

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告 期末報告

N 在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考

計畫類別：個別型計畫
計畫編號：MOST 102-2410-H-004-241-
執行期間：102年08月01日至104年01月31日
執行單位：國立政治大學歷史學系

計畫主持人：藍適齊

報告附件：移地研究心得報告
出席國際會議研究心得報告及發表論文

處理方式：

1. 公開資訊：本計畫可公開查詢
2. 「本研究」是否已有嚴重損及公共利益之發現：否
3. 「本報告」是否建議提供政府單位施政參考：否

中華民國 104 年 03 月 28 日

中文摘要：在第二次世界大戰之後，有一百七十餘名台灣人在遭各個盟國以 B/C 級戰犯來審判並因而服刑，分別是澳大利亞(95 名台籍戰犯；超過台籍戰犯總數的 55%)、中國、荷蘭、英國和美國。其中 21 名被判處並執行死刑。遭判處死刑的台籍戰犯以在澳大利亞與英國軍事法庭中最多。本研究發現，他們大多數在戰爭當中擔任的是「通譯」的工作。而之所以這些臺灣人被指派在東南亞各戰地擔任正式或非正式的翻譯工作，主要是因為他們身為日本帝國的被殖民者所具備的特殊語言能力。他們的語言能力提供了這些臺灣人在戰爭的發展之下特別的（工作）機會；卻也導致了部分臺灣人被帶入他們無法抗拒的工作環境，進而涉入戰爭犯罪。身為日本帝國的被殖民者的「台籍戰犯」，凸顯了在日本帝國與歐洲殖民帝國的競爭衝突之下所衍生出來的一種特殊的「殖民戰爭責任」。從跨國的脈絡之下來重建的「台籍戰犯」歷史，同時也顯現了戰後英法荷等殖民國透過戰犯審判和其他針對其「被殖民者」的補償手段，來重新建立其在東南亞各地殖民統治的過程。

中文關鍵詞：台籍戰犯，二次世界大戰，通譯，英國戰犯審判，澳洲戰犯審判

英文摘要：After the Second World War, 173 Taiwanese who were recruited to serve in the Japanese military across Asia-Pacific during the war were convicted as war criminals. Based on studies of trial records and archival materials, this paper finds that among the 21 executed Taiwanese war criminals, at least 13 of them were convicted and consequently executed for crimes committed while serving as interpreters—formal and informal—during the war. In addition, a handful of Taiwanese interpreters were convicted as war criminals for various degrees of prison terms. While their number is small, the trials and punishment of these Taiwanese interpreters as war criminals provide a new perspective to understand the history of interpretation/interpreters in colonial/post-colonial and wartime context. Trial records—particularly the details of “victims” and convicted “crime”—of British courts set up in Singapore, Penang, and Kuala Lumpur and Dutch courts in the present-day Indonesia shows that most Taiwanese interpreters were convicted of crimes

committed against “local civilians” . This paper argues that it was their language proficiency and interpretation duty brought/forced many Taiwanese serving in the Japanese military into close and frequent contact with the local population, particularly the Chinese, and thereby led to occasions in which these Taiwanese interpreters were involved in the alleged crime. In addition, this paper studies several cases of Taiwanese informal interpreters who committed crimes against Chinese prisoners of war (POWs) and were put on trial in the Australian courts held in Rabaul. It finds that while these Taiwanese were originally recruited as laborers, they were assigned to ad hoc interpretation duty because of their language proficiency under the contingency in the battlefields.

英文關鍵詞： Taiwanese war criminals, the Second World War, interpreters, British war crime trials, Australian war crime trials

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告

(期末報告)

在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：

被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考

計畫類別： 個別型計畫

計畫編號：MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015

執行期間：102 年 8 月 1 日至 104 年 1 月 31 日

執行機構及系所：

國立中正大學歷史系，102 年 8 月 1 日至 103 年 7 月 31 日

國立政治大學歷史系，103 年 8 月 1 日至 104 年 1 月 31 日

計畫主持人：藍適齊助理教授

共同主持人：無

計畫參與人員：

兼任助理人員－中正大學歷史所碩士班學生許凱婷

兼任助理人員－中正大學歷史所碩士班學生侯淑娟

兼任助理人員－嘉義大學碩士班學生黃華浩

兼任助理人員－中正大學歷史系學生林思琪

本計畫除繳交成果報告外，另含下列出國報告，共 2 份：

執行國際合作與移地研究心得報告

出席國際學術會議心得報告

期末報告處理方式：

1. 公開方式：非列管計畫亦不具下列情形，立即公開查詢
2. 「本研究」是否已有嚴重損及公共利益之發現： 否
3. 「本報告」是否建議提供政府單位施政參考 否

中 華 民 國 104 年 3 月 22 日

中英文摘要

在第二次世界大戰之後，有一百七十餘名台灣人在遭各個盟國以 B/C 級戰犯來審判並因而服刑，分別是澳大利亞(95 名台籍戰犯；超過台籍戰犯總數的 55%)、中國、荷蘭、英國和美國。其中 21 名被判處並執行死刑。遭判處死刑的台籍戰犯以在澳大利亞與英國軍事法庭中最多。本研究發現，他們大多數在戰爭當中擔任的是「通譯」的工作。而之所以這些臺灣人被指派在東南亞各戰地擔任正式或非正式的翻譯工作，主要是因爲他們身爲日本帝國的被殖民者所具備的特殊語言能力。他們的語言能力提供了這些臺灣人在戰爭的發展之下特別的（工作）機會；卻也導致了部分臺灣人被帶入他們無法抗拒的工作環境，進而涉入戰爭犯罪。身爲日本帝國的被殖民者的「台籍戰犯」，凸顯了在日本帝國與歐洲殖民帝國的競爭衝突之下所衍生出來的一種特殊的「殖民戰爭責任」。從跨國的脈絡之下來重建的「台籍戰犯」歷史，同時也顯現了戰後英法荷等殖民國透過戰犯審判和其他針對其「被殖民者」的補償手段，來重新建立其在東南亞各地殖民統治的過程。

After the Second World War, 173 Taiwanese who were recruited to serve in the Japanese military across Asia-Pacific during the war were convicted as war criminals. Based on studies of trial records and archival materials, this paper finds that among the 21 executed Taiwanese war criminals, at least 13 of them were convicted and consequently executed for crimes committed while serving as interpreters—formal and informal—during the war. In addition, a handful of Taiwanese interpreters were convicted as war criminals for various degrees of prison terms. While their number is small, the trials and punishment of these Taiwanese interpreters as war criminals provide a new perspective to understand the history of interpretation/interpreters in colonial/post-colonial and wartime context. Trial records— particularly the details of “victims” and convicted “crime”—of British courts set up in Singapore, Penang, and Kuala Lumpur and Dutch courts in the present-day Indonesia shows that most Taiwanese interpreters were convicted of crimes committed against “local civilians”. This paper argues that it was their language proficiency and interpretation duty brought/forced many Taiwanese serving in the Japanese military into close and frequent contact with the local population, particularly the Chinese, and thereby led to occasions in which these Taiwanese interpreters were involved in the alleged crime. In addition, this paper studies several cases of Taiwanese informal interpreters who committed crimes against Chinese prisoners of war (POWs) and were put on trial in the Australian courts held in Rabaul. It finds that while these Taiwanese were originally recruited as laborers, they were assigned to *ad hoc* interpretation duty because of their language proficiency under the contingency in the battlefields.

關鍵詞

臺籍戰犯，二次世界大戰，通譯，英國戰犯審判，澳洲戰犯審判

Taiwanese war criminals, the Second World War, interpreters, British war crime trials, Australian war crime trials

報告内容

Introduction

After the Second World War ended in 1945, the Allied countries conducted extensive war crime trials against Germany and Japan. While post-war trials of the major (Class A) war criminals, such as the Nuremberg Trial and the Tokyo Trial, continue to attract a good deal of scholarly attention more than half a century after the trials,¹ trials of the minor (Class B/C) war criminals have been relatively under-studied.² In spite of their much larger number—more than 4400 were convicted,³ Class B/C war criminals have received disproportionately little attention in the academia.

Among the Japanese Class B/C war criminals, it is particularly worth noting—though often neglected—that there were a significant number of former colonial subjects, namely Taiwanese (Formosans)

¹ For example, see recent works on the Nuremberg Trial by Eugene Davidson, *The Trial of the Germans: an account of the twenty-two defendants before the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1997); Whitney R. Harris, *Tyranny on Trial: The Trial of the Major War Criminals at the End of World War II at Nuremberg, Germany, 1945-1946* (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1999); Guénaél Mettraux, ed., *Perspectives on the Nuremberg Trial*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008). For the Tokyo Trial, see Tim Maga, *Judgment at Tokyo: The Japanese war crimes trials* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2001); Yuma Totani, *The Tokyo War Crimes Trial: the pursuit of justice in the wake of World War II* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Asia Center, 2008); Kayoko Takeda, *Interpreting the Tokyo War Crimes Trial: A sociopolitical analysis* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2010). Interest in the Tokyo Trial is further extended by personal account of persons who were involved in the trial, see for example Drexel A. Sprecher, *Inside the Nuremberg Trial: A Prosecutor's Comprehensive Account* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1999); Norbert Ehrenfreund, *The Nuremberg Legacy: How the Nazi War Crimes Trials Changed the Course of History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); Elaine B Fischel, *Defending the Enemy: Justice for the WWII Japanese war criminals* (Minneapolis: Bascom Hills Books, 2009).

² The few exceptions are works by Philip Piccigallo, *The Japanese on Trial* (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1979); Alan B. Lyon, *Japanese War Crimes: The Trials of the Naoetsu Camp Guards* (Loftus, Australia: Australian Military History Publications, 2000)

³ A total of 5700 were put on trial, and 4403 were convicted. See 法務大臣官房司法法制調査部編刊, 『戦争犯罪裁判概史要』, 1973, 266-269 頁, 轉引自内海愛子, 『キムはなぜ裁かれたのか : 朝鮮人 BC 級戦犯の軌跡』, 東京都 : 朝日新聞, 2008, 7 頁。

and Koreans who served in the Japanese military during the war. According to existing documents, 173 Taiwanese were convicted in war crime trials after the war. Among these Taiwanese war criminals (TWCs), 26 were sentenced to death (and 21 were consequently executed).⁴ In comparison, there were a total of 148 Koreans war criminals (KWC), among them 23 were sentenced to death.⁵

It was reported that during the war, more than 80,000 Taiwanese-native soldiers and more than 126,000 Taiwanese “auxiliary military personnel” were recruited or mobilized by the Japanese colonial and military authorities. Among them, there were more than 30,000 casualties.⁶ It would be fair to conclude that by the end of the war, more than 200,000 Taiwanese had fought—as “Japanese”—for the Empire and Emperor of Japan in the Second World War. The Japanese wartime mobilization of the Taiwanese certainly constituted part of what Takashi Fujitani has called “politics of disavowal”.⁷ But in comparison, the history of Taiwanese

⁴ The number of Taiwanese war criminals sentenced to death is given as 26 in most accounts; see Zhong 2001, p.262 and Li 2005, pp.4, 6. However, it should be noted that the Japanese source quoted by Zhong further explains that 5 of the 26 TWCs who were recorded as “dead” were those who died, of illness or suicide, during imprisonment. See 東京裁判ハンドブック編集委員会編, 東京裁判ハンドブック *tokyo saiban handobukku* (Tokyo: Aoki, 1989), p.225. This account is confirmed by the Name List of Korean- and Taiwanese-native War Criminals, an official record compiled by the Bureau of Repatriation and Emergence Aid of Japan’s Ministry of Health and Welfare (Kosei-sho) in 1955 (hereafter as *MHW Name List*) 日本厚生省引揚援護局, 《韓國臺灣出身戦争裁判受刑者名簿》(昭和30年12月1日現在), in which 2 under the Australian jurisdiction were listed as “death from accident”, 1 under the Australian jurisdiction was listed as “death from illness”, 1 under the Australian jurisdiction was listed as “death from suicide”, and 1 under the Chinese jurisdiction was listed as “death from illness” (pp.36-38). Thereby, this paper confirms that 26 TWCs were recorded as “dead”, and among them 21 were actually executed.

It should be further noted that, as this paper will further explain in the later section on the Australian trials, 5 TWCs who were sentenced to death were commuted to life imprisonment on 27th June 1947, and thereby spared of death. With the other 21 TWCs who were executed, this paper confirms that the total number of TWCs *sentenced* to death is 26.

⁵ *MHW Name List*, p.4. The number is identical to the number given in other scholarly works, see Utsumi Aiko *chosenjin bishikyū senpan no kiroku* (Tokyo: Keisoshobo, 1982) 内海愛子, 《朝鮮人BC級戦犯の記録》(東京:勁草書房, 1982), p.ii; and Tokyo *saiban handobukku henshu iinkai*, *Tokyo saiban handobukku* (Tokyo: Aoki, 1989) 東京裁判ハンドブック編集委員会編, 《東京裁判ハンドブック》(東京:青木書房, 1989), p.225.

⁶ Cai Jintang, *Zhanzheng tizhi xia de Taiwan* (Taipei: Richuangshe, 2006) 蔡錦堂, 《戰爭體制下的臺灣》(臺北:日創社文化事業有限公司, 2006), p.121.

⁷ Takashi Fujitani, *Race for Empire: Koreans as Japanese and Japanese as Americans during World War II* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).

mobilized by the Japanese during the Second World War is rather under-studied, if not ignored,⁸ and Taiwanese who had served in the Japanese military remains, to paraphrase from Christopher Bayly and Tim Harper, the “forgotten armies” of the War.⁹

And not surprisingly, the history of Taiwanese war criminals has drawn very little attention so far.¹⁰ Based on the records available today, Taiwanese war criminals were put on trials at military tribunals by five

⁸ Most studies are oral history published in Chinese in the 1990s; see Zheng Liling, *Taiji Ribenbing de “zhanzheng jingyan”* [war experiences of Taiwanese-native Japanese soldiers] (Banchiao: Taipei xianli wenhua zhongxin, 1995); Chou Wan-yao (Zhou Wanyao), ed., *Taiji Ribenbing zuotanhui jilu bing xiangguan ziliao* [record from the roundtable discussion by Taiwanese-native Japanese soldiers and related materials] (Taipei: Institute of Taiwan History Preparatory Office, Academia Sinica, 1997); Pan Guozheng, *Tianhuang dianxia no chizi* [loyal sons of his excellence the Tenno] (Xinzhu: Qifengtang chubanshe, 1997); Hui-yu Caroline Ts’ai (Cai, Huiyu), ed., *Zouguo liangge shidai de ren: Taiji Riben bing* [original English title: The Lives and Times of Taiwanese Veterans] (Taipei: Institute of Taiwan History, Academia Sinica, 1997); Tang Xiyong and Chen Yiru, eds., *Taibeishi Taiji Ribenbing chafang zhuanji* [special investigative report on Taiwanese-native Japanese soldier in Taipei city] (Taipei: Taibeishi wenxian weiyuanhui, Taipei Municipal Government, 2001). In addition, only a handful of scholarly works have studied this topic, see Chou Wan-yao (Zhou Wanyao), *Haixing xi de niandai: Riben zhimin tongzhi moqi Taiwanshi lunji* (The era of sea voyage: collection of works on the history of the final stage of the Japanese colonial rule in Taiwan) (Taipei: Yunchen wenhua, 2002); Cai Jintang, *Zhanzheng tizhi xia de Taiwan* [Taiwan under the wartime institutions] (Taipei: Richuangshe, 2006). And only a few works are available for the English-speaking readers, see Chen Yingzhen, “Imperial Army Betrayed”, in T. Fujitani, Geoffrey M. White, and Lisa Yoneyama, eds., *Perilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s)* (Durham and London: Duke University Press 2003), pp.181-198; Chih-huei Huang, “The *Yamatodamashi* of the Takasago volunteers of Taiwan: A reading of the postcolonial situation”, in Harumi Befu and Sylvie Guichard-Anguis, eds., *Globalizing Japan: Ethnography of the Japanese Presence in Asia, Europe, and America* (London and New York: Routledge, 2001), pp.222-250. Study of this “ignorance” in historiography and its significance in postwar Taiwan, see Shichi Mike Lan, “(Re-)Writing History of the Second World War: Forgetting and Remembering the Taiwanese-native Japanese Soldiers in Postwar Taiwan”, *positions: Asia Critique*, Vol.21, No.4, Fall 2013, pp.801-852

⁹ Christopher Bayly and Tim Harper, *Forgotten Armies: Britain’s Asian Empire and the War with Japan* (London: Penguin, 2005).

¹⁰ Zhong Shumin has written several works on this topic, see Zhong Shumin, “Fulu shourongsuo: jindai taiwanshi de yiduan beige [Prisoners of war internment camps: a sad story in modern Taiwan history]”, in Cao Yonghe xiansheng bashi shouqing lunwenji bianji weiyuanhui, ed., *Cao Yonghe xiansheng bashi shouqing lunwenji* [papers compiled in honor of the eightieth birthday of Mr Cao Yonghe] (Taipei: Lexue shuju, 2001) 鍾淑敏,〈俘虜收容所——近代臺灣史的一段悲歌〉,收於《曹永和先生八十壽慶論文集》(臺北:樂學書局,2001), pp.261-288; and Zhong Shumin, “Zhanzheng zuifan yu zhanhou chuli: yi fulu shourongsuo jianshiyuan wei zhongxin [war crime and postwar settlement: focusing on the guards at prisoners of war interment camps]”, paper presented at the International Conference on Social and Economic Transformation in Postwar Taiwan, Institute of Taiwan History, Academia Sinica, Taipei, December 23-24, 2009. In addition, Li Zhanping has conducted extensive interview with former TSJ and published two books based on oral history, see Li Zhanping, *Qianjin poluozhou: taiji zhanfu jianshiyuan* [Going to Borneo:

different Allied countries: Australia, China, Holland, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Among them, Australia convicted the largest number of Taiwanese war criminals (95), followed by China (41), the United Kingdom (26), the Netherland (7), and the US/the Philippines (4).¹¹

Earlier studies have pointed out that most of the 173 Taiwanese war criminals were former camp guards of the Allied prisoners of war (POWs) in Southeast Asia.¹² And it has been further pointed out that among these Taiwanese camp guards who were tried as war criminals, 8 were sentenced to death.¹³ The “Name List of Korean- and Taiwanese-native War Criminals” (《韓國臺灣出身戰爭裁判受刑者名簿》), an official record compiled by the Bureau of Repatriation and Emergence Aid of Japan’s Ministry of Health and Welfare (Kosei-sho 日本厚生省引揚援護局) in 1955 (hereafter as *MHW Name List*), also confirms that the majority of Taiwanese (and Korean) war criminals were former POW camp guards,¹⁴ followed by “interpreters” working for military police, and then “ordinary people”. However, A closer look at the *MHW Name List* shows that in terms of the wartime designation and job profile of those Taiwanese war criminals who were sentenced to the death penalty, the group of “**interpreters**” is the most significant: a total of 11 Taiwanese who were formally designated as “interpreters” were sentenced to death and executed. In comparison, 5 other executed TWCs were POW camp guards, 3 were auxiliary military personnel who worked at warehouses, 2 were police officers, and 1 was businessman.¹⁵

Taiwanese-native guards of prisoners of war] (Nantou: Guoshi guan Taiwan wenxian guan [Taiwan archive section, Academic Historical], 2005), and Li Zhanping *Zhanhuo wenshen de jianshiyuan: taiji zhanfu beige* [Camp guards tattooed by the war: Taiwanese prisoners of war] (Nantou: Guoshi guan Taiwan wenxian guan, 2007).

¹¹ Nippon Kosei-sho Hikiage engo-kyoku, 《Kankoku Taiwan Shusshin Senso Saiban Jukeisha Meibo》;《Taiwan Shusshin Senso Hanzai Saiban Shibotsusha Ichiran》日本厚生省引揚援護局，《韓國臺灣出身戰爭裁判受刑者名簿》；《臺灣出身戰爭犯罪裁判死歿者一覽》 [Bureau of Repatriation and Relief, Japanese Ministry of Health and Welfare, *Name List of Korean- and Taiwanese-native War Criminals; List of Executed and Dead Taiwanese War Criminals*] (昭和 30 年 12 月 1 日現在) 1955, p.4.

¹² Zhong 2001, p.262; Li 2005, pp.6-7.

¹³ The number is 8 from a chart compiled by Zhong Shumin, based on 3 different works of war crime documents compiled by Japanese scholar Chaen Yoshio; see Zhong 2001, pp.280-281.

¹⁴ Nippon Kosei-sho Hikiage engo-kyoku, 《Kankoku Taiwan Shusshin Senso Saiban Jukeisha Meibo》日本厚生省引揚援護局，*《韓國臺灣出身戰爭裁判受刑者名簿》* [Bureau of Repatriation and Relief, Japanese Ministry of Health and Welfare, *Name List of Korean- and Taiwanese-native War Criminals*] (昭和 30 年 12 月 1 日現在) 1955, p.2.

¹⁵ The number of executed former POW camp guards adds up to 5 (number by countries: 1 by the United States, 8 sentenced to death by Australia but only 4 were executed), see Nippon Kosei-sho Hikiage engo-kyoku, 《Kankoku Taiwan Shusshin Senso

While existing scholarship and oral history have studied and provided a better understanding of Taiwanese who had served as POW camp guards,¹⁶ very few scholarly works have examined the Taiwanese “interpreters” in military service.¹⁷ Furthermore, so far no work on war crimes has studied or provided any explanation to the high number of former “interpreters” put on trails and convicted as war criminals. While the killing and/or ill treatment of the Allied POWs has been identified in war crime tribunals as the major reason behind the death sentence handed down to most Taiwanese camp guards,¹⁸ no reason has been clearly defined or identified to explain the death sentence handed down to Taiwanese “interpreters”. Zhong Shumin points out, in her most recent work on POW camps and Taiwanese camp guards, that many Taiwanese interpreters were prosecuted and later received severe sentence in war crime tribunals in China, Indonesia (the Dutch courts), and Malaya (the British courts). Zhong further identifies that the charges against these interpreters were often recorded in the available fragmented court records simply as “ill-treatment” or “killing” of local residents.¹⁹ But what exactly did these “interpreters” do during the war that was later considered as a sufficient ground to indict them as war criminals and to sentence some of them to death? Why and in what context did these “interpreters” change their job responsibilities from undertaking interpretation, supposedly between the Japanese military/police forces and local residents, to committing “ill-treatment” or

Saiban Jukeisha Meibo》日本厚生省引揚援護局，《韓國臺灣出身戰爭裁判受刑者名簿》 [Bureau of Repatriation and Relief, Japanese Ministry of Health and Welfare, *Name List of Korean- and Taiwanese-native War Criminals*] (昭和 30 年 12 月 1 日現在) 1955, pp.4, 36-38 . .

¹⁶ For works in Chinese, see Zhong 2001, Li 2005, and Zhong 2009. In comparison, there are many more Japanese works on the topic of Koreans serving as POW camp guards during the war, see note 6.

¹⁷ Few exceptions are: Xu Xueji’s work that studies the general condition of Taiwanese serving as interpreters during the Japanese colonial period, see Xu Xueji, “Rizhi shiqi taiwan de tongyi [Taiwanese interpreters of the Japanese-rule period]” *Fu Jen Historical Journal*, No.18 (2006) 許雪姬, 〈日治時期台灣的通譯〉, 《輔仁歷史學報》, 第 18 輯 (2006), pp.1-35; Chen Wanpin, *Interpreter’s National Identity: The Case Studies of War Interpreters during Kominka Period in Taiwan*. MA Thesis, Fu Jen Catholic University, 陳宛頻, 通譯的國族認同之探討: 以皇民化時代戰場通譯為例. 輔仁大學碩士論文, 2013. I would like to thank Miss Chen for her generosity in sending me her thesis.

¹⁸ See personal account and recollection by former Taiwanese war criminals in Li 2005, p.14, 42-43, 56, 89, 91, 134. Scholars also made the same conclusion based on court records and archival materials, see Li 2005, pp.116-121, 138, 142, 153-154; Zhong 2001, pp.279-287; and Zhong 2009, pp.1, 11.

¹⁹ Zhong 2009, pp.5-7.

“killing”? This paper will utilize archival materials, focusing on the 21 executed TWCs, and try to study the history of Taiwanese wartime interpreters who were convicted as war criminals after the war.

Taiwanese as Wartime Interpreters

As a land of many waves of immigrants and foreign rulers, Taiwan is a place full of cross-cultural/cross-lingual interaction since the ancient time. Among its aboriginal population of Austronesian origin (consist of more than a dozen major tribes, each with its own distinct language), the Chinese migrants (consist of many distinct ‘dialect’ groups from various parts of southern China) from the 16th to the 19th century, the Dutch, the Spaniards, the Japanese, and the second major wave of Chinese migrants after 1945, the ‘language-scape’ of Taiwan has been highly diversified and evolving over history. Expectedly, there must be a constant need for, and thereby a great deal of stories about, interpretation. But so far, little has been written about *interpreters* in Taiwan, not to mention Taiwanese who performed interpretation in military operation during wartime.

Interpreters in general have attracted a great deal of scholarly attention. Many—if not most—interpreters who got recognized, and thereby studied by scholars, are individuals who interpreted for “great men”, such as the interpreters of Napoleon, George Washington, and Woodrow Wilson;²⁰ some were themselves close to become “great men” as they also served as diplomats.²¹ As scholars point out, “Interpreting and diplomacy have tended to overlap”.²² However, interpreters were present and needed in many other occasions. In the time of wars, for example, interpreters were deployed long before diplomatic efforts came in to settle conflicts, and long after military conflicts were ceased. They were indispensable in the occupation of a foreign land (and its people), in interrogation of enemy soldiers, and in intelligence work, just to name a few examples. These unique conditions have led to scholars’ recent interest in studying wartime interpreters—particularly in relations to politics of language, identity, and justice—in the context of Asia, Europe, and elsewhere.²³ But

²⁰ Jean Delisle and Judith Woodsworth, eds., *Translators through History* (Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1995), pp.267, 270

²¹ Jean Delisle and Judith Woodsworth, eds., *Translators through History* (Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1995), pp.269-272

²² Jean Delisle and Judith Woodsworth, eds., *Translators through History* (Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1995), p.274.

²³ See recent studies by Myriam Salama-Carr, ed., *Translating and Interpreting Conflicts* (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2007); Hilary Footitt and Kelly, Michael, eds., *Languages and the Military: Alliances, Occupation and Peace Building* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), particularly Part IV. Alice Kaplan has produced two fascinating accounts of military interpreters in France in the Second World War, see *The Interpreter* (University of Chicago Press, 2005); and Louis Guilloux (Alice Kaplan, trans.) *Ok, Joe* (University of Chicago Press, 2003). For studies of wartime interpreters in the Asian context, see Hyung-ju

similar to the “unknown soldiers”, wartime interpreters were often forgotten and became unknown once the war ended, and thereby hardly recorded, recognized, or studied.

In light of the issue of military and language, this paper will discuss two groups of Taiwanese wartime interpreters who were convicted as war criminals—and many executed—after the war. **Group 1** consists of Taiwanese wartime interpreters who had formal **interpreter status** during the war. They were officially designated as “interpreters” (通譯, as *tsu-yaku* in Japanese or *tongyi* in Chinese), as recorded in official Japanese documents.²⁴ This group consisted of those Taiwanese who served as interpreters under the Japanese military police (J: *kempetai*) during the war, and many were convicted after the war in the British, the Dutch, and the Chinese courts. Most of them were sentenced to death and executed; others were sentenced to various prison terms. **Group 2** consists of Taiwanese wartime interpreters who had **informal or ad hoc interpretation duty** during the war. They were Taiwanese who were originally recruited and designated NOT as formal “interpreters” in military service, but were (re-)assigned—because of language proficiency—to perform interpretation under the contingency in the battlefields. Similar to Group 1, those in Group 2 were put on war crime trials after the war, and several were sentenced to death.

As mentioned earlier, 11 out of the 21 executed TWCs had the job classification as “interpreters”; 6 were convicted and executed by the United Kingdom, 3 by ROC, and 2 by the Netherland.²⁵ These TWCs made up the majority of **Group 1**. If we look more closely at each Allied country’s trial, in the British trials, a total of 6 TWCs were convicted and executed between 1946 and 1948, and all of the 6 were interpreters. In addition, the British courts convicted 3 more Taiwanese interpreters (sentenced for imprisonment of 6 months, 3 years, and 8 years respectively). In the ROC trials, a total of 5 TWCs convicted and executed, and 3 of them were interpreters. In the Dutch trials, a total of 2 TWCs convicted and executed, and both of them were

Ahn, *Between Two Adversaries: Korean Interpreters at Japanese Alien Enemy Detention Centers during World War II* (Fullerton, California: Oral History Program, California State University, 2002); Yong Hyun Kim, Susanne Kim Nelson ed. *Into the Vortex of War: A Korean Interpreter’s Close Encounter with the Enemy*. (Author House, 2008).

