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# Introduction

In 2012, Translation Studies (TS) scholar Christopher Rundle wrote an article that posed some weighty and at times uneasy questions about the discipline and its relation to the study of history. The article, titled "Translation As an Approach to History," argued in favor of history-focused research that aims to shed light on historical topics rather than on the history of translation. Rundle posited that such history-first research can be more valuable and interesting than the alternative, but he cautioned that it tends to be incompatible with the main methodologies and interests of the TS community, particularly in its Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) approaches. The current paper aims to explore Rundle's arguments and offer detailed insights on the benefits of his suggested approach. This will be done by reviewing and analyzing four articles that use translation as a framework for investigating issues pertaining to the Cold War between the US-led Western bloc and the Soviet-led Eastern camp. Two of these articles focus on the superpower battle known as the Cultural Cold War, while the other two are about topics related to intelligence and espionage. At the core of this study are four chapters that present summaries of the key points in each article followed by analysis and discussion that link them to Rundle's contentions. The findings suggest that his observations are highly pertinent to the nexus between TS and history, and merit close attention. Moreover, the four articles highlight the robust contribution and rich rewards that translation research can offer to the field of history, as well as to other disciplines. Overall, the paper reinforces Rundle's assertions about the challenges inherent in producing historical studies from a translation perspective, while demonstrating that such efforts are certainly worthwhile and should be further encouraged.

# Historical Inquiry vs. Translation History

In his 2012 article, Rundle makes the case for using TS as a means for expanding our knowledge about a particular historical subject rather than exploring the history of translation itself. He thus questions the assumption that engaging in the study of translation must first and foremost contribute to a "universal history of translation or an overall theory of translation" via TS methodologies and concepts (Rundle 2012, 233). Focusing on DTS, he argues that translation in and of itself does not provide an adequate common denominator to produce "meaningful history." Hence, he suggests that TS research should be organized around "more specific historical themes" while drawing on both historical and translation studies tools (Ibid, 236). Rundle notes that in some cases, focusing on a historical topic rather than on translation history would tend to produce more interesting and valuable insights. Conversely, he writes, an exclusive focus on translation history may result in case studies that add little substance to previous research (Ibid, 237). To illustrate the point, Rundle views his own research work on translation under the fascist regime in Italy. Examining the history of translation as reflected in the Italian case study would largely generate previously unearthed insights that have been widely analyzed before, he says. This suggests that the conclusions of such research would be of little or no interest, and that it would be difficult to detect features of translation that are unique to Italian fascism. On the other hand, studying Italian fascism through the prism of translation enabled Rundle to come up with fresh and original observations about the nature of Benito Mussolini's regime. Among other things, it became apparent that fascist Italy viewed translations as an important means for measuring and asserting its cultural dominance on the global stage (Ibid, 237-239).

Rundle warns that prioritizing translation history over historical analysis may ultimately produce a massive corpus of case studies of limited value to TS scholars, who lack the needed historical expertise to fully appraise and appreciate such diverse research. He illustrates this by bringing up an article by translation researcher Lawrence Venuti that analyzed 13 historical examples from different eras (Ibid, 233-234). Rundle argues that such studies offer no historical value as they reduce developments from entirely different periods and contexts into a shallow analysis lacking any historical meaning. To reinforce this point, he emphasizes that the historical approach mostly aims to identify the specific attributes of events rather than to generalize about them (Ibid, 234-235). Rundle adds that TS scholars motivated by an interest in a specific historical subject are likely to have more in common with historians researching the same field than with translation specialists. In this context, he also notes that history and TS are two distinct disciplines that employ different discourses and utilize different methodologies (Ibid, 232-233, 235). Thus, TS historians who rely on the discipline's tools often end up addressing a research community with limited knowledge of the historical issues in question, while possibly excluding historians with relevant expertise and high interest in such research. This suggests that aiming to contribute to the historiography of specific topics may require TS scholars to distance themselves from the discipline and its methodologies, Rundle says, citing previous comments by researcher Paul Bandia (Ibid, 233). He also argues that "the more we address other scholars in translation studies, the less we are contributing to the historical field of our choice" (Ibid, 233).

Unsurprisingly, Rundle's article elicited some criticism from the TS community. Observers noted, among other things, that the field of TS is much wider than Rundle has described, that his almost exclusive emphasis on DTS is misplaced, and that other approaches to studying the history of translation focus on specific contexts without aiming to artificially link broad phenomena (St. Pierre 2012, 241-242; Hermans 2012, 242-243). Indeed, Rundle may have overly generalized some of his points and deserves the criticism, but the essence of his argument about the value of history-focused TS remains highly relevant and highlights important questions about translation research. Notably, even his critics accepted some of his arguments, conceding that he raised "pertinent points," and agreeing that the problem he addressed "deserves attention" (St. Pierre 2012, 242; Hermans 2012, 242). Rundle subsequently continued to advance his arguments in various forums. In a 2016 conversation with historian Vicente Rafael, Rundle again pointed to the tension inherent to TS between studying specific historical subjects and the "desire to generalize," while highlighting the value of using translation research as a means for producing historical insights (Rundle 2016, 38). He stressed that this could be particularly relevant for periods or events that feature intercultural interaction, thereby helping expose subtleties that may be hard to spot otherwise. Returning to the case of Italy, he noted how his own research helped reveal the "collective psychology" of the fascist regime (Ibid, 37). Most recently, in the introduction to a wide-ranging book he edited on translation history, Rundle reiterated that "translation can also function as an approach to history rather than just being the object of inquiry" (Rundle 2022, xxi). To further scrutinize Rundle's arguments, this paper will focus on research into different facets of the Cold War. This issue lends itself well to such exploration as it features a growing corpus of studies that combine historical analysis with a focus on the role of translation from different perspectives and in varied contexts. Indeed, given the Cold War's broad international scope and the critical function played by language mediators throughout the conflict, it constitutes an ideal focal point for this study.

