

UC Santa Barbara

Territories: A Trans-Cultural Journal of Regional Studies

Title

Small and Large Cultures: Individuality, the Collective, Conformity and the Period of the Cold War

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5vw2h0h8>

Journal

Territories: A Trans-Cultural Journal of Regional Studies, 2(1)

Author

Hart, Jonathan Locke

Publication Date

2020

DOI

10.5070/T22144902

Copyright Information

Copyright 2020 by the author(s). This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Title: Small and Large Cultures: Individuality, the Collective, Conformity and the Period of the Cold War¹

Author: Jonathan Locke Hart

Affiliation: University of Toronto/Harvard University

Abstract: The Cold War is something I analyze in two parts. First, I examine its politics, including political literatures and cultures large and small that concentrate on central concerns of the Cold War. Second, I discuss small and minor literatures in the period of the Cold War in theory and practice, including examples from the Netherlands and Canada that are in the period of the Cold War but do not focus on it as its primary concern or theme. In these sections, I argue for the centrality of the tension between tyranny and liberty, individual and the group, conformity and nonconformity and related matters. The article ranges in the politics of the Cold War from the background of Marx and Mill through Churchill, Stalin, Truman, McCarthy to Russell, Grant and Ignatieff. In literature, that is the Cold War in ink, the essay analyzes Orwell's essay on the nuclear bomb and his novels, *Nineteen Eighty-four* and *Animal Farm* as well as Miller's play, *The Crucible* and a poem by Einstein on Russell. I concentrate on examples of Dutch fiction and their translation into English and a Canadian novel, *The Weekend Man*, by Richard B. Wright, because they are an element of "minority literatures." Besides exploring the Cold War, I briefly examine theories of minor or small literatures, including some aspects of the views of Kafka, Deleuze and Guattari.

Word count: 9,415

¹ My thanks to Raleigh Whiting for suggestions to improve my translation of Einstein's German and to Jack Robinson for suggesting I discuss *The Weekend Man* in the context of this article.

1. “The Politics of the Cold War: A Debriefing”

On 5 March 1946, Winston Churchill gave his speech on the sinews of peace at Fulton, Missouri, introduced by Harry Truman, in which Churchill, Leader of the Opposition, spoke about many issues, including the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. In the speech, he said: “A shadow has fallen upon the scenes so lately lighted by the Allied victory. Nobody knows what Soviet Russia and its Communist international organisation intends to do in the immediate future, or what are the limits, if any, to their expansive and proselytizing tendencies. I have a strong admiration and regard for the valiant Russian people and for my wartime comrade, Marshal Stalin”² here and below (for the speech, see also Churchill, “The Sinews” in *Sinews* 93-105). There is an ambivalence here, admiration for the Russian people and their leader, but a wariness about the intention of the communists and their international zeal of proselytization. Despite the goodwill of Churchill and the people of Britain to Russia and the Russians, Churchill sets out facts: “From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent.”, describing a meridian Soviet Russian sphere. In the wake of the Second World War, Churchill sets out a warning, and it is not in terms of class, because in this speech he has said he wants workers everywhere to prosper and to know and understand one another. The admonition comes as following:

However, in a great number of countries, far from the Russian frontiers and throughout the world, Communist fifth columns are established and work in complete unity and absolute obedience to the directions they receive from the Communist centre. Except in the British Commonwealth and in the United States where Communism is in its infancy, the Communist parties or fifth columns constitute a growing challenge and peril to Christian civilisation. These are sombre facts for anyone to have to recite on the morrow of a victory gained by so much splendid comradeship in arms and in the cause of freedom and democracy; but we should be most unwise not to face them squarely while time remains.

It is the spectre of communism against Christianity as found in the British Empire and the United States that requires attention. The godly and ungodly becomes a division in this tension between communism and capitalism from the time of Marx. “Freedom” and “democracy” are words Churchill uses for the Anglo-American world in the ruins of the Second World War. Despite the victory of the US, the British Empire, the Soviet Union and their allies against the regimes in Germany, Italy and Japan, the tensions

² Retrieved from <https://winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/1946-1963-elder-statesman/the-sinews-of-peace/>

over the aftermath, over what freedom and democracy mean, are underpinnings of what came to be called the Cold War.

Churchill spoke in New York on 15 March 1946 and, in the opening sentence, alluded to his speech at Fulton ten days before. He argued that equating elections in Eastern and Central Europe with those in Britain and the United States is not a fair equation: “All this argument overlooks the fact that democratic governments are based on free elections” (Churchill, “Reception,” *Sinews* 118). In this speech, Churchill continues to stress democracy and not the appearance of it: “It can hardly be called a democratic election where the candidates of only one party are allowed to appear and where the voter has not even the secrecy of the ballot to protect him” (119). Choice and voting in private in elections are keys to the democratic process. Churchill argues that if we “get through” this “difficult period” and “the British, American and Russian peoples are allowed to mingle freely with one another and see how things are done in their respective countries,” then such “misunderstandings will be swept away” (119). Churchill supports freedom of movement and understanding amongst these key nations and their people, which will allow for discussions of democracy and an exploration way of doing things. Churchill is not in any way demonizing the Russian people and is advocating for their democratic rights and for the British and Americans to understand the Russians better.

This fear of communism can be seen in Harry Truman’s Executive Order 9835 on 21 March 1947, which called for loyalty and against possible infiltration by communists of the government of the United States, the President possibly reacting to the election of 1946 in which the Republicans, a party hard on communism, won both houses of Congress³ Public opinion, as J. S. Mill had observed, was driving politics and may have forced Truman’s hand (Mill 1859, 1864 ed. 110). Judging by these historical facts, mass conformity was on its way, as can be seen in the figure of Senator Joseph McCarthy.

There is much to say about McCarthy, which a vast topic in and of itself. Here, I want to emphasize how he saw the Cold War in this speech given on Lincoln’s birthday in 1950:” This is a time of the Cold War. This is a time when all the world is split into two vast, increasingly hostile armed camps— a time of a great armaments race. Today we can almost physically hear the mutterings and rumblings of an invigorated god of war. You can see it, feel it, and hear it all the way from the hills of Indochina, from the shores of Formosa right over into the very heart of Europe itself.” (McCarthy, “Enemies” 1950 n. p. here and below). McCarthy imagines this Cold War from Asia to Europe with the United States, the most powerful victor after the Second World War, losing ground, in a battle between hostile camps in an arms race, so that the fruits of peace are ceding to a personified “god of

³ Retrieved from <https://www.archives.gov/federal-register/executive-orders/1947.html>

war". McCarthy appeals to the senses of sight, feeling and hearing of the "mutterings and rumblings" of such a god.