²⁴ This article uses the term 「通訳」 (*tsu-yaku*), instead of 「通訳者」, because in documents such as 《Kankoku Taiwan Shusshin Senso Saiban Jukeisha Meibo》 《韓國臺灣出身戰爭裁判受刑者名簿》 [Name List of Korean- and Taiwanese-native War Criminals] and Japanese trial reports compiled by 茶園義男, these Taiwanese were listed as 「通訳」 (*tsu-yaku*).

²⁵ Nippon Kosei-sho Hikiage engo-kyoku, 《Kankoku Taiwan Shusshin Senso Saiban Jukeisha Meibo》 ;日本厚生省引揚援護局,《韓國臺灣出身戰爭裁判受刑者名簿》[Bureau of Repatriation and Relief, Japanese Ministry of Health and Welfare, Name List of Korean- and Taiwanese-native War Criminals](昭和 30 年 12 月 1 日)1955; Kosei-sho Engo-kyoku,《Taiwan Shusshin Senso Hanzai Saiban Shibotsusha Ichiran》 厚生省援護局,《臺灣出身戰爭犯罪裁判死囚者一覽》 [Bureau of Relief, Ministry of Health and Welfare, List of Executed and Dead Taiwanese-native War Criminals] (昭和 43 年 8 月 26 日) 1968

interpreters. These numbers show that the rate of conviction of death sentence was unusually high among **Group 1.**

In terms of job portfolio, in the British trials, 3 out of the 6 TWCs-wartime interpreters executed had served with the Penang Military Police (*kempetai*) during the war; one had served with the Kuala Lumpur Military Police; one had served in the military forces in Car Nicobar Island; the other had served with the police force in Kuala Besut, Malaya.²⁶ The other 3 TWCs-military interpreters convicted to various terms of imprisonment in the British trials served respectively with the Penang Military Police²⁷, Borneo Military Police²⁸, and Singapore Military Police.²⁹ Conspicuously, Taiwanese who served as wartime interpreters were closely associated with the Military Police. It is well recognized that during the Second World War, Japanese Military Police was widely deployed in the occupied areas to be in charge of maintaining social order, more often than not through means of terror against local residents. And this is consistent with the trial records of TWCs convicted by the British. According to rather limited records of the British trials available today, the alleged crimes of TWCs were mostly mistreatment/torture of local civilian residents. Among the 6 TWCs-military interpreters executed by the British, those 3 who had served with the Penang Military Police were accused of “torturing, interrogating, and causing death of local residents” in Penang and “interrogating and causing death of civilians” in Taiping;³⁰ the one who had served with the Kuala Lumpur Military Police was accused of “interrogating local residents”³¹; the one who had served in the military forces in Car Nicobar

²⁶ Nippon Kosei-sho Hikiage engo-kyoku, 《Kankoku Taiwan Shusshin Senso Saiban Jukeisha Meibo》 ;日本厚生省引揚援護局・《韓國臺灣出身戰爭裁判受刑者名簿》[Bureau of Repatriation and Relief, Japanese Ministry of Health and Welfare, *Name List of Korean- and Taiwanese-native War Criminals*](昭和 30 年 12 月 1 日)1955; Kosei-sho Engo-kyoku,《Taiwan Shusshin Senso Hanzai Saiban Shibotsusha Ichiran》 厚生省援護局,《臺灣出身戰爭犯罪裁判死歿者一覽》 [Bureau of Relief, Ministry of Health and Welfare, *List of Executed and Dead Taiwanese-native War Criminals*](昭和 43 年 8 月 26 日) 1968.

²⁷ 茶園義男編.解説,BC 級戦犯英軍裁判資料(上). 東京都 : 不二出版社 1988 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan Eigun saiban shiryō* [records of the British trials of Class B/C war criminals] top part (Tōkyō : Fuji Shuppan, 1988) , p.117.

²⁸ 茶園義男編.解説,BC 級戦犯英軍裁判資料(上). 東京都 : 不二出版社 1988 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan Eigun saiban shiryō* [records of the British trials of Class B/C war criminals] top part (Tōkyō : Fuji Shuppan, 1988) , p.133

²⁹ 茶園義男編.解説,BC 級戦犯英軍裁判資料(下). 東京都 : 不二出版社 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan Eigun saiban shiryō* [records of the British trials of Class B/C war criminals] bottom part (Tōkyō : Fuji Shuppan, 1989) , p.164

³⁰ 茶園義男編.解説,BC 級戦犯英軍裁判資料(上). 東京都 : 不二出版社 1988 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan Eigun saiban shiryō* [records of the British trials of Class B/C war criminals] top part (Tōkyō : Fuji Shuppan, 1988) , pp.112-113.

³¹ 茶園義男編.解説,BC 級戦犯英軍裁判資料(上). 東京都 : 不二出版社 1988 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan Eigun saiban*

Island was accused of “torturing, interrogating, and causing death of local residents”;³² and the other one who had served with the police force in Malaya was accused of “torturing and causing death of local residents”.³³ In addition, there were 3 other TWCs-military interpreters convicted to various terms of imprisonment: the one had served with the Penang Military Police was accused of “torturing local residents”³⁴; the one who had served with the Borneo Military Police was accused of “torturing Chinese”³⁵; and while the alleged crime of the one who had served with the Singapore Military Police was not specified in the available record,³⁶ it is reasonable to assume, based on the typical activities of Military Police, that the alleged crime was also dealing with local residents.

The cases of Taiwanese interpreters convicted in the British trials clearly show that the job as interpreters brought these Taiwanese into close contact with “local residents” during the war, and their alleged crimes—and the consequence of conviction (and in some cases, execution) in war crime trials—were partly resulted from their involvement with local residents. The same can be found in the Dutch and ROC trials. One of the 2 TWCs-military interpreters executed by the Dutch was convicted in a trial in Batavia, for crimes committed in “organized terror in interrogation of civilians” and “interrogating and supervising civilians” using “inhumane means” while he was serving with the Military Police;³⁷ the other was convicted in a trial in Medan, for crimes committed in “mistreatment of suspects, organized terror”, whom most likely would be

shiryō [records of the British trials of Class B/C war criminals] top part (Tōkyō : Fuji Shuppan, 1988) , p.121.

³²茶園義男編.解説,BC級戦犯英軍裁判資料(下).東京都:不二出版社 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan Eigun saiban shiryō* [records of the British trials of Class B/C war criminals] bottom part (Tōkyō : Fuji Shuppan, 1989) , pp.159-160

³³茶園義男編.解説,BC級戦犯英軍裁判資料(上).東京都:不二出版社 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan Eigun saiban shiryō* [records of the British trials of Class B/C war criminals] top part (Tōkyō : Fuji Shuppan, 1988) , p.123.

³⁴茶園義男編.解説,BC級戦犯英軍裁判資料(上).東京都:不二出版社,1988 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan Eigun saiban shiryō* [records of the British trials of Class B/C war criminals] top part (Tōkyō : Fuji Shuppan, 1988) , p.117.

³⁵茶園義男編.解説,BC級戦犯英軍裁判資料(上).東京都:不二出版社,1988 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan Eigun saiban shiryō* [records of the British trials of Class B/C war criminals] top part (Tōkyō : Fuji Shuppan, 1988) , p.133

³⁶茶園義男編.解説,BC級戦犯英軍裁判資料(下).東京都:不二出版社,1989 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan Eigun saiban shiryō* [records of the British trials of Class B/C war criminals] bottom part (Tōkyō : Fuji Shuppan, 1989) , p.164

³⁷茶園義男編,BC級戦犯和蘭裁判資料-全巻通覧.東京都:不二出版社,1992 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan Oranda saiban shiryō zenkan tsūran* [records of the Dutch trials of Class B/C war criminals] (Tōkyō : Fuji Shuppan, 1992), p.93; 巢鴨法務委員會編,戦犯裁判の実相.上巻.東京都:不二出版社,1981,p.100

local residents, while he was serving with the Military Police.³⁸ And in the ROC trials, one of the 3 TWCs-military interpreters executed had served with the Guangdong Navy Military Police, and was convicted with “illegal arrest, confinement, torturing, and causing death” of local residents³⁹; and another one served with the South China Army Military Police.⁴⁰

Further archival research on the British, Dutch, and Chinese trial records is needed in the future to examine more details and provide a fuller picture of those Taiwanese interpreters. At the moment, this paper has to rely on secondary sources to study individual cases. One of the better-studied Taiwanese interpreters/convicted TWCs is Yasuda Muneharu.⁴¹ Yasuda was recruited into the Japanese military in November 1941, specifically as an “interpreter of Annamese (Vietnamese)” of the rank of *gunzoku* (military auxiliary personnel).⁴² He was first dispatched to Malaya, then Sumatra, and was stationed in Car Nicobar Island, an island of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands in the Indian Ocean at the end of the war.⁴³ After the Japanese surrender, Yasuda was arrested for alleged war crime and sent to Singapore for trial. He was convicted by the British court and sentenced to death in March 1946; executed in Singapore in May 1946⁴⁴

Thanks to earlier research done by Japanese scholar Kimura Kōichirō, we are able to get a glimpse into the training before deployment and the actual activities and experiences of a Taiwanese military interpreter in the battlefields through Yasuda’s case—particularly the trial records as hold in the Public Record Office in London. Records retrieved by Kimura show that Yasuda was born in a village near Taipei in 1907, given the Chinese name of Lai Enqin. In 1941, at the Southern Association in Taiwan, Yasuda attended

³⁸ 巢鴨法務委員會編，戰犯裁判の実相。上巻。東京都：不二出版社，1981，p.118.

³⁹ 茶園義男編，BC級戦犯軍事法廷資料—廣東編。東京都：不二出版社，1984 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan gunji hōtei shiryō*. *Kanton hen* [records of the military courts of Class B/C war criminals, Guangdong part] (Tōkyō: Fuji Shuppan, 1984) , p.175

⁴⁰ 茶園義男編，BC級戦犯軍事法廷資料—廣東編。東京都：不二出版社，1984 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan gunji hōtei shiryō*. *Kanton hen* [records of the military courts of Class B/C war criminals, Guangdong part] (Tōkyō: Fuji Shuppan, 1984) , p.179

⁴¹ Unless noted otherwise, information about Yasuda is quoted from the Chinese edition of 木村宏一郎 (陳鵬仁譯)，被遺忘的戰爭責任 (台北：致良出版社，2010) Kimura Kōichirō (C: Mucun Hongyilang), Chen Pengren, trans., *Beiyiwang de zhanzheng zeren* [*Forgotten war responsibilities*]. Taipei: Zhiliang publication, 2010. Japanese original please refer to 木村宏一郎，忘れられた戦争責任：カーニコバル島事件と台湾人軍属 (東京：青木書店，2001) Kimura Kōichirō, *Wasurerareta sensō sekinin* : *Kānikobarutō jiken to Taiwanjin gunzoku* [*Forgotten war responsibilities: Car Nicobar Island Incident and Taiwanese military auxiliary personnel*] Tōkyō: Aoki Shoten, 2001.

⁴² Kimura Kōichirō, pp.39, 43.

⁴³ Kimura Kōichirō, pp.15-17, 44-45

⁴⁴ Kimura Kōichirō, pp.16-17

elementary-level Annamese (Vietnamese) classes in March and completed the classes in July; then he moved on to enroll in middle-level Annamese classes and Malay language classes in August, before being recruited as an “interpreter of Annamese (Vietnamese)” into the Japanese military in November.⁴⁵ His experiences before deployment show that in addition to the native language of Taiwanese (Chinese dialects of Minnan/Hokkien or Hakka) and the school language of Japanese, Taiwanese interpreters such as Lai/Yasuda were trained and then assigned to interpret non-native languages. The choice of non-native language such as Annamese and Malay in language training was clearly an effort to (utilize Taiwanese as human resources to) fulfill the need of Japan’s advancement into Southeast Asia. And what is more significant is the timing of Yasuda’s training, which started nine months before Japan’s attack of Pearl Harbor and military invasion of Southeast Asia; it shows the extent of Japan’s planning for advancement into Southeast Asia.

Trial records further shed light on Yasuda’s wartime activities as an interpreter in Car Nicobar Island. Most notably, Yasuda was assigned to take part in the interrogation—and consequently was accused of committing war crime of “ill-treatment”—of local “civilian residents” who were suspected of espionage in July and August 1945.⁴⁶ According to the testimony by one accused Japanese sergeant, Yasuda was the only interpreter present at all three rounds of interrogation.⁴⁷

As Delisle and Woodsworth point out in the case of German interpreter Eugen Dollmann, who served as interpreter between Hitler and Mussolini in World War Two, Dollmann “took pains to point out that he was made a member of the SS without having being consulted”. In his own words, Dollmann recalled “I woke up one morning...to find myself in the SS”.⁴⁸ In many cases, interpreters may be forced into a situation without one’s own control or consent. In his own testimony, Yasuda admitted using violence during the interrogation of civilian residents,⁴⁹ nevertheless he was convicted of murder in the court.⁵⁰ Whether or not a war criminal like Yasuda was given a fair trial is not this paper’s concern. What this paper wants to argue, based on the case of Yasuda and other Taiwanese interpreters convicted of war crime, is to show how an interpreter may be forced into a situation without one’s own control or consent, especially in an unusual situation such as wars. While the status/job portfolio as an interpreter alone did not lead to the conviction or execution of any TWCs, the status/job portfolio as an interpreter was nevertheless a critical factor that led/forced some Taiwanese interpreters such as Yasuda into a situation in which they were put into close contact with local civilian

⁴⁵Kimura Kōichirō, pp.38-39

⁴⁶Kimura Kōichirō, pp.136, 146

⁴⁷Kimura Kōichirō, pp.151-152. It should be noted that in the testimony by one witness, Yasuda conducted interrogation in English; see Kimura Kōichirō, p.147

⁴⁸ Jean Delisle and Judith Woodsworth, eds., *Translators through History* (Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1995), p.274

⁴⁹ Kimura Kōichirō, pp.209-211

⁵⁰ Kimura Kōichirō, p.229

residents and, subsequently (if not consequently), situations in which the (alleged) war crime was committed. Thereby, the status/job portfolio as interpreters was at least partially responsible for the conviction and execution of some TWCs.

Cases of interpreter on trial in Southeast Asia, such as Yasuda, can also be examined in another larger context: the postwar return of colonial powers and the rise of anti-colonial voices. During the wartime, Japan's conquest of European colonies in Southeast Asia—or from another perspective, in the eyes of the colonized people, the sudden surrender and collapse of European powers, made many realized how fragile colonial powers were and how little colonial powers could do when the colonies and the colonized people were under threat. It would be fair to argue that anti-colonial sentiment rose along with Japan's military expansion across Southeast Asia. Thereby after the war, to the European colonial powers returning to re-gain control of their colonies in Southeast Asia, one of the highest priorities was to re-establish and assert their sole ruling legitimacy and authorities.

By conducting war crime trials in which the victims were exclusively and explicitly the colonized people, colonial powers found a rather public and immediate means to re-claim and prove their legitimacy in ruling the colonies. On the one hand, the returning colonial authorities were acting to punish the Japanese aggressors who had invaded the colonies, as a way of re-establishing and exercising its sovereignty over the colonies *without*. On the other hand, the returning colonial authorities were acting on behalf of the colonized, as a way of re-establishing and exercising its sovereignty over the colonies *within*. This is particularly critical in view of their humiliating defeat at the hands of the Japanese in the past and the rising anti-colonial sentiment and action throughout colonies in Southeast Asia at the present. The collapse of empires was well underway even before the war ended. In view of this ruling crisis, empires returning to Southeast Asia were eager to adopt any means to hold on to their powers immediately after the war. Under the circumstances, trials of war crime against “local residents” or the “native population” became one of the most immediate and effective ways for all the returning colonial powers to re-establish their ruling legitimacy in colonies throughout Southeast Asia in the immediate postwar years.

And equally important is the location of the trials. By conducting these trials in the colonies, instead of extraditing the accused class-B/C war criminals to the imperial capital such as London, or to an international military tribunal like the class-A war criminals in Tokyo, or to a neutral international court in a third country (such as the latter-day International Court of Justice, which was set up in June 1945 and began to operate in

April 1946)⁵¹, the colonial authorities intentionally kept these trials physically close (and relevant) to the colonized subjects. And in doing so, made these trials one of the most visible ways (or rituals)—in the eyes of both the colonial and the colonized—of demonstrating the legitimacy and authorities of the newly returning colonial governments.

And because of the significance of such trials, war crime against “local residents” or the “native population” became one of the focal points of postwar war crime trials conducted by returning colonial powers such as the British and the Dutch throughout Southeast Asia. As a result, war criminals who alleged had committed crime against “local residents” or the “native population” became the main target of prosecution. But among the numerous Japanese officers and soldiers who had committed crime against local population, who would be picked out first by the local population? One of these targets would be the Taiwanese who had served as interpreters.

After the war, one of the most common practices of identifying war criminals was by survey, in which local residents were asked to identify those who had committed any alleged crime against them during the war. In this process, those Japanese who had the most direct and frequent contact with the local residents were most likely to be identified as war criminals. Under the circumstances, the Taiwanese who served as interpreters between the Japanese military authorities and the local residents soon became one of the most conspicuous targets of war crime accusation and prosecution. From this perspective, colonial empires’ attempt to re-establish and consolidate their authorities contributed, partly, to the trials of Taiwanese interpreters as war criminals in Southeast Asia.

Furthermore, in comparison to their Japanese counterparts, Taiwanese interpreters were at a higher risk of being identified by the local residents, especially the Chinese Overseas in Southeast Asia. Not only the Taiwanese spoke the language of these local residents, they also shared common culture and heritage. Most Chinese Overseas in Southeast Asia traced their origin back to provinces in southeastern China, so did the Taiwanese. During the war, having been given the order to serve as interpreters, the Taiwanese were able to communicate with Chinese Overseas in Southeast Asia because of such common ground. But when local

⁵¹ “The Court”, see International Court of Justice website, <http://www.icj-cij.org/court/index.php?p1=1> (accessed in August 15, 2014)

residents of Southeast Asia came out to identify war criminals after the war, the Taiwanese became an obvious target for the local Chinese Overseas, because: 1) culturally and socially, the Taiwanese names were easier to identify, as they share common surnames/family names with many Chinese Overseas; 2) politically, the Taiwanese were on the Japanese side against the Chinese Overseas. As a result, during the Japanese occupation, the Taiwanese working for the Japanese were often seen by the Chinese Overseas in Southeast Asia as “traitors” and worse than the Japanese. And for some Taiwanese, they paid the ultimate price as they were identified and prosecuted as war criminals after the war. Trials of “traitors” or “treason” were commonly found in China, the US, and France after the Second World War,⁵² but in these cases the alleged “traitors” were put on trial by the government of their own country. In comparison, the cases of the Taiwanese discussed here were unique, as they were seen as “traitors” by the Chinese Overseas but were put on trial—under the colonial context in Southeast Asia—by a third party, the returning colonial authorities.

The special “connection” between the Chinese Overseas and the Taiwanese was particularly relevant to one Taiwanese war criminal mentioned earlier in the British trials, as he was specifically convicted of the crime of “interrogation of mostly Chinese”⁵³. But the same could be said about several other Taiwanese war criminals accused and convicted in the British courts in Penang and Kuala Lumpur, who had their names recorded in court records with their original Chinese forms, as pronounced and spelled phonetically in southern Fujian dialect (also known as Minnan or Hokkian). A brief explanation on the significance of

⁵² Studies of Chinese traitors, often known as *Hanjian* (traitors to the Han people), who collaborated with the Japanese during the war, see Frederic Wakeman Jr., “*Hanjian* (Traitor)! Collaboration and Retribution in Wartime Shanghai”, in Wen-hsin Yeh, ed., *Becoming Chinese: Passages to Modernity and Beyond* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA.: University of California Press, 2000), pp.298-341; Timothy Brook, *Collaboration: Japanese Agents and Local Elites in Wartime China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005). It is worth pointing out that the postwar Chinese authorities also dealt with the unique case of the Taiwanese as “traitors”, see Jiu-jung Lo, “Trials of the Taiwanese as *Hanjian* or War Criminals and the Postwar Search for Taiwanese Identity”, in Kai-wing Chow, Kevin M. Doak and Poshek Fu, eds., *Imagining National Identity in Modern East Asia* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001), pp. 279-316. But in comparison, the trials of the Taiwanese in Southeast Asia as studied in this paper were more complicated. In the US, the trial of John Provoost was the best example; see Barak Kushner, “Traitorous Allied: The Cold War in East Asia and American Postwar Anxiety”, *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 45(4), 2010, pp.812-843. For the trial of Vichy personnel, see Eric Conan and Henry Rousso (Nathan Bracher, trans.) *Vichy: An Ever-present Past* (Hanover : University Press of New England, 1998)

⁵³ 茶園義男編.解説, BC 級戦犯英軍裁判資料(上). 東京都 : 不二出版社, 1988 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan Eigun saiban shiryō* [records of the British trials of Class B/C war criminals] top part (Tōkyō : Fuji Shuppan, 1988) · p.133

Taiwanese names under the Japanese colonial rule, and particularly during the wartime, is needed here. As militarism rose further in Japan in the 1930s, total mobilization of the population was expanded from the mainland to the colonies of Taiwan and Korea. To mobilize the colonized people for Japan's war efforts, a policy called "*kominka*", meaning to make the colonial subjects into imperial subjects, was widely implemented and forced upon people of the colonies. One of the key points of *kominka* was "*kaiseimei* (name-changing)"—demanding colonial subjects in Taiwan and Korea to adopt a Japanese name. While the Japanese colonial policy of *kaiseimei* encountered certain degree of resistance from the public and was not thoroughly implemented in the colonies, it was common to find colonial subjects who were mobilized to work or fight in Japanese military adopted Japanese names. Apart from ideological reason of pledging allegiance to the Japanese Empire, changing to Japanese names also had a practical side for military operation.⁵⁴ Chinese names, while written in characters that were comprehensible to the Japanese, were pronounced completely different in their original Chinese language and in Japanese language. The same character as pronounced in Chinese would be difficult, if not impossible, for a Japanese to understand and pronounce; and vice versa, for a Chinese, the Japanese pronunciation of Chinese characters would be impossible to understand and pronounce. Thereby, for those Taiwanese serving in various capacities in Japanese military, it was common to adopt a Japanese name.

For example, Taiwanese war criminals convicted in the Australian trials, as this paper shall discuss in the next section, universally adopted this practice of name-changing, as each of them had his name recorded in trial records as pronounced and spelled phonetically in Japanese. In comparison, in at least three cases in Penang and another three cases in Kuala Lumpur, the accused Taiwanese war criminals—all had served as interpreters—were recorded not with their Japanese names, but instead had their original Chinese names as pronounced and spelled phonetically in southern Fujian dialect recorded in trials records. In Penang trials, three TWCs were convicted and executed by the British courts; they had all served as interpreters with the Penang Military Police (*kempetai*) during the war, and were accused of "torturing, interrogating, and causing death of local residents" in Penang and "interrogating and causing death of civilians" in Taiping. In the Japanese records, their names were recorded with characters of their original Chinese names (郭張興, 楊樹

⁵⁴ I would like to thank Professor Chin Hsiang-jung for this point.

木, 許祺禪 respectively); no Japanese names were given.⁵⁵ In the British records, their names were recorded respectively as Kwek Tiong Hin, Yeow Chew Bok, and Khor Kee Sian; each was exactly the three characters of their original Chinese names as pronounced and spelled phonetically in southern Fujian dialect.⁵⁶ In Kuala Lumpur trials, one TWC who had served as an interpreter with the Kuala Lumpur Military Police was convicted of “interrogating local residents” and executed. In the Japanese record, his name was recorded only with characters of his original Chinese name (鄭錦樹).⁵⁷ In the British records, his name was recorded as Ten Ten Chuan, which was fairly close to the three characters of his original Chinese name as pronounced and spelled phonetically in southern Fujian dialect.⁵⁸ In addition, in the British records of Kuala Lumpur trials, two TWCs who had served as interpreters were accused, and were recorded with names that can only be pronounced and spelled phonetically in southern Fujian dialect;⁵⁹ according to the Japanese records, at least one of them had served with the Penang Military Police and subsequently was accused of “torturing local residents”⁶⁰. It would be fair to assume that in these cases, local residents—as victims in the alleged crime and accusers in the trials—were the Chinese Overseas.

⁵⁵ 茶園義男編.解説, BC 級戦犯英軍裁判資料(上). 東京都 : 不二出版社, 1988 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan Eigun saiban shiryō* [records of the British trials of Class B/C war criminals] top part (Tōkyō : Fuji Shuppan, 1988) , pp.112-113.

⁵⁶ The National Archives (the United Kingdom), Reference: WO 235/931 (Description: Defendant: Kwek Tiong Hin Place of Trial: Penang); Reference: WO 235/931 (Description: Defendant: Yeow Chew Bok Place of Trial: Penang); Reference: WO 235/931 (Description: Defendant: Khor Kee Sian Place of Trial: Penang)

⁵⁷ 茶園義男編.解説, BC 級戦犯英軍裁判資料(上). 東京都 : 不二出版社, 1988 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan Eigun saiban shiryō* [records of the British trials of Class B/C war criminals] top part (Tōkyō : Fuji Shuppan, 1988) , p.121.

⁵⁸ The National Archives (the United Kingdom), Reference: WO 235/949 (Description: Defendant: Ten Ten Chuan Place of Trial: Kuala Lumpur)

⁵⁹ The National Archives (the United Kingdom), Reference: WO 235/1059 (Description: Defendant: Cheah Kam-Sang Place of Trial: Kuala Lumpur); Reference: WO 235/1026 (Description: Defendant: Ee-Fook-Seong Place of Trial: Kuala Lumpur; Date: 1947 Aug. 19-Oct. 26)

⁶⁰ 茶園義男編.解説, BC 級戦犯英軍裁判資料(上). 東京都 : 不二出版社, 1988 Chaen Yoshio, *BC-kyū senpan Eigun saiban shiryō* [records of the British trials of Class B/C war criminals] top part (Tōkyō : Fuji Shuppan, 1988) , p.117.

It may be possible that the aforementioned six TWCs in the British trials simply did not have Japanese names, and thereby had their names recorded in their original Chinese forms. But it is also highly likely that the reason of having the names of these TWCs recorded in trial records, as pronounced and spelled phonetically in southern Fujian dialect, was that their accusers were local Chinese Overseas. It would be fair to argue that only the local Chinese Overseas could and would identify the alleged Taiwanese war criminals in the latters' original Chinese/southern Fujian names. To better understand the trials of Group 1 Taiwanese wartime interpreters who had served and subsequently were put on war crime trials in Southeast Asia, it is important to recognize this context of Chinese Overseas and their special “connection” with the Taiwanese.

While Group 1 consists of Taiwanese wartime interpreters who had formal interpreter status during the war and subsequently tried and convicted as war criminals after the war, there were another group, **Group 2**, of Taiwanese wartime interpreters who had **informal** or **ad hoc interpretation duty** during the war, but subsequently were tried and convicted as war criminals after the war. Group 2 consists of TWCs who were originally recruited and designated NOT as interpreters, but were assigned—because of language proficiency—to perform interpretation under the contingency of war. As we explore further into archival documents related to the 21 executed TWCs, it becomes apparent that several executed TWCs who were not listed under the job designation of “interpreters” on government and court records were actually performing the role of interpreters during the war and, subsequently, were prosecuted and punished after the war for what they had done while serving as **informal** or **ad hoc** interpreters during the war.

Notably, several TWCs who originally served as laborers or POW camp guards during the war and were subsequently sentenced to death in the Australian courts constituted Group 2. As trial records showed, they were indeed performing interpretation duty during the war and, most importantly, while they were engaged in the alleged war crime.⁶¹ One of the most notable examples of Group 2 Taiwanese wartime interpreters can be found in the trial of “Chinese POW killing”, which was conducted by the Australian court in Rabual in April 1946.⁶² The alleged war crime in this trial was the killing of Chinese POWs by Japanese soldiers and

⁶¹ It is worth pointing out that based on the available statistics, Australia is the most significant country in the trials of Taiwanese war criminals. In terms of the sheer number, Australian courts convicted the highest number of TWCs among all the Allied countries, a total of 95; among them 7 were sentenced to death and executed (which is also the highest among all Allied nations in absolute number of TWCs sentenced to death and executed). See Kosei-sho 1955. Although the number adds up to 109, according to Chaen 1990 and Chaen 1991.