# The Cold War: Cultural Warfare and Intelligence Battles

The Cold War, a tense and often menacing superpower rivalry between the United States and Soviet Union, was a sweeping global contest that dominated the geopolitical landscape in the second half of the 20th Century. It was fought "at different levels in dissimilar ways in multiple places over a very long time," leading Cold War scholar John Lewis Gaddis wrote in a comprehensive book on the subject (Gaddis 2005, Loc 85). While the Cold War pitted two competing ideologies against each other on a grand scale, resolving this competition via military force was not seen as an attractive option due to the danger of nuclear war. This forced both America and the USSR to channel their efforts into other strategies and tactics to gain an advantage over their archrivals and reduce the risk of an all-out war. These alternatives included ideological and symbolic battles waged by taking up cultural warfare (White 2019, 2).

The Cultural Cold War is a broad term referring to the massive efforts, often covert, undertaken by the United States and Soviet Union to "win hearts and minds" (Haddadian-Moghaddam and Scott-Smith 2020, 325). To achieve this ambitious objective, both sides promoted a wide range of cultural works and events, ranging from international art exhibitions and musical and dance performances to book publishing and radio broadcasts (Haddadian-Moghaddam 2020, 443). Through these efforts, America and the USSR attempted to convince the enemy's as well as their own citizens that they were a force for good that could steer the world toward a brighter future. While the Soviets were experienced with such maneuvers since the days of the 1917 Russian Revolution, Washington had to quickly catch up and build a large apparatus to engage in a struggle where cultural icons, propaganda and disinformation reigned supreme (White 2019, 3). The Americans and Russians invested enormous resources in secret and overt efforts to undermine their foes via the wide dissemination of cultural works. Both sides took this endeavor seriously, with their secret services forming extensive propaganda networks to boost the resonance of writers and other artists deemed to promote the "right" ideologies. In the same vein, both took pains to censor and silence the work of critical authors (Ibid, 2). As part of these efforts, the CIA secretly funded front organizations that produced tens of millions of books, leaflets, and pamphlets, as well as the means needed to launch them into hostile territory such as hundreds of thousands of balloons (Ibid, 1).

As the Cultural Cold War was fought across borders and in multiple languages, translation and interpretation served as a key weapon for both sides in advancing their cause. Existing research on the subject suggests that the Cultural Cold War would have been largely impossible or very different without translators and interpreters working behind the scenes in the service of America, the USSR, and their respective allies (Haddadian-Moghaddam and Scott-Smith 2020, 326). Yet despite its importance, this area of research has been neglected by most historians and normally treated as a peripheral issue that merited little attention. At the same time, TS contributions to the study of the Cultural Cold War often lacked the interdisciplinary approach to fully position and explore translation in the relevant political and social contexts (Ibid, 327). However, by now TS scholars are offering increasingly nuanced and sophisticated studies and perspectives on the subject, as illustrated by a 2020 issue dedicated to the Cultural Cold War in the journal *Translation and Interpreting Studies*. The first two articles reviewed and analyzed in this paper were taken from this publication.

Another arena for fighting the Cold War was the realm of espionage and intelligence. Both superpowers and their allies relied heavily on intelligence to gain the upper hand while averting a disastrous large-scale war that threatened to lead to nuclear devastation (Sulick 2014, 47). Espionage activities were carried out on multiple fronts, ranging from recruiting and running agents in hostile territories to collecting classified data by intercepting coded communications. In parallel, the security services monitored publicly available sources such as press reports and radio broadcasts for more clues about the enemy's plans, intentions, and mindset. All of these efforts produced vast amounts of intelligence that had to be interpreted and analyzed to gain deeper insights and supply decision-makers with vital information. Notably, just as in cultural and information warfare, the superpowers were unevenly matched in the battle of spies in the early stages of the Cold War. While Soviet intelligence agencies drew on traditions that dated back centuries, the Americans had far less experience and had to quickly develop new strategies and tradecraft to bolster their capabilities (Ibid, 47).

As the Cold War was waged globally, many countries were involved in the conflict's intelligence battles across Europe, Asia and elsewhere (Garthoff 2004, 45). This granted translators and other types of language mediators a prominent role in the wide range of espionage activities undertaken by the warring sides. TS scholars have taken a growing interest in this subject as well, drawing on archival and other material from different countries and in multiple languages. This research includes a series of books titled "Languages at War," published as part of a British project dedicated to studying the "policies and practices of language contacts in conflict" (Footitt and Tobia 2013). As with the Cultural Cold War, the East-West intelligence wars are also well suited for the purposes of the current study. Hence, the last two articles examined in this paper are about intelligence-related aspects of the Cold War.