He states the case baldly and not in terms that different than those set out by Churchill, except Churchill sees common feeling among Russian, British and American people: "Today we are engaged in a final, all-out battle between communistic atheism and Christianity. The modern champions of communism have selected this as the time. And, ladies and gentlemen, the chips are down— they are truly down" (McCarthy n.p.). Godlessness and godliness are in a great battle: communism and Christianity are engaging in this Cold War.

To support his case, McCarthy, a lawyer, judge and senator during his career, appeals to communist leaders themselves:

Lest there be any doubt that the time has been chosen, let us go directly to the leader of communism today –Joseph Stalin. Here is what he said –not back in 1928, not before the war, not during the war— but two years after the last war was ended: "To think that the communist revolution can be carried out peacefully, within the framework of a Christian democracy, means one has either gone out of one's mind and lost all normal understanding, or has grossly and openly repudiated the communist revolution." (McCarthy n.p.).

McCarthy's Stalin agrees with McCarthy that in the aftermath of the Second World War, the battle is between Christian democracy and communist revolution. It is easy to demonize McCarthy who demonized others, but actually his argument and Stalin's, right or wrong, are logical and seem to reflect how people on both sides looked at the struggle. Marx had seen religion as an opium, Mill not quite so, although he saw conformity, public opinion and scapegoating as the human appear to see that, despite the peace, the struggle continues. Churchill might well have agreed (Marx, *Einleitung* 1843-1844 1; Marx *Introduction* 1843-1844 no pagination [n.p.] here and below; Mill 1859, 1864 ed. 99-133; see Tocqueville 485 and see Cohen 108-111). The great struggles, including those from 1848, were not over a hundred years later. The Cold War was heir to this conflict and friction.

McCarthy appeals to Stalin's use of Lenin to support this claim of a struggle between communism and Christian states:

And this is what was said by Lenin in 1919, which was also quoted with approval by Stalin in 1947:"We are living," said Lenin, "not merely in a state but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with Christian states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that

end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable." (McCarthy n.p.).

This is a fight to the finish, of which system will triumph. McCarthy seems to do his homework and goes to the sources of the leaders of the Soviet Union and not hearsay or unstudied prejudice. McCarthy becomes the *demonizer* after his fall and is in turn demonized, which is not helpful to my argument, which sees nuance, ambiguity, contradictions and intricacy. McCarthy's Stalin's Lenin becomes evidence in the great Cold War.

McCarthy appeals directly to his audience of both genders with a sense of urgency: "Ladies and gentlemen, can there be anyone here tonight who is so blind as to say that the war is not on? Can there be anyone who fails to realize that the communist world has said, 'The time is now' -that this is the time for the showdown between the democratic Christian world and the communist atheistic world? Unless we face this fact, we shall pay the price that must be paid by those who wait too long" (McCarthy, n.p.). One worldview insists on itself as the one that is the triumph in the face of its opponent. If one does not conform to this truth -either Christian or communist - one is shunned, criticized or worse.

Stalin's speech on 9 February 1946 may have brought some reaction in Washington and elsewhere, but in fact the speech had aspects that were not polarizing: "The Second World War against the Axis Powers, unlike the First World War, assumed from the very outset the character of an anti-fascist war, a war of liberation, one of the tasks of which was to restore democratic liberties. The entry of the Soviet Union into the war against the Axis Powers could only augment -and really did augment- the anti-fascist and liberating character of the Second World War" (Stalin 23-24). For Stalin, the allies fought "to restore democratic liberties" and he sees the Soviet Union in being a key contributor to that. Like Churchill, Stalin stresses the alliance among the three great allied powers in the recent war: "It was on this basis that the anti-fascist coalition of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Great Britain and other freedom-loving countries came into being and later played the decisive role in defeating the armed forces of the Axis Powers" (Stalin 24). Stalin is praising the coalition of freedom and democracy against the expansionist tyranny of fascism. In the speech Stalin also states the contribution of the Soviet Union: "Our victory signifies, first of all, that our Soviet social system was victorious, that the Soviet social system successfully passed the test of fire in the war and proved that it is fully viable" (Stalin 26). Stalin appeals to criticism: what the war can teach. But he sees the criticism in the foreign press that the Soviet Union is a house of cards to be baseless. It is Stalin's critique of the lessons of the victory of the war that matters:

Now we can say that the war has, refuted all these assertions of the foreign press and has proved them to have been groundless. The war proved that the Soviet social system is a genuinely people's system, which grew up from the ranks of the people and enjoys their powerful support; that the Soviet social system is fully viable and stable form of organization of society.

More than that. The issue now is not whether the Soviet social system is viable or not, because after the object lessons of the war, no skeptic now dares to express doubt concerning the viability of the Soviet social system. Now the issue is that the Soviet social system has proved to be more viable and stable than the non-Soviet social system, that the Soviet social system is a better form of organization of society than any non-Soviet social system (Stalin 27).

Stalin's interpretation is, for him, the one that is correct and stands. The war proves that the Soviet Union is of the people because it is their system. For Stalin, the *demos* is the foundation of the USSR. Stalin had said that criticism of the Soviet Union was essential in the wake of the Second World War, but now he argues in his own interpretation or critique that the war proved the viability and, by implication, the democracy of the Soviet Union, so that "no skeptic dares to express doubt" about the Soviet Union as a viable system.

Rather than go to some stereotyping of McCarthy or Stalin, or even Karl Marx and John Stuart Mill, I am more interested in the logic of their ideas as foundations of or expressions of the Cold War (see Mill and Marx; see also Tocqueville 485). It is easy to take sides and to get emotional. The murderous policies of Stalin or the hysterical denunciations by McCarthy at various points are harsh and need to be scrutinized and condemned, but that does not mean that all their views or actions need to be thrown out or demonized. McCarthy is pressing his audience to ascent to Christianity and Christian democracies and Stalin comes to a position in which scepticism against the Marxism and communism of the Soviet Union is not to be dared. Despite some of the balance and logic that McCarthy and Stalin display, conformity to patriotism for their respective countries and systems is the end. Otherwise, one is unpatriotic and to criticize the system and the country is something best not dared. Mill's conformity is here.