⁶² Nippon Gaimu-sho Toan , 《Kowa Joyaku Hakko-go: Syamen Kankoku Kankei, Osutoraria-no Bu》日本外務省檔案: 講和條約

Formosans guards in 1943. These Chinese POWs were part of the 88th Division, the 3rd Army, of the Nationalist Army. They were captured by the Japanese forces in China in July 1942,⁶³ and subsequently sent to Rabaul in January 1943.⁶⁴ Afterwards, in two separate occasions about 3rd and 11th March 1943, a good number of Chinese POWs (24 in the first occasion, 6 in the second) were shot and killed, allegedly by Japanese soldiers and Formosans guards. Two Japanese soldiers and seven Formosans guards were charged for the killing and put on trial, held in Rabaul, between 10 and 16 April, 1946. All the accused were sentenced to “death by hanging” under the charge of “killing Chinese laborers”, on 16 April 1946.⁶⁵

The seven accused Formosans were:⁶⁶

- Hayashi Hajime (AWC 2683) 林一 (林發伊)⁶⁷
- Kiohara (Kiyohara) Takeo (AWC 2913) 木代原武雄 (陳銘志)⁶⁸
- Okabayashi Eikyu (AWC 2685) 岡林永久
- Yanagawa Uetane (AWC 2914) 柳川植種

發效後: 赦免勸告關係, オーストラリアの部 [Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs Archive (JMFA): After the Peace Treaty became effective, on the issue of pardon and appeal: Australia], D-1-3-0-3-9-2, pp. 376-438. According to this record, in the trial 1 Japanese Sergeant, 1 Japanese Corporal, two members of the Formosan Volunteer's Corps were sentenced to death by hanging and executed on 17 July 1946; 5 other members of the Formosan Volunteer's Corps were sentenced to death by hanging but commuted to life imprisonment on 4 July 1947, see p.381.

⁶³ court testimony by Captain Liu Wei Pao, 10th April, 1946, in Proceedings of Military Tribunal, Sgt. Matsushima, Tozaburo and others, Department of the Army, A471.80915, Australian National Archive.

⁶⁴ court testimony by Major Lee Wai Sing, 11th April, 1946, in A471.80915

⁶⁵ Record of Military Court, Court, Place, Date and Formation: Rabaul, 10-16 Apr (19)46, 8 MD, in A471.80915

⁶⁶ Memorandum for Judge Advocate General, 14 May, 1947, in A471.80915

⁶⁷ Nippon Kosei-sho Hikiage engo-kyoku, 《Kankoku Taiwan Shusshin Senso Saiban Jukeisha Meibo》 ;日本厚生省引揚援護局・《韓國臺灣出身戰爭裁判受刑者名簿》[Bureau of Repatriation and Relief, Japanese Ministry of Health and Welfare, *Name List of Korean- and Taiwanese-native War Criminals*] (昭和 30 年 12 月 1 日) 1955

⁶⁸ Nippon Kosei-sho Hikiage engo-kyoku, 《Kankoku Taiwan Shusshin Senso Saiban Jukeisha Meibo》 ;日本厚生省引揚援護局・《韓國臺灣出身戰爭裁判受刑者名簿》[Bureau of Repatriation and Relief, Japanese Ministry of Health and Welfare, *Name List of Korean- and Taiwanese-native War Criminals*] (昭和 30 年 12 月 1 日) 1955

- Shimura Yuzo (AWC 2911) 志村勇三
- Furuya Eisuke (AWC 2912) 古谷榮助
- Takabayashi (*sic*, Takebayashi) Tsuruichi (AWC 2684) 武林鶴一

After the trial, Hayashi Hajime and Kiohara Takeo, together with the two convicted Japanese soldiers were hanged on 17th July, 1946. As for Okabayashi, Yanagawa, Shimura, Furuya, and Takabayashi, their lives were spared as they were required to serve as witnesses to another war crime trials. Later on, their sentences were commuted to life imprisonment, on 27th June 1947.⁶⁹

From the trial records, we can learn more about these TWCs' job as well as crimes these TWCs were accused of committing. Major Lee Wai Sing, one of the defense witnesses, testified that "Each of the 7 Formosans accused used either rifles or revolvers and shot into the pit" which a group of sick Chinese POWs were ordered to go into on 3rd March, 1943; and he added that the accused Formosans did the same thing again on 11 March, 1943.⁷⁰ Another defense witness Lieutenant Wong Yu Shing testified that from the time of the arrival of Chinese POWs in Rabaul in January 1943 and the time of the killing in March 1943, "the people who controlled us (the Chinese POWs) all the time were the (seven) accused (Formosans)".⁷¹ From these testimonies it is clear that the accused TWCs were assigned to be in charge of supervising Chinese POWs and, subsequently involved in the killing of some Chinese POWs.

But at the trial, several Chinese officers who served as witnesses in court also testified that the Formosans were usually unarmed. When asked "How many Formosans brought weapons with them to the (Chinese POW) camp" on the first occasion of the killing, witness Captain Liu Wei Pao testified that "As far as I remember the Formosans were not carrying arms when they entered our camp"; and the answer was the same when Captain Liu was asked about the second occasion of killing.⁷² Major Lee Wai Sing also testifies

⁶⁹ Record of Military Court, Court, Place, Date and Formation: Rabaul, 10-16 Apr (19)46, 8 MD, in A471.80915"; the "commuted sentences (were) promulgated to (the) accused (on) 12 July 1947"

⁷⁰ court testimony by Major Lee Wai Sing, 11th April, 1946, in A471.80915

⁷¹ court testimony by Lt. Wong Yu Shing, 11th April, 1946, in A471.80915

⁷² court testimony by Captain Liu Wei Pao, 10th April, 1946, in **A471.80915**

that with the exception of one Formosan, “the only time the others (other Formosans) were armed was during the shooting”.⁷³ A Japanese witness, Paymaster Major Shimizaki Masaomi, who was “in charge of general affairs” of the 26th Supply Depot, was called to the court and he further testified that “They (Formosans) were not given any military training, they were used wholly as labourers” and the use of firearm was never explained to the Formosans.⁷⁴

The above testimonies show that the Formosans were originally deployed as laborers; they were not given combatant training or duties, and they were originally not deployed for any assignment that involved Chinese POWs. Their job designations, as recorded in Japan’s government sources such as the aforementioned *MHW Name List*, were members of Formosan Special Labor Volunteer’s Corp 台灣特設勤勞奉公團.⁷⁵ Attached to the 26th Depot in Rabaul,⁷⁶ these Taiwanese laborers were engaged in the unloading, transporting and collecting of goods. So why these Formosan laborers ended up being assigned to “control” other laborers such as the Chinese POWs in Rabaul? The answer, as shown in other trial records, is language proficiency.

Language Proficiency of Taiwanese as Informal Interpreters

⁷³ court testimony by Major Lee Wai Sing, 11th April, 1946, in **A471.80915**

⁷⁴ court testimony by Paymaster Major Shimizaki Masaomi, 15th April, 1946, in **A471.80915**

⁷⁵ For further information, see 近藤正己著，許佩賢譯，〈對異民族的軍事動員與皇民化政策——以臺灣軍夫為中心〉，《臺灣文獻》46：2，（1995）Kondo Masami (Xu Peixian trans.) “Dui yiminzu de junshi dongyuan yu huangminhua zhengce—yi Taiwan junfu weili [military mobilization of the alien nation and the *kominka* policy—focusing on the Taiwanese military servants]”，*Taiwan Wenxian*, Vol.46, No.2 (1995), pp.216-217.

⁷⁶ Nippon Kosei-sho Hikiage engo-kyoku, 《Kankoku Taiwan Shusshin Senso Saiban Jukeisha Meibo》；日本厚生省引揚援護局，《韓國臺灣出身戰爭裁判受刑者名簿》[Bureau of Repatriation and Relief, Japanese Ministry of Health and Welfare, *Name List of Korean- and Taiwanese-native War Criminals*] (昭和 30 年 12 月 1 日) 1955；Kosei-sho Engo-kyoku, 《Taiwan Shusshin Senso Hanzai Saiban Shibotsusha Ichiran》厚生省援護局，《臺灣出身戰爭犯罪裁判死歿者一覽》[Bureau of Relief, Ministry of Health and Welfare, *List of Executed and Dead Taiwanese-native War Criminals*] (昭和 43 年 8 月 26 日) 1968

In the Australian trial records, language proficiency was repeatedly identified by the accused TWCs, as a critical factor leading to what their involvement in the alleged war crime. The first TWC on the list of the accused was **Hayashi Hajime**, who was called to the court as the fifth witness for the defence on 12th April 1946. He testified that he belonged to the 26th Supply Depot, and his duty at the Chinese POW camp was making “Daily report concerning Chinese laborers” to Lt. Amada, who was in charge of the Chinese POWs. When asked about the Chinese killing, Hayashi stated, “I am a Formosan and was never allowed to be present at the scene of any killing. The reason I knew about the death of Chinese was that I held the nominal roll and checked the personnel (*sic*) daily”; and he added,

“At the time, I had been working almost every day in the orderly room (in the Chinese POW camp), and sometimes I will be at the scene of working as an (*sic*) Chinese interpreter”.⁷⁷

In another statement signed by Hayashi, recorded on the same day as his court appearance, he stated: “At that time, I had been working almost every day in the orderly room, and sometimes I would be working at the scene as an Chinese interpreter”.⁷⁸ In addition, in an earlier interrogation report (1st February, 1946), Hayashi stated:

“I was appointed to work in the Chinese labourers compound near Tobio in Jan (January) 1943. I was there as an interpreter as I spoke a little Chinese. My duties were to allot labourers as requested by various units”.⁷⁹

It should be noted that Hayashi seemed to be the leading interpreter dealing with Chinese POWs, as he was the only one among the seven accused Formosans at the trial identified as “Chinese interpreter” by two fellow Formosan witnesses.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ court testimony by Accused Hayashi, 12th April, 1946, in **A471.80915**

⁷⁸ Hayashi, Hajime, 12th April, 1946, in **A471.80915**

⁷⁹ Hayasi (*sic*) (Civilian), 1 Feb (February), 1946, in **A471.80915**

Another accused Formosan, **Okabayashi Eikyu**, was called to the court as the sixth witness for the defence on 13th April, 1946. He stated that he arrived in Rabaul in November 1942 (together with the other accused TWCS, except Furuya Eisuke who arrived one month later), and was attached to the 26th Supply Depot. He testified that his duties at the “Chinese camp” were “to work along the Chinese labour (*sic*)”, and added in an earlier written statement that “From Jan (January) to Sept (September) 43 (1943) I was employed as civilian interpreter at Gongo wharf area and was out daily with Chinese labourers”.⁸¹ And similar to Hayashi, Okabayashi also stated in an earlier interrogation report: “In Jan (January) to Sept (September) 1943 I was employed as (an) civilian interpreter....and was out daily with Chinese labourers”.⁸²

The above testimonies and statements by two accused TWCs directly identified language proficiency—and the resulted interpretation duty—as the critical factor that led to the assignment of Formosans to “control” Chinese POWs in Rabaul. Notably, language proficiency is mentioned again in other documents related to this “Chinese POW killing” as a deciding factor in the accused TWC’s job assignment in the battlefields. In 1954, the five TWCs who were commuted to life imprisonment filed application for clemency while serving time in Sugamo Prison in Japan. In a document compiled for each application, the Japanese authorities, National Offenders Prevention and Rehabilitation Commission, explained the Formosans’ role at the Chinese POW camp in Rabaul. It was stated, specifically: several Japanese “superior class privates” were in charge of “guarding and maintenance as well as employment” of the Chinese laborers. However,

“as these superior class privates did not understand Chinese, 20 odd Formosans who had been selected from among the members of the said (Formosan special Labor) Volunteer’s Corp who were comparatively proficient in language and clerical work were temporarily assigned to the said Company

⁸⁰ statement by Tanioka Kunihiro, a Formosan, 15th April, 1946; and statement by Toyoda Toshio, a Formosan civilian, 15th April, 1946, both in **A471.80915**

⁸¹ court testimony by Okabayashi Eikyu, 13th April, 1946, in **A471.80915**

⁸² Okabayashi, 1 Feb (February), 1946, in **A471.80915**

as their assistants and....employed for superintending and leading the said Chinese laborers in operations, and, at the same time, some of the capable Formosans were employed for clerical work”.⁸³

Analysis above shows that, proficiency in “Chinese” language enabled these Taiwanese laborers in Rabaul to perform interpretation between the Japanese superiors and Chinese POWs and led the Taiwanese to take up an additional role as informal interpreter. But, the issue of **language** in the process of interpretation deserves to be further examined. Scholar has pointed out that there is *no* single spoken Chinese language; instead, Chinese language consists of a group of dialects or “regionalects”, and many are mutually incomprehensible.⁸⁴ So, in the Rabaul case, exactly what was *the* “Chinese” language spoken between these Taiwanese interpreters and the Chinese POWs? While the Australian trial records simply stated that some of the Taiwanese were assigned as “Chinese interpreters” in dealing with the Chinese laborers, the “Chinese” language they used—and consequently the interpretation process—was far more complicated. It would be a mistake to assume that “Chinese” is a homogeneous language. While the written Chinese is more or less one unified system, the spoken Chinese, however, consists of hundreds of dialects. On the Formosan side, while most of them should be able to write (some) Chinese characters, the “Chinese” language they typically spoke were the Chinese dialects of Minnan/Hokkien or Hakka. Then, what was the language spoken on the Chinese laborers’ side? The answer can be found in a recent investigation report published by Taiwan’s Ministry of Defense.⁸⁵

⁸³ Application for Clemency, 27 February, 1954, Document 3, Summary of the Case in which Chinese laborers were killed at Rabaul, page 5, in Nippon Gaimu-sho Toan, 《Kowa Joyaku Hakko-go: Syamen Kankoku Kankei, Osutoraria-no Bu》日本外務省 檔案: 講和條約發效後: 赦免勸告關係, オーストラリアの部 [Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs Archive (JMFA): After the Peace Treaty became effective, on the issue of pardon and appeal: Australia], D-1-3-0-3-9-2 (Ministry of Justice: Confidential Special No.1066, 29, May 1954), pp.377-379

⁸⁴ John DeFrancis in, *The Chinese Language: Fact and Fantasy* (University of Hawaii Press, 1984)

⁸⁵ Guofang bu [Ministry of Defense], ed., *Nanyang Yinglie: erzhan qijian Babuyaniujineiya jingnei guojun jiangshi jilu* [heroes and martyrs of the Southern Sea: records of generals and soldiers of the Nationalist Army in the territories of Papua New Guinea during the Second World War] (Taipei: Guofang bu shizheng bianyi ju, 2009). After the initial stage of investigation, the Ministry of Defense sent another mission to Papua New Guinea in February 2009. The mission identified and restored several gravesites of

In 2008, Ministry of Defense set up a special taskforce to investigate the history of Chinese Nationalist soldiers in Rabaul,⁸⁶ and eventually identified that those Chinese laborers sent to Rabaul consisted of three groups:⁸⁷ 1) surviving soldiers from the forces defending Si Hang Depot in Shanghai in 1937, captured by the Japanese in December 1941; 2) surviving soldiers from the forces defending Quzhou Airport in Zhejiang province, captured in June 1942; 3) surviving members of the Loyal Righteous National Defense Army [Zhongyi jiuguo jun], a guerrilla force directed by Dai Li and active in Jiangsu and Zhejiang provinces. It was further reported that a total of more than 1,500 Chinese POWs were sent to Rabaul as laborers, among them more than 1,000 were from the Nanjing POW camp, more than 500 were from the Shanghai POW camp.⁸⁸ Based on the places of origin of these Chinese POWs, the language they spoke should be the dialects of Shanghai/Jiangsu, and/or Zhejiang. It should be further noted that even within Jiangsu province, there are several different distinct dialects. For example, people in Shanghai speak a language that is categorically different from the language spoken in the neighboring northern Jiangsu (*subei*) area. In addition, for those Chinese POWs who had taken formal school training, they might be able to communicate in Mandarin, the “national language” promoted by the Chinese Nationalist government since the 1910s.

Based on the information presented above, it would be fair to argue that the languages spoken by the Chinese laborers/POWs, be it the dialect of Shanghai/Jiangsu, Zhejiang, or Mandarin, were incomprehensible to the Formosans speakers of Minnan/Hokkien or Hakka dialects. Under these circumstances, unless the Formosans assigned as “Chinese interpreters” had taken special language training or obtained rare opportunities to learn to speak the dialects of Shanghai/Jiangsu, and/or Zhejiang, and/or Mandarin, they actually spoke “Chinese” languages that were incomprehensible to the Chinese laborers in Rabaul. No evidence has shown that the Formosans assigned as “Chinese interpreters” were given any special language

Chinese soldiers, and conducted memorial service at the site. The mission returned to Taiwan in March, carrying with it the tablet of “spirit of the ROC soldiers who died in Papua New Guinea”. The Ministry of Defense subsequently conducted a formal state ceremony to receive the tablet and to enshrine the spirit at Martyr Shrine, see pp.137-149

⁸⁶ Guofang bu, p.9.

⁸⁷ Guofang bu, pp.12-13, 29-42

⁸⁸ Guofang bu, pp.42-43

training, before or after their deployment in the battlefields. It should be pointed out that the Taiwanese and Chinese POWs in Rabaul might be able to communicate through what scholar has called the “brushtalk”,⁸⁹ because the written Chinese was rather unified. However, the situation in which the said interpretation took place—i.e. condition in the battlefields and the work site—made it unlikely, if not impossible, to allow “brushtalk” as a means of interpretation.

So, under the circumstances, how did the Formosans assigned as “Chinese interpreters” fulfill their interpretation duty? And exactly what “Chinese” language did they speak to the Chinese laborers? Unfortunately, there was no documentation to verify and answer these questions in the trial records. The only clue available nowadays is in the recollection by surviving Chinese laborers. As one surviving Chinese officer stated:

“We were not under the direct supervision of Japanese officers; instead, Taiwanese-native military employees (*junfu*) served as guards. When (we) want to communicate with the Japanese, we had to first ask the Fujian-native members of our team, who could speak Minnan (southern Fujian dialect), to explain to the (Taiwanese-native) guards; and then they (guards) would relay (the message) to the Japanese; and vice versa for the returning communication (from the Japanese). It showed how difficult it was to communicate with the Japanese”.⁹⁰

From the evidences presented above, it would be fair to argue that while language proficiency was a critical factor in the Formosan’s assignment as “Chinese interpreters” in dealing with the Chinese laborers in Rabaul, the language that really matters in the interpretation duty of these Formosans was their native Minnan dialect. And it was exactly because the Formosans were proficient in this particular language that they were assigned as guards supervising Chinese laborers in Rabaul, and subsequently informal interpreters. As pointed out in court testimonies, the Formosans were originally deployed as laborers. They were initially recruited

⁸⁹ for further discussion of “brushtalk”, a practice in which Chinese intellectuals communicated with their Japanese counterparts through writing Chinese characters, see Douglas Howland, *Borders of Chinese Civilization: Geography and History at Empire's End* (Durham, N.C: Duke University Press, 1996)

⁹⁰ Interview record of Mr. Li Weixun, see Guofang bu, p.189

into the Japanese military service *not* as “interpreters”. It was under the contingency in the battlefield—the arrival of Chinese POWs in Rabual—that these Taiwanese war criminals were (re-)assigned to serve as interpreters because of their language proficiency. And more importantly, it is only because they were (re-)assigned to serve as interpreters, these Formosans were subsequently/consequently involved in activities that were considered “war crimes” after the War.

It should be noted that language proficiency was also considered and utilized as a critical factor in TWC’s defense in the Australian military court. In the same trial, 3 of the accused TWCs, Kiohara, Furuya, and Yanagawa all testified that they either have “forgotten Chinese (language)”⁹¹ or “do not understand the Chinese language”.⁹² These testimonies clearly were a strategy adopted by the defense to deny any contact with Chinese POWs. Similarly, another TWC, Shimura, in his testimony went as far as to deny any involvement with Chinese laborer at the time of the killing in March 1943.⁹³

The work situation of Hayashi, the leading interpreter dealing with Chinese POWs and one of the two TWCs executed as the result of the trial of Chinese POW killing, may further illustrate how language proficiency and interpretation duty brought/forced Formosans serving in the Japanese military into a difficult position in the battlefields during the war, as well as in the court rooms of war crime trial after the war. Hagihara Suehiro, who presented himself as Hayashi’s superior in Rabaul since November 1942, recalled in a signed document presented during the trial in April 1946 an earlier discussion he had with Hayashi concerning the latter’s work situation:

“During wartime it seemed that the Chinese disliked Hayashi and after Armistice it was not infrequent that he was on the verge of being assaulted. Therefore it was towards the end of September 1945 that I asked him if there was any reason for this and his reply was as follows: ‘During the time I was working at (*sic*) the Chinese labour party (,) I was very fluent in Chinese and in view of orders from superiors, I conveyed these orders to the Chinese and warned them from time to time. Then the stealing of military

⁹¹ court testimony by Kiohara Takeo, 13th April, 1946; and court testimony by Furuya Eisuke, 13th April, 1946, both in **A471.80915**

⁹² court testimony by Yanagawa Uetane, 15th April, 1946, in **A471.80915**

⁹³ court testimony by Shimura Yuzo, 13th and 15th April, 1946, in **A471.80915**

provisions by the Chinese at the scene of labour was frequent and on one occasion I said ‘During your work you men are stealing tinned goods and eating them (.) This is just like a stray dog. If you carry on such acts, you will be punished’. And on another occasion the Chinese at their quarters were saying bad things about me, and then I said ‘you were now saying bad things about me. If I reported this to the superior you will be punished (.) but if you will apologize to me now, I will overlook the matter’. Then they apologized. I think it is due to such incidents that I am disliked. I keenly felt that people who are in charge of persons are in a hatred (*sic*, hated) position”⁹⁴.

Clearly, it was Hayashi’s language proficiency in Chinese (and Japanese) that led to his assignment as an interpreter in the battlefield in dealing with Chinese POWs. And subsequently, this work situation as an interpreter of brought/forced a Formosan such as Hayashi into a delicate (and difficult) situation between his Japanese superiors and the Chinese POWs and worse, in his own words, “a hated position” facing the target audience of his interpretation, such as the Chinese labourers in Rabaul, who were then abused and hurt in the war.

Hayashi’s situation as an informal interpreter is not an isolated incident. **Takebayashi Tsuruichi**, another TWC convicted in the same trial of Chinese killing but was later commuted to life imprisonment, was also put into a similar situation facing Chinese POWs. Takebayashi’s superior, Sato Yasushi, made the following statement in a signed document presented during the trial in April 1946, concerning Takebayashi’s (personality and) work situation:

“Takebayashi had been gentle and had never quarreled with other Formosans or others but was so conceited that he interrupted sometimes my (*sic*) and other Japanese talking, therefore I think he was very conceited to Chinese, and he had been a Chinese interpreter for about one year as a result he was much disliked by the Chinese. Around the middle of October last year after the Armistice, the accused

⁹⁴ statement by Hagihara Suehiro, a civilian, 15th April, 1946, in **A471.80915**

was beaten severely by many Chinese while walking...and wounded severely and took to bed for about 10 days so I went and saw him. He had wounds in his face and eyes”.⁹⁵

Evidences analyzed above show that being an interpreter, though an informal one, put these Formosans into an unexpected, unusual, and unwilling position which led to their involvement in the alleged war crime and, in some cases, death sentence and execution.

In addition to the aforementioned case, Australian court in Rabual conducted another trial of “Chinese POW killing”, in which **Yoneda Susume**, a Taiwanese, was charged with the “Murder of of 4 Chinese PW at TALILI about 29 April 43” and brought to court in April 1946. Yoneda was convicted, and sentenced to death by hanging on 23rd April (and executed with Warrant of Execution on 11th June 1946.⁹⁶ According to Japanese records, the job designation of Yoneda was “auxiliary military personnel (*gunzoku*) of Rabaul Depot”.⁹⁷ However, in Australian court records, Yoneda was listed as “a civilian Formosan interpreter” when he allegedly committed the crime as charged.⁹⁸ These records together indicate that Yoneda was another case of **Group 2**, i.e. TWCs who were originally recruited and designated NOT as interpreters, but were assigned to perform interpretation duty in war zones

Yoneda’s role at the alleged crime scene was further clarified by one of the prosecutor witnesses, LO MEI LING, a “Lt. (lieutenant) in the Chinese National Army”. Lo, himself a prisoner of war in Talili, testified that he spoke to the supervising Japanese officer Tajima “through interpreter Yoneda”.⁹⁹ Another witness,

⁹⁵ statement by Sato Yasushi, a civilian, 15th April, 1946, in **A471.80915**

⁹⁶ Proceedings of Military Tribunal, Tasaka, Mitsuo and Others, Department of the Army, A471.80978

⁹⁷ Nippon Kosei-sho Hikiage engo-kyoku, 《Kankoku Taiwan Shusshin Senso Saiban Jukeisha Meibo》 ;日本厚生省引揚援護局・《韓國臺灣出身戰爭裁判受刑者名簿》[Bureau of Repatriation and Relief, Japanese Ministry of Health and Welfare, *Name List of Korean- and Taiwanese-native War Criminals*](昭和 30 年 12 月 1 日)1955, p.36. His Chinese name was given as 潘進添 Pan Jintian, and Japanese name as 米田進 Yoneda Susume.

⁹⁸ Précis of Evidence, A471.80978

⁹⁹ court testimony by Lo Mei Ling, A471.80978

YANG BING, a “2nd Lt. in the Chinese National Army”, also stated that “Yoneda was interpreting for Tajima”.¹⁰⁰ Yoneda in his own testimony in court also stated that he was assigned to interpret conversation between Tajima and Lo.¹⁰¹ Based on these records, Yoneda’s role in the alleged crime could be confirmed as an interpreter between the Japanese military and the Chinese prisoners of war.

In this case, the victims were identified as four “sick PW” (prisoners of war), who were former members of the Chinese Army.¹⁰² Looking at this case, questions arise, again: why did a Formosan (interpreter) end up (allegedly) killing these sick Chinese prisoners of war?

In their testimony, both Lo and Yang elaborated on the situation in which Yoneda, a non-combatant Formosan, got involved in the killing. Both of the aforementioned Chinese witnesses confirmed, Yoneda brought the weapon (a rifle) to the crime scene under the instruction of Tajima.¹⁰³ Clearly, from the perspective of Chinese POWs, i.e. victims of the alleged crime, Yoneda was merely serving as an assistant to Tajima.

Yoneda’s own testimony in court further elaborated on his involvement in the killing. While the testimony may seem lengthy and rather fragmented, it is worth quoting in details to understand the sequence of events leading to the accused war crime:¹⁰⁴

Question (by the Prosecutor). When did you first know that the Chinese were going to be killed?

Answer by Yoneda. I first found out when I went to the place of execution, together with Tajima.

*Q. Did you go to the sick men’s quarters before the sick men were taken to the mountain?*¹⁰⁵

A. Yes I did go.

¹⁰⁰ court testimony by Yang Bing, A471.80978

¹⁰¹ court testimony by Yoneda Susume, A471.80978

¹⁰² Record of Military Court, A471.80978

¹⁰³ court testimony by Lo Mei Ling, and court testimony by Yang Bing, A471.80978

¹⁰⁴ court testimony by Yoneda Susume, A471.80978

¹⁰⁵ The “mountain” refers to where the shooting/execution took place.

Q. Was Tajima with you in the sick men's quarters?

A. Yes.

.....

Q. Did you go with the sick men from their quarters to the mountain?

A. Yes I followed behind them.

Q. Was Sgt Awano with you then?

A. Yes Sgt Awano was there, but he was ahead of us leading us.

Q. Did he join you at the sick quarters?

A. I met him at the entrance to the labour camp.

Q. Was that after you had started with the sick men from their quarters?

A. Yes.

Q. When did you first know that the Chinese were going to be taken to the mountain?

A. When Sgt Awano told us to follow behind.

Q. Before you left with the sick men did you at any time during that morning interpret any conversations between Tajima and Lt. Lo?

A. Yes I did interpret it.

Q. Where did the conversation take place?

A. At Lt. Lo's quarters.

.....

Q. Did you think it odd that you a civilian was ordered to shoot Chinese when there were Japanese close handy?

A. D (*sic*, I) did not have an opportunity to think it odd at (*sic*, as) I was not giving (*sic*, given) a chance because it was at the pit right before the shooting.

Q. Why did you pretest when given the order by Sgt. Awano?

A. I thought it was not my duty to kill the Chinese as I was only a Formosan Labourer.

Q. What happened when you refused to carry out the order?

A. When I objected to that Awano came very close to me and told me that I was to do exactly the same as Tajima did or otherwise he would kill me.

Q. When Awano said that to you did you think he would actually carry out the threat?

A. Yes I thought he would carry out the threat.

In addition, the court took record of Yoneda's statement in another court document:

I was a Chinese interpreter attached to the Talili Branch of the 26 Field Supply Depot. I think the incident occurred about the 20th of April 1943. That day I interpreted and took Chinese to the place where they were to be shot. Being ordered by Sgt. AWANO, I shot two Chinese and First c _____¹⁰⁶ private TAJIMA shot the other two.