# Article 1: Manipulating Translations in the Soviet Union

The first article, written by Ilaria Sicari, is titled "Paratext as Weapon: The Role of Soviet Criticism in the Cultural Cold War." The article views the manipulation of translated foreign works in the Soviet Union, mostly via paratextual elements such as introductions, to culturally appropriate and align them with Soviet ideology. The study focuses on the Soviet domestication of novels by Italian writer Italo Calvino and by American author Kurt Vonnegut from the 1950s to the 1980s to achieve ideological objectives. Sicari analyzes varied examples of paratexts from prominent state-controlled publishers, as well as internal reviews by government censors. As part of her analysis, she also offers some insights on the translations themselves and the ways in which they were selected and manipulated. The article notes that the need to frame foreign works in a manner that supported the official party line was often emphasized by a government body known as the Ideological Commission of the Central Committee (Sicari 2020, 355). In this context, the Soviet regime believed that paratexts had two key functions to fulfill, namely underscoring the "ideological defects" found in Western works and highlighting their "progressive" aspects, which happened to endorse and reinforce Soviet thinking (Ibid, 357). Sicari notes that foreign writers hailed as progressives were mostly supporters of communism and of the Soviet Union, so their work tended to include some sympathetic views toward socialist ideals. However, the translations of their novels were often reduced to no more than a critical take on capitalism, even when this entailed a misleading interpretation of the author's original intent (Ibid, 357).

Looking at the work of Calvino, the article notes that despite once being an avowed communist he later distanced himself from the party and explored ideas considered taboo in the Soviet Union (Ibid, 358). In one example, Sicari describes how the Italian author's work was manipulated via an introduction that suggested a Marxist reading of his book and misrepresented his actual intentions (Ibid, 358). She says that this shows how fitting a book with a "proper" paratextual framework facilitated the publication of foreign works that were far removed from Soviet ideas in both ideology and style, and that were premised on theories deemed problematic in Soviet eyes (Ibid, 358). Ultimately, the chance of eventually reaching Soviet readers depended on the ability to domesticate what were seen as "ideological anomalies" within Western books, she writes (Ibid, 359). Moreover, the article suggests that most of Calvino's works were not translated and published in the Soviet Union because it was impossible to present readers with "politically oriented interpretations" of these texts (Ibid, 359). Notably, this issue pertained not only to the substance of books but also to their structure and style, Sicari says (Ibid, 356). The article provides an example of an internal review that rejected a book for translation as it lacked the familiar chronological linearity of works associated with Socialist Realism. The reviewer wrote that readers who are "not used to this narrative genre" would have trouble grasping the story and appreciating its literary value (Ibid, 360).

The article similarly reviews translated works by Vonnegut, who was seen as a "friend" of the Soviet Union because of his overall sympathy toward socialism, generally positive portrayal of communism, and criticism of the capitalist system (Ibid, 362). The article notes that the regular translator of his works, Rita Rait-Kovalëva, focused on domesticating his writings by omitting or misrepresenting any content that appeared "improper," such as unsuitable ideological passages or political and sexual descriptions that were seen as unpleasant or inappropriate for the Soviet reader (Ibid, 362). In parallel, and as was done with Calvino's work, further domestication was achieved by supplementing the original text with appropriate paratexts. Thus, the dystopian vision of America in Vonnegut's translated books was presented to Soviet readers as a description of grim current-day realities rather than a future prediction. This enabled the regime to push the notion that his novels endorsed the vision that communism offered the best path forward to progress and freedom for all (Ibid, 363). The article notes that stylistic elements of Vonnegut's writing were also misrepresented through paratextual commentary when these were deemed too "dangerous" ideologically. This was done by resorting to a "domesticating interpretation" that portrayed them in a more acceptable light (Ibid, 364). Overall, the article provides multiple such examples, citing widely from Soviet paratexts to demonstrate how the effort to domesticate foreign works was carried out. The article concludes that literary critics were significant actors that used domestication techniques to effectively adapt foreign novels to the needs of Soviet propaganda. However, Sicari says that this also allowed more American and other Western novels to be published in the USSR than would otherwise be permitted, including works that contained elements that clashed with the communist worldview (Ibid, 371).

Sicari's article epitomizes the value of history-focused translation research in several ways. First, it offers an effective framework for narrowing down a complex, wide-ranging topic such as the Cultural Cold War -- and more specifically Soviet propaganda -- into a focused study that incisively and plainly illustrates broad ideas and processes. By using many detailed examples, Sicari provides readers with a deeper understanding of how the Soviet apparatus operated, the assumptions that underpinned it, and the specific actions taken to achieve the regime's goals. Given the breadth of the subject, it would be all too easy to stray in many directions and produce work that may be overly general or too dispersed. However, using the translation lens can provide scholars with a convenient framework to work within and keep them on track, while allowing the audience to gain invaluable insights about intricate historical subjects.