Bertrand Russell, similar to Mill, was neither a fan of Stalin nor of McCarthy (Russell 20). Russell himself had recommended that the United States threaten war against the Soviet Union in 1948 to force disarmament on it before it developed equal nuclear weapons and for which he was criticized: "Nor do my critics appear to consider the evils that have developed as a result of the continued Cold War and that might have been avoided, along with the Cold War itself, had my advice to threaten war had

been taken in 1948” (Russell 18). Russell lectured on the Cold War in Australia in 1950 (Russell 26). He is ironic about John Foster Dulles’ comment that the United States might be losing the Cold War but would win a hot one (Russell 143). Russell tells how the horror of Stalin’s dictatorship had horrified him in the 1940s and 1950s and how that had made him think “that there would be no easy resolution to the cold war” (Russell 171). But he adds that the West had mistaken Stalin for an expansionist and that he had, despite his tyranny, mostly “kept his agreements with the West” and that in Stalin’s death Russell had hoped vainly that neutral countries could help with nuclear disarmament and bring reason to the great powers (Russell, 171-172). The Baruch Proposal, in which the United States would hand over its nuclear weapons to an international body, was something Stalin rejected and Russell sees this as contributing to the Cold War (Russell, 181). In a letter to Walter Ulbricht on 12 August 1963, Russell could write: “I am passionately opposed to the Cold War and to all those who trade in it” (Russell, 190-191). Russell himself encloses publications for Lord Gladwyn in a letter of 14 November 1964, including Russell’s “The Cold War and World Poverty” (Russell, 197). In a speech of 15 February 1965 to the London School of Economics, Russell quotes the Labour Manifesto that sees “Cold War strategies as second best” and wonders in practice if they have followed this view (Russell 205, 207, 209-210). Russell concludes: “In none of the actions of the Labour Government has there been evidence of the promised effort to relax the tensions of the Cold War” (Russell 214). This unhot conflict persisted despite the efforts of some, like Russell, to propose ways to end it.

Mill had been against conformity and Russell had also been an individual who would not conform. Writing to Julian Huxley on 10 March 1963, Russell reminds him, in an argument similar to Mill’s: “Exceptional merit is, and always has been, disliked by Authority” (Russell, 173). Russell argues that governments are not enlightened as Huxley seems to think: “Pythagoras was an exile because Policrates disliked him; Socrates was put to death; Aristotle had to fly from Athens as soon as Alexander died. In ancient Greece it was not hard to escape from Greece. In the modern world it is much more difficult; and that is one reason why there are fewer great men than there were in Greece” (Russell 173-174). Individualism depends on freedom of movement and even escape from tyranny and conformity.

In Canada, another critic of a culture of conflict and nuclear proliferation, George Grant, in *Lament for a Nation* (1965), had also argued against having nuclear missiles in Canada, as part of the Cold War (Grant 91-92). His nephew, Michael Ignatieff, whose father George I knew, thinks that Grant’s view of Canada being submerged in American imperialism was wrong:

To paraphrase Isaiah Berlin, the bent twig of national identity, pushed down by the forces of global commerce, the American way of life and

communist tyranny, snapped back with the end of the Cold War, and everywhere you looked - whether it was the former Yugoslavia, Quebec, the Basque country, Scotland or the Middle East - a passionate resurgence of ethnic, religious, tribal and local identities had rewritten the history Grant had thought was leading us to imperial domination and cultural uniformity (Ignatieff, n. p.).

Here, for Ignatieff, the Cold War cannot destroy the identities of the local and of smaller nations. The uniformity and conformity cannot endure. Here, the concern is the collective and not the individual as it was for Mill. Canada, despite Grant's lament, caught between the Soviet Union and the United States geographically, has survived and, perhaps, even thrived.

2. Through Minor Literature's Lens: Cold War in Ink

In this vein, uniformity, conformity, nuclear bombs, the arms race, espionage and other themes are key to literary, cultural and intellectual texts in the post-Second World War period. For the sake of space, I will briefly look at George Orwell's essay on the nuclear bomb and his novel, *Nineteen Eighty-four*, Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*, two fairly recent "top ten" lists of Cold War books and novels in the United States and the other in Britain respectively and the situation of Central and Eastern Europe.

Orwell –a novelist and essayist who represents the dangers of violence, surveillance, slavery and the abuses of atomic weapons—predicts the Cold War in 1945. In an article in the *Tribune* in 1945, discussing weapons, warfare, the atomic bomb and the concentration of power in two or three great states, Orwell says: "We may be heading not for general breakdown but for an epoch as horribly stable as the slave empires of antiquity. James Burnham's theory has been much discussed, but few people have yet considered its ideological implications - that is, the kind of world-view, the kind of beliefs, and the social structure that would probably prevail in a state which was at once unconquerable and in a permanent state of 'cold war' with its neighbours" (Orwell 1945 n.p.). Here, Orwell mentions Burnham's *The Managerial Revolution* in the context of despotism, police states and two or three large states controlling the fate of individuals and smaller states. Orwell concludes his analysis of the atomic bomb, quite prophetically: "If, as seems to be the case, it is a rare and costly object as difficult to produce as a battleship, it is likelier to put an end to large-scale wars at the cost of prolonging indefinitely a 'peace that is no peace'" (Orwell 1945 n.p.). Small states, cultures, literatures are always at the mercy of large ones.