The above testimony by Yoneda better delineates the sequence of events that led to his involvement—as well as that of other convicted TWCs who had served as *ad hoc* interpreters such as Hayashi—in the killing of Chinese POWs:

1. Assignment of *ad hoc* interpreter:

- Due to the language barrier, communication was difficult if not entirely impossible between the Japanese military authorities and the Chinese POWs. Under the circumstances, *ad hoc* interpreters were needed.
- In Rabaul, the only persons capable of this task were the Taiwanese, who were capable of speaking both Japanese and Chinese (dialects). Therefore, in addition to the original job such as laborers of the Formosan Special Labor Volunteer's Corp, Taiwanese who were able to speak/communicate in multiple languages were given additional assignment as *ad hoc* "Chinese interpreters".

2. Interpretation duty and more:

- Whenever any Japanese—whether it was an officer or soldier—needed to talk to or convey message to Chinese POWs, a Taiwanese would be required to be present as interpreter to conduct communication between the Japanese and the Chinese.

¹⁰⁶ The word is illegible in the document, but should be "class".

- Because of their language ability/interpretation duty, in any matters that dealt with Chinese POWs, Taiwanese would always be needed and present. For the sake of convenience, the duty of supervising Chinese POWs was also given to the Taiwanese.
3. Participation in the Chinese killing:
- At the occasion of killing Chinese POWs, the Taiwanese were needed and present because of their language ability/interpretation duty.
 - On the day of the killing, these Taiwanese were initially present at the occasion simply to perform the duty as interpreters.
 - The Taiwanese were first at the living quarters of Chinese POWs, serving as interpreters to convey message from the Japanese officers to Chinese POWs.
 - Then, when the Japanese officers asked those sick Chinese POWs to step out and walk to the pit where the Chinese POWs were eventually killed, the Taiwanese were present all the time, again, serving as interpreters to convey message from the Japanese officers to Chinese POWs.
 - The Taiwanese were at the bottom of the Japanese military rank, they were likely to be given order by other Japanese soldiers and not given any autonomy in terms of job assignment. In the case of Yoneda, he was originally/initially asked to be present to perform interpretation duty, but was given additional duty, by Tajima, who was a First Class Private, to carry weapons and follow Chinese POWs to the pit.
 - Japanese officers gave order to soldiers to kill the sick Chinese POWs at the pit.
 - While the Taiwanese were present at the pit, where the killing would take place, they were ordered by Japanese soldiers to take weapons and shoot the Chinese.
 - The Taiwanese could only follow order, as they did not have any power to refuse or act against Japanese officers or soldiers.
 - (As a result) The Taiwanese who served as *ad hoc* interpreter participated in the killing of Chinese POWs.

As illustrated above in cases of Yoneda and Hayashi, among others, civilian Formosans who served as interpreters between the Japanese military and the Chinese prisoners of war were brought (or rather *forced*)

into a situation in which he committed the alleged war crime. In other words, based on analysis of trials records from the Australian courts, informal interpretation duty was partially responsible for the conviction and death sentence of several TWCs, such as **Hayashi, Okabayashi, Takebayashi, and Yoneda** in the two Chinese POW killing trials.

Conclusion

While the status as formal interpreters or the assignment of informal interpretation duty alone did not lead to the trials of these Taiwanese wartime interpreters as war criminals and none of the TWCs was convicted solely because of interpretation, the assignment as interpreters did played a significant role in bringing/forcing a good number of TWCs into the situation in which they committed/were alleged to commit war crimes. And in the cases of Yasuda Muneharu, Hayashi Hajime, and Yoneda Susume, interpretation assignment partially but *directly* led them to a wartime (and postwar situation in court) in which they paid the ultimate price of life.

In discussing the relationship between interpretation and power (and its *consequence*), Delisle and Woodsworth point out that “In the German army, interpreters held the rank of officers. This was not necessarily an advantage if the interpreter became a prisoner of war”.¹⁰⁷ The cases of Taiwanese wartime interpreters as analyzed above show that during the war, language proficiency and interpretation duty brought a good number of Formosans to a peculiar work situation in the battlefields, in which they were seemingly given higher “power” vis-à-vis the Chinese POWs under their supervision or the local civilian residents under the terror of Military Police. And in contrast to wartime interpreters in other countries, the Taiwanese—as Japan’s colonial subjects—were made wartime interpreters under a rather particular colonial and wartime context, in which Taiwanese wartime interpreters’ unique language proficiency of their native Chinese dialects and the Japanese—the language of colonialism and their acquired “national language”—re-defined the relationship (of power) between the colonizer and the colonized. The history of Taiwanese wartime interpreters certainly adds a new dimension to the discussion of politics of language (*kokugo* or “national language”) and Japanese colonialism.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁷ Jean Delisle and Judith Woodsworth, eds., *Translators through History* (Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1995), p.274

¹⁰⁸ See further discussion in Lee Yeounsuk (Maki Hirano Hubbard, trans.), *The Ideology of Kokugo: Nationalizing Language in*

Language proficiency, unfortunately, became a burden on these Taiwanese wartime interpreters as they were sent to the courtrooms of war crime trial after the war and eventually either the scaffold or prison cells. To re-phrase Delisle and Woodsworth's point, in fulfilling their interpretation duty, willingly or unwillingly, Taiwanese wartime interpreters took on the *responsibilities* of Japanese officers and suffered the *consequences*. In battlefields, wartime interpreters served as the messengers between two warring parties; but as the above cases of Taiwanese wartime interpreters illustrate, it was the messengers who got punished (and sometimes killed) in the postwar war crime trials.

参考文献

Primary sources:

- Nippon Kosei-sho Hikiage engo-kyoku, 《Kankoku Taiwan Shusshin Senso Saiban Jukeisha Meibo》 日本厚生省引揚援護局，《韓國臺灣出身戦争裁判受刑者名簿》 [Bureau of Repatriation and Relief, Japanese Ministry of Health and Welfare, *Name List of Korean and Taiwanese War Criminals*] (昭和 30 年 12 月 1 日) 1955
- Kosei-sho Engo-kyoku, 《Taiwan Shusshin Senso Hanzai Saiban Shibotsusha Ichiran》 厚生省援護局，《臺灣出身戦争犯罪裁判死囚者一覽》 [Bureau of Relief, Ministry of Health and Welfare, *List of Executed and Dead Taiwanese War Criminals*] (昭和 43 年 8 月 26 日) 1968
- Proceedings of Military Tribunal, Sgt. Matsushima, Tozaburo and others, Department of the Army, A471.80915 [War Crimes - Military Tribunal - MATSUSHIMA Tozaburo (Sergeant) AWC 2910 : AYIZAWA Harimoto (Private) AWC 2651 : HAYASI Hajimo AWC 2683 : KIOHARA Takeo AWC 2913 : OKABAYASHI Eikyu AWC 2685 : YANAGAWA Vetane AWC 2914 : SHIMURA Yuzo AWC 2911 : FURUYA Eisuke AWC 2912 : TAKABAYASHI Tsuruichi AWC 2684 : Date and Place of Tribunal - Rabaul, 10-16 April 1946], Australian National Archive
- Proceedings of Military Tribunal, Tasaka, Mitsuo and Others, Department of the Army, A471.80978 [War Crimes - Military Tribunal - TAsAKA Mitsuo (Lieutenant) AWC 2915, 26th Supply Depot :

Modern Japan (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2010), or the Japanese original イ・ヨンスク, 《「国語」という思想: 近代日本の言語認識》 (東京: 岩波書店, 1996)

TAJIMA Morigi (Lance Corporal) AWC 2916, 228th Infantry Regiment : YONEDA Susume AWC 2686 : Date and Place of Tribunal - RABAUL, 23 April 1946], Australian National Archive

- Nippon Gaimu-sho Toan, 《Kowa Joyaku Hakko-go: Syamen Kankoku Kankei, Osutoraria-no Bu》日本外務省檔案：講和條約發效後：赦免勸告關係，オーストラリアの部 [Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs Archive (JMFA): After the Peace Treaty became effective, on the issue of pardon and appeal: Australia], D-1-3-0-3-9-2

Chinese:

- 國防部編. 2009. 南洋英烈：二戰期間巴布亞紐幾內亞境內國軍將士紀錄. 台北：國防部史政編譯局. Guofang bu [Ministry of Defense], ed., *Nanyang Yinglie: erzhan qijian Babuyaniujineiya jingnei guojun jiangshi jilu* [heroes and martyrs of the Southern Sea: records of generals and soldiers of the Nationalist Army in the territories of Papua New Guinea during the Second World War] (Taipei: Guofang bu shizheng bianyi ju, 2009)
- 近藤正己著，許佩賢譯，〈對異民族的軍事動員與皇民化政策——以臺灣軍夫為中心〉，《臺灣文獻》46：2，（1995，6）
- 李展平，前進婆羅洲：台籍戰犯監視員（南投：國史館台灣文獻館，2005）
- 李展平，戰火紋身的監視員：台籍戰俘悲歌（南投：國史館台灣文獻館，2007）
- 木村宏一郎（陳鵬仁譯），被遺忘的戰爭責任（台北：致良出版社，2010）。
- 許雪姬，〈日治時期台灣的通譯〉，《輔仁歷史學報》，第18輯，2006，頁1-35
- Zhong Shumin, “Fulu shourongsuo: jindai taiwanshi de yiduan beige [Prisoners of war internment camps: a sad story in modern Taiwan history]”, in Cao Yonghe xiansheng bashi shouqing lunwenji bianji weiyuanhui, ed., *Cao Yonghe xiansheng bashi shouqing lunwenji* [papers compiled in honor of the eightieth birthday of Mr Cao Yonghe] (Taipei: Lexue shuju, 2001) 鍾淑敏，〈俘虜收容所——近代臺灣史的一段悲歌〉，收於《曹永和先生八十壽慶論文集》，頁261-288。臺北：樂學書局，2001
- Zhong Shumin, “Zhanzheng zuifan yu zhanhou chuli: yi fulu shourongsuo jianshiyuan wei zhongxin [war crime and postwar settlement: focusing on the guards at prisoners of war interment camps]” 鍾淑敏，“戰爭罪犯與戰後處理：以俘虜收容所監視員為中心”，paper presented at the International

Conference on Social and Economic Transformation in Postwar Taiwan, Institute of Taiwan History, Academia Sinica, Taipei, December 23-24, 2009.

English:

- Ahn, Hyung-ju, *Between Two Adversaries: Korean Interpreters at Japanese Alien Enemy Detention Centers during World War II* (Fullerton, California: Oral History Program, California State University, 2002)
- Davidson, Eugene, *The Trial of the Germans: an account of the twenty-two defendants before the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1997)
- Daws, Gavan, *Prisoners of the Japanese: POWs of World War II in the Pacific* (New York: William Morrow, 1994)
- Delisle, Jean and Judith Woodsworth, eds., *Translators through History* (Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1995)
- Ehrenfreund, Norbert, *The Nuremberg Legacy: How the Nazi War Crimes Trials Changed the Course of History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)
- Fischel, Elaine B., *Defending the Enemy: Justice for the WWII Japanese war criminals* (Minneapolis: Bascom Hills Books, 2009)
- Footitt, Hilary and Michael Kelly, eds., *Languages and the Military: Alliances, Occupation and Peace Building* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)
- Guilloux, Louis (Alice Kaplan, trans.) *Ok, Joe* (University of Chicago Press, 2003).
- Harris, Whitney R., *Tyranny on Trial: The Trial of the Major War Criminals at the End of World War II at Nuremberg, Germany, 1945-1946* (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1999)
- Kaplan, Alice, *The Interpreter* (University of Chicago Press, 2005);
- Kim, Yong Hyun, and Susanne Kim Nelson ed. *Into the Vortex of War: A Korean Interpreter's Close Encounter with the Enemy*. (Author House, 2008)
- Lyon, Alan B., *Japanese War Crimes: The Trials of the Naoetsu Camp Guards* (Loftus, Australia: Australian Military History Publications, 2000)

- Maga, Tim, *Judgment at Tokyo: The Japanese war crimes trials* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2001)
- Marrus, Michael R., *The Nuremberg War Crimes Trial, 1945-46: A Documentary History* (Boston: Bedford Books, 1997)
- Mettraux, Guénaél, ed., *Perspectives on the Nuremberg Trial*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
- Piccigallo, Philip, *The Japanese on Trial* (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1979)
- Salama-Carr, Myriam, ed., *Translating and Interpreting Conflicts* (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2007)
- Sprecher, Drexel A., *Inside the Nuremberg Trial: A Prosecutor's Comprehensive Account* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1999)
- Takeda, Kayoko, *Interpreting the Tokyo War Crimes Trial: A sociopolitical analysis* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2010).
- Totani, Yuma, *The Tokyo War Crimes Trial: the pursuit of justice in the wake of World War II* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Asia Center, 2008)
- Towle, Philip, Margaret Kosuge, and Yoichi Kibata, eds., *Japanese Prisoners of War* (London: Hambledon and London, 2000)
- Tusa, Ann and John Tusa, *The Nuremberg Trial* (New York: Atheneum, 1984)

Japanese:

- 茶園義男編, BC 級戦犯軍事法廷資料—廣東編/東京都 : 不二出版社, 1984
- 茶園義男編.解説, BC 級戦犯英軍裁判資料(上)/東京都 : 不二出版社, 1988
- 茶園義男編.解説, BC 級戦犯英軍裁判資料(下)/東京都 : 不二出版社, 1989
- 茶園義男編, BC 級戦犯和蘭裁判資料-全巻通覽/東京都 : 不二出版社, 1992
- 洪鐘黙 (金蓬洙訳) 『泰緬鉄道—朝鮮人捕虜監視員の手記』 ぽんそんふぁ編集部、1991 年
- 岩川隆 『孤島の土となるとも—BC 級戦犯裁判』 講談社、1995 年
- 木村宏一郎, 忘れられた戦争責任 : カーニコバル島事件と台湾人軍属 (東京: 青木書店, 2001)
- 巢鴨法務委員会編, 戦犯裁判の実相. 上巻. 東京都 : 不二出版社, 1981
- 法務大臣官房司法法制調査部編刊, 『戦争犯罪裁判概史要』, 1973

- 東京裁判ハンドブック編集委員会編, 東京裁判ハンドブック(東京: 青木書店, 1989)
- 山本七平『洪思翊中将の処刑』文芸春秋、1986年
- 内海愛子、村井吉敬『赤道下の朝鮮人叛乱』勁草書房、1980
- 内海愛子, 朝鮮人BC級戦犯の記録 (東京:勁草書房, 1982)
- 内海愛子『朝鮮人「皇軍」兵士たちの戦争』岩波書店(岩波ブックレット)、1991年
- 内海愛子, 韓国・朝鮮人BC級戦犯を支える会,『死刑台から見えた二つの国—韓国・朝鮮人BC級戦犯の証言』梨の木舎、1992年
- 内海愛子,『キムはなぜ裁かれたのか: 朝鮮人BC級戦犯の軌跡』, 東京都: 朝日新聞, 2008

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現（簡要敘述成果是否有嚴重損及公共利益之發現）或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估

達成目標

說明：

本計畫針對臺籍戰犯在戰爭中所從事的任務和工作進行考察與分析，得到豐碩的成果，達成原來計畫目標（請參見下列研究成果）。

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形：

已發表論文 2 篇：

- 〈可悲傷性，「戰爭之框」與台籍戰犯〉，收入汪宏倫主編，《戰爭與社會：理論、歷史、主體經驗》（台北：聯經出版公司，2014年7月），頁393-433
- “(Re-)Writing History of the Second World War: Forgetting and Remembering the Taiwanese-native Japanese Soldiers in Postwar Taiwan”, *positions: Asia Critique*, Vol.21, No.4, Fall 2013 (February 2014), pp.801-852

即將出版／審查中論文 4 篇：

- “Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War”, book chapter in Kayoko Takeda and Jesús Baigorri, eds., *New Insights in the History of Interpreting* (Benjamins Translation Library) (Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company, forthcoming 2015) (*英文專書論文，有審查)
- 〈戰爭的終結：中華民國對日戰犯審判〉，國史館編，《中國抗日戰爭史新編》，第六部：戰後中國—戰犯審判篇；審查中
- 〈戰爭的終結與臺灣人—海外臺灣人的集中與遣返問題〉，國史館《中國抗日戰爭史新編》，第六部：戰後中國—戰爭與台灣篇；審查中
- 〈言語能力がもたらした罪名—第二次世界大戦で戦犯となった台湾人通訳〉(潮田耕一譯)，收入楊承淑編，《臺灣日治時期的譯者與譯事活動》(暫定)，台灣大學『日本學研究叢書』(臺北：國立臺灣大學出版中心)，審查中

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性），如已有嚴重損及公共利益之發現，請簡述可能損及之相關程度（以 500 字為限）

過去學者一般都認為，在看管盟軍戰俘期間對戰俘直接而「不當」的對待是導致如此眾多台籍監視員在戰後受到盟軍軍事法庭審判的主要原因。但本研究發現，在被判死刑並執行處決的臺灣戰犯當中，至少有8名是擔任「通譯」的工作。而本研究的結果也顯示，台灣籍戰犯在戰爭中實際擔任的工作，往往與他們的頭銜不相符合；例如貨物廠軍屬雇員在戰爭當中臨時受命擔任通譯者。這個問題突顯了「台籍戰犯」作為「被殖民者」在戰爭當中和戰後的特殊身分。而有關「台籍戰犯」在戰爭中所從事的任務和工作的研究，對「殖民戰爭責任」的討論更有特殊的啟發作用。相關的研究成果已經在國內外學術研討會上進行多次發表，引起跨領域學者的討論。

本研究同時也促進了國際學術界對臺籍戰犯的跨國研究，包括在2013年12月舉辦「國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯」國際學術研討會（由日本學術振興會科學研究費與臺灣國立中正大學共同提供經費），共有來自臺灣、英國、日本、和澳洲的六位學者發表論文；會後已經著手進行專書的編纂工作。

而在進一步發展之可能性方面，研究過程當中所搜集到的豐富資料使得計劃主持人得以發展出新的相關研究議題，包括：

- 擔任「通譯」的臺籍戰犯/臺灣在戰爭時期的「通譯」
- 「海外被拘留的臺灣人:集中與遣返」
- 「在戰後帝國崩解的跨國脈絡下的臺灣人」

科技部補助計畫衍生研發成果推廣資料表

日期：__年__月__日

科技部補助計畫	計畫名稱：在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考 計畫主持人：藍適齊 計畫編號：MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
研發成果名稱	(中文) 無		
	(英文)		
成果歸屬機構		發明人 (創作人)	
技術說明	(中文) (200-500 字)		
	(英文)		
產業別			
技術/產品應用範圍			
技術移轉可行性及預期效益			

註：本項研發成果若尚未申請專利，請勿揭露可申請專利之主要內容。

科技部補助專題研究計畫執行國際合作與移地研究心得報告

日期：104年02月22日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	時任：國立中正大學歷史系助理教授 現任：國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
出國時間	103年6月23日 至 103年6月27日	出國地點	新加坡
出國研究目的	移地研究，蒐集史料		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

前往新加坡國家圖書館 (National Library, Singapore) 查找相關史料，包括 1945 年二戰結束前後的當地與東南亞各地的主要報紙。

二、研究成果

此次移地研究，一方面就戰後英國在殖民地所進行的戰犯審判過程、以及殖民地當地民眾對審判的反應，取得豐富的材料。此部分的史料，對本人在 2014 年所發表的會議論文以及正在撰寫的論文都提供了重要的補充。其中一篇 *Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War*，經改寫投稿，目前已經通過審查與修改補充，即將收錄在由國際翻譯學界的兩位著名學者 Kayoko Takeda (Rikkyo University, Japan) 與 Jesús Baigorri (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain) 合編的專書，*New Insights in the History of Interpreting* (Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company, forthcoming 2015)。該書預計在 2015 年出版，作為國際翻譯學界最重要的系列叢書 Benjamins Translation Library 的最新出版成果。透過此平台，本計劃的研究成果將有機會向國際翻譯學界引介台灣史的相關議題，更有助於吸引國際學界對台灣史更多跨學科的興趣。

另一方面，此次移地研究進一步發掘開拓了與「殖民戰爭責任」相關的新研究方向。其中最具有收獲的是，與海外的臺灣人集中與遣返相關的史料。在結合台灣國內以及其他國家的檔案資料之後，已經開始撰寫多篇論文，包括「戰爭的終結與臺灣人—海外臺灣人的集中與遣返問題」、

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	時任：國立中正大學歷史系助理教授 現任：國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
出國時間	103 年 7 月 23 日 至 103 年 8 月 2 日	出國地點	日本九州
出國研究目的	移地研究，蒐集史料		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

● 在九州與共同研究者會面：

本人自 2011 年起，與日本尚綱大學的和田英穗教授（及英國劍橋大學 University of Cambridge 的 Barak Kushner 教授）共同提出「台籍戰犯」的研究計畫，得到日本學術振興會為期三年(2011-2014)的研究經費支助；計畫名稱：對日本的 BC 級戰犯審判與台灣戰犯的研究：以中英法澳洲的戰犯審判為研究中心（計畫編號：Kakenhi 23720356, Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists B）。

本年度為計畫總結年。此次本人與共同研究者會面，就過去三年期間的研究成果進行彙整、回顧、檢討。該計畫在過去三年間，2012 年在日本舉辦一次國際學術工作坊，2013 年在台灣舉辦一次國際學術研討會，共有 10 餘位來自台灣、日本、英國、新加坡、澳洲的學者曾經參與並發表論文。在推動國際合作與促進學術交流等方面，都有豐碩的成果。在成果出版方面，參與研究計畫的個別學者已經分別以中文、日文、英文出版期刊與專書論文多篇。

● 在九州停留期間，本人同時也與共同研究者匯集過去三年間分別從中國、澳洲、日本等地檔案館所蒐集而來的大量資料，進行共同解讀與整理，以利未來持續進行研究。

二、研究成果

此次更進一步擬定出版專書計畫，將以 2013 年所舉辦國際學術研討會上發表的論文為基礎，編撰《帝國崩解之際：在戰後跨國脈絡下的臺灣人》。該書將以中文出版；會上發表的外文文章將在近期進行翻譯。預計在 2015 年出版。

目前所擬定的出版計畫書如下：

1945 年 8 月，隨著日本的戰敗，日本在台灣的殖民統治也同時結束。中華民國政府在該年的 10 月，正式派員接受台灣。自此，台灣成為中華民國政府轄下的領土迄今。而在這樣的狀態改變之下，台灣的「人」當然也受到了非常巨大的影響。而與領土不同的是，領土是物，人卻是活的、是有生命的。條約的內容或政權的更迭或者可以在一夜之間改變決定領土的歸屬，但是對人的改變卻很難在一瞬之間完成。人

有生活、人際關係、過去的經驗、現在的認同、還有對未來的規劃與期望。這一切都是經年累月的結果，當然也不是在短時間之內隨著「領土重劃」就可以完全改變的。

由此觀點出發，我們就能夠理解在 1945 年 8 月 15 日戰爭終結與殖民終結（去殖民）的交叉點上，無論對新的統治者（中華民國政府）、台灣人（作為被統治者）、以及包括原來／舊的統治者（日本）在內的諸多外國他者，（重新）界定「台灣人」都是一項必要但是卻複雜的過程。而更值得注意的是，這個過程同時在臺灣與海外進行，而其中首要的工作就是確認台灣人的國籍。

事實上，中華民國政府要到了 1946 年的 1 月 12 日才正式頒佈命令、宣佈所有的台灣人民為中國籍（中華民國籍）。在臺灣本地的台灣人，由於是在中華民國政府轄下，所以產生的國籍爭議主要是台灣人涉及司法裁判，應以「戰犯」或「漢奸」論處的問題。但是對當時身在海外的台灣人，所衍生的問題就更為複雜。在 1895-1945 年之間，隨著日本帝國經濟與政治力量的擴張，有許許多多的台灣人到海外受雇、創業、或是就學。在 1945 年第二次世界大戰結束的時候，仍然有數十萬的台灣人身在海外。如同另外數百萬當時在海外的日本國民，這些臺灣人也面對著遙遠的歸鄉道路。但是，與日本國民不同的是，在臺灣的「領土重劃」之後，這些當時仍然身在台灣以外的台灣人立刻就面臨了一個根本性的問題：1945 年 8 月 15 日之前，他們的身分是日本帝國殖民地台灣的人民（或是在中國被稱為「台灣籍民」）；那麼 1945 年 8 月 15 日開始呢？台灣人與原/前統治者（日本帝國）的關係終止之後，新的統治者（中華民國政府）並未立刻賦予他們新的身分，也尚未擬定對他們的相關政策。那麼 1945 年 8 月 15 日以後，對外國的他者來說，「台灣人」究竟是誰？更具體而且急迫的問題是：戰爭結束，要如何處置這些台灣人？

在外的中華民國使館，在 1946 年 1 月 30 日才接到上述有關台灣人國籍的通知。而後為了能夠進一步的透過外館等單位對在外台灣人進行登記、發給護照等作業，國民政府在 1946 年 6 月 22 日正式公布了「在外台僑國籍處理辦法」。¹⁰⁹ 但是這樣的作法與反應，在時間上，其實使得在海外的台灣人，從戰爭結束之後有將近半年的時間是無國籍或是被視為「第三國人」（即非戰勝國，亦非戰敗國）的身分，¹¹⁰ 更未能得到任何國家主權的保護，甚至在多處發生不分老幼的台灣人被盟國當局關入集中營的情況。¹¹¹

¹⁰⁹ 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，《人文及社會科學集刊》，第 17 卷第 2 期（2005），頁 398, 405

¹¹⁰ 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，頁 395

¹¹¹ 湯熙勇，〈臺灣人在東南亞(1945- 1953)：集中營、審判及遣返〉，發表於第三屆海外華人研究與文獻收藏國際研討會，新加坡：新加坡大學等，2005；張建偉，〈迢迢歸鄉路——戰後港澳地區台胞返籍始末〉，《港澳與近代中國學術研討會論文集》（台北：國史館，民國 89 年），頁 549-580

更重要的是在國際上，台灣人的國籍歸屬問題並不是由中華民國「單方面」就能夠完全決定的。美國、英國、荷蘭等盟國，基於對日和約尚未簽訂、台灣主權尚未正式轉移之考量，或對台灣人戰爭時期的「不當行為」進行審判制裁的需要等理由，在當時並未同意中華民國政府對台灣人國籍所做的主張。¹¹² 也因此，使得戰後仍然身在海外的台灣人處在國籍不定的狀態。學者曾經指出，這樣的狀態則導致了對海外台灣人三方面的影響：未受尊重、涉及司法(戰犯)裁判、以及個人財產未獲保護等。¹¹³

關於海外的台灣人在戰後所面臨的問題，近年來已有非常豐碩的研究成果，包括何義麟所著有關於在日本的台灣人¹¹⁴；許雪姬有關在中國大陸(及滿州)的台灣人¹¹⁵；湯熙勇有關在海外(特別是東南亞)的台灣人¹¹⁶；張建球有關在華南及港澳的台灣人¹¹⁷。另外，以台籍日本兵為主題的相關研究也已經有豐碩的成果¹¹⁸。另外，國史館的史料彙編更是提供了許多珍貴的材料。¹¹⁹

本書所要探討的就是，在戰後這樣特殊的狀態之下，台灣人由於身份的不確定所受到的影響。主要的關注點是台灣人涉及司法裁判的問題，特別是有關於「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」。由於在戰後的歷史書寫和集體的戰爭記憶中，台灣的二戰經驗有相當長的一段時間遭到邊緣化甚至忽略，也因此

¹¹² 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，頁 393，413-423

¹¹³ 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，頁 425-429

¹¹⁴ 〈戰後初期臺灣留日學生的左傾言論及其動向〉《臺灣史研究》，第 19 卷第 2 期，(THCI Core)。2012 年 06 月，151-192 頁；〈戰後在日台灣人之處境與認同：以蔡朝圻先生的經歷為中心〉《台灣風物》(第 60 卷 4 期，台灣風物雜誌社)。2010 年 12 月，161-194 頁

¹¹⁵ 《口述歷史 第五期(日據時期台灣人赴大陸經驗專號之一)》，臺北：中央研究院近代史研究所，1995；《口述歷史 第六期(日據時期台灣人赴大陸經驗專號之二)》，臺北：中央研究院近代史研究所，1995；《日治時期在「滿洲」的台灣人(再版)》，臺北：中央研究院近代史研究所，2004；〈1937 年至 1947 年在北京的台灣人〉，《長庚人文社會學報》，第 1 卷第 1 期，頁 33-84，2008；〈1937-1947 年在上海的台灣人〉，《臺灣學研究》，13 期，頁 1-32，2012。

¹¹⁶ 〈國籍回復とそれを巡る争い--在外台湾人の國籍問題(1943-1948)〉，《阪神華僑の國際ネットワークに関する研究》，(日本：日本神戸大學國際文化學部)，2004；〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，《人文及社會科學集刊》，第 17 卷第 2 期，頁 393-437，2005；〈脫離困境：戰後初期海南島之台灣人的返台〉，《臺灣史研究》第 12 卷第 2 期，頁 167-208，2005；〈公平對待與秩序維持之間：日本東京澀谷事件與臺灣人的審判(1946-47)〉，《亞太研究論壇(Asia-Pacific Forum)》，第 35 期，頁 1-35，2007；〈烽火後的同鄉情：戰後東亞臺灣同鄉會的成立、轉變與角色(1945-48)〉，《人文及社會科學集刊》，第 19 卷第 1 期，頁 1-49，2007。

