

Publishing ‘paper bullets’: Politics, propaganda, and Polish-English translation in wartime London

JOANNA RZEPA

Abstract

During World War 2, publishing was an important element of the war effort for both the Allies and the Axis powers. Wartime propaganda and cultural diplomacy relied primarily on books, magazines and the daily press. The exiled governments in London, including the Polish government, undertook a major effort to translate, publish and promote numerous books and pamphlets that would appeal to British readers and, thus, help sway public opinion. This paper focuses on translation as an important aspect of wartime publishing that has not yet received much scholarly attention. It offers a contribution to research into the role and place of translations in wartime publishing by discussing the Polish government-in-exile’s translation and publishing campaign. Drawing on various archival sources, it demonstrates that publishing translations was an important part of wartime cultural diplomacy and it led to the development of extensive state-private networks that brought together exiled governments and British publishers. By analysing this material in a broad cultural context, the paper highlights the historical, ideological and political relevance of translation studies research to wartime publishing and censorship.

Keywords: translation and World War 2, wartime publishing, Polish government-in-exile, wartime propaganda, cultural diplomacy

1. INTRODUCTION

During World War 2, publishing was an important element of the war effort for both the Allies and the Axis powers. Wartime propaganda relied primarily on books, magazines and the daily press. They were considered to have substantial power to sway opinion and, thus, were widely employed as ‘paper bullets’ or ‘weapons in the war of ideas’.¹ During the war, the international book trade underwent significant transformations as the war ‘sparked a cycle of profound change in the dynamics of publishing throughout the world’.² Recently, book historians Valerie Holman and John B. Hench have offered insightful and comprehensive accounts of wartime publishing in the UK and the US, and the overseas expansion of British and American publishers supported by state-funded organisations such as the British Council and the U.S. International Book Association.³ However, not much has been written on the position of and role played by translated material on the wartime publishing market, with the notable exception of Christopher Rundle’s study of translation and publishing in fascist Italy.⁴ At the same time, in the field of translation studies, new attention has been drawn to the importance of studying translation and interpretation practices during times of conflict. Hilary Footitt and Mona Baker have pointed to the multilingual nature of most warfare, arguing that ‘the “ground of war” is almost always a landscape marked deeply by languages’ and translators and interpreters are agents who ‘reframe aspects of political conflicts’.⁵

When London became home to a number of exiled governments from across occupied Europe, translation turned out to be a key element of their information and propaganda policies and cultural diplomacy. This paper focuses specifically on Polish-English translation and discusses the wartime publishing campaign of the Polish government-in-exile in London. By analysing archival documents and correspondence between the publishers and the Polish authorities held in the archives of the Polish Institute and Sikorski Museum, the Polish

Underground Movement Study Trust, and the Archive of British Publishing and Printing at the University of Reading Special Collections, I offer new insight into the specificity of the wartime publishing market and illustrate key challenges related to publishing translations in times of international conflict. As Jeremy Munday has pointed out, such archival material can be an ‘indispensable resource’ for investigating a ‘microhistory’ of translation.⁶

This paper brings together the methodologies of book history and translation studies to address translation as an important aspect of wartime publishing that has not received much scholarly attention so far.⁷ Examining various paratexts, including prefaces, afterwords, and correspondence between British publishers, Polish-English translators, and Polish authors and authorities, I identify translation and publishing strategies developed by the Polish government-in-exile in collaboration with British publishers. The aim of this paper is both to provide a ‘microhistory’ of Polish-English translation in wartime Britain and to offer a more general reflection on wartime state-private networks, the materiality of translation, and the place of translated texts on the British wartime book market.

2. REFRAMING THE NARRATIVE OF THE WAR: THE POLISH PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN

During World War 2, a number of European governments were forced to seek refuge in the UK, with London becoming the headquarters of governments and royalty from Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Yugoslavia, and diplomatic privileges extended to the Free French movement as well. Not only did this lead to an unprecedented political situation, but it also brought a number of foreign languages into the heart of the UK. That created an urgent need to translate into English, which was quickly becoming the global language of power. Since the exiled governments had little means to offer

practical help to the populations of their Nazi-overrun states, much of their effort was directed at influencing the policies of the British and American governments. As Michael Conway points out, the exiled governments' existence was characterised by strong 'dependence on Allied favour', and they 'could do or say nothing of significance either to the outside world or to their native lands without the approval of their British minders'.⁸ The relations between the British government and the exiled governments were shaped through the official diplomatic channels and networks, but they were also to a great extent informed by the public opinion. 'Official concern with public opinion and the state of national morale embraced a growing interest in reading and in the nature of people's responses not just to literature but also to published information and propaganda.'⁹ These responses were regularly monitored by the Mass-Observation project and reported to the British Ministry of Information, which could then design propaganda and publishing campaigns in response to the public mood at a given time.¹⁰ The exiled governments, with their own Ministries or Bureaus of Information, also recognised the importance of book publishing for drawing attention to their narratives of the war or even reframing the narrative dominating the British political discourse.