The novels Orwell wrote also portray the coming despotism in the wake of the Second World War in which large powers would subject their own people and those of smaller nations. No one was exempt. The allegory, *Animal Farm: A Fairy Tale* (1945) Orwell began late in 1943 after the Tehran

conference where Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin met and completed in 1944, seeming to have the three great powers on his mind. Orwell delineates and satirizes the abuse of power, revolution, repression, conformity and other themes. Major, the elderly pig, tells the other animals: “All the habits of Man are evil. And, above all, no animal must ever tyrannize over his own kind. Weak or strong, clever or simple, we are all brothers. No animal must ever kill any other animal. All animals are equal” (Orwell 1964 [1945] 6). This parable about equality and inequality, tyranny and freedom, truth and propaganda in the after-shadow of the Second World War. Throughout the novel, Orwell repeats “All animals are equal” a number of times as well as cognates like “equally” and “equality” and records the new slogan that went against what Major’s words: “ALL ANIMALS ARE EQUAL/ BUT SOME ANIMALS ARE MORE/ EQUAL THAN OTHERS” (Orwell 1964 [1945] 82). Here is political satire worthy of Jonathan Swift. This is the kind of “doublethink: that Orwell also explores in *Nineteen-Eighty-Four* (1945). Orwell’s first sentence in that novel has the clocks striking thirteen, which implies that “The time is out of joint, as Hamlet says (Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, I.v.—line 937 of the play). Orwell represents the surveillance state and what it does to Winston Smith (the protagonist) and others. On the opening page, Orwell writes: “On each landing, opposite the lift shaft, the poster with the enormous face gazed from the wall. It was one of those pictures which are so contrived that the eyes follow you about when you move. BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU, the caption beneath it ran” (Orwell 2003 [1949]). Surveillance, doublethink and other aspects of despotism appear throughout Orwell’s novel.

The translations of *Animal Farm* are a way large and small literatures team up. Orwell opposed regimes where the people did not benefit from the revolution or rule and this appealed to some others in Europe and beyond. Ksenya Kiebuszinski has written well on this topic and observes: “Orwell, however, prevailed over British caution and Soviet subterfuge. The publisher Seckler & Warburg accepted the manuscript, and released the first English edition of *Animal Farm* on 17 August 1945 in a small print run of forty-five hundred copies because of severe paper rationing after the war” (Kiebuszinski 4). The Soviet Union was in the process of promoting communist governments and parties across Europe. The American and Canadian editions came out in 1946. Kiebuszinski gives credit: “It was Orwell, though, and his literary agent Leonard Moore (d. 1959), who, in their lifetimes, did the most to disseminate the novel across Central and Eastern Europe. By the time Orwell died in 1950, translations had appeared in Polish (London, 1946), Czech (Prague, 1946), Ukrainian (Neu-Ulm, 1947), and Russian (Frankfurt am Main, 1949), along with other languages of Europe, the Middle East, and parts of Asia, ranging from Danish to Persian and Korean” (Kiebuszinski 4). Translations made Orwell’s representation of despotism before and during the early years of the Cold War part of smaller languages and cultures too in what was a struggle locally, regionally and globally. After Orwell’s death in January 1950, the British and American

intelligence communities seem to have made use of Orwell, unchecked by his critical eye, against communism: “Other translations ensued: Lithuanian (London, 1952), Hungarian (Budapest, 1952–53), Latvian (London, 1954), and Serbian (Munich, 1955). *Animal Farm* also circulated in underground versions across the Iron Curtain well into the 1980s” (Kiebusinski 4). Sometimes the distinctions between large and small cultures can make us to forget connections and solidarity in the republic of letters. Orwell expressed this bond: “The author further endeared himself to displaced persons following the Second World War by refusing to accept fees or royalties for translations undertaken by refugee groups. He told his literary agent, Leonard Moore, that ‘as in the case of other Russian-occupied countries, where translations can only be made by refugees, I do not want any payment’ (21 September 1946)” (Orwell quoted in Kiebusinski 4). Small and large literatures and cultures can be joined in many ways, including a common cause. Then, Orwell, like Shakespeare, went global: “Eventually *Animal Farm* was translated into at least 70 languages, including Esperanto, but it is worth stressing that the Slavic languages (Polish, Ukrainian, Russian) were among the first.” (Karp n.p.). *Animal Farm* became, through translation and editions in smaller states in English, part of world literature, in cultures small and large.

Arthur Miller’s *Crucible*, a play written in 1952 and published in 1953, is also an allegory of the anti-communist witch hunt that Senator Joseph McCarthy led after the Second World War through a representation of the Salem witch hunt of 1692. In 1996, in a year a film was being made based on his drama, Miller discussed why he wrote the *Crucible*, noting: “‘The Crucible’ was an act of desperation. Much of my desperation branched out, I suppose, from a typical Depression-era trauma—the blow struck on the mind by the rise of European Fascism and the brutal anti-Semitism it had brought to power. But by 1950, when I began to think of writing about the hunt for Reds in America, I was motivated in some great part by the paralysis that had set in among many liberals who, despite their discomfort with the inquisitors’ violations of civil rights, were fearful, and with good reason, of being identified as covert Communists if they should protest too strongly” (Miller n. p.). Miller characterized his motivation as the effect of the communist scare and Cold War on the United States. He also showed that his work in English from the United States had become part of global literature and culture: “I don’t think there has been a week in the past forty-odd years when it hasn’t been on a stage somewhere in the world” (Miller n. p.). For Miller, there were other specific effects and contexts: “It is only a slight exaggeration to say that, especially in Latin America, ‘The Crucible’ starts getting produced wherever a political coup appears imminent, or a dictatorial regime has just been overthrown. From Argentina to Chile to Greece, Czechoslovakia, China, and a dozen other places, the play seems to present the same primeval structure of human sacrifice to the furies of fanaticism and paranoia that goes on repeating itself forever as though imbedded in the

brain of social man” (Miller n.p.). Like Orwell, Miller represents the extremes, social control and the tensions between the individual and the collective with the spectre of despotism and the clash of those for and against communism. This English play in the United States has been performed in other countries, great and small. Translation and performance move the play into its own spaces in these other languages and cultures, small and large. Orwell and Miller have a political art that goes beyond the United States and the English-speaking world. Miller observes: “Certainly its political implications are the central issue for many people; the Salem interrogations turn out to be eerily exact models of those yet to come in Stalin’s Russia, Pinochet’s Chile, Mao’s China, and other regimes (Nien Cheng, the author of “Life and Death in Shanghai,” has told me that she could hardly believe that a non-Chinese—someone who had not experienced the Cultural Revolution—had written the play.)” (Miller n.p.). Like *Animal Farm*, *The Crucible* is open to allegorical interpretation, for instance in representing authoritarian regimes in different parts of the world. Translation and interpretation have cultures, big and small, meeting in a world literature.