¹¹⁷ 〈迢迢歸鄉路——戰後港澳地區台胞返籍始末〉，《港澳與近代中國學術研討會論文集》(台北：國史館，民國 89 年)，頁 549-580；〈田園將蕪胡不歸？—戰後廣州地區台胞處境及返籍問題之研究〉，《臺灣史研究》6 卷 1 期(民國 89 年 9 月)，1 頁 133-166

¹¹⁸ 周婉窈編。1997。台籍日本兵座談會紀錄并相關資料。台北：中央研究院台灣史研究所籌備處；蔡慧玉編著。1997。走過兩個時代的人：台籍日本兵。台北：中央研究院台灣史研究所籌備處；李展平，2005。《前進婆羅洲—台籍戰俘監視員》。南投：國史館台灣文獻館；李展平，2007。《戰火紋身的監視員—台籍戰俘悲歌》。南投：國史館台灣文獻館。

¹¹⁹ 例如，謝培屏編，《戰後遣送旅外華僑回國史料彙編(1)：德國·土耳其·義大利·日本篇》，台北：國史館，2007；《戰後遣送旅外華僑回國史料彙編(2)：澳洲·蘇聯·羅馬尼亞·捷克篇》，台北：國史館，2007；《戰後遣送旅外華僑回國史料彙編(3)：南洋海南島篇》，台北：國史館，2008。

「台籍戰犯」的問題一直都並未得到太多的關注。但事實上，由於戰後對「台籍戰犯」的審判是同時在澳大利亞、中國、荷蘭、英國和美國等盟國的軍事法庭當中分別所進行，「台籍戰犯」的審判最足以代表身在海外的台灣人，在國籍不定的狀態之下所面臨的問題。

根據統計，在二次大戰期間有超過了二十萬名的台灣人被徵召到亞洲各地的戰場，其中超過三萬人喪命於戰場，更有上百名台灣人在戰後遭各個盟國以 B/C 級戰犯審判。最終有 173 名台灣籍戰犯被判刑確定、其中 21 名被判處並執行死刑。因為台籍戰犯審判所牽涉的國家和地理位置的分布非常廣泛，台籍戰犯歷史的研究勢必是一項龐大的跨國性研究，也需要各國學者的共同參與。在 2010 年年底，由日本尚綱大學 (Shokei Gakuen University, Japan) 的和田英穗教授 (Dr Wada Hideho)，英國劍橋大學 (University of Cambridge, United Kingdom) 的 Barak Kushner 教授，以及現任教於台灣國立政治大學歷史系的藍適齊共同發起了一項台籍戰犯的跨國性研究計畫。這項計畫在 2011 年度得到了日本學術振興會 (Japan Society for the Promotion of Science) 為期三年的研究經費補助。計畫的題目為《対日 BC 級戦犯裁判における台湾人戦犯の研究—中英仏豪の戦犯裁判を中心に—》(中譯：對日本的 BC 級戰犯審判與台灣戰犯的研究：以中英法澳洲的戰犯審判為研究中心)。以此為基礎，三位學者分別在中國、香港、日本、澳洲、以及台灣進行了初步的資料蒐集，確立了更完整的研究架構，也開展了與各國學者更廣泛的合作。根據初期的研究成果，三位學者在 2012 年 9 月在日本召開了第一次的工作坊，並邀請了來自日本、台灣、及澳大利亞等地的多位學者共同與會，發表研究題目與交換初步的研究構想。以 2012 年的此項工作坊為基礎，2013 年邀集進行合作研究的學者在台灣國立中正大學舉辦了名為「國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯」的國際學術研討會。目前所提出的專書構想，將以在此會上提交的研究論文為基礎。論文作者與主題分別是：

- 英國劍橋大學 (University of Cambridge, United Kingdom) Barak Kushner 副教授：
《日本帝國的瓦解與殖民之罪：台籍戰犯審判與國際法的衝突》(The Collapse of Empire and the Search for Colonial Guilt: Taiwanese War Criminals and the Conflict with International Law) *由英文原文翻譯為中文
- 日本愛知大學現代中国学部加治宏基助理教授 Dr Kaji Hiromoto：
《日籍/台籍戰犯審判的國際法源基礎》*由日文原文翻譯為中文
- 日本尚綱大學 (Shokei Gakuen University, Japan) 和田英穗准教授 Dr Wada Hideho：
《在台灣法庭的戰犯審判與台灣華僑》*由日文原文翻譯為中文
- 台灣國立中正大學歷史系張建侖副教授：
《中華民國政府在華南地區進行的台籍戰犯審判》
- 澳洲 Murdoch 大學 Dean Aszkielowicz 教授：
《澳洲進行的台灣/朝鮮籍戰犯審判》(Australia's Pursuit of the Formosan and Korean 'Japanese' War Criminals) *由英文原文翻譯為中文
- 台灣國立政治大學歷史系藍適齊助理教授：

《翻譯致罪：二次大戰後受到國際戰犯審判的台灣人戰地通譯》

而在「在日台灣人」的定位這項議題方面，特別是在日台灣人法律地位之演變，則有兩篇論文：

- 臺灣國立臺北教育大學台文所何義麟教授：《戰後日本華僑報刊中台灣人身分論述之考察》
透過檢視日本華僑社會中台灣人之定位，來探討在日台灣人如何面對認同問題。
- 臺灣南台科技大學楊子震助理教授：《澀谷事件與戰後初期在日台灣人之法的地位》
討論 1946 年 7 月在東京所發生的澀谷事件，¹²⁰ 如何反映了台灣人在戰後從「帝國臣民」轉變成為「在日華僑」所面臨的處境。

更進一步的，本書希望透過「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」的研究來探討第二次世界大戰所衍生出來的「戰爭責任」以及「殖民責任」。一般來說，「戰爭責任」與「殖民責任」多被放在兩種不同的脈絡當中來討論。但是在第二次世界大戰中，殖民/去殖民與戰爭這兩股歷史發展力量產生了緊密的交會，進而對殖民地的人民以及殖民帝國帶來了巨大的衝擊和深遠的影響。而「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」正是處在這巨變交會之下，身份地位產生最明顯而複雜的變化的台灣人。因此，對他們的研究將對以上議題的討論有特別的啟發作用。在這樣的研究視角之下，這本專書的編撰將從跨國的脈絡之下來進一步討論「台籍戰犯」的審判當中所反映出來的「戰爭責任」以及殖民帝國/殖民地之間的角力關係。研究的主要目標是檢視「台籍戰犯」作為「被殖民者」在戰爭當中和戰後的「戰爭責任」，以及戰後歐美殖民國如何透過戰犯(包括台籍戰犯)的審判和其他針對其「被殖民者」的補償手段，來重新建立其在東南亞各地殖民統治的過程。同時，透過分析「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」所面臨的國籍問題以及因國籍未定而衍生的諸多問題，則能夠進一步思考日本帝國在戰後崩解之際，對作為前「被殖民者」的台灣人所擔負(或者欠缺)的「殖民責任」。

這樣的研究不但將有助於探討第二次世界大戰在臺灣史當中的意義。更進一步的，這項臺灣史的研究將會對第二次世界大戰的歷史以及近代帝國與殖民的歷史，特別是在後殖民的脈絡之下持續發生的殖民影響，作出新的貢獻。而從「去殖民」的角度來看，英法荷等殖民帝國對日本帝國所進行的戰犯審判可以被視為是二戰後已經在「崩解」的帝國之間的碰撞與角力。因此，作為前「被殖民者」，「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」的研究將提供我們對帝國「崩解」的過程、結果、以及其影響更深入而全面的了解。而這樣跨國性的研究，以台籍戰犯的歷史為基礎，更將有助於瞭解二戰結束前後在東亞和東南亞地區國際政治秩序和機制重新建構的過程，從而對二戰史、戰後東亞國際關係、和冷戰史做進一步的補充。

¹²⁰ 湯熙勇，〈公平對待與秩序維持之間：日本東京澀谷事件與臺灣人的審判（1946-47）〉，《亞太研究論壇（Asia-Pacific Forum）》，第35期，頁1-35，2007；何義麟，「戰後台灣における海外ニュースの報道と規制——澀谷事件の報道を中心に」，《現代台灣研究》，第32号（2007），頁3-19

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
出國時間	103年9月1日至 103年9月10日	出國地點	日本東京
出國研究目的	移地研究，蒐集史料		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

前往日本國立公文書館、外務省外交史料館、防衛省防衛研究所等地收集史料。

二、研究成果

此次所蒐集的資料，已經或將用以撰寫下列論文：

- “Path of War, Path of Memory: Taiwanese in the Pacific/War” . Paper presented at Pacific History Association 21st Biennial Conference, December 3rd, 2014, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan
- “教戰爭（歷史）= 教和平：戰爭歷史與人權／和平教育（Teaching Peace through History of War: War History and Human Rights/Peace Education）” . Paper to be presented at 「全球視野下的歷史思維教學與研究」歷史教育國際學術研討會，國立臺灣師範大學，2015年5月22—23日（預定）
- “「被殖民者」的罪，「帝國」（不負）的責任：二戰中台灣人在海外的歷史與記憶” . Paper to be presented at 「戰爭的歷史與記憶：抗戰勝利七十週年學術討論會」，國史館，2015年7月7-9日（預定）

三、建議：無

科技部補助專題研究計畫出席國際學術會議心得報告

日期：104年02月22日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	時任：國立中正大學歷史系助理教授 現任：國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
會議時間	103年5月24日至 103年5月25日	會議地點	日本立教大學 (Rikkyo University)， 東京
會議名稱	(中文) 第一屆口譯歷史國際會議 (英文) The First International Symposium on the History of Interpreting		
發表題目	(中文) 翻譯致罪：二次大戰受國際戰犯審判的台灣人戰地翻譯 (英文) Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War		

一、參加會議經過

103年5月24日：

- 上午報到註冊
- 上午參加 Anthony Pym (Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain) 論文發表與討論
- 中午與參加的學者餐會，討論未來國際學術合作交流計畫。
- 下午參加 Rachel Lung (Lingnan University, Hong Kong), Iciar Alonso-Araguas (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain), 與 David Sawyer (University of Maryland, United States) 論文發表與討論
- 晚間與參加的學者餐會，討論未來共同合作出版研究成果之計畫。

103年5月24日：

- 上午發表論文。主持人為 Jesús Baigorri-Jalon 教授(Universidad de Salamanca, Spain)。論文發表之後，與現場與會的多位國際學者進行熱烈的討論
- 上午參加 Kayoko Takeda (Rikkyo University, Japan)論文發表與討論
- 中午與參加的學者餐會，繼續討論未來國際學術合作交流計畫。
- 下午參加 Jesús Baigorri-Jalon (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain) 與 Kumiko Torikai (Rikkyo University, Japan)論文發表與討論
- 晚間與參加的學者餐會進行交流，確定未來共同合作出版研究成果之計畫。

二、與會心得

會議主辦機構 Rikkyo Graduate School of Intercultural Communication 為日本跨文化研究首屈一指的研究機構，此次特別以翻譯研究當中的口譯歷史作為研究主題召開國際會議，吸引了超過150名學者報名與會。此次應邀發表論文的包括幾位國際翻譯研究學界重量級的學者，例如 Anthony Pym (Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain), Jesús Baigorri-Jalon 教授(Universidad de Salamanca, Spain), Kayoko Takeda (Rikkyo University, Japan), 以及 Kumiko Torikai (Rikkyo University, Japan)。本人能夠受邀在此會發表論文，更是得到了一個非常難得能夠與國際學界交流接軌的機會。

我在此會發表論文一篇。該論文為歷史學的研究，但是在會上得到來自翻譯研究、社會學、以及語言學等學科的多位國際學者的肯定與討論。能夠參與此會，一方面藉著與各學科專家的交流來提升自我學術水平，在跨學科的思考方面有豐富的收穫，也建立了更廣大的國際性/跨學科學術網絡。另一方面，同時也非常高興能夠藉著此機會，將台灣研究推向國際學界，更能夠透過在國際學術的交流平台上介紹有關台灣的研究，引起國際學者對台灣研究更高的興趣。

三、發表論文全文或摘要

Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War

論文摘要

After the Second World War, 173 Taiwanese who were recruited to serve in the Japanese military across Asia-Pacific during the war were convicted as war criminals. Based on studies of trial records and archival materials, this paper finds that among the 21 executed Taiwanese war criminals, at least 13 of them were convicted and consequently executed for crimes committed while serving as interpreters—formal and informal—during the war. In addition, a handful of Taiwanese interpreters were convicted as war criminals for various degrees of prison terms. While their number is small, the trials and punishment of these Taiwanese interpreters as war criminals provide a new perspective to understand the history of interpretation/interpreters in colonial/post-colonial and wartime context. This paper first examines trial records of the British courts—held in Malaya and Singapore—that show most Taiwanese formal interpreters were convicted of crimes committed against “local civilians / residents” . This paper finds that it was their language proficiency and interpretation duty brought/forced many Taiwanese serving in the Japanese military into close and frequent contact with the local population, particularly the Chinese, and thereby led to occasions in which these Taiwanese interpreters were involved in the alleged crime. Furthermore, as returning colonial powers made trials of war crime against “local civilians” a priority in re-establishing their legitimacy in colonies across Southeast Asia in the immediate postwar period, they also targeted Taiwanese interpreters who were easily identified for their crime against local population. In addition, this paper studies several cases of Taiwanese informal interpreters who committed crimes against Chinese prisoners of war (POWs) and were put on trial in the Australian courts held in Rabaul. It finds that while these Taiwanese were originally recruited as laborers, they were assigned to *ad hoc* interpretation duty because of their language proficiency under the contingency in the battlefields.

四、建議：無

五、攜回資料名稱及內容：會議論文；會上同時舉辦的歷史照片展覽，*The*

Interpreter’ s One Hundred Years of Solitude: between history and memory

六、其他：無

科技部補助專題研究計畫執行國際合作與移地研究心得報告

日期：104年02月22日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	時任：國立中正大學歷史系助理教授 現任：國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
出國時間	103年6月23日 至 103年6月27日	出國地點	新加坡
出國研究目的	移地研究，蒐集史料		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

前往新加坡國家圖書館 (National Library, Singapore) 查找相關史料，包括 1945 年二戰結束前後的當地與東南亞各地的主要報紙。

二、研究成果

此次移地研究，一方面就戰後英國在殖民地所進行的戰犯審判過程、以及殖民地當地民眾對審判的反應，取得豐富的材料。此部分的史料，對本人在 2014 年所發表的會議論文以及正在撰寫的論文都提供了重要的補充。其中一篇 *Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War*，經改寫投稿，目前已經通過審查與修改補充，即將收錄在由國際翻譯學界的兩位著名學者 Kayoko Takeda (Rikkyo University, Japan) 與 Jesús Baigorri (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain) 合編的專書，*New Insights in the History of Interpreting* (Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company, forthcoming 2015)。該書預計在 2015 年出版，作為國際翻譯學界最重要的系列叢書 Benjamins Translation Library 的最新出版成果。透過此平台，本計劃的研究成果將有機會向國際翻譯學界引介台灣史的相關議題，更有助於吸引國際學界對台灣史更多跨學科的興趣。

另一方面，此次移地研究進一步發掘開拓了與「殖民戰爭責任」相關的新研究方向。其中最收獲的是，與海外的臺灣人集中與遣返相關的史料。在結合台灣國內以及其他國家的檔案資料之後，已經開始撰寫多篇論文，包括「戰爭的終結與臺灣人—海外臺灣人的集中與遣返問題」、

日期：104年02月22日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	時任：國立中正大學歷史系助理教授 現任：國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
出國時間	103年7月23日 至 103年8月2日	出國地點	日本九州
出國研究目的	移地研究，蒐集史料		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

● 在九州與共同研究者會面：

本人自 2011 年起，與日本尚絅大學的和田英穗教授（及英國劍橋大學 University of Cambridge 的 Barak Kushner 教授）共同提出「台籍戰犯」的研究計畫，得到日本學術振興會為期三年(2011-2014)的研究經費支助；計畫名稱：對日本的 BC 級戰犯審判與台灣戰犯的研究：以中英法澳洲的戰犯審判為研究中心（計畫編號：Kakenhi 23720356, Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists B）。

本年度為計畫總結年。此次本人與共同研究者會面，就過去三年期間的研究成果進行彙整、回顧、檢討。該計畫在過去三年間，2012 年在日本舉辦一次國際學術工作坊，2013 年在台灣舉辦一次國際學術研討會，共有 10 餘位來自台灣、日本、英國、新加坡、澳洲的學者曾經參與並發表論文。在推動國際合作與促進學術交流等方面，都有豐碩的成果。在成果出版方面，參與研究計畫的個別學者已經分別以中文、日文、英文出版期刊與專書論文多篇。

● 在九州停留期間，本人同時也與共同研究者匯集過去三年間分別從中國、澳洲、日本等地檔案館所蒐集而來的大量資料，進行共同解讀與整理，以利未來持續進行研究。

二、研究成果

此次更進一步擬定出版專書計畫，將以 2013 年所舉辦國際學術研討會上發表的論文為基礎，編撰《帝國崩解之際：在戰後跨國脈絡下的臺灣人》。該書將以中文出版；會上發表的外文文章將在近期進行翻譯。預計在 2015 年出版。

目前所擬定的出版計畫書如下：

1945 年 8 月，隨著日本的戰敗，日本在台灣的殖民統治也同時結束。中華民國政府在該年的 10 月，正式派員接受台灣。自此，台灣成為中華民國政府轄下的領土迄今。而在這樣的狀態改變之下，台灣的「人」當然也受到了非常巨大的影響。而與領土不同的是，領土是物，人卻是活的、是有生命的。條約的內容或政權的更迭或者可以在一夜之間改變決定領土的歸屬，但是對人的改變卻很難在一瞬之間完成。人

有生活、人際關係、過去的經驗、現在的認同、還有對未來的規劃與期望。這一切都是經年累月的結果，當然也不是在短時間之內隨著「領土重劃」就可以完全改變的。

由此觀點出發，我們就能夠理解在 1945 年 8 月 15 日戰爭終結與殖民終結（去殖民）的交叉點上，無論對新的統治者（中華民國政府）、台灣人（作為被統治者）、以及包括原來／舊的統治者（日本）在內的諸多外國他者，（重新）界定「台灣人」都是一項必要但是卻複雜的過程。而更值得注意的是，這個過程同時在臺灣與海外進行，而其中首要的工作就是確認台灣人的國籍。

事實上，中華民國政府要到了 1946 年的 1 月 12 日才正式頒佈命令、宣佈所有的台灣人民為中國籍（中華民國籍）。在臺灣本地的台灣人，由於是在中華民國政府轄下，所以產生的國籍爭議主要是台灣人涉及司法裁判，應以「戰犯」或「漢奸」論處的問題。但是對當時身在海外的台灣人，所衍生的問題就更為複雜。在 1895-1945 年之間，隨著日本帝國經濟與政治力量的擴張，有許許多多的台灣人到海外受雇、創業、或是就學。在 1945 年第二次世界大戰結束的時候，仍然有數十萬的台灣人身在海外。如同另外數百萬當時在海外的日本國民，這些臺灣人也面對著遙遠的歸鄉道路。但是，與日本國民不同的是，在臺灣的「領土重劃」之後，這些當時仍然身在台灣以外的台灣人立刻就面臨了一個根本性的問題：1945 年 8 月 15 日之前，他們的身分是日本帝國殖民地台灣的人民（或是在中國被稱為「台灣籍民」）；那麼 1945 年 8 月 15 日開始呢？台灣人與原/前統治者（日本帝國）的關係終止之後，新的統治者（中華民國政府）並未立刻賦予他們新的身分，也尚未擬定對他們的相關政策。那麼 1945 年 8 月 15 日以後，對外國的他者來說，「台灣人」究竟是誰？更具體而且急迫的問題是：戰爭結束，要如何處置這些台灣人？

在外的中華民國使館，在 1946 年 1 月 30 日才接到上述有關台灣人國籍的通知。而後為了能夠進一步的透過外館等單位對在外台灣人進行登記、發給護照等作業，國民政府在 1946 年 6 月 22 日正式公布了「在外台僑國籍處理辦法」。¹ 但是這樣的作法與反應，在時間上，其實使得在海外的台灣人，從戰爭結束之後有將近半年的時間是無國籍或是被視為「第三國人」（即非戰勝國，亦非戰敗國）的身分，² 更未能得到任何國家主權的保護，甚至在多處發生不分老幼的台灣人被盟國當局關入集中營的情況。³

¹ 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，《人文及社會科學集刊》，第 17 卷第 2 期（2005），頁 398, 405

² 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，頁 395

³ 湯熙勇，〈臺灣人在東南亞(1945- 1953)：集中營、審判及遣返〉，發表於第三屆海外華人研究與文獻收藏國際研討會，新加坡：新加坡大學等，2005；張建侖，〈迢迢歸鄉路——戰後港澳地區台胞返籍始末〉，《港澳與近代中國學術研討會論文集》（台北：國史館，民國 89 年），頁 549-580

更重要的是在國際上，台灣人的國籍歸屬問題並不是由中華民國「單方面」就能夠完全決定的。美國、英國、荷蘭等盟國，基於對日和約尚未簽訂、台灣主權尚未正式轉移之考量，或對台灣人戰爭時期的「不當行為」進行審判制裁的需要等理由，在當時並未同意中華民國政府對台灣人國籍所做的主張。⁴也因此，使得戰後仍然身在海外的台灣人處在國籍不定的狀態。學者曾經指出，這樣的狀態則導致了對海外台灣人三方面的影響：未受尊重、涉及司法(戰犯)裁判、以及個人財產未獲保護等。⁵

關於海外的台灣人在戰後所面臨的問題，近年來已有非常豐碩的研究成果，包括何義麟所著有關於在日本的台灣人⁶；許雪姬有關在中國大陸(及滿州)的台灣人⁷；湯熙勇有關在海外(特別是東南亞)的台灣人⁸；張建侖有關在華南及港澳的台灣人⁹。另外，以台籍日本兵為主題的相關研究也已經有豐碩的成果¹⁰。另外，國史館的史料彙編更是提供了許多珍貴的材料。¹¹

本書所要探討的就是，在戰後這樣特殊的狀態之下，台灣人由於身份的不確定所受到的影響。主要的關注點是台灣人涉及司法裁判的問題，特別是有關於「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」。由於在戰後的歷史書寫和集體的戰爭記憶中，台灣的二戰經驗有相當長的一段時間遭到邊緣化甚至忽略，也因此

⁴ 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，頁 393, 413-423

⁵ 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，頁 425-429

⁶ 〈戰後初期臺灣留日學生的左傾言論及其動向〉《臺灣史研究》，第 19 卷第 2 期，(THCI Core)。2012 年 06 月，151-192 頁；〈戰後在日台灣人之處境與認同：以蔡朝圻先生的經歷為中心〉《台灣風物》(第 60 卷 4 期，台灣風物雜誌社)。2010 年 12 月，161-194 頁

⁷ 《口述歷史 第五期(日據時期台灣人赴大陸經驗專號之一)》，臺北：中央研究院近代史研究所，1995；《口述歷史 第六期(日據時期台灣人赴大陸經驗專號之二)》，臺北：中央研究院近代史研究所，1995；《日治時期在「滿洲」的台灣人(再版)》，臺北：中央研究院近代史研究所，2004；〈1937 年至 1947 年在北京的台灣人〉，《長庚人文社會學報》，第 1 卷第 1 期，頁 33-84，2008；〈1937-1947 年在上海的台灣人〉，《臺灣學研究》，13 期，頁 1-32，2012。

⁸ 〈國籍回復とそれを巡る争い--在外台湾人の國籍問題(1943-1948)〉，《阪神華僑の國際ネットワークに関する研究》(日本：日本神戸大學國際文化學部)，2004；〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，《人文及社會科學集刊》，第 17 卷第 2 期，頁 393-437，2005；〈脫離困境：戰後初期海南島之台灣人的返台〉，《台灣史研究》第 12 卷第 2 期，頁 167-208，2005；〈公平對待與秩序維持之間：日本東京澀谷事件與臺灣人的審判(1946-47)〉，《亞太研究論壇(Asia-Pacific Forum)》，第 35 期，頁 1-35，2007；〈烽火後的同鄉情：戰後東亞臺灣同鄉會的成立、轉變與角色(1945-48)〉，《人文及社會科學集刊》，第 19 卷第 1 期，頁 1-49，2007。

⁹ 〈迢迢歸鄉路——戰後港澳地區台胞返籍始末〉，《港澳與近代中國學術研討會論文集》(台北：國史館，民國 89 年)，頁 549-580；〈田園將蕪胡不歸？——戰後廣州地區台胞處境及返籍問題之研究〉，《台灣史研究》6 卷 1 期(民國 89 年 9 月)，1 頁 133-166

¹⁰ 周婉窈編，1997。《台籍日本兵座談會紀錄并相關資料》。台北：中央研究院台灣史研究所籌備處；蔡慧玉編著，1997。《走過兩個時代的人：台籍日本兵》。台北：中央研究院台灣史研究所籌備處；李展平，2005。《前進婆羅洲——台籍戰俘監視員》。南投：國史館台灣文獻館；李展平，2007。《戰火紋身的監視員——台籍戰俘悲歌》。南投：國史館台灣文獻館。

¹¹ 例如，謝培屏編，《戰後遣送旅外華僑回國史料彙編(1)：德國·土耳其·義大利·日本篇》，台北：國史館，2007；《戰後遣送旅外華僑回國史料彙編(2)：澳洲·蘇聯·羅馬尼亞·捷克篇》，台北：國史館，2007；《戰後遣送旅外華僑回國史料彙編(3)：南洋海南島篇》，台北：國史館，2008。

「台籍戰犯」的問題一直都並未得到太多的關注。但事實上，由於戰後對「台籍戰犯」的審判是同時在澳大利亞、中國、荷蘭、英國和美國等盟國的軍事法庭當中分別所進行，「台籍戰犯」的審判最足以代表身在海外的台灣人，在國籍不定的狀態之下所面臨的問題。

根據統計，在二次大戰期間有超過了二十萬名的台灣人被徵召到亞洲各地的戰場，其中超過三萬人喪命於戰場，更有上百名台灣人在戰後遭各個盟國以 B/C 級戰犯審判。最終有 173 名台灣籍戰犯被判刑確定、其中 21 名被判處並執行死刑。因為台籍戰犯審判所牽涉的國家和地理位置的分布非常廣泛，台籍戰犯歷史的研究勢必是一項龐大的跨國性研究，也需要各國學者的共同參與。在 2010 年年底，由日本尚綱大學 (Shokei Gakuen University, Japan) 的和田英穗教授 (Dr Wada Hideho)，英國劍橋大學 (University of Cambridge, United Kingdom) 的 Barak Kushner 教授，以及現任教於台灣國立政治大學歷史系的藍適齊共同發起了一項台籍戰犯的跨國性研究計畫。這項計畫在 2011 年度得到了日本學術振興會 (Japan Society for the Promotion of Science) 為期三年的研究經費補助。計畫的題目為《対日 BC 級戦犯裁判における台湾人戦犯の研究—中英仏豪の戦犯裁判を中心に—》(中譯：對日本的 BC 級戰犯審判與台灣戰犯的研究：以中英法澳洲的戰犯審判為研究中心)。以此為基礎，三位學者分別在中國、香港、日本、澳洲、以及台灣進行了初步的資料蒐集，確立了更完整的研究架構，也開展了與各國學者更廣泛的合作。根據初期的研究成果，三位學者在 2012 年 9 月在日本召開了第一次的工作坊，並邀請了來自日本、台灣、及澳大利亞等地的多位學者共同與會，發表研究題目與交換初步的研究構想。以 2012 年的此項工作坊為基礎，2013 年邀集進行合作研究的學者在台灣國立中正大學舉辦了名為「國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯」的國際學術研討會。目前所提出的專書構想，將以在此會上提交的研究論文為基礎。論文作者與主題分別是：

- 英國劍橋大學 (University of Cambridge, United Kingdom) Barak Kushner 副教授：
《日本帝國的瓦解與殖民之罪：台籍戰犯審判與國際法的衝突》(The Collapse of Empire and the Search for Colonial Guilt: Taiwanese War Criminals and the Conflict with International Law) *由英文原文翻譯為中文
- 日本愛知大學現代中国学部加治宏基助理教授 Dr Kaji Hiromoto：
《日籍/台籍戰犯審判的國際法源基礎》*由日文原文翻譯為中文
- 日本尚綱大學 (Shokei Gakuen University, Japan) 和田英穗准教授 Dr Wada Hideho：
《在台灣法庭的戰犯審判與台灣華僑》*由日文原文翻譯為中文
- 台灣國立中正大學歷史系張建侖副教授：
《中華民國政府在華南地區進行的台籍戰犯審判》
- 澳洲 Murdoch 大學 Dean Aszkielowicz 教授：
《澳洲進行的台灣/朝鮮籍戰犯審判》(Australia's Pursuit of the Formosan and Korean 'Japanese' War Criminals) *由英文原文翻譯為中文
- 台灣國立政治大學歷史系藍適齊助理教授：