Another benefit of using translation as the focal point of historical research is the ability of TS to shed light or expand on themes that may be elusive, and to add nuance to situations that may appear unequivocal at first glance. Sicari does this by placing the domestication efforts applied to foreign works in the wider context of Soviet policies and diplomacy. She cites pervious research by scholar Deming Brown pointing to the Soviet desire starting in the 1950s to project a new image of "cultural openness" and tolerance, linking this attitude to the increase in Russian translations during this period (Ibid, 361). Viewing the subject from this angle offers us a more profound understanding of the dilemmas faced by the USSR, which wished to improve its reputation abroad while still maintaining rigid ideological control over the local population. As we review the examples in the article, we gain a better sense and deeper appreciation of the difficulties faced by the Soviet regime as it sought to navigate through conflicting aims and interests. Instead of reinforcing a black-and-white portrayal of the USSR, the article allows us to see the fragile nature of the regime, the uncertainties and concerns it faced, and the kinds of compromises it made in tackling them. All of this is neatly and lucidly depicted by utilizing the prism of translation.

In addition, TS can help in positioning research in a wider context through a common denominator that exposes links between similar phenomena in different periods. In this case, reading Sicari's article alongside TS studies about current-day Russia can offer additional insights about the evolution of Russian propaganda over time. To that end, consider a 2016 article by Anneleen Spiessens and Piet Van Poucke titled "Translating News Discourse on the Crimean Crisis: Patterns of Reframing on the Russian Website InosMI." In this study, the researchers looked into the ways a Russian news translation website represented Western coverage of the 2014 Crimea crisis. The paper concluded that the site in question utilized different "framing mechanisms" to misrepresent Western discourse to the Russian audience. By using tactics such as "selective appropriation," the website created the false impression that news reporting in the West was more closely aligned with official Russian views, the article said (Spiessens and Van Poucke 2016, 319). This should sound all too familiar after reading Sicari's work, helping reinforce the notion that Russian President Vladimir Putin is strongly influenced by the Soviet worldview and tends to adopt Soviet tactics. Exploring this topic via other translation-related research, such as "Literary Translation as an Instrument of Censorship in Soviet Russia" by Maria Zalambani and Ilaria Lelli (Zalambani and Lelli 2022), would likely enable scholars to further trace the development of Moscow's contemporary campaigns of disinformation and the way they draw on earlier Soviet tactics.

# Article 2: Translating Faulkner in the Middle East

The second article, written by Esmaeil Haddadian-Moghaddam, is titled "The Cultural Cold War in the Middle East: William Faulkner and Franklin Book Programs." The article views the Franklin Book Programs, a project that aimed to translate and disseminate American books worldwide in a bid to promote favorable views of the United States overseas. The organization operated for a total of 25 years in 12 countries, published thousands of translations, and had a large impact on helping to train a new generation of editors and translators. As such, it was one of the most prominent instruments employed by the United States in waging the Cultural Cold War. Notably, this wide-ranging venture was funded by the US government and was covertly supported by the CIA (Haddadian-Moghaddam 2020, 445). The article notes that despite the project's positive impact on developing local publishing and a stronger translation culture, some observers have concluded that it was mostly renowned for producing "propaganda." However, Haddadian-Moghaddam argues that viewing this massive cultural project in strictly propagandistic terms is overly simplistic given the wide range and impact of Franklin's efforts. He then suggests that scrutinizing the project through the prism of translation allows for a more nuanced analysis and exploration of the venture's different facets (Ibid, 445). The article specifically focuses on the translations of Nobel Prize-winning author William Faulkner into Persian and Arabic. It argues that this is a particularly informative case study because of Faulkner's Cold War impact, as well as the duality inherent in his work in terms of his attitude toward American society. In this context, the article reviews previous research that highlights Faulkner's significant role in the book programs and strong contribution to US cultural diplomacy in the 1950s. On the other hand, scholars have also emphasized that Faulkner challenged some aspects of US democracy, such as its prevalent racism, and thus created unease among Franklin's US staff regarding whether to promote him as a symbol of America. To put it bluntly, as one observer noted, "admiration for Faulkner’s novels hardly guaranteed admiration for the United States" (Ibid, 446-447).

Haddadian-Moghaddam describes and analyzes several instances where the views of Franklin's administrators clashed with the wishes of Middle Eastern publishers. Among other things, he addresses correspondence that highlights the American mindset and occasional reluctance to translate Faulkner's work in the face of keen interest by local publishers. For example, in one such letter, the president of the Franklin Book Programs recommends the translation of Faulkner's 1938 novel *The Unvanquished*. He argues that this is one of the author's few novels that not only showcase his talents but are also "not so evil and nihilistic in subject matter" as to question whether translating them would be a "wise choice" (Ibid, 450). In another case, one of the project's local editors in Tehran sought to promote what he thought was a "superb" translation into Persian of Faulkner's novel *The Sound and the Fury*. However, an internal note in the publication file reveals that administrators in New York were "not enthusiastic about the content in and by itself" but were "reluctantly persuaded by Franklin Tehran" (Ibid, 453).

Just like the previous article about the Soviet Union, this one also reinforces some of Rundle's fundamental arguments. For one thing, it demonstrates how using translation as the focal point of research can be useful in deepening our historical understanding of broad and complex subject matters. The detailed descriptions and correspondence incorporated into the article reveal how the US apparatus of cultural warfare operated, narrowing down a vast topic into an incisive and illuminating narrative. Haddadian-Moghaddam writes that the study sheds light on the history of the Franklin Book Programs while furthering our understanding of the Cultural Cold War in a non-European context (Ibid, 442). Moreover, and similarly to Sicari's work, the article adds nuance to and exposes the hidden layers of an issue that may otherwise be over-simplified. While reading the article we encounter the dilemmas faced by US practitioners of cultural warfare, their intricate decision-making process, and the grey areas in which they operated. It soon becomes apparent that this front of the Cultural Cold War was not a clear-cut affair from a US perspective, but rather a challenging endeavor that brought to the surface some uneasy questions and unpleasant issues related to the soul of America itself.