For the Council on Foreign Relations in the United States in November 2014, James M. Lindsay chooses ten Cold War novels and includes Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and gives an additional recommendation of Miller’s play, *The Crucible* (Lindsay n.p.). In *The Guardian*, published in Britain in January 2016, Francesca Kay, author of the novel, *The Long Room*, set in 1981 during nuclear tensions in the Cold War, provides a list of ten top books on the Cold War, with brief descriptions of these publications, that also include *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *The Crucible* (Kay n.p.). These important sites in the two major countries and cultures in the large language, English, focus on books from the United States and Britain. Despite this inward looking and monolingual approach, I have argued that these two texts were, through translation and performance, moved into world culture and literatures, including into small languages and cultures. This is a complex network of interactions over time that can bring together the large and the small, literatures in English and literatures in other languages, including small ones.

Briefly, I wish to shift the perspective to small literatures and cultures in the Cold War in the hot spot, Central and Eastern Europe. As Marcel Cornis-Pope notes, two interventions frame the literatures in this region, the first right “after the communist takeover in the mid-1940s, when large numbers of writers were executed, imprisoned, forced into exile or into conformity; the other after 1989, when these literatures were again submitted to a radical re-evaluation that removed old hierarchies and canons, calling into questions even some of the dissident writers under communism” (Cornis-Pope 160). From these interventions, I conclude that this is a complex story with existential implications. Themes of conformity, nationalism, multiculturalism, national identity, gender and race have, since

1989, have come to be expressed in even more intricate ways with some of these countries now being in the European Union (Cornis-Pope 172). These small literatures and languages have had large and far-reaching historical, cultural and literary implications in the Cold War and after the fall of the Berlin wall and the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The small literatures and cultures, and the politics of these peoples, also go into world literature and culture affecting large languages such as English and powers like Britain and the United States. The matter goes both ways.

Intellectuals and writers, such as Martin Heidegger, Paul de Man, Günter Grass and Julia Kristeva, are sometimes uncovered as agents, or party members, or mouthpieces, to have held extreme political views or affiliations in the Second World War or Cold War. For instance, in the Cold War, Julia Kristeva denies she was the agent of the Bulgarian security services that served the Communist Party, something that Dimiter Kenarov detailed in an article in *The New Yorker* in 2018. Bertrand Russell seems to have stood up as an individual and did not get drawn into collaboration or serving political parties or politicians. On 2 April 1958, Otto Nathan wrote to Russell about his conversations with Albert Einstein and sent to Russell a poem he composed at the time of Russell's controversy with City College in New York (dismissed in 1940 for being unfit to be a professor of philosophy owing to atheism and unsound morals) as well as a note Einstein drafted in 1948 after reading Russell's book on the history of philosophy:

Einstein on Bertrand Russell, 1940

Es wiederholt sich immer wider
In dieser Welt so fein und bieder
Der Pfaff den Poebel alarmiert
Der Genius wird executiert.

It is repeated again and again
In this world so fine and faithful
The Parson alerts the mob
The genius then gets executed. (Einstein in Nathan, my translation)

Like Mill, Einstein, writing during the Second World War, sees the exceptional individual being subject to the conformity of the many. In 1946, he responds to Russell's book:

Bertrand Russell's "Geschichte der Philosophie" ist eine koestliche Lektuere. Ich weiss nicht, ob man die koestliche Frische und Originalitaet oder die Sensitivitaet der Einfuehlung in ferne Zeiten und fremde Mentalitaet bei diesem grossen Denket mehr bewundern soll. Ich betrachte es als glueck, dass unsere so trockene und zugleich brutale Generation einen so Weisen, ehrlichen, tapferen und dabei

humorvollen Mann aufzuweisen hat. Es ist ein in hoechstem Sinne paedagogisches Wek, das ueber dem Streite der Parteien und Meinungen steht.

Bertrand Russell's "History of Philosophy" is a delightful read. I do not know whether one should more admire this great thinker's delightful freshness and originality or the sensitive empathy with which he depicts distant times and foreign mentality. I consider it fortunate that our generation, as dry and at the same time brutal as it is, can show for itself such a wise, honest, brave and at the same time humorous man. It is a pedagogical work in the highest sense, which stand over the disputes of the parties and opinions.

(Einstein in Nathan, my translation)

Einstein praises Russell for being above party and opinion. This is the kind of stance that Mill and Russell also admired. In the Cold War, some voices stood out, like Russell's, in a brave, distinct and individual way amidst division, conflict and suspicion. It is important to remember such individuality and to remember the individuals on both sides. Russell is a good example of seeking reason and justice in a world fighting a Cold War. He wanted both sides to come to peace through reason and independent thought: he wished to cool off the Cold War, which was not cool enough. Cultures, philosophies and literatures, from places small and big, are important in representing the human and the tensions between individual and collective in war and peace, in times hot and cold.

3. Final Thoughts on the Literary Explorations in the Period of the Cold War

Minor literatures are not minor; they are just not big relative to the literatures of the largest countries. Countries with smaller populations, like Canada, Australia and New Zealand also share English with Britain and the United States, larger countries and literatures, and are part of literature in English. Canada also has a moderate population that writes literature in French and so are related to literatures in French and culture in the Francophonie. The contrast between small and large cultures shows how difficult it is sometimes for the small to get noticed. It is easier for Canadian literary, cultural and political figures to be noticed in English and French than it might be for Dutch or Czech figures, for instance, unless they are working in English, French or another big language.

There is already a tension in the study of Kafka and minor literatures in the book by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari in 1975 (see Deleuze and Guattari). Although to define minor literature Deleuze and Guattari go to Kafka's discussion in his *Journal* of Jewish literature in Warsaw and Prague, they refer to minor literature and Kafka uses the term *kleine Literaturen* or

small literatures. Thus, even the terminology of minor or small, singular or plural (literature, literatures) is already in tension. Whereas Kafka was not talking about Jews writing in a major or large language like German (many speakers), Deleuze and Guattari see a minor literature as something a minority makes in a major language. These tensions between the two models can be productive as can be seen the way an association in the field describes these discrepancies between Deleuze and Guattari on the one hand and Kafka on the other and how they combine minor and small in their name: “Small/Minor Literatures & Cultures is an international collaborative network of researchers who work on small/minor literatures and cultures both theoretically and empirically with a special focus on a comparative analysis of their contacts, similarities and differences”⁴. The tension between the Kafka and Deleuze and Guattari ideas allows me to talk about Dutch literature, which Kafka might have seen as a small literature, and Canadian literature, which Deleuze and Guattari might have viewed as minor, a minority making literature through a major language, English. The bridge is translation (which I have just examined in relation to Orwell’s *Animal Farm*) as I discuss only some aspects of the translation of Dutch fiction into English, and mainly in the years of the Cold War, and also a Canadian novel in that period that has, as a key aspect of its background, the Cuban Missile Crisis, one of the hottest points of the Cold War.