While the British Ministry of Information could freely steer the narrative of the war, as it had access to almost unlimited resources, such as state funding, paper, and informal connections with various British publishers and institutions, the situation of the exiled governments was more challenging.¹¹ The war conditions brought to the fore issues related to the materiality of book publishing. As Hench observes, '[b]ooks were among the most conspicuous victims of this vicious warfare. Millions were destroyed by air raids, ship sinkings, infantry actions, orchestrated book burnings, and civilian paper drives.'¹² Printing presses in the countries overrun by the Nazis were either shut down or allowed to publish almost only German propaganda. In the case of Poland, the Nazis not only halted the production of new books, but carried out a deliberate destruction of public and private libraries; it is estimated that

‘three-quarters of the holdings of Polish scientific libraries – some 16 million volumes – were destroyed, while some 80 percent of the school libraries were lost to official vandalism’.¹³ Thus, in terms of printing, the Polish government-in-exile was completely dependent on British publishers and the few Polish publishers who managed to relocate their firms to London before the war broke out. All these publishers suffered from paper shortage. In the first year of the war, publishers could only use up to 60% of the amount they consumed in the previous year.¹⁴ At the same time, they suffered serious shortages of labour, as many employees were conscripted. Thus, while ‘the number of titles published annually in Britain dropped from 14,904 to 6,747’, ‘demand for books increased enormously because blackouts and air raids reduced Britons’ access to other familiar forms of entertainment, including going to the cinema and to pubs.’¹⁵

This situation provided a perfect opportunity for the exiled governments to enter the publishing scene with a selection of translations that sought to draw British readers’ attention to those aspects of the war that pertained to Nazi-overrun countries and allowed them to learn more about their history, cultures, and current political situation. What was particularly important for the Polish, British, and other Allied governments who launched propaganda campaigns during WW2 was to distance themselves from German propagandists and avoid ‘giving the impression that published material was subject to any form of central control’.¹⁶ This posed a number of difficulties as it was clear that maintaining high public morale and winning the ideological war depended on ‘find[ing] effective channels through which particular messages or impressions might reach a designated audience’.¹⁷ Much depended on the development of successful and efficient ‘state-private networks’ that allowed governments to provide publishers with covert sponsorship and led to the production of books that could not be attributed to the state.¹⁸

Designing and carrying out a translation and publishing campaign that would effectively draw the reading public's attention was a major challenge for the Polish government-in-exile. Throughout the war, the Polish government, who moved to London in June 1940, worked 'in very difficult conditions, under heavy pressure from the Allies and Polish public opinion'.¹⁹ As Piotr Wróbel observes, the Polish authorities 'had many British friends and enthusiastic supporters; at the same time, however, the Polish government-in-exile and the Polish press were attacked from various sides'.²⁰ After Soviet Russia joined the Allies in 1941, the Polish government was accused of unjustifiably hostile attitude towards the Soviet Ally (Poland was invaded by Soviet Russia on 17 September 1939). London Poles were also criticised for their lack of resolve to fight anti-Semitism in the Polish army, lack of commitment to the future democratic rule in Poland, and lack of cooperation with Soviet Russia on the subject of future Polish borders. Thus, the image of Poland that transpired through the major British publishing outlets was that of 'a backwater cursed with a haughty elite'.²¹ Left-wing circles were especially critical of Poland's defiance of Soviet Russia, and the 'conservative and liberal press frequently mocked and caricatured the [Polish] government'.²²

It was in this complex situation that the Polish government-in-exile undertook considerable steps to influence British public opinion. The translation and publishing campaign of the Polish government-in-exile was accompanied by a close analysis of the British public's mood, attitudes, and their understanding of the war. The Polish Ministry of Information followed all main British newspapers, and members of the Polish Research Centre (PRC), set up and sponsored by the Ministry, toured the country engaging in cultural diplomacy: delivering public lectures on topics related to Polish history, culture, society, and the political situation, and reporting back on the responses of their British audiences. The PRC's 1944 memorandum stipulated that:

Polish propaganda has to be subtle' and that it had to take into account the fact that 'even for a Briton who is sympathetic to Poland, our country is just one of many Allied countries. [...] Polish issues become more meaningful and can be shown in positive light only when Poles show interest in British, American or global issues instead of putting their country first always and everywhere.'²³

The Polish analyses also emphasised 'British society's general dislike of propaganda of any type'.²⁴ As a 1944 report put it: 'The British audience is afraid that listening to a foreigner's talk will effectively mean that they will have to do something, to make a mental effort'.²⁵ For that reason, the speakers were instructed to make sure they remain calm and composed and 'avoid any kind of affectation, sentimentality, or exaltation'.²⁶ Furthermore, the British and American public was distrustful of anything that resembled the so-called atrocity stories of World War I. The 'excesses of First World War propaganda' created a situation in which certain information, e.g. reports on the ongoing extermination of Polish Jews, was not disseminated publicly because it was considered 'unbelievable' and could lead to possibly disastrous 'mistrust in information propagated by the state'.²⁷ Vernon McKenzie, a contemporary scholar of journalism, spoke of 'suspicion [that] was cast on *all* atrocity reports', a 'hangover of scepticism' and a 'refusal to accept, or even examine critically, many accounts of atrocities unquestionably committed during the past few years'.²⁸

Thus, the Polish government-in-exile's publishing campaign, which relied primarily on translations, had to find a way to navigate around several difficulties: the British readers' distrust of state-sponsored propaganda and their reluctance to get emotionally involved in material that appeared too foreign, distant or peripheral, and thus irrelevant; the distrust of atrocity stories and any material that did not appear 'believable' and could be viewed as state-controlled fear-mongering; and from the more practical point of view, the shortage of paper and financial means required to produce quality publications. The strategies that the Polish

government-in-exile developed to market their translations to British readers were diverse and inventive. Depending on the content of the book, its political relevance, and its potential appeal to British readership, it could be published by a Polish publisher as an overt translation or as a covert translation printed by a British publisher, often without revealing the author's real name. In fact, some publications did not bear any physical mark of direct sponsorship by the Polish government-in-exile. In this way, the 'englishing' of the books took place at both the 'verbal-linguistic' and 'material-textual' levels, with much emphasis put on the physical appearance of the book.²⁹