In addition to the above, some of the article's flaws also support Rundle's observations, particularly about the need for extensive knowledge of history to fully appreciate TS research that aims to explore a specific historical topic. Haddadian-Moghaddam offers plenty of background material on various subjects throughout the article to provide readers with relevant information about the issues at hand. This ultimately creates a disorienting effect as he frequently digresses from the main topic and strays into proverbial alleyways before circling back shortly thereafter. The cumulative effect is that key passages that advance his argument are buried under heaps of contextual descriptions and explanations. To illustrate the point, consider the following: The article begins with an anecdote about the Franklin Book Programs, with some biographical information about its president. It then offers background information about the Cultural Cold War, including a lengthy section about the Franklin project. Subsequent diversions from the main theme include sections about Faulkner's literary endeavors and translations of his books, his role in the Cultural Cold War, and a review of previous research on these topics in the Middle Eastern context. It is easy to see how the core of Haddadian-Moghaddam's original contribution, namely the behind-the-scenes interactions inherent to producing Faulkner's translations, can get lost in the shuffle. The bottom line is that the final manuscript makes for a rather challenging and erratic read.

In Haddadian-Moghaddam's defense, it should be noted that much of his effort may be justified and necessary given the venue, a TS journal that is likely to draw readers who are not necessarily experts on US diplomatic history or literature. One can assume that an audience of researchers specializing in the American manifestations of the Cultural Cold War would require far fewer explanatory notes and descriptions. Going back to Rundle, the article reinforces the notion that TS scholars writing about history will likely have more in common with historians studying the same subject than with other translation researchers. This is especially noticeable in the current case, as it appears that Haddadian-Moghaddam did not rely on or refer much to TS tools or concepts in writing the piece. Indeed, his study mostly reads like a standard historical narrative that may not be automatically associated with the discipline of TS if it were not for the nature of the publication. One way or another, the article to a large extent echoes and amplifies some of the tough questions Rundle raises about the complex relationship between TS and the study of history.

# Article 3: Translation in the Counter-Intelligence World

The third article, written by Sergey Tyulenev, is titled "In a Wilderness of Mirrors: The Ethics of Translation in Cold-War Espionage." The article views translation in the context of counter-intelligence (CI) efforts. It notes that translation is a vital component of such activities as they usually traverse cultural and linguistic boundaries. Tyulenev adds that translation in the realm of CI tends to be very different than more standard translations produced for public consumption. The texts handled by CI translators are sometimes not "usual" and their work does not necessarily aim to produce a standalone target text from the original source text, he says (Tyulenev 2021, 369). The first part of the article focuses on American efforts to translate the Venona cables, a large corpus of coded Soviet communications intercepted by the United States during the Cold War. The telegrams were often very brief, included various symbols, and translators sometimes complained that necessary contextual details were lacking. At times, translators had to resort to "pure guesswork" to resolve the texts they were dealing with, Tyulenev writes (Ibid, 370). Some passages included text that was not yet decrypted, and plain Russian sentences were generally buried under multiple layers of intricate coding. On top of this, the cables also incorporated the jargon employed by the Soviet Union's secret services, making the meaning of some passages elusive even after a message was decoded and translated in full (Ibid, 370-371). The article offers a detailed description of the challenges faced by translators and examples of the content and structure of typical Soviet cables. Tyulenev characterizes this type of intelligence work as "painful and slow," with linguists painstakingly making progress and gradually building a body of knowledge to aid subsequent translation efforts. The project also entailed cooperation with both the CIA and FBI, further complicating an already convoluted work process (Ibid, 371).

One of the key observations in the article is that due to the nature of the texts in question, translated documents included numerous comments, question marks and guesses inserted by translators during their work. Some notes explained why translation choices were made, offered linguistic information, and at times provided in-depth clarifications about Russian phrases or terms. The linguists also provided additional background material about people and places when this seemed necessary (Ibid, 371-372). Such supplements were important as the translators had to supply decision-makers with as much information about the cables as possible, therefore adding "commentaries" on top of the basic translation work (Ibid, 371). The article provides examples of such notes to further illustrate the unique nature of the job. Tyulenev writes that in performing their duties, the translators "turned from invisible mediators to active interpreters and active co-warriors" (Ibid, 371). He focuses on this point, noting that the unusual nature of this CI work granted translators more visibility. He then links this to the wider TS discussion about the traditional invisibility of translators and their tendency to sometimes gravitate towards "subservience," citing previous research by Theo Hermans and Lawrence Venuti. On the other hand, he says, the translators in the project maintained a degree of invisibility as translations were produced collectively and the linguists did not sign their names (Ibid, 372). The article also suggests that these CI translations epitomize the broader practice of translation, which is a "metaphorical form of code breaking" that aims to uncover the hidden intent of the source text's author for the benefit of the target audience (Ibid, 376).

