy is justified on the account of one of the following subjects: Religious taboos, such as alcoholic drinks or religious critical studies, fiction or non-fiction that contains explicit sexual content and Political content that disagrees with linguist's political orientation. The discrepancy in the application of the rules of the regulatory agencies and the "old guards" of culture of a particular country was affected by the international alliances and the political consensus of the state and governments in an era. Socialism in Egypt in the era of Nasser, for example, dominated all aspects of the society, which led dissemination of the social bloc thought and knowledge. A great number of the socialist countries' thinkers and writers' works was transferred into Egypt, and its allies in the Arab world, through translation, regardless of the violation of most of these literary or political works (among which are masterpieces) of the Arab culture or not. Once Nasser died, things changed dramatically. Egypt of the Sadat was totally different to that of Nasser's. Capitalism replaced socialism. The USA replaced the (former) USSR. Socialism literary canon was condemned and. Translators were severely oppressed and translations were banned. In Jordan, the Control Policy has been viewed differently. Despite the fact that it has been demonstrated time and again, not many people view it negatively. Discussion on the freedom of the media in the modern technological age, the (electronic) press law, banning books, respecting the truth, contradicting the values of the Arab and Islamic nation, the national responsibility will remain the seeds of dispute in the country. Accordingly, the control policy could be defined as the rules applied by committees or officials in political and religious institutions or individuals working from their own cultural backgrounds and education to observing the degree of institutions (governmental or private) compliance with the concepts of Islam and Arabic heritage in the media, publications, culture, and translation.

References in English

- Al-Hamad, Mohammad Qasem (2001). Translation and Censorship with Special Reference to Jordan. Edinburgh University, Ph.D. thesis.
- Alvarez, Roman, and M. Cameron-Africa Vidal (ed.) (1996). *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Ashour, Rawda, Ferial Ghazoul and Hasna Reda Mekdashi (2008). *Arab Women Writers: A Critical Reference Guide 1873-199*. Cairo: the American University in Cairo Press.
- Badawi, M. M. (1992). *Modern Arabic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, Mona (2006). *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. London: Routledge.
- (ed.) (2001). "Norms". *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge:163-165.
- Bassnett, Sussan (1996). "The Meek or the Mighty: Reappraising the Role of the Translator". *Translation, Power, Subversion* (ed. Román Álvarez & Carmen-África Vidal), Clevedon/Philadelphia/Adelaide: Multilingual Matters: 24-51.
- Bassnett, Sussan, and Andrè Levere (ed) (1990). *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Printer.
- Boase-Beier, Jean and Michael Holman (eds.) 1999. *The Practices of Literary Translation: Constraints and Creativity*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Chaudhuri, Sukanta (2004). Translation and Understanding. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 1993. "From 'is' to 'ought': translation laws, norms and strategies". *Target* 5/1: 1-20.
- Cohen-Mor, Dalya (ed.) (2005). *Arab Women Writers: An Anthology of Short Stories*. *Suny Series, Women Writers in Translation*. New York: State University of New York.
- Cooke, Miriam, Forward. Arab Women's Lives Retold: Exploring Identity Through Writing (2007). (Ed) Nawar Al-Hassan Golley. New York: Syracuse University Press.**
- De Grazia, Edward, and Roger K. Newman (1985). *Banned Films: Movies, Censors and the First Amendment*. London: R. R. Bowker Company.
- Dworkin, Ronald (1994). "A New Map of Censorship". *Index on Censorship (1972-1997)*. W. L. Webb, and Rose Bell (ed.) (1997). London: Victor Gollancz: 211-218.