3. APPROACHING THE BRITISH READER: TRANSLATION, PUBLISHING, AND STATE-PRIVATE NETWORKS

The primary aim of the Polish government-in-exile's publishing campaign was to present Poland's case and the Polish war effort as issues that are close and relevant to the British reader, and to do that, the texts published had to appear both trustworthy and not too far-removed. While the texts themselves carried indelible foreignness – dealing with Poland, a far-away country that most of the British readership did not know much about – the Polish authorities tried to win the British reader's trust by 'domesticating' the translations through extratextual and material elements. The translations were 'domesticated' by means of paratexts (such as prefaces and introductions by British MPs and public intellectuals), imprints (commissioning British publishers to print selected translations) and distribution channels (e.g. inclusion in British publishers' catalogues). Investigating these strategies provides us with a unique insight into the wartime state-private networks and numerous agents and stakeholders who were involved in the process of publishing and distribution of translation. The role played by some

of them, such as the British publishers who collaborated with the governments in exile, has been under-researched and requires further investigation.

Publications about Poland targeting the British reader fall into three broad categories: (1) books and pamphlets by Polish authors, published by London-based Polish publishers, (2) books and pamphlets by Polish authors, sponsored by the Polish government-in-exile and published by established British firms; (3) books written by English-speaking authors and published by established British firms (with little or no subsidy from the Polish government-in-exile). Books belonging to categories (1) and (2) would be fully (or almost fully) sponsored by the Polish Ministry of Information, yet they differed radically in their appearance. Books published by Polish publishers would usually disclose the information about the government sponsorship, whereas titles published by British publishers would typically have an appearance of ordinary commercial publications, without any indication that they were state-sponsored or translated from Polish. In what follows, I discuss the differences between these publications and publishing strategies.

The Polish publishing houses in London were founded mostly by refugee publishers who fled Poland just before or around the outbreak of the war. Among these were Maurycy Kohn and Ignacy Lindenfeld, who opened the firms M. I. Kolin Publishers and Minerva Publishing. They published works both in Polish and in English, including numerous translations of Polish poetry and literature.³⁰ Another Polish firm, Liberty Publications, established by the Polish Socialist Party (PPS), specialised in socio-political publications that were aimed at the British left. The board of directors included two British members (Jimmy Middleton and Rennie Smith), who were appointed ‘to avoid complications with the Home Office’.³¹ The firm was sponsored by the Polish Ministry of Information through the Polish Social Information Bureau (*Polska Informacja Społeczna*), whose aim was ‘to inform the British people on all questions concerning life in Poland, the Polish war effort etc.’³² The books and pamphlets published by

all three firms – Kolin, Minerva and Liberty Publications – explicitly and openly dealt with all issues Polish and did not attempt to disguise that in any way. They either featured the names of Polish authors on the cover (sometimes followed by the name of the translator on the title page) or included information about the Polish origin of the political analyses they published. If the foreignness of those publications was so explicit and palpable, how could they possibly be marketed to the British audience?

The Polish publishers developed two strategies for tackling this question. Kolin and Minerva, who published primarily works of literature, art albums and memoirs, entered into an agreement with Faber & Faber. Faber, an established British firm of outstanding reputation, became their official distributor and included their books in a special section of their own catalogues. The patronage of such a renowned firm did not escape the attention of the London readership. In January 1941, *The Tablet* argued that both the British and the Poles ‘owe[d] a debt to the house of Faber for thus helping to make it possible for Polish culture to live on in exile’.³³

Liberty Publications developed a different strategy. For every pamphlet they published, Liberty Publications aimed to secure a British MP, scholar, or a public figure to write a preface or introduction. Such a piece would typically be two or three paragraphs long and reaffirm the value and relevance of the publication. Liberty Publications pamphlets were prefaced by an impressive number of British MPs, including Philip John Noel-Baker, future winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, who wrote a foreword to *Underground Poland Speaks* (1941), Vernon Bartlett, who introduced *Unknown Europe* (1942), Arthur Greenwood, who wrote a preface to *Towards a New Poland* (1942), or Jennie L. Adamson, who wrote a foreword to *Camp of Death* (1944).³⁴ The more recognisable the name of the person behind the introduction, the higher the chance for a larger publicity. Hardly ever did the pamphlets’ front covers or title pages feature the name of the author or translator; instead, it was the name of the person who penned the

introduction that was given prominence on the pamphlets' front covers. By highlighting the latter's British name in such a salient way, the editors were clearly trying to catch the attention of the British reader and reassure her/him.