This fiction is written within the period of the Cold War and share themes with literary works that concentrate primarily on issues explicitly raised by the Cold War itself. My focus on Dutch fiction and its translation into English and a Canadian novel in English is, then, one among many possibilities, and there have been important books on the theory and practice of “minority literatures,” another term critics use, for instance on Scots, Breton, Occitan and Basque (see Calin, Olaziregi). Novels written from the 1950s to 1980 in Dutch or a form of Dutch in the Netherlands or northern Belgium (Flanders) and translated into English suggest the movement from a small language into a larger one. English and Dutch are related Germanic languages and the Netherlands were a major power in Europe and overseas in the seventeenth century, when England and the Netherlands fought wars. Flemish and Dutch have relations as do different dialects of the same language. The translated novels include Gerard Walschap’s *Marriage and Ordeal* and Louis Paul Boon’s *Chapel Road* (Vanderauwera, 16). Ria Vanderauwera says that Dutch, a small literature, has a target language of Britain and the United States, the large parts of the English speaking world, so that publishers wishing to produce English translations of Dutch fiction are more likely to do so if the book can be published on both sides of the Atlantic, although the United States is the biggest market (Vanderauwera, 17). American and British publishers sometimes consider their readers to be incurious or given to different tastes: some Dutch novels are lean and are more like novellas (see Vanderauwera 20-21). How do Dutch novels, when

⁴ Retrieved from <http://www.minorliteratures.org/>

translated into English help to supplement literature in English or is it more that Dutch novelists need the large world audience of the *lingua franca* – English (see Vanderauwera 21-22)? A Dutch classic, *Max Havelaar of de Koffieveilingen der Nederlandse Handelmaatschappij* (1860), a representation of the uses and abuses of colonization in Indonesia, written by Multatuli (Eduard Douwes Dekker), translated as *Max Havelaar or the Coffee Auctions of the Dutch Trading Company* (1967) had, as of the 1980s, three English translations, including that by W. Siebenhaar, with an Introduction by D. H. Lawrence in 1927 (see Multatuli 1927, Vanderauwera 57-69). In 1954, the Foundation for the Promotion of the Translation of Dutch Literary Works was founded and, after 1960, was subsidized in the Netherlands by the Ministry of Culture and in Belgium by the Ministry of Dutch Culture (Vanderauwera, 27).

Whereas *Animal Farm* was translated from a large language and literature into smaller ones, some Dutch novels, from a small language and literature, had translations into English, a large language and literature. Themes of the individual and collective, non-conformity and conformity occur in literary works written in the Cold War but that do not concentrate on it and those that do not. Otherness, a key issue in the Cold War and in the literature in the period and about the Cold War, is an ancient concern in the meeting of the ancient Greeks and the Persians and other groups, including West and East (Wiesehöfer, 183; Paterson, n.p.). Vanderauwera's analysis of the translation of Jan Cremer's *Ik Jan Cremer* (Dutch 1964; English 1965 as *I, Jan Cremer*) is suggestive for discussions of small literatures being recast and translated into large literatures (Vanderauwera, 77-85, see 123-124). *I, Jan Cremer*, which reached a mass audience in English, is a fictional autobiography that represented rebellion against society, themes that George Orwell and Arthur Miller also represented. For this book, Cremer did not use the Foundation but was his own agent, finding an audience in the United States in the turbulent 1960s, in which writers, such as Henry Miller, were read (Vanderauwera 77-78). Vanderauwera asserts that the translated version strips Cremer's original of its newness and says that this is in keeping with what she observed in her corpus, that is the toning down of the Dutch original of "all kinds of deviations from conventional narrative" (Vanderauwera 85). Among the many observations Vanderauwera makes is that "translators of Dutch fiction exhibited reserve in rendering unusual and mannered imagery and word choice in the target language" (Vanderauwera, 108). Often Dutch authors do not receive the kind of attention and audience that Cremer did. Even a well-known author and translator like J. M. Coetzee could not always count on his translation receiving publicity, promotion and reviews. He complained about this situation for his translation of *Een nagelaten bekentenis* (1894) by Marcellus Emants, entitled *A Posthumous Confession* (1975). Moreover, the view of Egbert Krispin, the editor of Twayne's Library of Netherlandic Literature, in which Coetzee's translation appeared, is that major American journals and magazines will not give space

to translation and prefer to provide space to third rate German books to second rate Dutch ones. From these two views, Vanderauwera generalizes: “Which brings us back to where we started: the ‘major’ target pole is not interested in literature from smaller, unsensational areas” (Vanderauwera 127). She also notes constraints in the translation of Dutch fiction in English and the reluctance of the English target publishers, journals, magazines and audience to pay attention to Dutch fiction. This process is circular: Dutch novels “were little known, hence little translated, distributed, and reviewed, and therefore likely to remain little known” (Vanderauwera 145). Vanderauwera makes an important contribution to translation studies and to the analysis of small literatures in relation to larger literatures, what some call, using more Latinate language, the minor and major. Writers, translators, scholars such as Vanderauwera contribute to the understanding of Dutch literature and culture in the Netherlands, the English-speaking world and beyond.

Another important figure in such endeavours was Douwe Fokkema, and I had the honour and pleasure of introducing him to my publisher Palgrave Macmillan, who along with Royal Van Gorcum, published an English translation of five beautiful and significant volumes from the Dutch with the title *Dutch Culture in a European Perspective*. Fokkema was on the Editorial Board (see *Dutch* 2004). The Netherlands were once a great power and have made great contributions intellectually and culturally, for instance in painting, so sometimes the small can be great and the minor not so minor, a caveat worth remembering. In the twentieth century, the Dutch, caught between Britain, France and Germany, witnessed two terrible world wars and the Cold War that came after. Canada, which helped to liberate the Netherlands at the end of the Second World War, also suffered through those two hot wars and the cold war that came after.