Tyulenev then turns his attention to the translators themselves. He observes that linguists had different motivations for pursuing this work, ranging from a fascination with "solving puzzles" to patriotic sentiments (Ibid, 374). He writes that translators faced an inherent paradox, engaging in work that was largely immoral as it involved stealing information and reading private messages, but doing this for a cause extolled as supremely moral. Given this moral duality, they had to navigate between "the ethics of everyday life and the ethics of warfare," he writes (Ibid, 374). The article dives deeper into the issue of allegiance, noting that questions of fidelity and betrayal are inherent to translation work in general as it requires the constant mediation between source and target text and the choices this entails (Ibid, 373). Tyulenev focuses on one Venona translator who ended up spying for Russia, William Weisband. In analyzing this act of treachery, the article notes that the most capable translators are those who can empathize with and "internalize the intentions and meanings" of the source text's author (Ibid, 379). Tyulenev concludes that CI linguists engage in work that is different from translators in other contexts, while epitomizing the essential attributes of translation in general (Ibid, 380).

Like the previous articles, this study also highlights Rundle's argument about the contribution of TS to historical research and knowledge, as well as to other disciplines. Although the article may well be of interest to TS scholars, intelligence practitioners and researchers will likely derive the most value from it, especially if they engage with CI or other translation-heavy domains. For one thing, Tyulenev sheds light on a key question, namely to what extent should intelligence translators be viewed as analysts. This issue has been raised in previous research, such as a chapter about British open-source translation efforts during World War II in a book titled *WarTalk: Foreign Languages and the British War Effort in Europe, 1940-47*. The authors of that study, Hilary Footitt and Simona Tobia, wrote that translators who monitored and summarized news reports on the radio, for example, had to select speeches of events that they thought were of high interest and intelligence value, thereby acting as "primary sifters and analysts" (Footitt and Tobia 2013, 33). Some of the linguists employed in this role also argued that they should in fact be seen as intelligence analysts. Moreover, these translators had some leeway in the way they drafted summaries of radio broadcasts, which meant that consumers of this material had to be informed that the process of producing it went beyond basic translation (Ibid, 33-34). Tyulenev's article reinforces the notion that language mediation in the intelligence context often involves skills that go well beyond a narrow definition of translation. The article also suggests that CI translators should be able to cope with an unusual degree of uncertainty and incoherence, as they encounter source materials that are far less cohesive than a typical text. These and similar observations carry important implications for the hiring and training practices of such linguists.

Translation-focused research is particularly well positioned to offer important insights to the study of historical and contemporary intelligence. TS contributions would be exceptionally valuable as the field of intelligence studies tends to neglect questions of translation despite their centrality to espionage work. A search of previous research on intelligence issues would reveal that most studies have little or nothing to do with translation. Even articles about topics that are closely related to questions of translation often gloss over this crucial aspect. Consider, for example, a paper written by Robert R. Tomes titled "Socio-Cultural Intelligence and National Security." This article addresses the US intelligence community's failure to adequately analyze developments in Iraq and elsewhere. Although translation is a vital component of this type of intelligence work, the paper does not mention translation at all, and only briefly notes the need to increase language proficiency (Tomes 2015, 76). This blind spot in intelligence research likely relates to the familiar theme of unseen and underappreciated translators who are often taken for granted, as is the case in other fields as well. In the introduction to their book, Footitt and Tobia note that translators in a military and intelligence context have traditionally been invisible, linking this to the wider phenomena described by the likes of Venuti (Footitt and Tobia 2013, 2). They suggest that translation in defense organizations is often viewed as a simplistic logistical need that requires no special attention (Ibid, 3). Footitt and Tobia also observe that historians who specialize in researching wars and conflicts tended to be largely uninterested in issues pertaining to languages (Ibid, 4). However, the two authors write that this lacuna has been increasingly filled by TS scholars and some historians, pointing to a growing number of studies about the role language intermediaries play in military contexts (Ibid, 2). In this respect, Tyulenev's article serves as another important contribution that further highlights the vast potential of TS to contribute to our understanding of historical events in general and of the tradecraft of intelligence in particular.

# Article 4: British Security Services Learn Russian

The fourth article, titled "The Russian Ally: Moving to Cold War," appears as a chapter in the previously cited book by Footitt and Tobia. The study examines Britain's effort in the 1950s to train a large number of Russian-language translators and interpreters in a bid to meet surging demand due to changing geopolitical realities. While the United Kingdom and Russia initially cooperated in occupied Germany in the wake of World War II, the dynamics of these ties changed dramatically as the West and the Soviet Union shifted to an increasingly hostile relationship. As part of the preparations for a potential future conflict, British officials took a closer look at the expected need for linguists and at methods to boost the pool of Russian speakers. In turn, the various security services were asked to estimate the number of needed linguists if a war broke out (Footitt and Tobia, 166). Yet even in the absence of an open conflict, the growing demand for collecting and interpreting intelligence on Soviet moves and intentions necessitated a sizeable cadre of translators. The article notes that the projected requirement for Russian speakers was high, totaling nearly 4,000 for all security services in 1951. Given the shortage of capable linguists at the time, authorities were in essence facing a "linguistic emergency," the article says. It cites a British government report warning that available resources of reliable Russian translators were "hopelessly inadequate" (Ibid, 167). It was also becoming clear that resolving the crisis would be expensive. Some officials argued that the quickest and cheapest solution would be to employ Russian-speaking foreigners. However, this presented a problem as it was difficult to perform proper security checks on many candidates due to insufficient information. There was also a concern that if war erupted, public pressure would encourage the government to detain foreign nationals. Ultimately, the article says, the only acceptable solution was to rapidly train a large group of British-born linguists to undertake the numerous tasks at hand (Ibid, 167-168). The authorities also concluded that they needed two types of linguists, namely "first-class translators" for especially demanding or sensitive missions and "second-class translators" for what was deemed lesser work (Ibid, 168-169).