In April-July 1944, several texts written in occupied Poland were brought to London by Polish resistance officers who were airlifted from Poland in clandestine military operations code-named Wildhorn I, II, and III.³⁵ These included Aleksander Kamiński's *Stones for the Rampart* (*Kamienie na szaniec*) and Jerzy Andrzejewski's *Roll Call* (*Apel*).³⁶ Both are literary texts based on real-life events. The former tells the story of the scouts' contribution to the resistance movement in Nazi-occupied Warsaw, the latter recounts a disciplinary roll call held in the concentration camp at Auschwitz in the autumn of 1941. When the texts were delivered to the Polish Ministry of Information, they were translated into English and the PRC approached two high-profile critics and poets to write introductions to them: T. S. Eliot was approached by Adam Żółtowski, director of the PRC, and Percy Hugh Lyon, headmaster of Rugby School, was contacted by Jan Baliński-Jundziłł, deputy director of the PRC. Both Eliot and Lyon were informed that the texts 'most authentically' came from Poland and were 'sent by our [Polish] Underground Movement'.³⁷ In his letter to Eliot, Żółtowski admitted that his desire was that 'the most outstanding British critic should testify that the publication is well worth reading', and Baliński-Jundziłł informed Lyon that 'a foreword from [him] would be most gratifying to my countrymen, as well as being a very fine introduction to English readers'.³⁸ Both Lyon and Eliot agreed to write the prefaces, and Eliot explicitly refused to 'take payment from the Polish Government for a service of this sort'. *Stones for the Rampart* with Lyon's foreword was published in early 1945 by the Polish Boy Scouts' and Girl Guides' Association in London, though *Roll Call*, which was to be published by the journal *Nowa Polska* (*New Poland*) and would have been the first literary text in English to talk about Auschwitz, never appeared in print with Eliot's preface for reasons we may only speculate

about.³⁹ The significance of such introductions and reviews written by established critics and scholars cannot be overemphasised. It was not only important to secure support of a public intellectual, but also that that person be seen as an impartial and unbiased outsider with no obvious connections to the Polish government-in-exile. For example, in October 1943, Gilbert Murray, a retired professor of Greek at the University of Oxford, declined the PRC's request to write an introduction to a book on Lwów (present-day Lviv), explaining: 'I am beginning to be known for my sympathy with Poland, so a new name would carry more weight than mine', and suggesting a couple of his colleagues instead.⁴⁰

Publishing anonymous pamphlets that had a price on them (on average, they were sold for 1-3 pence) and, thus, could be considered of commercial value was effective at the beginning of the war. By 1944, however, it was increasingly difficult to find a market for them. In July 1944, Liberty Press published an anonymous English translation of Natalia Zarembina's underground pamphlet *Camp of Death (Obóz śmierci)*, which provided a report on the situation at the concentration camp in Auschwitz in 1941, but also made use of more up-to-date statistics to estimate the number of the camp's victims.⁴¹ The pamphlet was printed in 25,000 copies, and despite the fact that it was advertised in the *Times Literary Supplement* and other outlets, by December 1944, Liberty Press still had 10,000 copies in stock. They continued to advertise it until late spring 1945, even after Auschwitz was liberated, and the text of the advertisement was changed accordingly: 'Full story of the Concentration Camp in Oświęcim recently liberated'.⁴²

The second publishing strategy developed by the Polish Ministry of Information was to commission established British firms to print covert translations of Polish books of propaganda value. In this way, the Polish authorities emulated the work of the British Ministry of Information, though on a much smaller a scale. The advantage of such an arrangement was that books published by British publishers, such as Allen & Unwin or Hutchinson, had the

appearance of ordinary commercial books. Both the British and the refugee governments recognised that, as Holman observed, '[p]ropaganda was most effective when least visible, that is, when it appeared to be produced and distributed by a trade publisher with no connection to the Government'.⁴³ Therefore, the covers and title pages of such commissioned publications would not disclose the fact that they were sponsored by the government. In most cases, they would also not include the name of the translator, attempting to pass for texts originally written in English. In this way, such publications could more easily attract the British reader's attention by hiding their foreignness behind the British publishers' imprints. The only element of the title page that could give away such books' foreign nature was the name of the author, and in some cases even this element was deliberately altered, suppressed, or 'Anglicised'. An interesting example of such a publication is Stanisław Baliński's or Stephen Baley's book *Two Septembers: Warsaw 1939 – London 1940* published by Allen&Unwin in 1941.⁴⁴ Baliński was a Warsaw-born writer and poet who fled Poland in 1939 and soon arrived in London, where he worked for the Polish Ministry of Information and Ministry of Foreign Affairs. *Two Septembers* is a memoir in which he recounts the Nazi invasion of Poland in 1939 and the Battle of Britain in 1940. Writing about the two campaigns that the Nazis waged against Poland and Britain, as well as the contribution of the Polish pilots who fought for Britain, Baliński argues that there are certain 'ideals which for ever bind Poland and Britain'.⁴⁵ He speaks of Poland as a 'distant country' that is united with Britain in its 'love of freedom'.⁴⁶ In this way, the title page and the introduction to *Two Septembers*, visually bringing together London and Warsaw, make the book appear immediately relevant to the British audience. Yet this is not the only way in which Baliński aimed to appeal to the British reader. He insisted on publishing the book under the pseudonym of 'Stephen Bailey'. When Allen & Unwin sent him a draft of the advertisement slip with his real name, he immediately complained, insisting that '[i]t is very important that steps should be taken at once to put the name of the author as we corrected

it on the proofs, i.e. to Stephen Bailey.’⁴⁷ The name that eventually appears on the title page is ‘Stephen Baley’. Thus, not only is the book a covert government-sponsored translation (as Baliński’s letters reveal, it was translated into English by a ‘Mr. Stevens’) that assumed the appearance of an ordinary commercial publication, but it also pretends to be authored by an English-speaker, not a Pole. The cost of producing such publications was of course high, and in the case of *Two Septembers*, the Polish Ministry of Information had to provide Allen & Unwin with paper, agree to purchase 1,000 copies of the book and any unsold stock of the remaining 4,000 copies six months after the date of publication, as well as agree for Allen & Unwin not to pay any royalties on copies that they sold.⁴⁸ Books such as *Two Septembers* were virtually unattributable. The radical englishing of the ‘material-textual’ forms of such books meant that the translators’ presence had to be erased as well. The books had to pass for original English-language texts. Indeed, today the translators’ names can be recovered only from the surviving archival material, such as correspondence with publishers or invoices for commissioned translations.