《翻譯致罪：二次大戰後受到國際戰犯審判的台灣人戰地通譯》

而在「在日台灣人」的定位這項議題方面，特別是在日台灣人法律地位之演變，則有兩篇論文：

- 臺灣國立臺北教育大學台文所何義麟教授：《戰後日本華僑報刊中台灣人身分論述之考察》
透過檢視日本華僑社會中台灣人之定位，來探討在日台灣人如何面對認同問題。
- 臺灣南台科技大學楊子震助理教授：《澀谷事件與戰後初期在日台灣人之法的地位》
討論 1946 年 7 月在東京所發生的澀谷事件，¹² 如何反映了台灣人在戰後從「帝國臣民」轉變成為「在日華僑」所面臨的處境。

更進一步的，本書希望透過「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」的研究來探討第二次世界大戰所衍生出來的「戰爭責任」以及「殖民責任」。一般來說，「戰爭責任」與「殖民責任」多被放在兩種不同的脈絡當中來討論。但是在第二次世界大戰中，殖民/去殖民與戰爭這兩股歷史發展力量產生了緊密的交會，進而對殖民地的人民以及殖民帝國帶來了巨大的衝擊和深遠的影響。而「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」正是處在這巨變交會之下，身份地位產生最明顯而複雜的變化的台灣人。因此，對他們的研究將對以上議題的討論有特別的啟發作用。在這樣的研究視角之下，這本專書的編撰將從跨國的脈絡之下來進一步討論「台籍戰犯」的審判當中所反映出來的「戰爭責任」以及殖民帝國/殖民地之間的角力關係。研究的主要目標是檢視「台籍戰犯」作為「被殖民者」在戰爭當中和戰後的「戰爭責任」，以及戰後歐美殖民國如何透過戰犯(包括台籍戰犯)的審判和其他針對其「被殖民者」的補償手段，來重新建立其在東南亞各地殖民統治的過程。同時，透過分析「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」所面臨的國籍問題以及因國籍未定而衍生的諸多問題，則能夠進一步思考日本帝國在戰後崩解之際，對作為前「被殖民者」的台灣人所擔負(或者欠缺)的「殖民責任」。

這樣的研究不但將有助於探討第二次世界大戰在臺灣史當中的意義。更進一步的，這項臺灣史的研究將會對第二次世界大戰的歷史以及近代帝國與殖民的歷史，特別是在後殖民的脈絡之下持續發生的殖民影響，作出新的貢獻。而從「去殖民」的角度來看，英法荷等殖民帝國對日本帝國所進行的戰犯審判可以被視為是二戰後已經在「崩解」的帝國之間的碰撞與角力。因此，作為前「被殖民者」，「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」的研究將提供我們對帝國「崩解」的過程、結果、以及其影響更深入而全面的了解。而這樣跨國性的研究，以台籍戰犯的歷史為基礎，更將有助於瞭解二戰結束前後在東亞和東南亞地區國際政治秩序和機制重新建構的過程，從而對二戰史、戰後東亞國際關係、和冷戰史做進一步的補充。

¹² 湯熙勇，〈公平對待與秩序維持之間：日本東京澀谷事件與臺灣人的審判（1946-47）〉，《亞太研究論壇（Asia-Pacific Forum）》，第35期，頁1-35，2007；何義麟，「戰後台灣における海外ニュースの報道と規制——澀谷事件の報道を中心に」，《現代台湾研究》，第32号（2007），頁3-19

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
出國時間	103年9月1日至 103年9月10日	出國地點	日本東京
出國研究目的	移地研究，蒐集史料		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

前往日本國立公文書館、外務省外交史料館、防衛省防衛研究所等地收集史料。

二、研究成果

此次所蒐集的資料，已經或將用以撰寫下列論文：

- “Path of War, Path of Memory: Taiwanese in the Pacific/War” . Paper presented at Pacific History Association 21st Biennial Conference, December 3rd, 2014, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan
- “教戰爭（歷史）= 教和平：戰爭歷史與人權／和平教育（Teaching Peace through History of War: War History and Human Rights/Peace Education）” . Paper to be presented at 「全球視野下的歷史思維教學與研究」歷史教育國際學術研討會，國立臺灣師範大學，2015年5月22—23日（預定）
- “「被殖民者」的罪，「帝國」（不負）的責任：二戰中台灣人在海外的歷史與記憶” . Paper to be presented at 「戰爭的歷史與記憶：抗戰勝利七十週年學術討論會」，國史館，2015年7月7-9日（預定）

三、建議：無

科技部補助專題研究計畫出席國際學術會議心得報告

日期：104年02月22日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	時任：國立中正大學歷史系助理教授 現任：國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
會議時間	103年5月24日至 103年5月25日	會議地點	日本立教大學 (Rikkyo University)， 東京
會議名稱	(中文) 第一屆口譯歷史國際會議 (英文) The First International Symposium on the History of Interpreting		
發表題目	(中文) 翻譯致罪：二次大戰受國際戰犯審判的台灣人戰地翻譯 (英文) Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War		

一、參加會議經過

103年5月24日：

- 上午報到註冊
- 上午參加 Anthony Pym (Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain) 論文發表與討論
- 中午與參加的學者餐會，討論未來國際學術合作交流計畫。
- 下午參加 Rachel Lung (Lingnan University, Hong Kong), Iciar Alonso-Araguas (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain), 與 David Sawyer (University of Maryland, United States) 論文發表與討論
- 晚間與參加的學者餐會，討論未來共同合作出版研究成果之計畫。

103年5月24日：

- 上午發表論文。主持人為 Jesús Baigorri-Jalon 教授(Universidad de Salamanca, Spain)。論文發表之後，與現場與會的多位國際學者進行熱烈的討論
- 上午參加 Kayoko Takeda (Rikkyo University, Japan)論文發表與討論
- 中午與參加的學者餐會，繼續討論未來國際學術合作交流計畫。
- 下午參加 Jesús Baigorri-Jalon (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain) 與 Kumiko Torikai (Rikkyo University, Japan)論文發表與討論
- 晚間與參加的學者餐會進行交流，確定未來共同合作出版研究成果之計畫。

二、與會心得

會議主辦機構 Rikkyo Graduate School of Intercultural Communication 為日本跨文化研究首屈一指的研究機構，此次特別以翻譯研究當中的口譯歷史作為研究主題召開國際會議，吸引了超過150名學者報名與會。此次應邀發表論文的包括幾位國際翻譯研究學界重量級的學者，例如 Anthony Pym (Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain), Jesús Baigorri-Jalon 教授(Universidad de Salamanca, Spain), Kayoko Takeda (Rikkyo University, Japan), 以及 Kumiko Torikai (Rikkyo University, Japan)。本人能夠受邀在此會發表論文，更是得到了一個非常難得能夠與國際學界交流接軌的機會。

我在此會發表論文一篇。該論文為歷史學的研究，但是在會上得到來自翻譯研究、社會學、以及語言學等學科的多位國際學者的肯定與討論。能夠參與此會，一方面藉著與各學科專家的交流來提升自我學術水平，在跨學科的思考方面有豐富的收穫，也建立了更廣大的國際性/跨學科學術網絡。另一方面，同時也非常高興能夠藉著此機會，將台灣研究推向國際學界，更能夠透過在國際學術的交流平台上介紹有關台灣的研究，引起國際學者對台灣研究更高的興趣。

三、發表論文全文或摘要

Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War

論文摘要

After the Second World War, 173 Taiwanese who were recruited to serve in the Japanese military across Asia-Pacific during the war were convicted as war criminals. Based on studies of trial records and archival materials, this paper finds that among the 21 executed Taiwanese war criminals, at least 13 of them were convicted and consequently executed for crimes committed while serving as interpreters—formal and informal—during the war. In addition, a handful of Taiwanese interpreters were convicted as war criminals for various degrees of prison terms. While their number is small, the trials and punishment of these Taiwanese interpreters as war criminals provide a new perspective to understand the history of interpretation/interpreters in colonial/post-colonial and wartime context. This paper first examines trial records of the British courts—held in Malaya and Singapore—that show most Taiwanese formal interpreters were convicted of crimes committed against “local civilians / residents” . This paper finds that it was their language proficiency and interpretation duty brought/forced many Taiwanese serving in the Japanese military into close and frequent contact with the local population, particularly the Chinese, and thereby led to occasions in which these Taiwanese interpreters were involved in the alleged crime. Furthermore, as returning colonial powers made trials of war crime against “local civilians” a priority in re-establishing their legitimacy in colonies across Southeast Asia in the immediate postwar period, they also targeted Taiwanese interpreters who were easily identified for their crime against local population. In addition, this paper studies several cases of Taiwanese informal interpreters who committed crimes against Chinese prisoners of war (POWs) and were put on trial in the Australian courts held in Rabaul. It finds that while these Taiwanese were originally recruited as laborers, they were assigned to *ad hoc* interpretation duty because of their language proficiency under the contingency in the battlefields.

四、建議：無

五、攜回資料名稱及內容：會議論文；會上同時舉辦的歷史照片展覽, *The*

Interpreter’ s One Hundred Years of Solitude: between history and memory

六、其他：無

科技部補助專題研究計畫執行國際合作與移地研究心得報告

日期：104年02月22日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	時任：國立中正大學歷史系助理教授 現任：國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
出國時間	103年6月23日 至 103年6月27日	出國地點	新加坡
出國研究目的	移地研究，蒐集史料		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

前往新加坡國家圖書館 (National Library, Singapore) 查找相關史料，包括 1945 年二戰結束前後的當地與東南亞各地的主要報紙。

二、研究成果

此次移地研究，一方面就戰後英國在殖民地所進行的戰犯審判過程、以及殖民地當地民眾對審判的反應，取得豐富的材料。此部分的史料，對本人在 2014 年所發表的會議論文以及正在撰寫的論文都提供了重要的補充。其中一篇 *Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War*，經改寫投稿，目前已經通過審查與修改補充，即將收錄在由國際翻譯學界的兩位著名學者 Kayoko Takeda (Rikkyo University, Japan) 與 Jesús Baigorri (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain) 合編的專書，*New Insights in the History of Interpreting* (Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company, forthcoming 2015)。該書預計在 2015 年出版，作為國際翻譯學界最重要的系列叢書 Benjamins Translation Library 的最新出版成果。透過此平台，本計劃的研究成果將有機會向國際翻譯學界引介台灣史的相關議題，更有助於吸引國際學界對台灣史更多跨學科的興趣。

另一方面，此次移地研究進一步發掘開拓了與「殖民戰爭責任」相關的新研究方向。其中最收獲的是，與海外的臺灣人集中與遣返相關的史料。在結合台灣國內以及其他國家的檔案資料之後，已經開始撰寫多篇論文，包括「戰爭的終結與臺灣人—海外臺灣人的集中與遣返問題」、

日期：104年02月22日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	時任：國立中正大學歷史系助理教授 現任：國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
出國時間	103年7月23日 至 103年8月2日	出國地點	日本九州
出國研究目的	移地研究，蒐集史料		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

● 在九州與共同研究者會面：

本人自 2011 年起，與日本尚絅大學的和田英穗教授（及英國劍橋大學 University of Cambridge 的 Barak Kushner 教授）共同提出「台籍戰犯」的研究計畫，得到日本學術振興會為期三年(2011-2014)的研究經費支助；計畫名稱：對日本的 BC 級戰犯審判與台灣戰犯的研究：以中英法澳洲的戰犯審判為研究中心（計畫編號：Kakenhi 23720356, Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists B）。

本年度為計畫總結年。此次本人與共同研究者會面，就過去三年期間的研究成果進行彙整、回顧、檢討。該計畫在過去三年間，2012 年在日本舉辦一次國際學術工作坊，2013 年在台灣舉辦一次國際學術研討會，共有 10 餘位來自台灣、日本、英國、新加坡、澳洲的學者曾經參與並發表論文。在推動國際合作與促進學術交流等方面，都有豐碩的成果。在成果出版方面，參與研究計畫的個別學者已經分別以中文、日文、英文出版期刊與專書論文多篇。

● 在九州停留期間，本人同時也與共同研究者匯集過去三年間分別從中國、澳洲、日本等地檔案館所蒐集而來的大量資料，進行共同解讀與整理，以利未來持續進行研究。

二、研究成果

此次更進一步擬定出版專書計畫，將以 2013 年所舉辦國際學術研討會上發表的論文為基礎，編撰《帝國崩解之際：在戰後跨國脈絡下的臺灣人》。該書將以中文出版；會上發表的外文文章將在近期進行翻譯。預計在 2015 年出版。

目前所擬定的出版計畫書如下：

1945 年 8 月，隨著日本的戰敗，日本在台灣的殖民統治也同時結束。中華民國政府在該年的 10 月，正式派員接受台灣。自此，台灣成為中華民國政府轄下的領土迄今。而在這樣的狀態改變之下，台灣的「人」當然也受到了非常巨大的影響。而與領土不同的是，領土是物，人卻是活的、是有生命的。條約的內容或政權的更迭或者可以在一夜之間改變決定領土的歸屬，但是對人的改變卻很難在一瞬之間完成。人

有生活、人際關係、過去的經驗、現在的認同、還有對未來的規劃與期望。這一切都是經年累月的結果，當然也不是在短時間之內隨著「領土重劃」就可以完全改變的。

由此觀點出發，我們就能夠理解在 1945 年 8 月 15 日戰爭終結與殖民終結（去殖民）的交叉點上，無論對新的統治者（中華民國政府）、台灣人（作為被統治者）、以及包括原來／舊的統治者（日本）在內的諸多外國他者，（重新）界定「台灣人」都是一項必要但是卻複雜的過程。而更值得注意的是，這個過程同時在臺灣與海外進行，而其中首要的工作就是確認台灣人的國籍。

事實上，中華民國政府要到了 1946 年的 1 月 12 日才正式頒佈命令、宣佈所有的台灣人民為中國籍（中華民國籍）。在臺灣本地的台灣人，由於是在中華民國政府轄下，所以產生的國籍爭議主要是台灣人涉及司法裁判，應以「戰犯」或「漢奸」論處的問題。但是對當時身在海外的台灣人，所衍生的問題就更為複雜。在 1895-1945 年之間，隨著日本帝國經濟與政治力量的擴張，有許許多多的台灣人到海外受雇、創業、或是就學。在 1945 年第二次世界大戰結束的時候，仍然有數十萬的台灣人身在海外。如同另外數百萬當時在海外的日本國民，這些臺灣人也面對著遙遠的歸鄉道路。但是，與日本國民不同的是，在臺灣的「領土重劃」之後，這些當時仍然身在台灣以外的台灣人立刻就面臨了一個根本性的問題：1945 年 8 月 15 日之前，他們的身分是日本帝國殖民地台灣的人民（或是在中國被稱為「台灣籍民」）；那麼 1945 年 8 月 15 日開始呢？台灣人與原/前統治者（日本帝國）的關係終止之後，新的統治者（中華民國政府）並未立刻賦予他們新的身分，也尚未擬定對他們的相關政策。那麼 1945 年 8 月 15 日以後，對外國的他者來說，「台灣人」究竟是誰？更具體而且急迫的問題是：戰爭結束，要如何處置這些台灣人？

在外的中華民國使館，在 1946 年 1 月 30 日才接到上述有關台灣人國籍的通知。而後為了能夠進一步的透過外館等單位對在外台灣人進行登記、發給護照等作業，國民政府在 1946 年 6 月 22 日正式公布了「在外台僑國籍處理辦法」。¹ 但是這樣的作法與反應，在時間上，其實使得在海外的台灣人，從戰爭結束之後有將近半年的時間是無國籍或是被視為「第三國人」（即非戰勝國，亦非戰敗國）的身分，² 更未能得到任何國家主權的保護，甚至在多處發生不分老幼的台灣人被盟國當局關入集中營的情況。³

¹ 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，《人文及社會科學集刊》，第 17 卷第 2 期（2005），頁 398, 405

² 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，頁 395

³ 湯熙勇，〈臺灣人在東南亞(1945- 1953)：集中營、審判及遣返〉，發表於第三屆海外華人研究與文獻收藏國際研討會，新加坡：新加坡大學等，2005；張建侖，〈迢迢歸鄉路——戰後港澳地區台胞返籍始末〉，《港澳與近代中國學術研討會論文集》（台北：國史館，民國 89 年），頁 549-580

更重要的是在國際上，台灣人的國籍歸屬問題並不是由中華民國「單方面」就能夠完全決定的。美國、英國、荷蘭等盟國，基於對日和約尚未簽訂、台灣主權尚未正式轉移之考量，或對台灣人戰爭時期的「不當行為」進行審判制裁的需要等理由，在當時並未同意中華民國政府對台灣人國籍所做的主張。⁴也因此，使得戰後仍然身在海外的台灣人處在國籍不定的狀態。學者曾經指出，這樣的狀態則導致了對海外台灣人三方面的影響：未受尊重、涉及司法(戰犯)裁判、以及個人財產未獲保護等。⁵

關於海外的台灣人在戰後所面臨的問題，近年來已有非常豐碩的研究成果，包括何義麟所著有關於在日本的台灣人⁶；許雪姬有關在中國大陸(及滿州)的台灣人⁷；湯熙勇有關在海外(特別是東南亞)的台灣人⁸；張建侖有關在華南及港澳的台灣人⁹。另外，以台籍日本兵為主題的相關研究也已經有豐碩的成果¹⁰。另外，國史館的史料彙編更是提供了許多珍貴的材料。¹¹

本書所要探討的就是，在戰後這樣特殊的狀態之下，台灣人由於身份的不確定所受到的影響。主要的關注點是台灣人涉及司法裁判的問題，特別是有關於「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」。由於在戰後的歷史書寫和集體的戰爭記憶中，台灣的二戰經驗有相當長的一段時間遭到邊緣化甚至忽略，也因此

⁴ 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，頁 393, 413-423

⁵ 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，頁 425-429

⁶ 〈戰後初期臺灣留日學生的左傾言論及其動向〉《臺灣史研究》，第 19 卷第 2 期，(THCI Core)。2012 年 06 月，151-192 頁；〈戰後在日台灣人之處境與認同：以蔡朝圻先生的經歷為中心〉《台灣風物》(第 60 卷 4 期，台灣風物雜誌社)。2010 年 12 月，161-194 頁

⁷ 《口述歷史 第五期(日據時期台灣人赴大陸經驗專號之一)》，臺北：中央研究院近代史研究所，1995；《口述歷史 第六期(日據時期台灣人赴大陸經驗專號之二)》，臺北：中央研究院近代史研究所，1995；《日治時期在「滿洲」的台灣人(再版)》，臺北：中央研究院近代史研究所，2004；〈1937 年至 1947 年在北京的台灣人〉，《長庚人文社會學報》，第 1 卷第 1 期，頁 33-84，2008；〈1937-1947 年在上海的台灣人〉，《臺灣學研究》，13 期，頁 1-32，2012。

⁸ 〈國籍回復とそれを巡る争い--在外台湾人の國籍問題(1943-1948)〉，《阪神華僑の國際ネットワークに関する研究》(日本：日本神戸大學國際文化學部)，2004；〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，《人文及社會科學集刊》，第 17 卷第 2 期，頁 393-437，2005；〈脫離困境：戰後初期海南島之台灣人的返台〉，《台灣史研究》第 12 卷第 2 期，頁 167-208，2005；〈公平對待與秩序維持之間：日本東京澀谷事件與臺灣人的審判(1946-47)〉，《亞太研究論壇(Asia-Pacific Forum)》，第 35 期，頁 1-35，2007；〈烽火後的同鄉情：戰後東亞臺灣同鄉會的成立、轉變與角色(1945-48)〉，《人文及社會科學集刊》，第 19 卷第 1 期，頁 1-49，2007。

⁹ 〈迢迢歸鄉路——戰後港澳地區台胞返籍始末〉，《港澳與近代中國學術研討會論文集》(台北：國史館，民國 89 年)，頁 549-580；〈田園將蕪胡不歸？——戰後廣州地區台胞處境及返籍問題之研究〉，《台灣史研究》6 卷 1 期(民國 89 年 9 月)，1 頁 133-166

¹⁰ 周婉窈編，1997。《台籍日本兵座談會紀錄并相關資料》。台北：中央研究院台灣史研究所籌備處；蔡慧玉編著，1997。《走過兩個時代的人：台籍日本兵》。台北：中央研究院台灣史研究所籌備處；李展平，2005。《前進婆羅洲——台籍戰俘監視員》。南投：國史館台灣文獻館；李展平，2007。《戰火紋身的監視員——台籍戰俘悲歌》。南投：國史館台灣文獻館。

¹¹ 例如，謝培屏編，《戰後遣送旅外華僑回國史料彙編(1)：德國·土耳其·義大利·日本篇》，台北：國史館，2007；《戰後遣送旅外華僑回國史料彙編(2)：澳洲·蘇聯·羅馬尼亞·捷克篇》，台北：國史館，2007；《戰後遣送旅外華僑回國史料彙編(3)：南洋海南島篇》，台北：國史館，2008。

「台籍戰犯」的問題一直都並未得到太多的關注。但事實上，由於戰後對「台籍戰犯」的審判是同時在澳大利亞、中國、荷蘭、英國和美國等盟國的軍事法庭當中分別所進行，「台籍戰犯」的審判最足以代表身在海外的台灣人，在國籍不定的狀態之下所面臨的問題。

根據統計，在二次大戰期間有超過了二十萬名的台灣人被徵召到亞洲各地的戰場，其中超過三萬人喪命於戰場，更有上百名台灣人在戰後遭各個盟國以 B/C 級戰犯審判。最終有 173 名台灣籍戰犯被判刑確定、其中 21 名被判處並執行死刑。因為台籍戰犯審判所牽涉的國家和地理位置的分布非常廣泛，台籍戰犯歷史的研究勢必是一項龐大的跨國性研究，也需要各國學者的共同參與。在 2010 年年底，由日本尚綱大學 (Shokei Gakuen University, Japan) 的和田英穗教授 (Dr Wada Hideho)，英國劍橋大學 (University of Cambridge, United Kingdom) 的 Barak Kushner 教授，以及現任教於台灣國立政治大學歷史系的藍適齊共同發起了一項台籍戰犯的跨國性研究計畫。這項計畫在 2011 年度得到了日本學術振興會 (Japan Society for the Promotion of Science) 為期三年的研究經費補助。計畫的題目為《対日 BC 級戦犯裁判における台湾人戦犯の研究—中英仏豪の戦犯裁判を中心に—》(中譯：對日本的 BC 級戰犯審判與台灣戰犯的研究：以中英法澳洲的戰犯審判為研究中心)。以此為基礎，三位學者分別在中國、香港、日本、澳洲、以及台灣進行了初步的資料蒐集，確立了更完整的研究架構，也開展了與各國學者更廣泛的合作。根據初期的研究成果，三位學者在 2012 年 9 月在日本召開了第一次的工作坊，並邀請了來自日本、台灣、及澳大利亞等地的多位學者共同與會，發表研究題目與交換初步的研究構想。以 2012 年的此項工作坊為基礎，2013 年邀集進行合作研究的學者在台灣國立中正大學舉辦了名為「國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯」的國際學術研討會。目前所提出的專書構想，將以在此會上提交的研究論文為基礎。論文作者與主題分別是：

- 英國劍橋大學 (University of Cambridge, United Kingdom) Barak Kushner 副教授：
《日本帝國的瓦解與殖民之罪：台籍戰犯審判與國際法的衝突》(The Collapse of Empire and the Search for Colonial Guilt: Taiwanese War Criminals and the Conflict with International Law) *由英文原文翻譯為中文
- 日本愛知大學現代中国学部加治宏基助理教授 Dr Kaji Hiromoto：
《日籍/台籍戰犯審判的國際法源基礎》*由日文原文翻譯為中文
- 日本尚綱大學 (Shokei Gakuen University, Japan) 和田英穗准教授 Dr Wada Hideho：
《在台灣法庭的戰犯審判與台灣華僑》*由日文原文翻譯為中文
- 台灣國立中正大學歷史系張建侖副教授：
《中華民國政府在華南地區進行的台籍戰犯審判》
- 澳洲 Murdoch 大學 Dean Aszkielowicz 教授：
《澳洲進行的台灣/朝鮮籍戰犯審判》(Australia's Pursuit of the Formosan and Korean 'Japanese' War Criminals) *由英文原文翻譯為中文
- 台灣國立政治大學歷史系藍適齊助理教授：

《翻譯致罪：二次大戰後受到國際戰犯審判的台灣人戰地通譯》

而在「在日台灣人」的定位這項議題方面，特別是在日台灣人法律地位之演變，則有兩篇論文：

- 臺灣國立臺北教育大學台文所何義麟教授：《戰後日本華僑報刊中台灣人身分論述之考察》
透過檢視日本華僑社會中台灣人之定位，來探討在日台灣人如何面對認同問題。
- 臺灣南台科技大學楊子震助理教授：《澀谷事件與戰後初期在日台灣人之法的地位》
討論 1946 年 7 月在東京所發生的澀谷事件，¹² 如何反映了台灣人在戰後從「帝國臣民」轉變成為「在日華僑」所面臨的處境。

更進一步的，本書希望透過「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」的研究來探討第二次世界大戰所衍生出來的「戰爭責任」以及「殖民責任」。一般來說，「戰爭責任」與「殖民責任」多被放在兩種不同的脈絡當中來討論。但是在第二次世界大戰中，殖民/去殖民與戰爭這兩股歷史發展力量產生了緊密的交會，進而對殖民地的人民以及殖民帝國帶來了巨大的衝擊和深遠的影響。而「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」正是處在這巨變交會之下，身份地位產生最明顯而複雜的變化的台灣人。因此，對他們的研究將對以上議題的討論有特別的啟發作用。在這樣的研究視角之下，這本專書的編撰將從跨國的脈絡之下來進一步討論「台籍戰犯」的審判當中所反映出來的「戰爭責任」以及殖民帝國/殖民地之間的角力關係。研究的主要目標是檢視「台籍戰犯」作為「被殖民者」在戰爭當中和戰後的「戰爭責任」，以及戰後歐美殖民國如何透過戰犯(包括台籍戰犯)的審判和其他針對其「被殖民者」的補償手段，來重新建立其在東南亞各地殖民統治的過程。同時，透過分析「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」所面臨的國籍問題以及因國籍未定而衍生的諸多問題，則能夠進一步思考日本帝國在戰後崩解之際，對作為前「被殖民者」的台灣人所擔負(或者欠缺)的「殖民責任」。

這樣的研究不但將有助於探討第二次世界大戰在臺灣史當中的意義。更進一步的，這項臺灣史的研究將會對第二次世界大戰的歷史以及近代帝國與殖民的歷史，特別是在後殖民的脈絡之下持續發生的殖民影響，作出新的貢獻。而從「去殖民」的角度來看，英法荷等殖民帝國對日本帝國所進行的戰犯審判可以被視為是二戰後已經在「崩解」的帝國之間的碰撞與角力。因此，作為前「被殖民者」，「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」的研究將提供我們對帝國「崩解」的過程、結果、以及其影響更深入而全面的了解。而這樣跨國性的研究，以台籍戰犯的歷史為基礎，更將有助於瞭解二戰結束前後在東亞和東南亞地區國際政治秩序和機制重新建構的過程，從而對二戰史、戰後東亞國際關係、和冷戰史做進一步的補充。

¹² 湯熙勇，〈公平對待與秩序維持之間：日本東京澀谷事件與臺灣人的審判（1946-47）〉，《亞太研究論壇（Asia-Pacific Forum）》，第35期，頁1-35，2007；何義麟，「戰後台灣における海外ニュースの報道と規制——澀谷事件の報道を中心に」，《現代台湾研究》，第32号（2007），頁3-19

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
出國時間	103年9月1日至 103年9月10日	出國地點	日本東京
出國研究目的	移地研究，蒐集史料		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

前往日本國立公文書館、外務省外交史料館、防衛省防衛研究所等地收集史料。

二、研究成果

此次所蒐集的資料，已經或將用以撰寫下列論文：

- “Path of War, Path of Memory: Taiwanese in the Pacific/War” . Paper presented at Pacific History Association 21st Biennial Conference, December 3rd, 2014, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan
- “教戰爭（歷史）= 教和平：戰爭歷史與人權／和平教育（Teaching Peace through History of War: War History and Human Rights/Peace Education）” . Paper to be presented at 「全球視野下的歷史思維教學與研究」歷史教育國際學術研討會，國立臺灣師範大學，2015年5月22—23日（預定）
- “「被殖民者」的罪，「帝國」（不負）的責任：二戰中台灣人在海外的歷史與記憶” . Paper to be presented at 「戰爭的歷史與記憶：抗戰勝利七十週年學術討論會」，國史館，2015年7月7-9日（預定）