The article then takes a closer look at the British scheme for training numerous Russian-language specialists. The task was met by setting up a large-scale military project that would select suitable recruits for the rigorous course of study. Britain advanced the program rapidly and put it into action in record time, with nearly 1,000 students embarking on their studies in 1952, the article says (Ibid, 170). It offers rich detail about the program, which was highly demanding and included long hours of contending with various aspects of the Russian language (Ibid, 169-172). Footitt and Tobia note that while British officials were wary of recruiting foreigners as translators, they were more open to hiring them as language instructors. This move was partly motivated by the acute shortage of competent teachers, and ultimately resulted in a teaching staff that was largely non-British-born (Ibid, 173). However, finding capable instructors even among the foreign corps proved challenging for various reasons, such as security risks or lacking competency. Overall, most of the 56 teachers selected for the program came from various countries in Eastern Europe, while only eight were born in the United Kingdom (Ibid, 173-174). Another challenge faced by the program's administrators and instructors was the limited access to the Soviet Union. Students could not freely travel to Russia for study at the time, prompting the government to find alternatives such as arranging visits to émigré families in exile. Authorities were also able to secure some materials such as copies of Soviet papers or films to aid the study process. However, up-to-date reports about life in the USSR were extremely hard to obtain (Ibid, 175-176).

The article says that the Russian training program was terminated in the end of the 1950s for various reasons. As fears grew about the Cold War exploding into an all-out conflict, it became obvious that the demand for linguists in wartime would be far greater than the number of specialists that the government could realistically train. Moreover, by now Britain was getting involved in various decolonization conflicts, which required a much wider range of language capabilities beyond Russian. This coincided with a decline in available resources due to the end of the national service program and reduced budgets (Ibid, 176-177). In sum, the article notes that this was the largest and most ambitious language program ever advanced by the British government. Overall, some 5,000 people joined the project and were taught Russian from scratch in "well organized and highly successful courses." Footitt and Tobia note that the program had a far-reaching long-term impact on the careers of these Russian students, as well as on teaching methods of Russian at British universities (Ibid, 178).

Just like the previous article, this one also highlights the value of TS in deepening historical inquiry and contributing to existing research into intelligence affairs. The study would be particularly invaluable to researchers and professionals working on linguistic aspects of intelligence collection and seeking to boost the scope or quality of translation teams. Notably, the article goes into detail about the British language training program, including specifics about the time allotted to various tasks such as Russian dictation and translation in the daily schedule. Footitt and Tobia further note that instructors combined traditional methods of learning grammar with newer approaches to language learning (Ibid, 170-172). Some of the methods are described in more detail to offer a deeper understanding of the teaching approach used in the program. The article also raises important questions to consider in selecting instructors. The two authors note that students soon realized that different teachers came from different language backgrounds and spoke in varied accents. Overall, the article says, the mix of Russian taught in the course was "eccentric" and represented a "hybrid" Russia of exiles that did not quite exist in the Soviet Union at the time (Ibid, 174-175). This seems like a useful observation to keep in mind when building a similar training program today. On a more strategic level, the article also offers important lessons to intelligence experts and policy makers. Most crucially perhaps, it highlights the ramifications of not preparing in time to acquire language capabilities needed to cope with emerging conflicts. Footitt and Tobia note that even after it became clear that Britain urgently needed to train more language mediators, the initial government response was slow and relied on ad hoc measures rather than on a large and focused program. The project was only centralized and accelerated when the risk of war increased dramatically, they write (Ibid, 170). In today's fast-paced world, anticipating growing demand for linguists could be critical in countering rapidly evolving security challenges.

Yet beyond its intelligence value, the article also offers interesting insights into the changing fabric of British society in the post-WWII period. Footitt and Tobia notes that the Russian-language program drew on a broad range of social classes, unlike previous British efforts related to languages during wartime. This meant that recruits increasingly came from less privileged backgrounds rather than being exclusively drawn from the middle and upper classes (Ibid, 170). This observation correlates with the sweeping transformations in the United Kingdom during and after the World War, as members of different classes increasingly came together to ward off the Nazi threat (Addison 1994). The article also notes that the program brought thousands of young Brits into close contact with foreigners, a dynamic that was unusual in the 1950s (Ibid, 174). It is noteworthy that Footitt's and Tobia's book is peppered with information pertaining to interactions between British-born citizens and newly arrived immigrants. For example, the chapter about open-source intelligence offers plenty of detail about the foreigners recruited for the mission and the way they were received by the local population. The chapter describes how the town of Caversham, where the government set up an intelligence collection center, became home to a "motely community of foreigners, well known to those in the surrounding area." While these foreign translators were perceived as "weird," they later recounted that they mostly encountered local curiosity and surprise rather than hostility and racism (Ibid, 32-33). Indeed, had the two authors selected a somewhat different focus, their book could also serve as a prominent work of social history. This should not come as a surprise, as the discipline of TS often deals with intercultural phenomena. As such, translation-focused research offers rich opportunities for exploring issues pertaining to cultural exchanges and social changes from a national or local perspective, like migration or other forms of societal evolution.