The third strategy developed by the Polish government-in-exile relied on a more creative type of translation, in which the Polish authorities delivered source materials, analyses, and documents to English-speaking authors who used them to prepare English-language publications on Poland-related topics. Depending on the definitions adopted, these publications could be classified as adaptations, rewritings, free translations or (semi-)original works.⁴⁹ Examples of such publications include G. M. Godden’s *Murder of a Nation: German Destruction of Polish Culture* (published by Burns & Oates in 1943) and Zoë Zajdler’s *The Dark Side of the Moon* (published anonymously by Faber & Faber in 1946 with T. S. Eliot’s prefatory note).⁵⁰ Zajdler, who also published under the pseudonym of Martin Hare, was an Irish-born writer who moved to Warsaw with her Polish-born husband in the 1930s. Her 1940 book *My Name is Million: The Experiences of an Englishwoman in Poland* tells the story of

her escape from Nazi- and Soviet-occupied Poland through Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and her and her husband's capture by the Gestapo. While Zajdler was freed after a couple of days and managed to make her way to London, where she made contact with the Polish government-in-exile, her husband's fate remained unknown. Since she was an established writer who had published several novels before the war, and had her own literary agent, Spencer Curtis Brown, her contribution to the Polish government's publishing campaign was highly valued. On 21 November 1942 Michał Protasewicz, Head of Bureau VI of the Polish General Staff, responsible for intelligence, sent a coded cable message to Warsaw to Stefan Rowecki, leader of the Home Army (*Armia Krajowa*, the Polish underground movement), inquiring about Zajdler's husband and adding that his wife is 'a writer [and] contributes greatly to our cause. Information about her husband would be a small favour.'⁵¹ The reply from Warsaw confirmed that Zajdler's husband was well and he was an active member of the Home Army.⁵² When this exchange was taking place, Zajdler was already working on her next book, *The Dark Side of the Moon*, which tells the story of the Soviet invasion and occupation of Poland, and the subsequent deportations of thousands of Poles to hard labour camps in Siberia. Since Zajdler did not have any first-hand experience of such camps, she had to rely on accounts by witnesses or their families and friends. She was given access to the material collected by the Polish government-in-exile when she was working on her book. As John Coutouvidis and Thomas Lane have established, the files that Zajdler most probably drew on can now be found in the Archive of the Polish Institute and Sikorski Museum in London.⁵³ Since Zajdler was an experienced writer and Polish-English translator, she would not have had problems translating the deportees' accounts and editing them into a longer narrative. When her book was submitted to Faber & Faber in 1945, it drew the attention of T. S. Eliot, who wrote the preface to the book himself, though its publication was delayed until 1946 for political reasons.⁵⁴ The book was published anonymously, for Zajdler was concerned for the safety of her husband, who was still

in Poland, but it included a brief note by Helena Sikorska, wife of the Prime Minister Władysław Sikorski. Sikorska's note affirms that General Sikorski had 'confidence in the author' and she was 'given access to official material and documents'.⁵⁵ Thus, though the book was written by an English-speaker and published by an established British firm, which would make it appear less foreign and more relevant to the British reader, it was nevertheless presented as fully credible and trustworthy since it was based on authentic documents. As a result, the book received much publicity and was reviewed in many leading magazines, such as *Times Literary Supplement*, *The Spectator*, and *International Affairs*.⁵⁶ As one of the reviewers aptly observed, 'Mr. Eliot's name has attracted to the book attention in wider circles than it might otherwise have won.'⁵⁷

4. CONCLUSION: PUBLISHING, COLLABORATION, AND CULTURAL DIPLOMACY

The Polish government-in-exile's publishing campaign relied predominantly on translations. It was by means of translations that the Polish authorities attempted to reframe the mainstream narrative of the war and win public support for the cause of independent Poland. The history of the collaboration between London-based governments-in-exile and British publishers requires further research, but it is clear that the state-private networks developed during the war brought considerable benefits to the publishers. Throughout the war, the publishers' paper quota was regularly reduced by the British Ministry of Supply. In 1941, the paper quota was only 37.5 per cent of the pre-war consumption.⁵⁸ Since refugee governments received their own paper quotas, printing commissioned books allowed the publishers to remain active even after their own quotas were finished.⁵⁹ At the same time, they could offer contracts that obliged the governments to purchase any unsold copies of commissioned books, which made it a relatively safe venture.