三、建議：無

科技部補助專題研究計畫出席國際學術會議心得報告

日期：104年02月22日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	時任：國立中正大學歷史系助理教授 現任：國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
會議時間	103年5月24日至 103年5月25日	會議地點	日本立教大學 (Rikkyo University)， 東京
會議名稱	(中文) 第一屆口譯歷史國際會議 (英文) The First International Symposium on the History of Interpreting		
發表題目	(中文) 翻譯致罪：二次大戰受國際戰犯審判的台灣人戰地翻譯 (英文) Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War		

一、參加會議經過

103年5月24日：

- 上午報到註冊
- 上午參加 Anthony Pym (Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain) 論文發表與討論
- 中午與參加的學者餐會，討論未來國際學術合作交流計畫。
- 下午參加 Rachel Lung (Lingnan University, Hong Kong), Iciar Alonso-Araguas (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain), 與 David Sawyer (University of Maryland, United States) 論文發表與討論
- 晚間與參加的學者餐會，討論未來共同合作出版研究成果之計畫。

103年5月24日：

- 上午發表論文。主持人為 Jesús Baigorri-Jalon 教授(Universidad de Salamanca, Spain)。論文發表之後，與現場與會的多位國際學者進行熱烈的討論
- 上午參加 Kayoko Takeda (Rikkyo University, Japan)論文發表與討論
- 中午與參加的學者餐會，繼續討論未來國際學術合作交流計畫。
- 下午參加 Jesús Baigorri-Jalon (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain) 與 Kumiko Torikai (Rikkyo University, Japan)論文發表與討論
- 晚間與參加的學者餐會進行交流，確定未來共同合作出版研究成果之計畫。

二、與會心得

會議主辦機構 Rikkyo Graduate School of Intercultural Communication 為日本跨文化研究首屈一指的研究機構，此次特別以翻譯研究當中的口譯歷史作為研究主題召開國際會議，吸引了超過150名學者報名與會。此次應邀發表論文的包括幾位國際翻譯研究學界重量級的學者，例如 Anthony Pym (Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain), Jesús Baigorri-Jalon 教授(Universidad de Salamanca, Spain), Kayoko Takeda (Rikkyo University, Japan), 以及 Kumiko Torikai (Rikkyo University, Japan)。本人能夠受邀在此會發表論文，更是得到了一個非常難得能夠與國際學界交流接軌的機會。

我在此會發表論文一篇。該論文為歷史學的研究，但是在會上得到來自翻譯研究、社會學、以及語言學等學科的多位國際學者的肯定與討論。能夠參與此會，一方面藉著與各學科專家的交流來提升自我學術水平，在跨學科的思考方面有豐富的收穫，也建立了更廣大的國際性/跨學科學術網絡。另一方面，同時也非常高興能夠藉著此機會，將台灣研究推向國際學界，更能夠透過在國際學術的交流平台上介紹有關台灣的研究，引起國際學者對台灣研究更高的興趣。

三、發表論文全文或摘要

Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War

論文摘要

After the Second World War, 173 Taiwanese who were recruited to serve in the Japanese military across Asia-Pacific during the war were convicted as war criminals. Based on studies of trial records and archival materials, this paper finds that among the 21 executed Taiwanese war criminals, at least 13 of them were convicted and consequently executed for crimes committed while serving as interpreters—formal and informal—during the war. In addition, a handful of Taiwanese interpreters were convicted as war criminals for various degrees of prison terms. While their number is small, the trials and punishment of these Taiwanese interpreters as war criminals provide a new perspective to understand the history of interpretation/interpreters in colonial/post-colonial and wartime context. This paper first examines trial records of the British courts—held in Malaya and Singapore—that show most Taiwanese formal interpreters were convicted of crimes committed against “local civilians / residents” . This paper finds that it was their language proficiency and interpretation duty brought/forced many Taiwanese serving in the Japanese military into close and frequent contact with the local population, particularly the Chinese, and thereby led to occasions in which these Taiwanese interpreters were involved in the alleged crime. Furthermore, as returning colonial powers made trials of war crime against “local civilians” a priority in re-establishing their legitimacy in colonies across Southeast Asia in the immediate postwar period, they also targeted Taiwanese interpreters who were easily identified for their crime against local population. In addition, this paper studies several cases of Taiwanese informal interpreters who committed crimes against Chinese prisoners of war (POWs) and were put on trial in the Australian courts held in Rabaul. It finds that while these Taiwanese were originally recruited as laborers, they were assigned to *ad hoc* interpretation duty because of their language proficiency under the contingency in the battlefields.

四、建議：無

五、攜回資料名稱及內容：會議論文；會上同時舉辦的歷史照片展覽，*The*

Interpreter’ s One Hundred Years of Solitude: between history and memory

六、其他：無

科技部補助專題研究計畫執行國際合作與移地研究心得報告

日期：104年02月22日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	時任：國立中正大學歷史系助理教授 現任：國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
出國時間	103年6月23日 至 103年6月27日	出國地點	新加坡
出國研究目的	移地研究，蒐集史料		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

前往新加坡國家圖書館 (National Library, Singapore) 查找相關史料，包括 1945 年二戰結束前後的當地與東南亞各地的主要報紙。

二、研究成果

此次移地研究，一方面就戰後英國在殖民地所進行的戰犯審判過程、以及殖民地當地民眾對審判的反應，取得豐富的材料。此部分的史料，對本人在 2014 年所發表的會議論文以及正在撰寫的論文都提供了重要的補充。其中一篇 *Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War*，經改寫投稿，目前已經通過審查與修改補充，即將收錄在由國際翻譯學界的兩位著名學者 Kayoko Takeda (Rikkyo University, Japan) 與 Jesús Baigorri (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain) 合編的專書，*New Insights in the History of Interpreting* (Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company, forthcoming 2015)。該書預計在 2015 年出版，作為國際翻譯學界最重要的系列叢書 Benjamins Translation Library 的最新出版成果。透過此平台，本計劃的研究成果將有機會向國際翻譯學界引介台灣史的相關議題，更有助於吸引國際學界對台灣史更多跨學科的興趣。

另一方面，此次移地研究進一步發掘開拓了與「殖民戰爭責任」相關的新研究方向。其中最具有收獲的是，與海外的臺灣人集中與遣返相關的史料。在結合台灣國內以及其他國家的檔案資料之後，已經開始撰寫多篇論文，包括「戰爭的終結與臺灣人—海外臺灣人的集中與遣返問題」、

日期：104年02月22日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	時任：國立中正大學歷史系助理教授 現任：國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
出國時間	103年7月23日 至 103年8月2日	出國地點	日本九州
出國研究目的	移地研究，蒐集史料		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

● 在九州與共同研究者會面：

本人自 2011 年起，與日本尚絅大學的和田英穗教授（及英國劍橋大學 University of Cambridge 的 Barak Kushner 教授）共同提出「台籍戰犯」的研究計畫，得到日本學術振興會為期三年(2011-2014)的研究經費支助；計畫名稱：對日本的 BC 級戰犯審判與台灣戰犯的研究：以中英法澳洲的戰犯審判為研究中心（計畫編號：Kakenhi 23720356, Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists B）。

本年度為計畫總結年。此次本人與共同研究者會面，就過去三年期間的研究成果進行彙整、回顧、檢討。該計畫在過去三年間，2012 年在日本舉辦一次國際學術工作坊，2013 年在台灣舉辦一次國際學術研討會，共有 10 餘位來自台灣、日本、英國、新加坡、澳洲的學者曾經參與並發表論文。在推動國際合作與促進學術交流等方面，都有豐碩的成果。在成果出版方面，參與研究計畫的個別學者已經分別以中文、日文、英文出版期刊與專書論文多篇。

● 在九州停留期間，本人同時也與共同研究者匯集過去三年間分別從中國、澳洲、日本等地檔案館所蒐集而來的大量資料，進行共同解讀與整理，以利未來持續進行研究。

二、研究成果

此次更進一步擬定出版專書計畫，將以 2013 年所舉辦國際學術研討會上發表的論文為基礎，編撰《帝國崩解之際：在戰後跨國脈絡下的臺灣人》。該書將以中文出版；會上發表的外文文章將在近期進行翻譯。預計在 2015 年出版。

目前所擬定的出版計畫書如下：

1945 年 8 月，隨著日本的戰敗，日本在台灣的殖民統治也同時結束。中華民國政府在該年的 10 月，正式派員接受台灣。自此，台灣成為中華民國政府轄下的領土迄今。而在這樣的狀態改變之下，台灣的「人」當然也受到了非常巨大的影響。而與領土不同的是，領土是物，人卻是活的、是有生命的。條約的內容或政權的更迭或者可以在一夜之間改變決定領土的歸屬，但是對人的改變卻很難在一瞬之間完成。人

有生活、人際關係、過去的經驗、現在的認同、還有對未來的規劃與期望。這一切都是經年累月的結果，當然也不是在短時間之內隨著「領土重劃」就可以完全改變的。

由此觀點出發，我們就能夠理解在 1945 年 8 月 15 日戰爭終結與殖民終結（去殖民）的交叉點上，無論對新的統治者（中華民國政府）、台灣人（作為被統治者）、以及包括原來／舊的統治者（日本）在內的諸多外國他者，（重新）界定「台灣人」都是一項必要但是卻複雜的過程。而更值得注意的是，這個過程同時在臺灣與海外進行，而其中首要的工作就是確認台灣人的國籍。

事實上，中華民國政府要到了 1946 年的 1 月 12 日才正式頒佈命令、宣佈所有的台灣人民為中國籍（中華民國籍）。在臺灣本地的台灣人，由於是在中華民國政府轄下，所以產生的國籍爭議主要是台灣人涉及司法裁判，應以「戰犯」或「漢奸」論處的問題。但是對當時身在海外的台灣人，所衍生的問題就更為複雜。在 1895-1945 年之間，隨著日本帝國經濟與政治力量的擴張，有許許多多的台灣人到海外受雇、創業、或是就學。在 1945 年第二次世界大戰結束的時候，仍然有數十萬的台灣人身在海外。如同另外數百萬當時在海外的日本國民，這些臺灣人也面對著遙遠的歸鄉道路。但是，與日本國民不同的是，在臺灣的「領土重劃」之後，這些當時仍然身在台灣以外的台灣人立刻就面臨了一個根本性的問題：1945 年 8 月 15 日之前，他們的身分是日本帝國殖民地台灣的人民（或是在中國被稱為「台灣籍民」）；那麼 1945 年 8 月 15 日開始呢？台灣人與原/前統治者（日本帝國）的關係終止之後，新的統治者（中華民國政府）並未立刻賦予他們新的身分，也尚未擬定對他們的相關政策。那麼 1945 年 8 月 15 日以後，對外國的他者來說，「台灣人」究竟是誰？更具體而且急迫的問題是：戰爭結束，要如何處置這些台灣人？

在外的中華民國使館，在 1946 年 1 月 30 日才接到上述有關台灣人國籍的通知。而後為了能夠進一步的透過外館等單位對在外台灣人進行登記、發給護照等作業，國民政府在 1946 年 6 月 22 日正式公布了「在外台僑國籍處理辦法」。¹ 但是這樣的作法與反應，在時間上，其實使得在海外的台灣人，從戰爭結束之後有將近半年的時間是無國籍或是被視為「第三國人」（即非戰勝國，亦非戰敗國）的身分，² 更未能得到任何國家主權的保護，甚至在多處發生不分老幼的台灣人被盟國當局關入集中營的情況。³

¹ 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，《人文及社會科學集刊》，第 17 卷第 2 期（2005），頁 398, 405

² 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，頁 395

³ 湯熙勇，〈臺灣人在東南亞(1945- 1953)：集中營、審判及遣返〉，發表於第三屆海外華人研究與文獻收藏國際研討會，新加坡：新加坡大學等，2005；張建侖，〈迢迢歸鄉路——戰後港澳地區台胞返籍始末〉，《港澳與近代中國學術研討會論文集》（台北：國史館，民國 89 年），頁 549-580

更重要的是在國際上，台灣人的國籍歸屬問題並不是由中華民國「單方面」就能夠完全決定的。美國、英國、荷蘭等盟國，基於對日和約尚未簽訂、台灣主權尚未正式轉移之考量，或對台灣人戰爭時期的「不當行為」進行審判制裁的需要等理由，在當時並未同意中華民國政府對台灣人國籍所做的主張。⁴也因此，使得戰後仍然身在海外的台灣人處在國籍不定的狀態。學者曾經指出，這樣的狀態則導致了對海外台灣人三方面的影響：未受尊重、涉及司法(戰犯)裁判、以及個人財產未獲保護等。⁵

關於海外的台灣人在戰後所面臨的問題，近年來已有非常豐碩的研究成果，包括何義麟所著有關於在日本的台灣人⁶；許雪姬有關在中國大陸(及滿州)的台灣人⁷；湯熙勇有關在海外(特別是東南亞)的台灣人⁸；張建侖有關在華南及港澳的台灣人⁹。另外，以台籍日本兵為主題的相關研究也已經有豐碩的成果¹⁰。另外，國史館的史料彙編更是提供了許多珍貴的材料。¹¹

本書所要探討的就是，在戰後這樣特殊的狀態之下，台灣人由於身份的不確定所受到的影響。主要的關注點是台灣人涉及司法裁判的問題，特別是有關於「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」。由於在戰後的歷史書寫和集體的戰爭記憶中，台灣的二戰經驗有相當長的一段時間遭到邊緣化甚至忽略，也因此

⁴ 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，頁 393, 413-423

⁵ 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，頁 425-429

⁶ 〈戰後初期臺灣留日學生的左傾言論及其動向〉《臺灣史研究》，第 19 卷第 2 期，(THCI Core)。2012 年 06 月，151-192 頁；〈戰後在日台灣人之處境與認同：以蔡朝圻先生的經歷為中心〉《台灣風物》(第 60 卷 4 期，台灣風物雜誌社)。2010 年 12 月，161-194 頁

⁷ 《口述歷史 第五期(日據時期台灣人赴大陸經驗專號之一)》，臺北：中央研究院近代史研究所，1995；《口述歷史 第六期(日據時期台灣人赴大陸經驗專號之二)》，臺北：中央研究院近代史研究所，1995；《日治時期在「滿洲」的台灣人(再版)》，臺北：中央研究院近代史研究所，2004；〈1937 年至 1947 年在北京的台灣人〉，《長庚人文社會學報》，第 1 卷第 1 期，頁 33-84，2008；〈1937-1947 年在上海的台灣人〉，《臺灣學研究》，13 期，頁 1-32，2012。

⁸ 〈國籍回復とそれを巡る争い--在外台湾人の國籍問題(1943-1948)〉，《阪神華僑の國際ネットワークに関する研究》(日本：日本神戸大學國際文化學部)，2004；〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，《人文及社會科學集刊》，第 17 卷第 2 期，頁 393-437，2005；〈脫離困境：戰後初期海南島之台灣人的返台〉，《台灣史研究》第 12 卷第 2 期，頁 167-208，2005；〈公平對待與秩序維持之間：日本東京澀谷事件與臺灣人的審判(1946-47)〉，《亞太研究論壇(Asia-Pacific Forum)》，第 35 期，頁 1-35，2007；〈烽火後的同鄉情：戰後東亞臺灣同鄉會的成立、轉變與角色(1945-48)〉，《人文及社會科學集刊》，第 19 卷第 1 期，頁 1-49，2007。

⁹ 〈迢迢歸鄉路——戰後港澳地區台胞返籍始末〉，《港澳與近代中國學術研討會論文集》(台北：國史館，民國 89 年)，頁 549-580；〈田園將蕪胡不歸？——戰後廣州地區台胞處境及返籍問題之研究〉，《台灣史研究》6 卷 1 期(民國 89 年 9 月)，1 頁 133-166

¹⁰ 周婉窈編，1997。《台籍日本兵座談會紀錄并相關資料》。台北：中央研究院台灣史研究所籌備處；蔡慧玉編著，1997。《走過兩個時代的人：台籍日本兵》。台北：中央研究院台灣史研究所籌備處；李展平，2005。《前進婆羅洲——台籍戰俘監視員》。南投：國史館台灣文獻館；李展平，2007。《戰火紋身的監視員——台籍戰俘悲歌》。南投：國史館台灣文獻館。

¹¹ 例如，謝培屏編，《戰後遣送旅外華僑回國史料彙編(1)：德國·土耳其·義大利·日本篇》，台北：國史館，2007；《戰後遣送旅外華僑回國史料彙編(2)：澳洲·蘇聯·羅馬尼亞·捷克篇》，台北：國史館，2007；《戰後遣送旅外華僑回國史料彙編(3)：南洋海南島篇》，台北：國史館，2008。

「台籍戰犯」的問題一直都並未得到太多的關注。但事實上，由於戰後對「台籍戰犯」的審判是同時在澳大利亞、中國、荷蘭、英國和美國等盟國的軍事法庭當中分別所進行，「台籍戰犯」的審判最足以代表身在海外的台灣人，在國籍不定的狀態之下所面臨的問題。

根據統計，在二次大戰期間有超過了二十萬名的台灣人被徵召到亞洲各地的戰場，其中超過三萬人喪命於戰場，更有上百名台灣人在戰後遭各個盟國以 B/C 級戰犯審判。最終有 173 名台灣籍戰犯被判刑確定、其中 21 名被判處並執行死刑。因為台籍戰犯審判所牽涉的國家和地理位置的分布非常廣泛，台籍戰犯歷史的研究勢必是一項龐大的跨國性研究，也需要各國學者的共同參與。在 2010 年年底，由日本尚綱大學 (Shokei Gakuen University, Japan) 的和田英穗教授 (Dr Wada Hideho)，英國劍橋大學 (University of Cambridge, United Kingdom) 的 Barak Kushner 教授，以及現任教於台灣國立政治大學歷史系的藍適齊共同發起了一項台籍戰犯的跨國性研究計畫。這項計畫在 2011 年度得到了日本學術振興會 (Japan Society for the Promotion of Science) 為期三年的研究經費補助。計畫的題目為《対日 BC 級戦犯裁判における台湾人戦犯の研究—中英仏豪の戦犯裁判を中心に—》(中譯：對日本的 BC 級戰犯審判與台灣戰犯的研究：以中英法澳洲的戰犯審判為研究中心)。以此為基礎，三位學者分別在中國、香港、日本、澳洲、以及台灣進行了初步的資料蒐集，確立了更完整的研究架構，也開展了與各國學者更廣泛的合作。根據初期的研究成果，三位學者在 2012 年 9 月在日本召開了第一次的工作坊，並邀請了來自日本、台灣、及澳大利亞等地的多位學者共同與會，發表研究題目與交換初步的研究構想。以 2012 年的此項工作坊為基礎，2013 年邀集進行合作研究的學者在台灣國立中正大學舉辦了名為「國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯」的國際學術研討會。目前所提出的專書構想，將以在此會上提交的研究論文為基礎。論文作者與主題分別是：

- 英國劍橋大學 (University of Cambridge, United Kingdom) Barak Kushner 副教授：
《日本帝國的瓦解與殖民之罪：台籍戰犯審判與國際法的衝突》(The Collapse of Empire and the Search for Colonial Guilt: Taiwanese War Criminals and the Conflict with International Law) *由英文原文翻譯為中文
- 日本愛知大學現代中国学部加治宏基助理教授 Dr Kaji Hiromoto：
《日籍/台籍戰犯審判的國際法源基礎》*由日文原文翻譯為中文
- 日本尚綱大學 (Shokei Gakuen University, Japan) 和田英穗准教授 Dr Wada Hideho：
《在台灣法庭的戰犯審判與台灣華僑》*由日文原文翻譯為中文
- 台灣國立中正大學歷史系張建侖副教授：
《中華民國政府在華南地區進行的台籍戰犯審判》
- 澳洲 Murdoch 大學 Dean Aszkielowicz 教授：
《澳洲進行的台灣/朝鮮籍戰犯審判》(Australia's Pursuit of the Formosan and Korean 'Japanese' War Criminals) *由英文原文翻譯為中文
- 台灣國立政治大學歷史系藍適齊助理教授：

《翻譯致罪：二次大戰後受到國際戰犯審判的台灣人戰地通譯》

而在「在日台灣人」的定位這項議題方面，特別是在日台灣人法律地位之演變，則有兩篇論文：

- 臺灣國立臺北教育大學台文所何義麟教授：《戰後日本華僑報刊中台灣人身分論述之考察》
透過檢視日本華僑社會中台灣人之定位，來探討在日台灣人如何面對認同問題。
- 臺灣南台科技大學楊子震助理教授：《澀谷事件與戰後初期在日台灣人之法的地位》
討論 1946 年 7 月在東京所發生的澀谷事件，¹² 如何反映了台灣人在戰後從「帝國臣民」轉變成為「在日華僑」所面臨的處境。

更進一步的，本書希望透過「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」的研究來探討第二次世界大戰所衍生出來的「戰爭責任」以及「殖民責任」。一般來說，「戰爭責任」與「殖民責任」多被放在兩種不同的脈絡當中來討論。但是在第二次世界大戰中，殖民/去殖民與戰爭這兩股歷史發展力量產生了緊密的交會，進而對殖民地的人民以及殖民帝國帶來了巨大的衝擊和深遠的影響。而「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」正是處在這巨變交會之下，身份地位產生最明顯而複雜的變化的台灣人。因此，對他們的研究將對以上議題的討論有特別的啟發作用。在這樣的研究視角之下，這本專書的編撰將從跨國的脈絡之下來進一步討論「台籍戰犯」的審判當中所反映出來的「戰爭責任」以及殖民帝國/殖民地之間的角力關係。研究的主要目標是檢視「台籍戰犯」作為「被殖民者」在戰爭當中和戰後的「戰爭責任」，以及戰後歐美殖民國如何透過戰犯(包括台籍戰犯)的審判和其他針對其「被殖民者」的補償手段，來重新建立其在東南亞各地殖民統治的過程。同時，透過分析「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」所面臨的國籍問題以及因國籍未定而衍生的諸多問題，則能夠進一步思考日本帝國在戰後崩解之際，對作為前「被殖民者」的台灣人所擔負(或者欠缺)的「殖民責任」。

這樣的研究不但將有助於探討第二次世界大戰在臺灣史當中的意義。更進一步的，這項臺灣史的研究將會對第二次世界大戰的歷史以及近代帝國與殖民的歷史，特別是在後殖民的脈絡之下持續發生的殖民影響，作出新的貢獻。而從「去殖民」的角度來看，英法荷等殖民帝國對日本帝國所進行的戰犯審判可以被視為是二戰後已經在「崩解」的帝國之間的碰撞與角力。因此，作為前「被殖民者」，「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」的研究將提供我們對帝國「崩解」的過程、結果、以及其影響更深入而全面的了解。而這樣跨國性的研究，以台籍戰犯的歷史為基礎，更將有助於瞭解二戰結束前後在東亞和東南亞地區國際政治秩序和機制重新建構的過程，從而對二戰史、戰後東亞國際關係、和冷戰史做進一步的補充。

¹² 湯熙勇，〈公平對待與秩序維持之間：日本東京澀谷事件與臺灣人的審判（1946-47）〉，《亞太研究論壇（Asia-Pacific Forum）》，第35期，頁1-35，2007；何義麟，「戰後台灣における海外ニュースの報道と規制——澀谷事件の報道を中心に」，《現代台湾研究》，第32号（2007），頁3-19

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
出國時間	103年9月1日至 103年9月10日	出國地點	日本東京
出國研究目的	移地研究，蒐集史料		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

前往日本國立公文書館、外務省外交史料館、防衛省防衛研究所等地收集史料。

二、研究成果

此次所蒐集的資料，已經或將用以撰寫下列論文：

- “Path of War, Path of Memory: Taiwanese in the Pacific/War” . Paper presented at Pacific History Association 21st Biennial Conference, December 3rd, 2014, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan
- “教戰爭（歷史）= 教和平：戰爭歷史與人權／和平教育（Teaching Peace through History of War: War History and Human Rights/Peace Education）” . Paper to be presented at 「全球視野下的歷史思維教學與研究」歷史教育國際學術研討會，國立臺灣師範大學，2015年5月22—23日（預定）
- “「被殖民者」的罪，「帝國」（不負）的責任：二戰中台灣人在海外的歷史與記憶” . Paper to be presented at 「戰爭的歷史與記憶：抗戰勝利七十週年學術討論會」，國史館，2015年7月7-9日（預定）

三、建議：無

科技部補助專題研究計畫出席國際學術會議心得報告

日期：104年02月22日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	時任：國立中正大學歷史系助理教授 現任：國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
會議時間	103年5月24日至 103年5月25日	會議地點	日本立教大學 (Rikkyo University)， 東京
會議名稱	(中文) 第一屆口譯歷史國際會議 (英文) The First International Symposium on the History of Interpreting		
發表題目	(中文) 翻譯致罪：二次大戰受國際戰犯審判的台灣人戰地翻譯 (英文) Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War		

一、參加會議經過

103年5月24日：

- 上午報到註冊
- 上午參加 Anthony Pym (Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain) 論文發表與討論
- 中午與參加的學者餐會，討論未來國際學術合作交流計畫。
- 下午參加 Rachel Lung (Lingnan University, Hong Kong), Iciar Alonso-Araguas (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain), 與 David Sawyer (University of Maryland, United States) 論文發表與討論
- 晚間與參加的學者餐會，討論未來共同合作出版研究成果之計畫。

103年5月24日：

- 上午發表論文。主持人為 Jesús Baigorri-Jalon 教授(Universidad de Salamanca, Spain)。論文發表之後，與現場與會的多位國際學者進行熱烈的討論
- 上午參加 Kayoko Takeda (Rikkyo University, Japan)論文發表與討論
- 中午與參加的學者餐會，繼續討論未來國際學術合作交流計畫。
- 下午參加 Jesús Baigorri-Jalon (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain) 與 Kumiko Torikai (Rikkyo University, Japan)論文發表與討論
- 晚間與參加的學者餐會進行交流，確定未來共同合作出版研究成果之計畫。

二、與會心得

會議主辦機構 Rikkyo Graduate School of Intercultural Communication 為日本跨文化研究首屈一指的研究機構，此次特別以翻譯研究當中的口譯歷史作為研究主題召開國際會議，吸引了超過150名學者報名與會。此次應邀發表論文的包括幾位國際翻譯研究學界重量級的學者，例如 Anthony Pym (Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain), Jesús Baigorri-Jalon 教授(Universidad de Salamanca, Spain), Kayoko Takeda (Rikkyo University, Japan), 以及 Kumiko Torikai (Rikkyo University, Japan)。本人能夠受邀在此會發表論文，更是得到了一個非常難得能夠與國際學界交流接軌的機會。

我在此會發表論文一篇。該論文為歷史學的研究，但是在會上得到來自翻譯研究、社會學、以及語言學等學科的多位國際學者的肯定與討論。能夠參與此會，一方面藉著與各學科專家的交流來提升自我學術水平，在跨學科的思考方面有豐富的收穫，也建立了更廣大的國際性/跨學科學術網絡。另一方面，同時也非常高興能夠藉著此機會，將台灣研究推向國際學界，更能夠透過在國際學術的交流平台上介紹有關台灣的研究，引起國際學者對台灣研究更高的興趣。

三、發表論文全文或摘要

Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War

論文摘要

After the Second World War, 173 Taiwanese who were recruited to serve in the Japanese military across Asia-Pacific during the war were convicted as war criminals. Based on studies of trial records and archival materials, this paper finds that among the 21 executed Taiwanese war criminals, at least 13 of them were convicted and consequently executed for crimes committed while serving as interpreters—formal and informal—during the war. In addition, a handful of Taiwanese interpreters were convicted as war criminals for various degrees of prison terms. While their number is small, the trials and punishment of these Taiwanese interpreters as war criminals provide a new perspective to understand the history of interpretation/interpreters in colonial/post-colonial and wartime context. This paper first examines trial records of the British courts—held in Malaya and Singapore—that show most Taiwanese formal interpreters were convicted of crimes committed against “local civilians / residents” . This paper finds that it was their language proficiency and interpretation duty brought/forced many Taiwanese serving in the Japanese military into close and frequent contact with the local population, particularly the Chinese, and thereby led to occasions in which these Taiwanese interpreters were involved in the alleged crime. Furthermore, as returning colonial powers made trials of war crime against “local civilians” a priority in re-establishing their legitimacy in colonies across Southeast Asia in the immediate postwar period, they also targeted Taiwanese interpreters who were easily identified for their crime against local population. In addition, this paper studies several cases of Taiwanese informal interpreters who committed crimes against Chinese prisoners of war (POWs) and were put on trial in the Australian courts held in Rabaul. It finds that while these Taiwanese were originally recruited as laborers, they were assigned to *ad hoc* interpretation duty because of their language proficiency under the contingency in the battlefields.