There is a literature of the Cold War and when I discuss one Canadian novel in English, *The Weekend Man*, by Richard B. Wright, with a background of and allusions to the more recent world war, post- Second World War politics, the Cuban Missile Crisis, I am only presenting one small shard in this large prism. Canada is often not part of the discussion of Cold War literature. For instance, neither does Andrew Hammond’s edited collection nor Daniel Cordle’s monograph focus on Canadian literature or culture (see Hammond, Cordle). Wright’s novel was first published in Toronto in 1970 and then in New York in 1971. English-Canadian writers have often sought out the larger markets in Britain and the United States, countries, along other Commonwealth states, with whom Canada shares a language. The private life of the protagonist, Wes Wakeham, is also in a context, in a public and political dimension. Wes is in sales in publishing with “Winchester House, a small Canadian subsidiary of Fairfax Press of London and New York” and lives in Union Place, an eastern suburb of Toronto (Wright 4). The novel occurs during four days before Christmas and includes office parties and business

and represents Wes in this context and how he wishes for reconciliation with his wife and the possibilities and pitfalls of his actions and choices. The aftermath of the Second World War lingers in this novel. Mrs. Bruner and her husband, Helmut, have emigrated from Germany to Canada, and the narrator speaks about Mrs. Bruner's prejudice against black immigrants to Canada and likens her to a Prussian general (Wright 43, 98). Wes remembers his father and his experience in the Second World War and on his return and the death of his parents in a car accident (Wright 55-57, 63-73).

References to American popular culture, especially related to television, film, books, entertainment, shows, so prevalent in Canada and certainly in the 1960s, occur throughout the novel (see Wright 8, 26-29, 35, 47-48, 60, 103-104, 107, 223). Wright combines entertainment with a battle between the United States and communist forces: Wes hears on his neighbour's television "a Bob Hope Christmas Special from Viet Nam" (Wright 55). The war in Viet Nam is legacy of imperialism and colonialism, of the Cold War and decolonization, the United States picking up where the French left off with the communist resistance. The Cold War, including the Cuban Missile Crisis, are part of the words Wes hears at the door of his neighbour, Mrs. Brown, words from Walter Cronkite on the television an "emergency session" of President Kennedy's cabinet (Wright 109-110). Mrs. Brown says to Wes Wakeham: "I don't think Kennedy'll break down and I, for one, hope he doesn't" and she soon adds "Those Russians have to be taught a lesson" (Wright 111). At one point, after his romance had ended, Wes sits in a chair listening to Mrs. Brown's television. Wes hears Walter Cronkite's voice on edge: "Mr. Kennedy was standing firm and the word from the Russians was nor reassuring. They wanted the Americans to scrap their bases in Turkey. They wanted the Americans to scrap their bases in Turkey. You are a bunch of hypocrites, Mr. Khrushchev was reported to have said" (Wright 119). The Cuban Missile Crisis ends: "So ended my October Wednesday of 1962. Of course, the great black wind blew itself out eventually and Mrs. Brown and I were able to sink back again into our gloom" (Wright 123). Later, Wes stands in Harold Pendle's bomb shelter, which Harold admits he built it "after the Cuban crisis" and he thinks it was in 1963 and Wes tells him the crisis was in 1962 (Wright 132). Wes imagines himself from the other side of the Cold War. He is always amazed at "fabulous prodigal variety" of the goods at the department store, saying "though I am a poor shopper and am likely to wander down the wide aisles as abstracted as a visitor from one of the Iron Curtain countries" (Wright 231). The possible takeover of Winchester House by Universal Electronics Corporation prompts Ron Tuttle to say to Wes: "'Then you're not really worried about American big business taking over the Canadian economy'" (Wright 161). American, Russian and wider themes of the Cold War occur in this Canadian novel in English.

Another argument of two-way traffic between literatures large and small is that smaller countries is that some of the countries of Eastern and Central Europe have had major impacts, culturally and politically, on large languages and cultures in Britain, Russia and the United States. Both large and small languages, literatures and cultures contribute in important ways to the intricate and ever-changing constellation of world literature and culture. The period of the Cold War can tell us much about significant aspects of these relations and this constellation.

After the decline of the British Empire, the Americanization of Canada was a topic of debated in Canada. Although Canadian literature and culture are small, the movement of language and people, of culture, has long crossed the evolving border between the two countries, which once were part the British empire in the 1760s. Natives, Europeans and Africans moved across the border. The small and large cultures of English Canada and the United States share similar accents in speaking English and many other patterns but have become different countries, so their relation is an interesting case in discussing literatures and cultures, small and large, bound and separated by a common language. Canada is a territory between the United States and the Soviet Union, so critical in the Cold War, which Wright has as an important public background to the private journey of Wes Wakeham. In this period, the Dutch novel, *I, Jan Cramer* and the English-Canadian novel, *The Weekend Man*, represent, through their protagonists, the relation between the individual and society, a major tension or conflict in the Cold War.

Bibliography

- Calin, William. 2000. *Minority Literatures and Modernism: Scots, Breton, and Occitan, 1920-1990*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Churchill, Winston S. 1946, 1948. "A Speech at the Reception by the Mayor of New York, The Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York." *The Sinews of Peace: Post-War Speeches by Winston S. Churchill*. Ed. Randolph S. Churchill. London: Cassell and Company Ltd., 1948. 115-120.
- Churchill, Winston S. 1946, 1948. "The Sinews of Peace." 5 March 1946. *The Sinews of Peace: Post-War Speeches by Winston S. Churchill*. Ed. Randolph S. Churchill. London: Cassell and Company Ltd., 1948. 93-105.
- Cohen, G. A. 1978, 2000. *Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defence*. Expanded Edition. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cordle, Daniel. 2017. *Late Cold War Literature and Culture: The Nuclear 1980s*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cornis-Pope, Marcel. 2006. « An Anxious Triangulation: Cold War, Nationalism and Regionalism Resistance in East-Central European Literatures." In Andrew Hammond, ed. 2006. *Cold War Literature: Writing the Global Conflict*. London and New York: Routledge. 160-175
- Cremer, Jan. 1965. *I, Jan Cremer*. New York: Shorecrest [original: *Ik, Jan Cremer* 1964].
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1975. *Kafka: Pour une littérature mineure*. Paris : Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Dutch Culture in a European Perspective. 2004. Editorial Board. Jan Bank et al. Each volume has different editors. The five volumes are: 1650: Hard-Won Unity; 1800: Blueprints for a National Community; 1900: The Age of Bourgeois Culture; 1950: Prosperity and Welfare; Accounting for the Past: 1650-2000. Assen and London: Royal Van Gorcum/ Palgrave Macmillan.
- Einstein, Albert. 1940. "Einstein on Bertrand Russell, 1940." In Otto Nathan. 1958. Letter to Bertrand Russell. 2 April 1958. *Papers of Sir Joseph Rotblat*. Churchill College Archives, RBTB 5/1/1/1 (5).
- Einstein, Albert. 1946. "Einstein on Bertrand Russell, 1946." In Otto Nathan. 1958. Letter to Bertrand Russell. 2 April 1958. *Papers of Sir Joseph Rotblat*. Churchill College Archives, RBTB 5/1/1/1 (5).
- Emants, Marcellus. 1975. *A Posthumous Confession*. Trans. J. M. Coetzee. New York: Twayne [original: *Een nagelaten bekentenis* 1894]. Grant, George Parkin. 2005. (Andrew Potter, introduction). *Lament for a Nation*. McGill-Queen's University Press. Original edition 1965.
- Hammond, Andrew, ed. 2006. *Cold War Literature: Writing the Global Conflict*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ignatieff, Michael. 2009. "George Grant was 'wrong, wrong, wrong'." Published April 17, 2009 Updated May 2, 2018, *The Globe and Mail* <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/arts/books-and-media/george-grant->