Another problem that the publishers struggled with was conscription. Throughout the war, the publishing trade was extremely short of manpower as ‘nearly half of the Typographical Association’s thirty-two thousand members were moved to munitions work or called up’.⁶⁰ Receiving governmental contracts made it possible for the publishers to request an exemption. For example, in a 1941 letter to John Hampden of the British Ministry of Information, Allen & Unwin argued that since they ‘have become virtually the official printers of the Czech Government over here’ and their ‘total volume of business runs [...] to many thousands of pounds in the course of the year’, they would like to be able to secure a contract that would ‘exempt them as fully as they would wish from the drastic call up of their older and highly skilled men’.⁶¹

Finally, working with refugee governments gave the publishers access to a large pool of qualified translators. As Stanley Unwin wrote to Hanna Kister of Roy Publishers in March 1945, ‘there are in London refugee publishers of most of the countries concerned, [who] should be employed to supervise the preparation of the translations. This has in fact been done in several cases’.⁶² In this situation, some British publishers assumed a proactive stance and not only printed books commissioned by the refugee governments, but also acted as their publishing advisors, suggesting titles to publish or reprint, indicating potential niches in the book market and offering professional advice. For example, in 1943 Stanley Unwin became the Netherland Government Information Bureau’s adviser ‘on all book publishing matters’ while his firm Allen & Unwin was given the right of first refusal on all of the Bureau’s publications.⁶³

From the point of view of translation history, these networks and collaborations constitute an important yet so far under-researched aspect of wartime publishing. While it is clear that translated books and pamphlets were considered an important weapon of ideological warfare during WW2, more archival research is necessary fully to understand the complex connections

between exiled governments, authors, translators, and publishers as well as wartime networks of book distribution and issues related to censorship, publishing restrictions, and the material conditions of translation and publishing. That such research can significantly change our understanding of international book distribution networks has been recently demonstrated by a number of insightful studies of Cold War cultural diplomacy. As Richard J. Aldrich points out, through archival research ‘historians have made some notable discoveries about the extent to which many “free and independent” international movements were enmeshed in “state-private networks” during the Cold War. These networks were often clandestine or semi-clandestine and characterized by a complex partnership – albeit sometimes volatile – rather than by simple state manipulation.’⁶⁴ It is also worth noting that some of the publishers who took part in the US- and UK-sponsored programmes targeting the Soviet Bloc countries in the 1950s-1970s, such as Allen & Unwin or Faber & Faber, had had previous links with the Allied governments during the war.⁶⁵ Indeed, in the late 1940s and early 1950s, certain state-private networks developed between the Allied governments and commercial publishers on a temporary and *ad hoc* basis during World War 2, perhaps unexpectedly became the basis for what turned out to be a long-term collaboration that played an important part in the ideological struggle of the Cold War.⁶⁶

Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge the generous support of the Irish Research Council’s Government of Ireland Postdoctoral Research Fellowship [GOIPD/2016/7].

¹ Leo Jay Margolin, *Paper Bullets: A Brief Story of Psychological Warfare in World War II* (New York: Froben Press, 1946). The second quote is by W. W. Norton, cited in John Hench, *Books as Weapons: Propaganda*,

Publishing, and the Battle for Global Markets in the Era of World War II (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2010), p. 45. Decades later those sentiments still held true. In 1961 a confidential Cold War report by the head of the CIA's covert operations argued: 'Books differ from all other propaganda media, primarily because one single book can significantly change the reader's attitude and action to an extent unmatched by the impact of any other single medium. [...] [T]his is, of course, not true of all books at all times and with all readers – but it is true significantly often enough to make books the most important weapon of strategic (long-range) propaganda.' Quoted in Mark Kramer, 'Book Distribution as Political Warfare', introduction to: Alfred A. Reisch, *Hot Books in the Cold War: The CIA-Funded Secret Western Book Distribution Program Behind the Iron Curtain* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2013), pp. ix-xxviii (p. xiii).

² Hench, *Books as Weapons*, p. 3.

³ Hench, *Books as Weapons*; Valerie Holman, *Print for Victory: Book Publishing in England, 1939–1945* (London: The British Library, 2008).

⁴ Christopher Rundle, *Publishing Translations in Fascist Italy* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2010).

⁵ Hilary Footitt, 'Incorporating Languages into Histories of War: A Research Journey', *Translation Studies*, 5.2 (2012), 217-231 (p. 229); Mona Baker, 'Reframing Conflict in Translation', *Social Semiotics*, 17.2 (2007), 151-169 (p. 151). See also Hilary Footitt, 'War and Culture Studies in 2016: Putting "Translation" into the Transnational?', *Journal of War & Culture Studies*, 9.3 (2016), 209-221.

⁶ Jeremy Munday, 'Using Primary Sources to Produce a Microhistory of Translation and Translators: Theoretical and Methodological Concerns', *The Translator*, 20.1 (2014), 64-80 (p. 65).

⁷ In 2010 Norbert Bachleitner argued that the disciplines of book history and translation studies could benefit from one another. He pointed out that 'to elucidate the international transfer of literature by way of translation we have to reconstruct the relevant conditions of book production and distribution, including the expectations of publishers, editors and readers in the target culture' (423). While Bachleitner's focus was 19th-century German translations of British and French prose, his methodological reflection on Robert Darnton's 'communication circuit model' and the importance of researching the social, intellectual and political conditions can be easily applied to other periods and cultural contexts, and it informs much of this paper. See Norbert Bachleitner, 'A Proposal to Include Book History in Translation Studies. Illustrated with German Translations of Scott and Flaubert', *Arcadia*, 44.2 (2010), 420-440.

⁸ Michael Conway, 'Legacies of Exile: The Exile Governments in London during the Second World War and the Politics of Post-war Europe', in *Europe in Exile: European Exile Communities in Britain 1940-45*, edited by Michael Conway and José Gotovitch (New York: Berghahn Books, 2001), pp. 255-274 (p. 257).