# Conclusion

This paper suggests that Christopher Rundle's observations and arguments are largely correct: Translation research that prioritizes the study of history can indeed unlock promising opportunities, while simultaneously posing inherent difficulties. Viewed separately and as a whole, the four articles reviewed and analyzed in this essay demonstrate the strong potential and multiple rewards of adopting Rundle's approach and suggested practices. Among other things, such research can illuminate elusive facts and uncover nuanced processes, reveal invaluable insights and lessons, and offer fresh viewpoints on overlooked questions. Moving forward, this should encourage TS scholars to apply their expertise to an ever-widening range of issues and fields. Moreover, the translation prism appears to be particularly suitable not only for the study of historical geopolitics and conflict but also for analyzing more contemporary developments. Some thinkers, such as strategist and military historian Edward Luttwak, have already pointed to this potential avenue of inquiry. In recent years he has persistently linked US fiascos such as the withdrawal from Afghanistan in 2021 to the erosion of language capabilities in the US intelligence community, rather than to commonly addressed strategic issues (Luttwak 2021, 18). Indeed, the paper suggests that translation *is* a strategic issue in the context of conflict and war, albeit an often neglected one. As such, TS has the potential to make vital and unique contributions to the debate over some of the most pressing issues of the day. Growing engagement in this kind of research could eventually narrow the distance between TS and other disciplines, as both sides become increasingly comfortable operating and cooperating within the shared spaces that straddle their respective fields.

# Bibliography

Addison, Paul. *The Road to 1945: British Politics and the Second World War*. London: Pimlico, 1994

Footitt, Hilary and Simona Tobia. "Intelligence and Translation: Finding Out about the Enemy." In *WarTalk: Foreign Languages and the British War Effort in Europe, 1940-47*, 29-47. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013.

Footitt, Hilary and Simona Tobia. "Introduction." In *WarTalk: Foreign Languages and the British War Effort in Europe, 1940-47*, 1-11. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013.

Footitt, Hilary and Simona Tobia. "The Russian Ally: Moving to Cold War." In *WarTalk: Foreign Languages and the British War Effort in Europe, 1940-47*, 156-186. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013.

Gaddis, John L. "Preface." In *The Cold War: A New History*, Loc 48-97. New York: Penguin Books, 2005. Kindle Edition.

Garthoff, Raymond L. "Foreign Intelligence and the Historiography of the Cold War."

*Journal of Cold War Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (Spring, 2004): 21-56.

Haddadian-Moghaddam, Esmail. "The Cultural Cold War in the Middle East: William Faulkner and Franklin Book Programs." *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (November 2020): 441-463.

Haddadian-Moghaddam, Esmail and Giles Scott-Smith. "The Cultural Cold War: An Introduction." *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (November 2020): 325-332.

Hermans, Theo. "Response." *Translation Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (2012): 242-245.

Luttwak, Edward N. "Can't Beat an Insurgency Without Intelligence." *Wall Street Journal*. November 15, 2021, A18.

Rundle, Christopher. "Introduction." In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation History*, edited by Christopher Rundle, xviii- xxvi. New York: Routledge, 2022.

Rundle, Christopher. "Translation As an Approach to History." *Translation Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (2012): 232-240.

Rundle, Christopher and Vicente Raphael. "History and Translation: The Event of Language." *In Border Crossings: Translation Studies and Other Disciplines*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 23-48. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2016.

Sicari, Ilaria. "Paratext As Weapon: The Role of Soviet Criticism in the Cultural Cold War." *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (November 2020): 354-379.

Spiessens, Anneleen and Piet Van Poucke. "Translating News Discourse on the Crimean Crisis: Patterns of Reframing on the Russian Website InoSMI." In *The Translator*, Vol. 22, No. 3 (2016): 319-339.

St-Pierre, Paul. "Response." *Translation Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (2012): 240-242.

Sulick, Michael J. "Intelligence in the Cold War." *The Intelligencer*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (Winter 2014-2015): 47-52.

Tomes, Robert R. "Socio-Cultural Intelligence and National Security." *Parameters*, Vol. 45, no. 2 (Summer 2015): 61-76.

Tyulenev, Sergey: "In a Wilderness of Mirrors: The Ethics of Translation in Cold-War Espionage." *The Translator*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (2021): 368-383.

University of Reading. "Welcome to Languages at War." Accessed October 12, 2022. https://www.reading.ac.uk/languages-at-war/

White, Duncan. "Introduction." In *Cold Warriors: Writers Who Waged the Literary Cold War*, 1-17. New York: Custom House, 2019.

Zalambani Maria and Ilaria Lelli. "Literary Translation As an Instrument of Censorship in Soviet Russia." In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation History*, edited by Christopher Rundle, 485-504. New York: Routledge, 2022.