四、建議：無

五、攜回資料名稱及內容：會議論文；會上同時舉辦的歷史照片展覽，*The*

Interpreter’ s One Hundred Years of Solitude: between history and memory

六、其他：無

科技部補助專題研究計畫執行國際合作與移地研究心得報告

日期：104年02月22日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	時任：國立中正大學歷史系助理教授 現任：國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
出國時間	103年6月23日 至 103年6月27日	出國地點	新加坡
出國研究目的	移地研究，蒐集史料		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

前往新加坡國家圖書館 (National Library, Singapore) 查找相關史料，包括 1945 年二戰結束前後的當地與東南亞各地的主要報紙。

二、研究成果

此次移地研究，一方面就戰後英國在殖民地所進行的戰犯審判過程、以及殖民地當地民眾對審判的反應，取得豐富的材料。此部分的史料，對本人在 2014 年所發表的會議論文以及正在撰寫的論文都提供了重要的補充。其中一篇 *Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War*，經改寫投稿，目前已經通過審查與修改補充，即將收錄在由國際翻譯學界的兩位著名學者 Kayoko Takeda (Rikkyo University, Japan) 與 Jesús Baigorri (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain) 合編的專書，*New Insights in the History of Interpreting* (Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company, forthcoming 2015)。該書預計在 2015 年出版，作為國際翻譯學界最重要的系列叢書 Benjamins Translation Library 的最新出版成果。透過此平台，本計劃的研究成果將有機會向國際翻譯學界引介台灣史的相關議題，更有助於吸引國際學界對台灣史更多跨學科的興趣。

另一方面，此次移地研究進一步發掘開拓了與「殖民戰爭責任」相關的新研究方向。其中最具有收獲的是，與海外的臺灣人集中與遣返相關的史料。在結合台灣國內以及其他國家的檔案資料之後，已經開始撰寫多篇論文，包括「戰爭的終結與臺灣人—海外臺灣人的集中與遣返問題」、

日期：104年02月22日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	時任：國立中正大學歷史系助理教授 現任：國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
出國時間	103年7月23日 至 103年8月2日	出國地點	日本九州
出國研究目的	移地研究，蒐集史料		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

● 在九州與共同研究者會面：

本人自 2011 年起，與日本尚絅大學的和田英穗教授（及英國劍橋大學 University of Cambridge 的 Barak Kushner 教授）共同提出「台籍戰犯」的研究計畫，得到日本學術振興會為期三年(2011-2014)的研究經費支助；計畫名稱：對日本的 BC 級戰犯審判與台灣戰犯的研究：以中英法澳洲的戰犯審判為研究中心（計畫編號：Kakenhi 23720356, Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists B）。

本年度為計畫總結年。此次本人與共同研究者會面，就過去三年期間的研究成果進行彙整、回顧、檢討。該計畫在過去三年間，2012 年在日本舉辦一次國際學術工作坊，2013 年在台灣舉辦一次國際學術研討會，共有 10 餘位來自台灣、日本、英國、新加坡、澳洲的學者曾經參與並發表論文。在推動國際合作與促進學術交流等方面，都有豐碩的成果。在成果出版方面，參與研究計畫的個別學者已經分別以中文、日文、英文出版期刊與專書論文多篇。

● 在九州停留期間，本人同時也與共同研究者匯集過去三年間分別從中國、澳洲、日本等地檔案館所蒐集而來的大量資料，進行共同解讀與整理，以利未來持續進行研究。

二、研究成果

此次更進一步擬定出版專書計畫，將以 2013 年所舉辦國際學術研討會上發表的論文為基礎，編撰《帝國崩解之際：在戰後跨國脈絡下的臺灣人》。該書將以中文出版；會上發表的外文文章將在近期進行翻譯。預計在 2015 年出版。

目前所擬定的出版計畫書如下：

1945 年 8 月，隨著日本的戰敗，日本在台灣的殖民統治也同時結束。中華民國政府在該年的 10 月，正式派員接受台灣。自此，台灣成為中華民國政府轄下的領土迄今。而在這樣的狀態改變之下，台灣的「人」當然也受到了非常巨大的影響。而與領土不同的是，領土是物，人卻是活的、是有生命的。條約的內容或政權的更迭或者可以在一夜之間改變決定領土的歸屬，但是對人的改變卻很難在一瞬之間完成。人

有生活、人際關係、過去的經驗、現在的認同、還有對未來的規劃與期望。這一切都是經年累月的結果，當然也不是在短時間之內隨著「領土重劃」就可以完全改變的。

由此觀點出發，我們就能夠理解在 1945 年 8 月 15 日戰爭終結與殖民終結（去殖民）的交叉點上，無論對新的統治者（中華民國政府）、台灣人（作為被統治者）、以及包括原來／舊的統治者（日本）在內的諸多外國他者，（重新）界定「台灣人」都是一項必要但是卻複雜的過程。而更值得注意的是，這個過程同時在臺灣與海外進行，而其中首要的工作就是確認台灣人的國籍。

事實上，中華民國政府要到了 1946 年的 1 月 12 日才正式頒佈命令、宣佈所有的台灣人民為中國籍（中華民國籍）。在臺灣本地的台灣人，由於是在中華民國政府轄下，所以產生的國籍爭議主要是台灣人涉及司法裁判，應以「戰犯」或「漢奸」論處的問題。但是對當時身在海外的台灣人，所衍生的問題就更為複雜。在 1895-1945 年之間，隨著日本帝國經濟與政治力量的擴張，有許許多多的台灣人到海外受雇、創業、或是就學。在 1945 年第二次世界大戰結束的時候，仍然有數十萬的台灣人身在海外。如同另外數百萬當時在海外的日本國民，這些臺灣人也面對著遙遠的歸鄉道路。但是，與日本國民不同的是，在臺灣的「領土重劃」之後，這些當時仍然身在台灣以外的台灣人立刻就面臨了一個根本性的問題：1945 年 8 月 15 日之前，他們的身分是日本帝國殖民地台灣的人民（或是在中國被稱為「台灣籍民」）；那麼 1945 年 8 月 15 日開始呢？台灣人與原/前統治者（日本帝國）的關係終止之後，新的統治者（中華民國政府）並未立刻賦予他們新的身分，也尚未擬定對他們的相關政策。那麼 1945 年 8 月 15 日以後，對外國的他者來說，「台灣人」究竟是誰？更具體而且急迫的問題是：戰爭結束，要如何處置這些台灣人？

在外的中華民國使館，在 1946 年 1 月 30 日才接到上述有關台灣人國籍的通知。而後為了能夠進一步的透過外館等單位對在外台灣人進行登記、發給護照等作業，國民政府在 1946 年 6 月 22 日正式公布了「在外台僑國籍處理辦法」。¹ 但是這樣的作法與反應，在時間上，其實使得在海外的台灣人，從戰爭結束之後有將近半年的時間是無國籍或是被視為「第三國人」（即非戰勝國，亦非戰敗國）的身分，² 更未能得到任何國家主權的保護，甚至在多處發生不分老幼的台灣人被盟國當局關入集中營的情況。³

¹ 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，《人文及社會科學集刊》，第 17 卷第 2 期（2005），頁 398, 405

² 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，頁 395

³ 湯熙勇，〈臺灣人在東南亞(1945- 1953)：集中營、審判及遣返〉，發表於第三屆海外華人研究與文獻收藏國際研討會，新加坡：新加坡大學等，2005；張建侖，〈迢迢歸鄉路——戰後港澳地區台胞返籍始末〉，《港澳與近代中國學術研討會論文集》（台北：國史館，民國 89 年），頁 549-580

更重要的是在國際上，台灣人的國籍歸屬問題並不是由中華民國「單方面」就能夠完全決定的。美國、英國、荷蘭等盟國，基於對日和約尚未簽訂、台灣主權尚未正式轉移之考量，或對台灣人戰爭時期的「不當行為」進行審判制裁的需要等理由，在當時並未同意中華民國政府對台灣人國籍所做的主張。⁴也因此，使得戰後仍然身在海外的台灣人處在國籍不定的狀態。學者曾經指出，這樣的狀態則導致了對海外台灣人三方面的影響：未受尊重、涉及司法(戰犯)裁判、以及個人財產未獲保護等。⁵

關於海外的台灣人在戰後所面臨的問題，近年來已有非常豐碩的研究成果，包括何義麟所著有關於在日本的台灣人⁶；許雪姬有關在中國大陸(及滿州)的台灣人⁷；湯熙勇有關在海外(特別是東南亞)的台灣人⁸；張建俤有關在華南及港澳的台灣人⁹。另外，以台籍日本兵為主題的相關研究也已經有豐碩的成果¹⁰。另外，國史館的史料彙編更是提供了許多珍貴的材料。¹¹

本書所要探討的就是，在戰後這樣特殊的狀態之下，台灣人由於身份的不確定所受到的影響。主要的關注點是台灣人涉及司法裁判的問題，特別是有關於「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」。由於在戰後的歷史書寫和集體的戰爭記憶中，台灣的二戰經驗有相當長的一段時間遭到邊緣化甚至忽略，也因此

⁴ 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，頁 393, 413-423

⁵ 湯熙勇，〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，頁 425-429

⁶ 〈戰後初期臺灣留日學生的左傾言論及其動向〉《臺灣史研究》，第 19 卷第 2 期，(THCI Core)。2012 年 06 月，151-192 頁；〈戰後在日台灣人之處境與認同：以蔡朝圻先生的經歷為中心〉《台灣風物》(第 60 卷 4 期，台灣風物雜誌社)。2010 年 12 月，161-194 頁

⁷ 《口述歷史 第五期(日據時期台灣人赴大陸經驗專號之一)》，臺北：中央研究院近代史研究所，1995；《口述歷史 第六期(日據時期台灣人赴大陸經驗專號之二)》，臺北：中央研究院近代史研究所，1995；《日治時期在「滿洲」的台灣人(再版)》，臺北：中央研究院近代史研究所，2004；〈1937 年至 1947 年在北京的台灣人〉，《長庚人文社會學報》，第 1 卷第 1 期，頁 33-84，2008；〈1937-1947 年在上海的台灣人〉，《臺灣學研究》，13 期，頁 1-32，2012。

⁸ 〈國籍回復とそれを巡る争い--在外台湾人の國籍問題(1943-1948)〉，《阪神華僑の國際ネットワークに関する研究》(日本：日本神戸大學國際文化學部)，2004；〈恢復國籍的爭議：戰後旅外臺灣人的復籍問題(1945- 1947)〉，《人文及社會科學集刊》，第 17 卷第 2 期，頁 393-437，2005；〈脫離困境：戰後初期海南島之台灣人的返台〉，《台灣史研究》第 12 卷第 2 期，頁 167-208，2005；〈公平對待與秩序維持之間：日本東京澀谷事件與臺灣人的審判(1946-47)〉，《亞太研究論壇(Asia-Pacific Forum)》第 35 期，頁 1-35，2007；〈烽火後的同鄉情：戰後東亞臺灣同鄉會的成立、轉變與角色(1945-48)〉，《人文及社會科學集刊》，第 19 卷第 1 期，頁 1-49，2007。

⁹ 〈迢迢歸鄉路——戰後港澳地區台胞返籍始末〉，《港澳與近代中國學術研討會論文集》(台北：國史館，民國 89 年)，頁 549-580；〈田園將蕪胡不歸？——戰後廣州地區台胞處境及返籍問題之研究〉，《台灣史研究》6 卷 1 期(民國 89 年 9 月)，1 頁 133-166

¹⁰ 周婉窈編，1997。《台籍日本兵座談會紀錄并相關資料》。台北：中央研究院台灣史研究所籌備處；蔡慧玉編著，1997。《走過兩個時代的人：台籍日本兵》。台北：中央研究院台灣史研究所籌備處；李展平，2005。《前進婆羅洲——台籍戰俘監視員》。南投：國史館台灣文獻館；李展平，2007。《戰火紋身的監視員——台籍戰俘悲歌》。南投：國史館台灣文獻館。

¹¹ 例如，謝培屏編，《戰後遣送旅外華僑回國史料彙編(1)：德國·土耳其·義大利·日本篇》，台北：國史館，2007；《戰後遣送旅外華僑回國史料彙編(2)：澳洲·蘇聯·羅馬尼亞·捷克篇》，台北：國史館，2007；《戰後遣送旅外華僑回國史料彙編(3)：南洋海南島篇》，台北：國史館，2008。

「台籍戰犯」的問題一直都並未得到太多的關注。但事實上，由於戰後對「台籍戰犯」的審判是同時在澳大利亞、中國、荷蘭、英國和美國等盟國的軍事法庭當中分別所進行，「台籍戰犯」的審判最足以代表身在海外的台灣人，在國籍不定的狀態之下所面臨的問題。

根據統計，在二次大戰期間有超過了二十萬名的台灣人被徵召到亞洲各地的戰場，其中超過三萬人喪命於戰場，更有上百名台灣人在戰後遭各個盟國以 B/C 級戰犯審判。最終有 173 名台灣籍戰犯被判刑確定、其中 21 名被判處並執行死刑。因為台籍戰犯審判所牽涉的國家和地理位置的分布非常廣泛，台籍戰犯歷史的研究勢必是一項龐大的跨國性研究，也需要各國學者的共同參與。在 2010 年年底，由日本尚綱大學 (Shokei Gakuen University, Japan) 的和田英穗教授 (Dr Wada Hideho)，英國劍橋大學 (University of Cambridge, United Kingdom) 的 Barak Kushner 教授，以及現任教於台灣國立政治大學歷史系的藍適齊共同發起了一項台籍戰犯的跨國性研究計畫。這項計畫在 2011 年度得到了日本學術振興會 (Japan Society for the Promotion of Science) 為期三年的研究經費補助。計畫的題目為《対日 BC 級戦犯裁判における台湾人戦犯の研究—中英仏豪の戦犯裁判を中心に—》(中譯：對日本的 BC 級戰犯審判與台灣戰犯的研究：以中英法澳洲的戰犯審判為研究中心)。以此為基礎，三位學者分別在中國、香港、日本、澳洲、以及台灣進行了初步的資料蒐集，確立了更完整的研究架構，也開展了與各國學者更廣泛的合作。根據初期的研究成果，三位學者在 2012 年 9 月在日本召開了第一次的工作坊，並邀請了來自日本、台灣、及澳大利亞等地的多位學者共同與會，發表研究題目與交換初步的研究構想。以 2012 年的此項工作坊為基礎，2013 年邀集進行合作研究的學者在台灣國立中正大學舉辦了名為「國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯」的國際學術研討會。目前所提出的專書構想，將以在此會上提交的研究論文為基礎。論文作者與主題分別是：

- 英國劍橋大學 (University of Cambridge, United Kingdom) Barak Kushner 副教授：
《日本帝國的瓦解與殖民之罪：台籍戰犯審判與國際法的衝突》(The Collapse of Empire and the Search for Colonial Guilt: Taiwanese War Criminals and the Conflict with International Law) *由英文原文翻譯為中文
- 日本愛知大學現代中国学部加治宏基助理教授 Dr Kaji Hiromoto：
《日籍/台籍戰犯審判的國際法源基礎》*由日文原文翻譯為中文
- 日本尚綱大學 (Shokei Gakuen University, Japan) 和田英穗准教授 Dr Wada Hideho：
《在台灣法庭的戰犯審判與台灣華僑》*由日文原文翻譯為中文
- 台灣國立中正大學歷史系張建侖副教授：
《中華民國政府在華南地區進行的台籍戰犯審判》
- 澳洲 Murdoch 大學 Dean Aszkielowicz 教授：
《澳洲進行的台灣/朝鮮籍戰犯審判》(Australia's Pursuit of the Formosan and Korean 'Japanese' War Criminals) *由英文原文翻譯為中文
- 台灣國立政治大學歷史系藍適齊助理教授：

《翻譯致罪：二次大戰後受到國際戰犯審判的台灣人戰地通譯》

而在「在日台灣人」的定位這項議題方面，特別是在日台灣人法律地位之演變，則有兩篇論文：

- 臺灣國立臺北教育大學台文所何義麟教授：《戰後日本華僑報刊中台灣人身分論述之考察》
透過檢視日本華僑社會中台灣人之定位，來探討在日台灣人如何面對認同問題。
- 臺灣南台科技大學楊子震助理教授：《澀谷事件與戰後初期在日台灣人之法的地位》
討論 1946 年 7 月在東京所發生的澀谷事件，¹² 如何反映了台灣人在戰後從「帝國臣民」轉變成為「在日華僑」所面臨的處境。

更進一步的，本書希望透過「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」的研究來探討第二次世界大戰所衍生出來的「戰爭責任」以及「殖民責任」。一般來說，「戰爭責任」與「殖民責任」多被放在兩種不同的脈絡當中來討論。但是在第二次世界大戰中，殖民/去殖民與戰爭這兩股歷史發展力量產生了緊密的交會，進而對殖民地的人民以及殖民帝國帶來了巨大的衝擊和深遠的影響。而「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」正是處在這巨變交會之下，身份地位產生最明顯而複雜的變化的台灣人。因此，對他們的研究將對以上議題的討論有特別的啟發作用。在這樣的研究視角之下，這本專書的編撰將從跨國的脈絡之下來進一步討論「台籍戰犯」的審判當中所反映出來的「戰爭責任」以及殖民帝國/殖民地之間的角力關係。研究的主要目標是檢視「台籍戰犯」作為「被殖民者」在戰爭當中和戰後的「戰爭責任」，以及戰後歐美殖民國如何透過戰犯(包括台籍戰犯)的審判和其他針對其「被殖民者」的補償手段，來重新建立其在東南亞各地殖民統治的過程。同時，透過分析「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」所面臨的國籍問題以及因國籍未定而衍生的諸多問題，則能夠進一步思考日本帝國在戰後崩解之際，對作為前「被殖民者」的台灣人所擔負(或者欠缺)的「殖民責任」。

這樣的研究不但將有助於探討第二次世界大戰在臺灣史當中的意義。更進一步的，這項臺灣史的研究將會對第二次世界大戰的歷史以及近代帝國與殖民的歷史，特別是在後殖民的脈絡之下持續發生的殖民影響，作出新的貢獻。而從「去殖民」的角度來看，英法荷等殖民帝國對日本帝國所進行的戰犯審判可以被視為是二戰後已經在「崩解」的帝國之間的碰撞與角力。因此，作為前「被殖民者」，「台籍戰犯」與「在日台灣人」的研究將提供我們對帝國「崩解」的過程、結果、以及其影響更深入而全面的了解。而這樣跨國性的研究，以台籍戰犯的歷史為基礎，更將有助於瞭解二戰結束前後在東亞和東南亞地區國際政治秩序和機制重新建構的過程，從而對二戰史、戰後東亞國際關係、和冷戰史做進一步的補充。

¹² 湯熙勇，〈公平對待與秩序維持之間：日本東京澀谷事件與臺灣人的審判（1946-47）〉，《亞太研究論壇（Asia-Pacific Forum）》，第35期，頁1-35，2007；何義麟，「戰後台灣における海外ニュースの報道と規制——澀谷事件の報道を中心に」，《現代台湾研究》，第32号（2007），頁3-19

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
出國時間	103年9月1日至 103年9月10日	出國地點	日本東京
出國研究目的	移地研究，蒐集史料		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

前往日本國立公文書館、外務省外交史料館、防衛省防衛研究所等地收集史料。

二、研究成果

此次所蒐集的資料，已經或將用以撰寫下列論文：

- “Path of War, Path of Memory: Taiwanese in the Pacific/War” . Paper presented at Pacific History Association 21st Biennial Conference, December 3rd, 2014, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan
- “教戰爭（歷史）= 教和平：戰爭歷史與人權／和平教育（Teaching Peace through History of War: War History and Human Rights/Peace Education）” . Paper to be presented at 「全球視野下的歷史思維教學與研究」歷史教育國際學術研討會，國立臺灣師範大學，2015年5月22—23日（預定）
- “「被殖民者」的罪，「帝國」（不負）的責任：二戰中台灣人在海外的歷史與記憶” . Paper to be presented at 「戰爭的歷史與記憶：抗戰勝利七十週年學術討論會」，國史館，2015年7月7-9日（預定）

三、建議：無

科技部補助專題研究計畫出席國際學術會議心得報告

日期：104年02月22日

計畫編號	MOST 102-2410-H-194- 015		
計畫名稱	在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考		
出國人員姓名	藍適齊	服務機構及職稱	時任：國立中正大學歷史系助理教授 現任：國立政治大學歷史系助理教授
會議時間	103年5月24日至 103年5月25日	會議地點	日本立教大學 (Rikkyo University)， 東京
會議名稱	(中文) 第一屆口譯歷史國際會議 (英文) The First International Symposium on the History of Interpreting		
發表題目	(中文) 翻譯致罪：二次大戰受國際戰犯審判的台灣人戰地翻譯 (英文) Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War		

一、參加會議經過

103年5月24日：

- 上午報到註冊
- 上午參加 Anthony Pym (Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain) 論文發表與討論
- 中午與參加的學者餐會，討論未來國際學術合作交流計畫。
- 下午參加 Rachel Lung (Lingnan University, Hong Kong), Iciar Alonso-Araguas (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain), 與 David Sawyer (University of Maryland, United States) 論文發表與討論
- 晚間與參加的學者餐會，討論未來共同合作出版研究成果之計畫。

103年5月24日：

- 上午發表論文。主持人為 Jesús Baigorri-Jalon 教授(Universidad de Salamanca, Spain)。論文發表之後，與現場與會的多位國際學者進行熱烈的討論
- 上午參加 Kayoko Takeda (Rikkyo University, Japan)論文發表與討論
- 中午與參加的學者餐會，繼續討論未來國際學術合作交流計畫。
- 下午參加 Jesús Baigorri-Jalon (Universidad de Salamanca, Spain) 與 Kumiko Torikai (Rikkyo University, Japan)論文發表與討論
- 晚間與參加的學者餐會進行交流，確定未來共同合作出版研究成果之計畫。

二、與會心得

會議主辦機構 Rikkyo Graduate School of Intercultural Communication 為日本跨文化研究首屈一指的研究機構，此次特別以翻譯研究當中的口譯歷史作為研究主題召開國際會議，吸引了超過150名學者報名與會。此次應邀發表論文的包括幾位國際翻譯研究學界重量級的學者，例如 Anthony Pym (Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain), Jesús Baigorri-Jalon 教授(Universidad de Salamanca, Spain), Kayoko Takeda (Rikkyo University, Japan), 以及 Kumiko Torikai (Rikkyo University, Japan)。本人能夠受邀在此會發表論文，更是得到了一個非常難得能夠與國際學界交流接軌的機會。

我在此會發表論文一篇。該論文為歷史學的研究，但是在會上得到來自翻譯研究、社會學、以及語言學等學科的多位國際學者的肯定與討論。能夠參與此會，一方面藉著與各學科專家的交流來提升自我學術水平，在跨學科的思考方面有豐富的收穫，也建立了更廣大的國際性/跨學科學術網絡。另一方面，同時也非常高興能夠藉著此機會，將台灣研究推向國際學界，更能夠透過在國際學術的交流平台上介紹有關台灣的研究，引起國際學者對台灣研究更高的興趣。

三、發表論文全文或摘要

Crime of Interpreting: Taiwanese Interpreters as War Criminals of the Second World War

論文摘要

After the Second World War, 173 Taiwanese who were recruited to serve in the Japanese military across Asia-Pacific during the war were convicted as war criminals. Based on studies of trial records and archival materials, this paper finds that among the 21 executed Taiwanese war criminals, at least 13 of them were convicted and consequently executed for crimes committed while serving as interpreters—formal and informal—during the war. In addition, a handful of Taiwanese interpreters were convicted as war criminals for various degrees of prison terms. While their number is small, the trials and punishment of these Taiwanese interpreters as war criminals provide a new perspective to understand the history of interpretation/interpreters in colonial/post-colonial and wartime context. This paper first examines trial records of the British courts—held in Malaya and Singapore—that show most Taiwanese formal interpreters were convicted of crimes committed against “local civilians / residents” . This paper finds that it was their language proficiency and interpretation duty brought/forced many Taiwanese serving in the Japanese military into close and frequent contact with the local population, particularly the Chinese, and thereby led to occasions in which these Taiwanese interpreters were involved in the alleged crime. Furthermore, as returning colonial powers made trials of war crime against “local civilians” a priority in re-establishing their legitimacy in colonies across Southeast Asia in the immediate postwar period, they also targeted Taiwanese interpreters who were easily identified for their crime against local population. In addition, this paper studies several cases of Taiwanese informal interpreters who committed crimes against Chinese prisoners of war (POWs) and were put on trial in the Australian courts held in Rabaul. It finds that while these Taiwanese were originally recruited as laborers, they were assigned to *ad hoc* interpretation duty because of their language proficiency under the contingency in the battlefields.

四、建議：無

五、攜回資料名稱及內容：會議論文；會上同時舉辦的歷史照片展覽，*The*

Interpreter’ s One Hundred Years of Solitude: between history and memory

六、其他：無

科技部補助計畫衍生研發成果推廣資料表

日期:2015/03/28

科技部補助計畫	計畫名稱: 在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯: 被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考
	計畫主持人: 藍適齊
	計畫編號: 102-2410-H-004-241- 學門領域: 台灣史
無研發成果推廣資料	

102 年度專題研究計畫研究成果彙整表

計畫主持人：藍適齊		計畫編號：102-2410-H-004-241-				計畫名稱：N 在國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯：被殖民者的戰爭與對「殖民戰爭責任」的一個新思考	
成果項目		量化			單位	備註（質化說明：如數個計畫共同成果、成果列為該期刊之封面故事...等）	
		實際已達成數（被接受或已發表）	預期總達成數（含實際已達成數）	本計畫實際貢獻百分比			
國內	論文著作	期刊論文	0	0	0%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%		
		研討會論文	6	6	80%		
		專書	1	1	80%		
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力（本國籍）	碩士生	3	3	100%	人次	
		博士生	0	0	100%		
		博士後研究員	0	0	100%		
		專任助理	0	0	100%		
國外	論文著作	期刊論文	1	1	20%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%		
		研討會論文	2	2	80%		
		專書	1	1	80%		章/本
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力（外國籍）	碩士生	0	0	100%	人次	
		博士生	0	0	100%		
		博士後研究員	0	0	100%		
		專任助理	0	0	100%		

<p>其他成果 (無法以量化表達之成果如辦理學術活動、獲得獎項、重要國際合作、研究成果國際影響力及其他協助產業技術發展之具體效益事項等，請以文字敘述填列。)</p>	<p>2013年12月舉辦「國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯」國際學術研討會(由日本學術振興會科學研究費與臺灣國立中正大學共同提供經費)，共有來自臺灣、英國、日本、和澳洲的六位學者發表論文；會後已經著手進行專書的編纂工作。</p>
--	---

	成果項目	量化	名稱或內容性質簡述
科 教 處 計 畫 加 填 項 目	測驗工具(含質性與量性)	0	
	課程/模組	0	
	電腦及網路系統或工具	0	
	教材	0	
	舉辦之活動/競賽	0	
	研討會/工作坊	0	
	電子報、網站	0	
	計畫成果推廣之參與(閱聽)人數	0	

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估

達成目標

未達成目標（請說明，以 100 字為限）

實驗失敗

因故實驗中斷

其他原因

說明：

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形：

論文： 已發表 未發表之文稿 撰寫中 無

專利： 已獲得 申請中 無

技轉： 已技轉 洽談中 無

其他：（以 100 字為限）

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）（以 500 字為限）

過去學者一般都認為，在看管盟軍戰俘期間對戰俘直接而「不當」的對待是導致如此眾多台籍監視員在戰後受到盟軍軍事法庭審判的主要原因。但本研究發現，在被判死刑並執行處決的臺灣戰犯當中，至少有 8 名是擔任「通譯」的工作。而本研究的結果也顯示，台灣籍戰犯在戰爭中實際擔任的工作，往往與他們的頭銜不相符合；例如貨物廠軍屬雇員在戰爭當中臨時受命擔任通譯者。這個問題突顯了「台籍戰犯」作為「被殖民者」在戰爭當中和戰後的特殊身分。而有關「台籍戰犯」在戰爭中所從事的任務和工作的研究，對「殖民戰爭責任」的討論更有特殊的啟發作用。相關的研究成果已經在國內外學術研討會上進行多次發表，引起跨領域學者的討論。

本研究同時也促進了國際學術界對台籍戰犯的跨國研究，包括在 2013 年 12 月舉辦「國際戰犯審判中的台籍戰犯」國際學術研討會（由日本學術振興會科學研究費與臺灣國立中正大學共同提供經費），共有來自臺灣、英國、日本、和澳洲的六位學者發表論文；會後已經著手進行專書的編纂工作。

而在進一步發展之可能性方面，研究過程當中所搜集到的豐富資料使得計劃

主持人得以發展出新的相關研究議題，包括：

財 擔任「通譯」的臺籍戰犯/臺灣在戰爭時期的「通譯」

財 「海外被拘留的臺灣人:集中與遣返」

財 「在戰後帝國崩解的跨國脈絡下的臺灣人」