⁹ Holman, *Print for Victory*, p. 48.

¹⁰ See Ian McLaine, *Ministry of Morale: Home Front Morale and the Ministry of Information in World War II* (London: Allen&Unwin, 1979), pp. 137-216; and Holman, *Print for Victory*, pp. 95-130.

¹¹ See Holman, *Print for Victory*, pp. 63-130.

¹² Hensch, *Books as Weapons*, p. 19.

¹³ Hensch, *Books as Weapons*, p. 31.

¹⁴ Holman, *Print for Victory*, p. 266.

¹⁵ Hensch, *Books as Weapons*, p. 25.

¹⁶ Holman, *Print for Victory*, p. 99.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ The term 'state-private network' has been used by W. Scott Lucas to describe the early Cold War cultural diplomacy of the US, in particular the relationship between the Central Intelligence Agency and cultural initiatives such as the National Committee for Free Europe, the Campaign for Truth, and the Congress for Cultural Freedom. See W. Scott Lucas, 'Mobilizing Culture: The State-Private Network and the CIA in the Early Cold War', in *War and Cold War in American Foreign Policy 1942-62*, edited by Dale Carter and Robin Clifton (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 83-107.

¹⁹ Piotr Wróbel, 'Dziennik Polski, the Official Daily Organ of the Polish Government-In-Exile, and the Holocaust, 1940-1945', in *Why Didn't the Press Shout?: American and International Journalism During the Holocaust*, edited by Robert Moses Shapiro (Jersey, NJ: Jeshiva University Press, 2003), pp. 507-534 (p. 507).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 512.

²¹ Michael Stenton, *Radio London and Resistance in Occupied Europe: British Political Warfare, 1939-43* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 282.

²² Michael Fleming, *Auschwitz, the Allies and Censorship of the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), p. 81.

²³ The Polish Institute and Sikorski Museum in London, Polish Research Centre Collection, 434/203. Unless otherwise stated, all translations are my own.

²⁴ Minutes of the meeting of the Polish Research Centre, 31 July-1 August 1944. The Polish Institute and Sikorski Museum in London, Polish Research Centre Collection, 434/203.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Fleming, *Auschwitz*, p. 71.

²⁸ Vernon McKenzie, 'Atrocities in World War II—What Can We Believe?', *Journalism Quarterly*, 19.3 (1942), 268-276 (p. 269).

²⁹ A. E. B. Coldiron, *Printers without Borders: Translation and Textuality in the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p. 7.

³⁰ During the war Minerva Publishing published English translations of Stefan Żeromski's *Wierna rzeka* (*The Faithful River*, trans. by Stephen Garry, 1943), Kazimierz Przerwa-Tetmajer's *Na skalnym Podhalu* (*Tales of the Tatras*, trans. by Harriette Eleanor Kennedy and Zofia Umińska, 1941), Marian Hemar's *Cud biednych ludzi* (*The Poor Man's Miracle*, trans. F. B. Czarnomski, 1943), Piotr Choynowski's *Młodość, miłość, awanture* (*Youth, Love and Adventure*, trans. by Kate Żuk-Skarszewska, 1940), Zygmunt Nowakowski's *Przyłądek Dobrej Nadziei* (*The Cape of Good Hope*, trans. by Kate Żuk-Skarszewska, 1940), and Julian Tuwim's children's poems (*Locomotive, The Turnip, The Birds' Broadcast*, trans. and adapted by Bernard Gutteridge and William J. Peace, 1939), as well as Henryk Gotlib's study *Polish painting* (1942) and Józef Hieronim Retinger's monograph *Conrad and his Contemporaries* (1941). M. I. Kolin focused primarily on publishing Polish-language editions of classics, such as Adam Mickiewicz's *Grażyna* (1941) and *Konrad Wallenrod* (1943), Henryk Sienkiewicz's *Ogniem i mieczem* (*With fire and sword*, 1940) and *Potop* (*The deluge*, 1941-3), and Stanisław Wyspiański's *Wesele* (*The wedding*, 1940) and *Warszawianka* (*Varsavian anthem*, 1940), as well as contemporary Polish poetry, including Kazimierz Wierzyński's *Ziemia-wilczyca* (*Earth-she-wolf*, 1941), Maria Pawlikowska's *Róża i lasy płonące* (*The rose and the burning forests*, 1941), Władysław Broniewski's *Bagnet na broń. Poezje 1939-1943* (*Bayonet on. Poems 1939-1943*, 1943).

³¹ Polish Underground Movement Study Trust in London, Adam Ciołkosz Papers, 133/95.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ 'Books of the Week', *Tablet*, 18 January 1941, p. 50.

³⁴ *Underground Poland Speaks*, with a foreword by P. J. Noel-Baker, translated by anon. (London: Liberty Publications, 1941); *Unknown Europe*, with a foreword by Vernon Bartlett, translated by anon. (London: Liberty Publications, 1942); *Towards a New Poland: A Programme of the Polish Underground Movement*, with a

foreword by Arthur Greenwood, introduction by Jan Kwapiński, translated by anon. (London: Liberty Publications, 1942); [Natalia Zarembina], *Camp of Death*, with a foreword by Jennie L. Adamson, translated by anon. (London: Liberty Press, 1944).

³⁵ Jonathan Walker, *Poland Alone: Britain, SOE and the Collapse of the Polish Resistance, 1944* (Stroud: The History Press, 2008), pp. 86-113.