- Even-Zohar, Itmar (1990). "Polysystem Studies". *Poetics Today* (Special Issue). Durham NC: Duke University Press, 11(1).
- Fitzgerald, Edward (1901). *Letters of Edward Fitzgerald*. London: MacMillan.
- Harris, Brian (1990). "Norms in Interpretation", in *Target*. 2(1):115-119.
- Hatim, Basil (1997). *Communication Across Cultures: Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*. Exeter, England: University Exeter Press.
- Havel, Vaclav et al (1985). *The Power of the powerless: Citizens Against the State in Central-Eastern*. John Keane (ed.). London: Hutchinson.
- Hermans, Theo (1996). "Norms and the Determination of Translation. A Theoretical Framework", *Translation, Power, Subversion* (ed. Román Álvarez & Carmen-África Vidal), Clevedon/Philadelphia/Adelaide: Multilingual Matters: 24-51
- (1991). "Translational Norms and Correct Translations". In K. Van Leuven-Zwart and T. Naaijken (eds). *Translation Studies: the State of the Art*. Amsterdam: Rodopi: 155-169.
- Holmes, James (1988). *Translated! Papers on literary translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Katan, David (1999). *Translating Cultures: an Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Klíma, Ivan (1981). "Variation on an Eternal Theme". *Index on Censorship (1972–1997)*. W. L. Webb, and Rose Bell (ed.) (1997). London: Victor Gollancz: 99–103.
- Knightly, Philip (1991). "Here is the Particularly Censored News". *Index on Censorship (1972–1997)*. W. L. Webb, and Rose Bell (ed.) (1997). London: Victor Gollancz: 162–167.
- Levý, Jiří (1967). "Translation as a Decision Process", in *To Honor Roman Jakobson II*. The Hague: Mouton: 1171-1182.
- Manguel, Alberto (1997). "Daring to speak One's Name". *Index on Censorship (1972–1997)*. W. L. Webb, and Rose Bell (ed.) (1997). London: Victor Gollancz: 241–251.
- Niranjana, Tejaswini (1992). *Sitting Translation: History, post structuralism and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University Of California Press.
- O'Higgins, Paul (1972). *Censorship in Britain*. Melbourne: Thomas Nelson.
- Owen, Ursula. "Preface". *Index on Censorship (1972–1997)*. W. L. Webb, and Rose Bell (ed.) (1997). London: Victor Gollancz: 15–16.
- Robinson, Douglas (1996). *Translation and Taboo*. Illinois, US: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Robinson, William I. (1996). *Promoting Polyarchy: Globalization, US Intervention, and Hegemony*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Routti, Laura (2001). "Norms and Storms: Pentti Saarikoski's Translation of J. D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*". *The Electronic Journal of the Department of English. The University of Helsinki*: Volume1.
- Said, Edward (1991). "Embargoed Literature" in *The Nation*, 17 September.
- Schaffner, Christina (1999) (ed). *Norms and Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Shlesinger, Miriam (1989). "Extended the Theory of Translation to Interpretation: Norms as Case in Point". *Target* 1: 111-115.
- Schumach, Murray (1964). *The Face on the Cutting Room Floor: the Story of movie and Television Censorship*. Toronto: George J. McLeod Limited.
- Suleiman, Yasir (2004). *A War of Words: language and Conflict in the Middle East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Toury, Gideon (1995). "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation". *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 53-69.
- (1980). *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- (1981). "Translated Literature: System, Norm, Performance: Toward a TT-Oriented Approach to Literary Translation". *Poetics Today* 2,4 (summer-Autumn 1981): 9-27.
- (1977). *Translation, Norms and Literary Translations into Hebrew*. Tel Aviv: porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- Venuti, Lawrence (2005). "Local Contingencies: Translation and National Identities". *Nation, Language and the Ethics of Translation*. Sandra Bermann and Michael Wood (ED.) UK: Princeton University Press.
- W. L. Webb, and Rose Bell (1997) (ed.). *Index on Censorship (1972–1997)*. London: Victor Gollancz: 211–218.

References in Arabic

- Abbasah, Mohammed (1999). "ترجمة المعارف العربية وأثرها في الحضارة الغربية" (The Translation of Arabic Knowledge and its Impact on Western Civilization). *Al-Adaab*. No 5/6 May-June: 53-56.
- Abbod, Hanna (1999). "الترجمة والتبعية الثقافية" (Translation and the Cultural Dependency). *Al-Adaab*. No 5/6 May-June: 69-75.
- Abdulrahman, Taha (1996). *فقه الفلسفة: الفلسفة والترجمة* (Jurisprudence philosophy: philosophy and translation). The Arab Cultural Center.
- Al-Jundi, Anwar (1985). *مخاطر وأخطار في مواجهة إحياء التراث والترجمة من الفكر الغربي* (*Dangers and risks in the face of heritage and translation of Western thought*). Tunisia: Dar Bou Salamah.
- Daher, Mas'od (1989). "الاتجاهات الأساسية لحركة الترجمة في لبنان والوطن العربي" (The basic Trends of the Translation Movement in Lebanon and the Arab World). *El-Wahdah Journal*. No 61/62.
- Dalal, Jenin (1999). "الثقافة العالمية / المعولمة وسياسات الترجمة" (World/Globalized Culture and Translation policies) *Al-Adaab II*. No 5/6 May-June: 51-53.
- Najim, Mohammed Yousef (1966). *القصة في الأدب العربي الحديث (1870 - 1914)* (The Story in the Arab Literature (1870-1914)). Beirut: Dar Ath-Thagafah.

This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR PAPERS

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. There's no deadline for submission. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/Journals/>

The IISTE editorial team promises to review and publish all the qualified submissions in a **fast** manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