- [was-wrong-wrong-wrong/article4210782/](#) *From True Patriot Love* by Michael Ignatieff. © Michael Ignatieff 2009. Reprinted with permission of Penguin Group (Canada).
- Karp, Masha. "Orwell in Translation." *European Studies Blog*. British Library. 21 November 2017. <https://blogs.bl.uk/european/2017/11/orwell-in-translation.htm>
- Kay, Francesca. "Top 10 books about the cold war." *The Guardian*. 20 Jan 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2016/jan/20/top-10-books-about-the-cold-war>
- Kenarov, Dimiter. 2018. "Was the Philosopher Julia Kristeva a Cold War Collaborator? She insists that she never agreed to be a spy. Old documents, and old spies, tell a different story." *The New Yorker*. 5 September 2018. <https://www.newyorker.com/news/dispatch/was-the-philosopher-julia-kristeva-a-cold-war-collaborator>
- Kiebusinski, Ksenya. 2017. "Not Lost in Translation: Orwell's *Animal Farm* Among Refugees and Beyond the Iron Curtain." *The Halcyon*. ISSUE No. 59, June 2017, 3-6.
- Lindsay, James. M. 2014. "Ten Cold War Novels Worth Reading." Council on Foreign Relations. November 5, 2014. <https://www.cfr.org/blog/ten-cold-war-novels-worth-reading>
- Marx, Karl. 1843-1844. *Einleitung, Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie*, (Dezember 1843/Januar 1844), 1843-1844 <https://www.staff.uni giessen.de/~g31130/PDF/marx/Rechtsphilosophie.pdf>
- Marx, Karl. 1843-1844. "Introduction," *A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, 1843-1844, Written: December 1843-January 1844; First published: in *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, 7 & 10 February 1844 in Paris; Transcription: the source and date of transcription is unknown. It was proofed and corrected by Andy Blunden, February 2005, and corrected by Matthew Carmody in 2009. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1843/critique-hpr/intro.htm>
- McCarthy, Joseph. 1950. "Enemies from Within." Speech Delivered in Wheeling, West Virginia (1950). https://liberalarts.utexas.edu/coretexts/_files/resources/texts/1950%20McCarthy%20Enemies.pdf
- Mill, John Stuart. 1859, rpt. 1864. *On Liberty*. Third Edition. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts & Green, 1864.
- Miller, Arthur. "Why I Wrote 'The Crucible.' An artist's answer to politics." *LIFE AND LETTERS*. OCTOBER 21 & 28, 1996 ISSUE. *The New Yorker*. October 14, 1996. <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/1996/10/21/why-i-wrote-the-crucible>
- Multatuli. 1927 [1860]. *Max Havelaar; or, The coffee sales of the Netherlands Trading Company, by Multatuli (1860)*. Trans. W. Siebenhaar. Introduction by D. H. Lawrence. New York: A. A. Knopf.

- Nathan, Otto. 1958. Letter to Bertrand Russell. 2 April 1958. *Papers of Sir Joseph Rotblat*. Churchill College Archives, RBTB 5/1/1/1 (5).
- Olaziregi, Marie Jose, ed. 2009. *Writers In Between Languages: Minority Literatures in a Global Scene*. Reno, Nevada: Center for Basque Studies, University of Nevada, Reno.
- Patterson, Cynthia B., 2010, "Herodotus," In: Gagarin, Michael (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, np,
<https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780195170726.001.0001/acref-9780195170726-e-584>
- Orwell, George. 1945. "You and the Atom Bomb." *Tribune*, 19 October 1945. The Orwell Foundation. <https://www.orwellfoundation.com/the-orwell-foundation/orwell/essays-and-other-works/you-and-the-atom-bomb/>
- Orwell, George. 1964 [1945]. *Animal Farm: A Fairy Tale*. London: Longmans.
- Orwell, George. 2003 [1949]. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin Books.
- Plato. 1892. *Republic. The Dialogues of Plato. Translated into English with Analyses and Introductions by B. Jowett*. In Five Volumes: Vol. III. New York and London: Macmillan & Co. Small/Minor Literatures & Cultures (accessed January 14, 2020). Website.
<http://www.minorliteratures.org/>.
- Russell, Bertrand. 1969, rpt. 1971. *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell. 1944-1967 (Volume III)*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Shakespeare, William. [1600]. "Hamlet." *Open Source Shakespeare*. <https://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/>
- Stalin, Josef. 1946. "Speech Delivered by Stalin at a Meeting of Voters of the Stalin Electoral District, Moscow," February 09, 1946, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1946.
<http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/116179>
- Toqueville, Alexis de. 2002. *Democracy in America*. Translator - Henry Reeve. A Penn State Electronic Classics Series Publication. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University.
- Vanderauwera, Ria. 1985. *Dutch Novels Translated into English: The Transformation of a "Minority" Literature*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Wiesehöfer, Josef, 2009, "Greeks and Persians," In: Raaflaub, K. & van Wees H. (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Archaic Greece*, Oxford, pp. 162-185.
- Wright, Richard B. *The Weekend Man*. 1971 [originally published 1970]. New York: Farrar, Strauss & Giroux.