³⁶ Polish Underground Movement Study Trust in London, Bureau VI Collection, A377.

³⁷ PISM, Polish Research Centre Collection, 434/193 and 434/124.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ J. Górecki [Aleksander Kamiński], *Stones of the Rampart: The Story of Two Lads in the Polish Underground Movement*, with a foreword by Percy Hugh Beverley Lyon, translated by anon. (London: Polish Boy Scouts' and Girl Guides' Association, 1945). For a detailed discussion of the publication history of *Roll Call*, see Joanna Rzepa, 'The "Demonic Forces" at Auschwitz: T. S. Eliot Reads Jerzy Andrzejewski's *Roll Call*', *Modernism/modernity* (forthcoming in 2019).

⁴⁰ PISM, Polish Research Centre Collection, 434/223.

⁴¹ See Fleming, *Auschwitz*, pp. 194-6.

⁴² 'Other New Publications', *Times Literary Supplement*, 12 May 1945, p. 227. See also Fleming, *Auschwitz*, p. 360.

⁴³ Holman, *Print for Victory*, p. 102.

⁴⁴ Stephen Baley [Stanisław Baliński], *Two Septembers: Warsaw 1939 – London 1940: A Diary of Events*, [translated by ? Stevens] (London: George Allen&Unwin, 1941).

⁴⁵ Baley [Baliński], *Two Septembers*, p. 14.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ The University of Reading Special Collections, Allen & Unwin Collection, 122/10.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ As the entry on adaptation in the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* aptly states, 'it is rare to find clear definitions of the terminology used in discussing this and other related controversial concepts' (p. 3). Georges L. Bastin, 'Adaptation', in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 2nd ed., edited by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha (London: Routledge, 2009), pp. 3-6.

⁵⁰ Gertrude M. Godden, *Murder of a Nation: German Destruction of Polish Culture*, with a preface by Sir David Ross (London: Burns&Oats, 1943); [Zoë Zajdler], *My Name is Million: The Experiences of an Englishwoman in*

Poland (London: Faber&Faber, 1940); [Zoë Zajdler], *The Dark Side of the Moon*, with a preface by T. S. Eliot (London: Faber & Faber, 1946).

⁵¹ PUMST, Boxes Collection, SK36.

⁵² PUMST, Bureau VI Collection, A253.

⁵³ Zoë Zajdlerowa, *The Dark Side of the Moon*, with a preface by T. S. Eliot, second edition, edited by John Coutouvidis and Thomas Lane (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989), p. 38.

⁵⁴ Zajdler delivered the last chapter of the book to Faber & Faber on 28 June 1945. However, T. S. Eliot and co-directors decided that the book would not appear until the spring of 1946. Eliot referred to it as ‘very damaging to our Russian allies, and therefore a ticklish business’. It was eventually published on 10 June 1946. See also the critical introduction and annotations to T. S. Eliot, ‘Preface to *The Dark Side of the Moon* [by Zoe Zajdlerowa]’, in *The Complete Prose of T. S. Eliot: The Critical Edition*, vol. 6: *The War Years, 1940–1946*, edited by David E. Chinitz and Ronald Schuchard (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017), pp. 742-747 (p. 746).

⁵⁵ [Zajdler], *The Dark Side of the Moon* (1946), p. 4.

⁵⁶ R. D. Charques, ‘Poles in Captivity’, *Times Literary Supplement*, 3 August 1946, p. 363; Edward Crankshaw, ‘The Dark Side of Russia’, *The Spectator*, 5 July 1946, pp. 16-18 (see also readers’ responses: ‘Letters to the Editor’, *The Spectator*, 12 July 1946, p. 37; and 19 July 1946, p. 65); Jane Degras, ‘Review of *The Dark Side of the Moon*’, *International Affairs*, 23.1 (1947), 120-121.

⁵⁷ Degras, ‘Review of *The Dark Side of the Moon*’, p. 120.

⁵⁸ Holman, *Print for Victory*, p. 82.

⁵⁹ Publishers could also apply for paper from the so-called Moberly Pool, which was created in 1941, and managed by the British Ministry of Supply and later the Board of Trade. As Hench explains in *Books as Weapons*, the paper was ‘to be allocated to publishers in order to issue books, mostly reprints, of national importance in wartime, what became known as “essential” books that couldn’t otherwise be produced out of a publisher’s normal quota’ (p. 25).

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ The University of Reading Special Collections, Allen&Unwin Collection, 119/3.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 237/12.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 173/5.

⁶⁴ Richard J. Aldrich, 'Putting Culture into the Cold War: The Cultural Relations Department (CRD) and British Covert Information Warfare', in *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe 1945-1960*, edited by Giles Scott-Smith and Hans Krabbendam (London: Frank Cass, 2003), pp. 86-106 (103).

⁶⁵ John P. C. Matthews, 'The West's Secret Marshall Plan for the Mind', *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence*, 16.3 (2003), 409-427 (p. 422).

⁶⁶ See Alfred A. Reisch, *Hot Books in the Cold War: The CIA-Funded Secret Western Book Distribution Program Behind the Iron Curtain* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2013) and W. Scott Lucas and C.J. Morris, 'A Very British Crusade: The Information Research Department and the Beginning of the Cold War', in *Espionage, Security, and Intelligence in Britain, 1945-1970*, edited by Richard Aldrich (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 85-110.